

## MINNESOTA.

James H. Toffemire to be postmaster at Jeffers, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## MISSISSIPPI.

Woodard M. Herring to be postmaster at Inverness, Miss. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

J. R. Moreland to be postmaster at Philipp, Miss. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Nora B. Rose to be postmaster at Shelby, Miss., in place of Rosa Mayers, resigned.

William J. Stephens to be postmaster at Webb, Miss. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## MISSOURI.

Robert J. Ball to be postmaster at Gallatin, Mo., in place of Robert J. Ball. Incumbent's commission expires May 1, 1917.

Frank D. Lair to be postmaster at Charleston, Mo., in place of Eugene H. Smith, resigned.

## NEBRASKA.

Laura E. Smith to be postmaster at Doniphan, Nebr. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Arthur H. Rollins to be postmaster at Andover, N. H. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## NEW YORK.

George B. Burdick to be postmaster at De Ruyter, N. Y., in place of Charles P. Monro, resigned.

Thomas G. Patten to be postmaster at New York, N. Y., in place of Edward M. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1915.

Eva K. Stuppelbeen to be postmaster at Nassau, N. Y., in place of Eva S. Kirby, name changed by marriage.

Herbert C. Wood to be postmaster at Morrisville, N. Y., in place of Irving D. Blowers, resigned.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

H. Roy Martin to be postmaster at Mayodan, N. C. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

R. E. Itskin to be postmaster at Hazen, N. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## OHIO.

Lena L. Reed to be postmaster at Amanda, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

George M. Towle to be postmaster at Sardis, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## OKLAHOMA.

Samuel L. Arnold to be postmaster at Devol, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Edwin R. Harrison to be postmaster at Byars, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

C. B. McCallon to be postmaster at Kiefer, Okla., in place of O. P. Ramsey, resigned.

David M. Watson to be postmaster at Francis, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

C. E. Chapel to be postmaster at Youngsville, Pa., in place of Ephraim A. Swanson, deceased.

John L. Goss to be postmaster at Expedit, Pa., in place of Thomas F. Curry, resigned.

J. W. Keffer to be postmaster at Starjunction, Pa., in place of Isaac Lowe, resigned.

Ella I. Price to be postmaster at Canadensis, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

W. A. Walker to be postmaster at Warren, Pa., in place of Edwin R. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired August 20, 1916.

## TENNESSEE.

J. B. Moore to be postmaster at Smithville, Tenn., in place of Clarence W. Moore, resigned.

Joe D. Sperry to be postmaster at Mount Juliet, Tenn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## WISCONSIN.

Frank H. Grimm to be postmaster at Cassville, Wis., in place of Aloys Grimm, resigned.

Malcolm McNaughton to be postmaster at New Auburn, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Richard S. Serrurier to be postmaster at Wilton, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Oscar M. Waterbury to be postmaster at Williams Bay, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## VIRGINIA.

William D. Davies to be postmaster at Manassas, Va., in place of A. W. Sinclair, deceased.

Harry A. Lamb to be postmaster at Ocean View, Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## WITHDRAWAL.

*Executive nomination withdrawn February 17 (legislative day of February 14), 1917.*

Mary L. Sage to be postmaster at Milroy, Ind.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 17, 1917.

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

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

O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth, before whom millions prostrate themselves day unto day and night unto night! Teach us wisdom, justice, mercy, truth, righteousness; that our worship may be free from cant and hypocrisy; that it may be acceptable unto Thee and inspiring to us; that we may meet all the conditions of life without fear and go forth to the work Thou hast given us to do willingly, patiently, conscientiously, leaving the results to Thee; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 19410) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, had requested a conference with the House on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, and Mr. TOWNSEND as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 12463. An act for the relief of Meredith G. Corlett, a citizen and resident of Williamson County, Tenn.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 6850. An act authorizing the transfer of certain retired Army officers to the active list; and

S. 7872. An act to confirm and ratify the sale of the Federal building site at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey and Mr. JONES members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Treasury Department.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 8113. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 8120. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 6690. An act for the relief of Americus A. Gordon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3771. An act for the relief of Alfred Cluff, Orson Cluff, Henry E. Norton, William B. Ballard, Elijah Hancock, Mrs. Susan R. Saline, Oscar Mann, Celia Thayne, William E. Cox, Theodore Farley, Adelaide Laxton, Clara L. Tenney, George M. Adams, Charlotte Jensen, Sophia Huff, Peter H. McBride, and David Edward Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

## POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOON, Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LEWIS rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 19410) be printed with the Senate amendments numbered. If there is no objection, I will be glad if the House would send this bill to conference and disagree to the amendments of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. How many requests is the gentleman making at once?

Mr. MOON. Two or three of them, but I will divide them. [Laughter.] The first is that the bill be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I believe that will be done without request under the practice.

Mr. MOON. That is true, but it is not always done.

The SPEAKER. That will be done.

Mr. MANN. I was going to say that I did not think it was desirable—

Mr. MOON. And then I ask that the Senate amendments be disagreed to and that the conferees be appointed.

Mr. MANN. I do not think it is desirable, Mr. Speaker, to take action on the Senate amendments until we have had them printed, and certainly not before Tuesday in any event.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman want a time fixed?

Mr. MANN. I do not think it is possible to take action on these amendments before they are printed, and I do not think it is possible to take action before Tuesday.

Mr. MOON. I have no objection to that, Mr. Speaker. Let the matter go over until Tuesday. I thought it might be disposed of this morning, but if there is objection to it, let it go over until Tuesday. I just ask that the bill be held on the Speaker's table. We can take it up later.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS HOUSE.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one hour on the general subject of this bill.

The SPEAKER. On the general subject of what?

Mr. LEWIS. On the general subject of the military bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent, before the House goes into committee, to address the House for one hour on the Army bill. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. It will not take very long to determine whether unanimous consent will be given.

The SPEAKER. It will not take half a minute to dispose of this other matter, either.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Pending that request, I ask unanimous consent to have considered a resolution which I would like to have read at the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania objecting to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I do not object, but I make this request. It can be quickly determined. I do not want to take the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Lewis] off his feet. This matter can be determined in a few minutes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9, 1917, pages 3220-3221, contained a statement by the Hon. OSCAR CALLAWAY, Member of Congress from Texas, charging that "the J. P. Morgan interests" and others had engaged certain persons "to purchase the policy, national and international" of certain newspapers in the matter "of preparedness arguments and misrepresentations as to the present condition of the United States Army and Navy, and the possibility and probability of the United States being attacked by foreign foes" and for "the suppression of everything in opposition to the wishes of the interests served":

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives appoint a select committee of seven Members of the House, with instructions to inquire into the charges made in the printed statement of the said Hon. OSCAR CALLAWAY, Member of Congress from Texas, as inserted by him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9, 1917, pages 3220-3221, respecting an alleged arrangement by "the J. P. Morgan interests" and others to engage certain persons "to purchase the policy, national and international" of certain newspapers in the matter "of preparedness arguments and misrepresentations as to the present condition of the United States Army and Navy, and the possibility and probability of the United States being attacked by foreign foes," and for "the suppression of everything in opposition to the wishes of the interests served," and such other matters as relate to the preparation, transmission, dissemination, or control, by advertisement or otherwise, of false or misleading information concerning the preparedness of the Army and Navy of the United States, or the suppression of truthful information in newspapers, magazines, or other publications, or as to other matters affecting the neutrality of the United States in its relations with foreign countries, or tending to disturb the peace of the United States; and to make effective such inquiry the select committee herein authorized shall have power to enforce the attendance of persons in Washington or elsewhere, to administer oaths to such persons, and to require the production of such books and papers as may be pertinent to the

inquiry; and to pay the expenses of such committee the sum of \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any unexpended balance in the Treasury.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection myself to that resolution. I object only to its being called up at the present time. I shall object to its consideration now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will say to the gentleman that certain responsible newspapers have demanded an investigation of this matter, and it seems important, in the interest of honest journalism in the United States, that the charges made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] should be investigated. Inasmuch as there is but a very brief time between now and adjournment of Congress, it is evident that the resolution should be acted upon immediately.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. ADAIR. Does not the gentleman believe that this House has already wasted enough of the people's money in making investigations of charges that have no foundation whatever?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That may be. The House has been very wasteful, I fear, in making other investigations; but this is an important matter, affecting not only the dignity of the House but the welfare of the country, and no committee should be expected to undertake to make an investigation of this kind at its own expense.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Has the gentleman any inside information to base this upon except newspaper reports?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have the word of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] that he can prove the statements made by him in the RECORD. I am not making the charges. I am asking an investigation of the charges made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY], who states that he has proof of these charges.

Mr. ADAIR. A few weeks ago we had the assurance of a gentleman by the name of Lawson that he could prove his own charges, and we investigated them, and now the taxpayers will pay the expenses.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That investigation developed some things that are of interest to the country and that certain information came from very high sources.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I do not disagree with the statements contained in the resolution, but I do not think it ought to displace the consideration of this bill, and I therefore shall have to object to unanimous consent.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What is the gentleman's thought—that it should be brought up on Monday?

Mr. DENT. I shall not have anything to do with the control of the calendar on Monday. I understand the debate will go over until Tuesday.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of decent journalism, which asks for an investigation, I make the request. If it is objected to, I can not prevent that.

Mr. DENT. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama objects.

CONFEDERATE VETERANS' ASSOCIATION REUNION.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution 157, giving authority to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make special regulations for the occasion of the reunion of the Confederate Veterans' Association, to be held in the District of Columbia in the year 1917, and for other purposes incident to said encampment. I do not believe it will take many minutes to consider it.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker lays before the House the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157).

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to make such special regulations for the occasion of the reunion of the Confederate Veterans' Association, which will take place in the District of Columbia in the year 1917, as they shall deem advisable for the preservation of public order and the protection of life and property, to be in force one week prior to said encampment, during said encampment, and one week subsequent thereto. Such special regulations shall be published in one or more of the daily newspapers of the District of Columbia, and no penalty prescribed for the violation of such regulations shall be enforced until five days after such publication; and said commissioners are authorized and directed to establish a special schedule of fares applicable to public conveyances in said District during the period aforesaid. Any person violating any of the aforesaid regulations or the aforesaid schedule of fares shall, upon conviction thereof in the police court of the said Dis-



tract, be liable for such offense to a fine not to exceed \$100, and in default of payment of such fine imprisonment in the workhouse or jail of said District for not longer than 60 days. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its approval, and the sum of \$11,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, payable from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and from the revenues of the District of Columbia in equal parts, is hereby appropriated to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to carry out the provisions of section 1 of this joint resolution, \$1,000 of which shall be available for the construction, maintenance, and operation of public-comfort stations and information booths, under the direction of said commissioners.

Sec. 2. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to permit the committee on illumination of the citizens' executive committee for the entertainment of the Confederate Veterans' Association to stretch suitable conductors, with sufficient supports wherever necessary, for the purpose of effecting the said illumination within the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the said conductors shall not be used for the conveying of electrical currents more than three days after the close of said reunion, and shall, with their supports, be fully and entirely removed from the streets and avenues of the said city of Washington on or before 10 days after said reunion: *Provided further*, That the stretching and removing of the said wires shall be under the supervision of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who shall see that the provisions of this resolution are enforced; that all needful precautions are taken for the protection of the public; and that the pavement of any street, avenue, or alley disturbed is replaced in as good condition as before entering upon the work herein authorized: *Provided further*, That no expense or damage on account of or due to the stretching, operation, or removing of the said temporary overhead conductors shall be incurred by the United States or the District of Columbia: *And provided further*, That if it shall be necessary to erect wires for illumination purposes over any park or reservation in the District of Columbia that the work of erection and removal of said wires shall be under the supervision of the official in charge of said park or reservation.

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy be, and they are hereby, authorized to loan to the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of street decorations, or his successor in said office, for the purpose of decorating the streets of the city of Washington, D. C., on the occasion of the reunion of the Confederate Veterans' Association, 1917, such of the United States ensigns, flags (except battle flags), signal numbers, etc., belonging to the Government of the United States as in their judgment may be spared and are not in use by the Government at the time of the reunion. The loan of the said ensigns, flags, signal numbers, etc., to said chairman shall not take place more than 10 days prior to said reunion and shall be returned by him within 10 days from the close of the reunion.

Sec. 4. That for the protection and return of said ensigns, flags, signal numbers, etc., the said chairman, or his successor in office, shall execute and deliver to the President of the United States, or to such officer as he may designate, a satisfactory bond in the penalty of \$50,000 to secure just payment for any loss or damage to said ensigns, flags, and signal numbers not necessarily incident to the use specified.

Sec. 5. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to grant permits to the citizens' executive committee for the entertainment of the Confederate veterans' reunion for the use of any reservation or other public spaces in the city of Washington on the occasion of said reunion which, in his opinion, will inflict no serious or permanent injuries upon such reservations or public spaces or statutory therein; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may designate for such and other purposes on the occasion aforesaid such streets, avenues, and sidewalks in said city of Washington as they may deem proper and necessary: *Provided, however*, That all stands and platforms that may be erected on the public spaces aforesaid shall be under the supervision of the said citizens' executive committee and in accordance with plans and designs to be approved by the Superintendent of the Capitol, the Commissioner of Public Buildings and Grounds, and the building inspector of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 6. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to loan to the chairman of the medical department of the citizens' executive committee for said reunion, or his successor in said office, for the purpose of caring for the sick, injured, and infirm on the occasion of the said reunion, such hospital tents and camp appliances and other necessities, hospital furniture, and utensils of all descriptions, ambulances, horses, drivers, stretchers, and Red Cross flags and poles belonging to the Government of the United States as in his judgment may be spared and are not in use by the Government at the time of the encampment: *Provided*, That the said chairman, or his successor in said office, shall indemnify the War Department for any loss to such hospital tents and appliances as aforesaid not necessarily incident to such use.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this being a joint resolution that would require consideration in Committee of the Whole, I suggest to the gentleman that he ask unanimous consent to consider it in the House, not in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House in lieu of in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the resolution be considered in the House. Is there objection to that?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

MEDAWAKANTON AND WAHPAKOOTA (SANTEE) SIOUX INDIANS.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a further conference on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on Senate bill 135.

Mr. KEATING. What is the bill?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863. Members of the House will remember that the matter was before the House a few days ago. There is a division between the House and Senate which seems to be irreconcilable, but I ask for a further conference.

Mr. MANN. We passed the Senate bill with a House amendment. Have not the Senate asked for a conference?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I understand so. The bill is on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The Senate asks for a conference. Now, the gentleman from Texas asks to take this bill from the Speaker's table and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. NORTON.

#### ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to address the House for one-half hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] asks unanimous consent to address the House for one-half hour on the Army appropriation bill. Is there objection?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to say to the gentleman from Maryland asking time on the bill that I had already agreed to give away all the time I had at my disposal. Much to the regret, I am sure, of the entire membership the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] will not be a Member of the House after the 4th of March, and under these circumstances I will not object to one-half hour being used by the gentleman, but I shall have to object to any further requests as long as this bill is under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, we are now launched into militarism. It is not our fault. The world's events are responsible. A generation ago our military expenditures were small. To-day, when this measure, with its sister measure, the Navy bill, shall have passed, this Government will be on a more expensive military footing than perhaps any Government before the war. And yet in modern times war, apart from its inhumanity, has lost all its logic. Centuries ago it might have promised a gambler's chance of gain to the victor. He could profit if he won. He could make slaves of the conquered population, confiscate their property, and work them unpaid. But this is all past. Human nature does change, you see. He can not enslave the vanquished, and he can only confiscate public property, such as roads, streets, courthouses, schools. But since he has to maintain these when he takes them, there is no advantage even in confiscation. In modern times this has also proven true of colonial conquest. There is not a colony which confers any business advantage on the governing country. We know that of our colonies. Rather, they are a bill of expense, and just a fearful anxiety. England knows this, too. Not one of her citizens has been made a shilling richer by her territorial acquisitions. During the jubilee an English beggar on the streets of London was heard to say:

I own Canada, the Australias, colonies in Africa, and the islands of the far Pacific, and here I am, starving for a crust of bread. I am a citizen of the greatest power of the modern world, and all people should bow to my greatness. But yesterday I asked alms of a negro savage, and he repulsed me with disgust.

Two years of war have cost Great Britain and Germany, Austria and Russia each enough treasure to thrice rebuild their railways—three generations of toll. War—it is a cheat as well as a crime.

#### ANARCHISM CAUSE OF WAR.

But, you ask, if war is unprofitable, grossly unprofitable, if it is atrocious and inhuman besides, why is it still resorted to? This question brings us to the real and responsible cause of war, to the cause of this war. What was its cause? My answer is that it was international anarchy, the absence of government in the community of nations, primarily in the relations of Austria and Serbia, then its absence generally in the international relations of the neutral and warring nations of the world.

Why is it that Governments themselves organized to preserve public order are themselves the chief offenders against public order? I call your attention now to something thoroughly kindergarten, it is true, but apparently, although kindergarten, essential to be expressed and emphasized in the present situation of our country and the world.



Public peace and order are institutional products in this world. They do not exist as a mere growth of sentiment and noble purpose. They exist, wherever they exist, as the result of a certain kind of institution, and that institution is government. I call the attention of the House—it is hardly necessary—to the fact that in every community where peace and order obtains you have government. The township has peace and order. It has government. The county has peace and order. It has government. The State, as a community, has peace and order. It also has government. And finally, the great interstate community in which we live, the country of Washington, has peace and order, because it, too, has a government to procure it.

But when we come to the international community, where nations meet as individuals meet in the domestic community and have the same complexity of relations, what do you find? You find a state of indescribable disorder at this very moment, but you also find a community without a government. We are citizens in our domestic communities, but in the international community we are simply anarchists. I use that expression not as an epithet but as a term of description, for anarchism means nothing more or less than the absence of government in a public community.

Mr. Speaker, schoolboys will ask the question why it is that every community has a government except the international community alone. And their histories will answer, "Every government has been built by the sword, and because no conqueror's sword was long enough or strong enough to build a world government, government now stops, and the public order with it, at the national boundaries and the ocean's edge."

THE LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE.

Sir, much discussion has taken place recently of measures designed to prevent future wars, and among these is the League to Enforce Peace. The provisions of the plan are:

(a) That the nations agree to submit their justiciable differences to an arbitration tribunal for decision. (Only a portion of the contentions between nations are regarded as "justiciable.")

(b) Other questions, e. g., privileges of immigration, which are nonjusticiable in character, to be submitted to a conciliation tribunal for recommendation.

(c) For one year, awaiting such decision or recommendation, neither party to the controversy shall make war upon the other.

(d) That neither party shall be bound by the decision, but if either nation shall fail to give such preliminary year of truce and commit an act of war, then—

(e) The other nations shall make war upon it.

(f) Existing international law may be amended at conferences of the nations, and be binding if no nation dissents to such amendment.

All of which means that war is proposed to be avoided only by "unanimous consent." The laws can only be enacted by unanimous consent; the decisions of the arbitral tribunal are effective only by consent of the parties to the controversy; the castigation of the offending nation is to be left to the 41 other nations in the trust that they will unanimously join in executing the punitive program. All of which, I repeat, means that war is to be discontinued only by "unanimous consent."

Mr. SLAYDEN. Is it not true that no arbitration award of international disputes has ever been disregarded, and is not such more to be desired and easier obtained than a scheme of international government?

Mr. LEWIS. With all respect to the gentleman's view of the matter, I fear that when the world's publicists come to analyze the plan, it presents so many novel elements, so many elements of uncertainty that conservative men will instinctively prefer the other alternative, namely, a full-fledged government. They know what government does. They know how government does it. They understand government perfectly. But as to any new-fangled schemes, a league to enforce peace—not a league to enforce law—for example, nobody knows what it may mean; and it probably would not mean as much as the Articles of Confederation which preceded our Constitution.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman permit an interruption and a question?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I am much interested in the gentleman's address, with the greater part of which I am in hearty agreement. I believe that I know his great purpose in advancing this argument. He is inspired by love for his fellow men and sympathy with them in their troubles. He wants to promote international peace, to banish wars and their cruelties from the face of the earth forever more. But why not follow the line of least resistance? Why undertake so impossible a task as a world government, with legislative, judicial, and executive

functions, and its necessary surrender of sovereignty by the individual governments, when experience suggests that universal peace may be secured by a simpler device and one that will involve no such national sacrifice? The gentleman knows that no international arbitral award has ever been disregarded, and we have had them for a hundred years or more. Why not, under these circumstances, try a world court of arbitration and, if you please, a world court for justiciable questions? Enough countries have already, at one time or another, assented to such a plan to encourage us to believe that it can be had without much more delay, and it has established its efficiency in the peaceful adjustment of many international disputes.

Mr. LEWIS. The gentleman is entitled to his opinions about the lines of least resistance. We have no way to decide that point. But about arbitration, let us see. When arbitration works, it works. But voluntary arbitration did not work for the Boer War, the Spanish-American War, the Russo-Japanese War, nor yet the present war. Ex-President Taft is the principal sponsor of this plan, and his present activities for world order make him illustrious, if nothing else had. If the Blaines and the Cleveland, if the Bismarcks and the Gladstones had so done their duty in their generation so it might have been. Now, Mr. Taft proposes to make the submission of controversies compulsory, through a treaty among the nations of the world. His object is my object—the securing of public order in the international community. But his plan, like any mere arbitration plan, is only a rope of sand. It may, indeed, comport with some men's ideas of the "lines of least resistance" in world politics, but its analysis of the nature of the subject matter is so very inadequate as to offer us only a chateau en Espagne.

The international community does not differ from the domestic community in the ingredients or requirements for securing public order; and we all know an arbitration scheme would not suffice for a domestic community. Nations meet in the international community just as individuals meet in the domestic community. They also are liable to have their cross-purposes and misunderstandings just like individuals. So the international community does not differ from the domestic community in the ingredients and requirements producing public order. What are they?

First. Rules of conduct, specific laws, defining the rights and duties of the parties, provided in advance, and which, being clearly understood, thus avoid nearly all potential controversies.

Second. A judiciary to decide disputed cases of law or fact, not responsible for the merits or demerits of the law, and without power to change it to suit particular cases, thus making its application wholly impersonal.

Third. Last and not least, the police power, an officer with no discretion except to enforce the law.

These three elements render the social law like a law of nature, a mechanical or a chemical law, because if it exists in advance the subject, knowing its meaning before he acts, can harmonize his conduct to it; and if it befalls him to have misunderstood, not his possible enemy, but an impartial institution, adjudicates the dispute, while an impartial agency will certainly call upon him for obedience to its decrees.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I understood the gentleman to say there would still be instances that could not be settled by this tribunal.

Mr. LEWIS. Yes. I was speaking of the League to Enforce Peace. Only justiciable causes are adjudicable. Nonjusticiable causes—that is, cases for which existing international rules supply no regulation; the gaps in international law, so to speak—would be referred to a conciliation board, with power to give advice only to the contending parties.

Now, my answer to the gentleman from Texas is that all of these elements of formal law have been found preessential to the maintenance of public order in domestic communities. An arbitration tribunal gives none of them. The rules of conduct, worked out in such elaborate detail, for our domestic relations; the court with processes so various as to fit all our individual relations, and compulsory processes, too, and the police power, all acting in complete coordination to achieve the objects of preserving security and public order; none of these, I say, are within the reach of the arbitration method. That the plan proposed is deficient in these respects is seen if it be but applied as a preventive to the existing war. (a) There were no rules of conduct, international law, that an arbitration tribunal could have applied to punish the alleged Serbian conspirators. The extraterritorial crime committed was not therefore a justiciable cause. Well, then, as a last resort, what could the second tribunal of conciliation have done? It could have delayed the matter, it is urged, for a year, giving the passions time to cool. But suppose they did not cool? Few people believe this method would have sufficed. Europe was headed for "der tag" as the inevitable consequence of ambitions formed and purposes con-



ceived, in a community where anarchism gave no nation rights that were indubitable, or duties that were adequately defined. (b) But suppose the tribunal had pronounced a decision or made a recommendation unsatisfactory to one of the parties, or even to both them, what then? Its decision could not be enforced, says the plan. And so we are where we began, anarchy and still more anarchy.

Mr. Speaker, of course, an arbitration tribunal is not a court, and can not do service for one. Said Prof. Seeley 70 years ago:

We have a problem of federation before us and not merely of constituting a law court. The law court is not only historically found invariably within the State, but it also takes all its character and efficiency from the State. It is a matter of demonstration that a State is implied in a law court, and as a necessary consequence, that an international law court implies an international State. The nations of Europe must therefore constitute themselves into some sort of federation, or the international court can never come into existence. Judges can not constitute themselves, and a judicial assembly is inconceivable without a legislative assembly of some kind executing its sentences.

Real law is the formal product of political government. The legislative, judicial, and executive functions are complementary, the flesh, blood, and bone of effective law. I despair of the plan that offers but one or two of them. We must have the rule of conduct first, to know what we should do; second, the judge to say what should be done, when the facts or law are disputed; and third, the force, for the rare personality that respects neither rule nor judge. Experience with domestic institutions shows that a definite rule of conduct operates to prevent controversy in nearly all cases; that the judge's decision is efficacious alone in the rest, except for an infinitesimal number, where the sheriff's club is required. Why should the experience be different in international affairs, if a precise and obligatory rule of conduct has been provided in advance? If I were compelled to choose from the disjecta membra of government but one of its members instead of all three, I should take the first, namely, the "rule of conduct," as most efficacious. If the "rule of conduct" were present, so that nations could clearly see how to avoid offending, or if still offending, precise rules were at hand by which to identify their offense, something might be expected of the coercive power of a public opinion, shared by all the world. Meanwhile what sound hope can we have for a mere arbitration tribunal, with no rules (or insufficient rules) of conduct, prescribed in advance? Its judgments must be in the nature of *ex post facto*, or retrospective lawmaking, and thus deter submission of causes or incite recalcitrancy to the disappointing decision. And what confidence could be placed in the operation of an executive force left to 40 different States, each to determine whether it would lend it or not? "Enforced peace" its sponsors call it. In all sincerity, what is that? I understand "enforced law." I will entrust my life and my property to it. But "enforced peace," who would prefer to commit his own life or his own property to such a Robbin Goodfellow, to such a Will of the Wisp as that?

What is this "arbitration" but more executory agreements for the interested diplomats to construe and break, as heretofore? Surely, the world has exhausted its faith in the sufficiency of the promises of diplomats. Says Seeley again:

In order to be really vigorous and effectual such a system absolutely requires a federation of the closer kind; that is, a federation not after the model of the late German Bund, but after the model of the United States, a federation with a complete apparatus of powers—legislative, executive, and judicial—and raised above dependence upon State governments.

#### AN INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION.

Is it not a government for the international community that we need? Then why waste our opportunity on new and doubtful substitutes when the institutions thoroughly tried out in analogous situations are at hand?

Mr. EMERSON. How would the gentleman have the international legislature constituted?

Mr. LEWIS. I should follow the Constitution of the United States, redrafted as the Constitution of the United Sovereign States. With the elimination of a few hundred words from its clauses and as many words added here and there it would serve to bring them the same orderly progression and security it has given our own sovereign States.

When the American Colonies threw off their adhesion to the British Empire they were 13 sovereign States, with all the extraterritorial relations implied in the international status, including the power to make treaties and to make war. The Federal Constitution, which provides an interstate or international government, was designed to cover these international or interstate relations, which, be it noticed, were much more numerous because of their contiguity than those we encounter among the historical nations of the world. But the inducing causes for the American Union were hardly as great as those calling now for international federation.

The problems then and now to me seem quite identical. There is the program of substituting law for anarchy in interstate intercourse, the protection of State boundaries, and sovereignty in local affairs, the conquering of the fear by the smaller State that the larger one would seize the international government and misuse it, the fear of the larger State that artful combinations of smaller States would strip it of its prestige or graft upon its prosperity. These fears were overcome. By splitting the legislative organization into two sections, the Senate representing the States as sovereigns, the House their people according to numbers, these disparities have been equalized and State apprehensions wholly dissipated. How does this problem differ then and now?

The fear of violation of boundaries or absorption of the powers of the State by the federation were presented. They were met by guaranties—and those guaranties have been effective, we say. How does this problem differ then and now?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. But if there were questions of sovereignty raised by the individual nations, would it not require as much armament as each nation requires at the present time?

Mr. LEWIS. Well, that problem hardly differed then and now.

The danger and fear of individual State militarism was there. It was met by the Constitution with a provision that no State "shall without the consent of Congress keep troops or ships of war in time of peace \* \* \* or engage in war unless actually invaded," and the State militia should be subject to Federal command. Disarmament established in a line. How does this problem differ then and now? Especially, how does it differ if the federation should acquire by purchase the existing armaments and military implements of the nations to execute its own laws, guaranteeing defensive protection to the respective member States?

Does not experience indicate that the promulgation of the rules of conduct and the obvious guaranties, such as the prohibition of invasion of one State by another and Federal non-interference in internal affairs of the States, would prove the end of international controversies. Practically this is the result that has followed the like guaranties under our Constitution.

Mr. BORLAND. I am very much interested in the parallel the gentleman is drawing between his proposed plan and the Constitution of the United States. The gentleman is aware that the Constitution had to withstand the shock of the argument that the arrangement between the States was simply a league by treaty and was not a consolidation into an indissoluble Nation. That is one question I would like to have the gentleman address himself to,

Mr. LEWIS. Well, with regard to the idea, and the former argument, that our Union was only a league between States: It may have been so designed; it certainly was primarily an international government for 13 independent States, but in a century it has developed such solidarity of spirit and interest as to have evolved from an international into a national form of government, to a substantial extent. There are many national things—indeed, most national things—it can not even now do, and may never do, that still remain with the States. Its primary purpose was to abolish struggle and possible war between our States. Virginia and Maryland had as much to quarrel about as other nations. Most people think it has now permanently succeeded. I quote a pertinent paragraph from Prof. Seeley:

In spite of their one internal war the American Union may be said to have solved the problem of abolishing war, and we may see there the model which Europe should imitate in her international relations. Now, this great triumph of the Union was achieved on the very ground upon which an earlier Confederation had conspicuously failed in the same undertaking; and a comparison of the two federations shows that where the Federal organization was lax, and decisively disentangled from the State organizations, the federation failed; it succeeded when the Federal bond was strengthened.

Now, supposing the federation to embrace all three elements of government, i. e., the legislative, the judicial, and the executive functions, what legislative powers should be granted this international government? I suggest the following as necessary to prevent war:

(a) To guarantee the inviolability of national boundaries and protect them from invasion by any sovereign State.

(b) To punish individuals for extraterritorial offenses against a State or its citizens.

(c) To substitute interstate laws for treaties, secure equal rights upon the seas, and exercise exclusive jurisdiction over treaties.

(d) To purchase existing national armament and military implements, and limit the armed force permissible to any State to its domestic needs of peace and order.



(e) The power of taxation for these ends and the right to maintain an army and navy.

It is submitted that such powers exercised in a governmental way would be effective to prevent war among the States, members of the Union.

To promote the progress of the world and invest the new Government with a continuous life activity, I should add:

(f) Power to make laws concerning all the merely international relations of the States and their citizens.

(g) Extradition and navigation regulations.

(h) Uniform laws on commercial paper, etc.

(i) To coin money, fix weights and measures, establish international posts, patent regulations, and copyrights.

The principal changes necessary in our Federal Constitution to effect these objects are thought to be:

The selection of the two Senators from each State by the authority which now appoints ambassadors.

The selection of the representatives, one for each 10,000,000 of population, by the legislature, no State to have less than two.

The election of President and Vice President according to the original plan provided in our Constitution.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman is making a fine argument, to which most of us can agree. Will the gentleman discuss the manner of enforcing the decrees of this tribunal?

Mr. LEWIS. The way of enforcing judgments and decrees would be just what you know here. You would have a Federal legislature constituted from among the member nations as our legislature is constituted from the States, the Senate representing the sovereigns and the House representing their populations. You would have courts like ours to enforce its enactments. Its laws would bear directly upon the citizens and subjects of the member nations just as ours do on ours. I quote Prof. Seeley:

The special lesson which is taught by the experience of the Americans is that the decrees of the federation must not be handed over for execution to the officials of the separate States, but that the federation must have an independent and separate Executive, through which its authority must be brought to bear directly upon individuals. The individual must be distinctly conscious of his obligation to the federation and of his membership in it; all federations are mockeries that are mere understandings between Governments.

With regard to any nation not joining the union—the federation—we should bear the same relations to it a nation does now.

In addition to our Bill of Rights, of which little need be changed, a guaranty of noninterference with the import and export tariff laws of the States should be added. And there should be a distinct statement that the citizens of the different States should be citizens of the union of sovereign States as well and owe its allegiance to make its laws operate directly upon them. Thus sovereign States would not be the offenders if offenses were committed. The citizens directly concerned would be the offending parties, and be denied the shelter of an intervening State authority. The constitution, treaties, and acts of the congress would be the supreme law, as in the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. Our Constitution provides that each State, members of the Union, shall be guaranteed a republican form of government. In other words, it makes uniformity, homogeneity in the local government of the different States. That is another question to which I would like the gentleman to address himself.

Mr. LEWIS. Answering the gentleman, I should say that that guaranty would be plainly inapplicable and even unnecessary for the purpose of the federation. And with respect to the homogeneity of which the distinguished gentleman speaks: While I think it highly fortunate that we possess it for our domestic purposes, I do not consider that mere homogeneity of political institutions in the member States of the proposed federation is essential, or that its absence would affect an international structure any more than it now does the treaty-making power. The domestic institutions, the domestic life and history of the member States would not concern the federation in any institutional way. International subjects, important as they are, are really few in number.

Let us notice, for comparison's sake, what the task of the international lawmaker would be. Now, the generic subjects of international law are very few. Beginning with "Piracy," of which war is now about the only analogy, we have—

National boundaries, protection of.

Navigation regulations.

Passports.

Fisheries, and so forth.

International posts.

Minatory armament, and so forth.

Neutrality.

Extraterritorial crimes.

Belligerency, capture, and so forth.

Compared with the volume of domestic law, it is easy to see that this field is actually inconsiderable. And yet only a few of even these subjects are such as to require, peremptorily, the exercise of international rather than national government; that is, but a few of them have produced contentions resulting in war. National boundaries, colonization, extraterritorial crimes, captures, and perhaps minatory armament, so far are the subjects for which treaty lawmaking and diplomatic adjudication have proved inadequate.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY. One of the great difficulties in carrying on the Austro-Hungarian Government is the diversity of language to be found among the peoples of those two nations. What does the gentleman think of a Congress composed of all the nations of the world with a multiplicity of languages?

Mr. LEWIS. It would present difficulties, but mainly difficulties of speech. The present international situation presents impossibilities, regarded from any standpoint of human nature. [Applause.]

But I should not seem to dispose of this difficulty too curtly. It is, in my judgment, a difficulty, but only a provisional difficulty. A number of parliaments have already encountered it, and successfully. Provision can, apparently, be made to overcome it, even should it be necessary to ask that the legislator be acquainted with a language or two besides his own. The Austrian, Chinese, and, I think, the Swiss, Parliaments manage to overcome these lingual difficulties now. A record printed in three or four languages—well, print paper is high, but so is the cost of war, or even preparedness.

#### INITIATORY CONDITIONS.

How many nations should enter such federation to make it effective? Two minimum alternatives are proposed:

The eight great powers are Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Russia, and the United States.

First, its acceptance by a majority of the sovereign States, if the majority include any six of the above powers.

Second, its acceptance by any two-thirds of the sovereign States of the world.

The number of sovereign States, sending and receiving ambassadors, appears to be forty-three.

Mr. BORLAND. Does not the gentleman think that if a group of the greater powers were to enter into such a federation the moral effect would be to draw the remaining States in when they began to see the benefits which resulted to the domestic and foreign status of the member States, such as the reduction in the burden of armament and of the establishment of fortified frontiers, and the closer commercial, social, and intellectual intercourse, and so forth?

Mr. LEWIS. I think that would be inevitable. It happened here. All the smaller States, it is thought, would welcome an order of things guaranteeing their territorial and domestic integrity, and protecting them from attack on land or sea. Two or three States are now possibly ambitious for territorial aggrandizement, but this appetite is chiefly active during war. I do not think any of the European States would decline a union simply to save a possible chance of successful territorial conquest.

The pride of kings—would that deter some of the great powers? Before the war, perhaps yea. An authority external to their own they might have resented. But fearfully chastened by their present experience, I think it reasonable to hope that any such personal vanity has disappeared.

Mr. BORLAND. I understand the gentleman to say that we could not concern ourselves about the local government of the different States?

Mr. LEWIS. That would be my answer.

Mr. BORLAND. Would there not be a great diversity of their rights or powers over their people and the method of choosing their representatives, and so on, if we did not have some uniform standard of government?

Mr. LEWIS. A uniform standard is proposed for the selection of the legislators and the President. The latter would be selected through electors chosen by the legislators of the member States, as our first Presidents were selected. The legislators would be selected, the Senators by the authority in each nation that now selects ambassadors, and the representatives by the lower house; for illustration, the House of Commons, the Chamber of Deputies, the lower houses would select them. I



think there would not be great popular interest in the proceedings of the institution after it had become fully established. With public order and the inviolability of national boundaries conclusively established, its legislative subject matters would be so few and so remote from the affairs of common life that it would be mostly publicists, travelers, shippers, and so forth, that would commonly concern themselves with its work.

Mr. EMERSON. How would the gentleman get around the fact that nations of different races and religions might combine against other nations of different religions and races?

Mr. LEWIS. The nations being represented in that Congress as our States are represented in this, the relative possibilities can be compared. There does not seem more danger in that direction than there is of some of our States with a special interest controlling this whole body.

Mr. EMERSON. We see it done here every session.

Mr. LEWIS. These little difficulties to which you refer are negligible compared with the calamities of war.

Mr. DECKER. The gentleman stated a while ago that all national governments had been established by the sword.

Mr. LEWIS. For the most part.

Mr. DECKER. And even in our own country is it not a fact that there came a time when the sword had to maintain it? Well, now, does the gentleman think in that connection perhaps an international government might also have to come to the same sword? Has the gentleman thought of that? What suggestion has the gentleman as to that?

Mr. LEWIS. I have thought of that; and while the wisest human being can not peer very far through the abstruse complications of human circumstance into coming time, it has occurred to me that something might arise to endanger such a federation, just as slavery, the vulnus immedicable of our federation, challenged it. Now, with domestic questions like that, and the hundreds of others involved in our social relations, the federation would have, and should exercise, no power of interference whatever. But I can imagine one national condition of a character possibly making it international in its effect. In the generations to come an overcrowded India or China might demand access for its population to the less populated sections of the earth, demands which, being refused by the States concerned on racial or economic grounds, might lead to attempted secession from the union and to war. But the danger, if such it be, would be a danger as actual for the States unfederated, and the problem perhaps less soluble than with an organized international system.

Now, gentlemen of the House, what I have been saying is, of course, but kindergarten to men of your experience. It is a mere truism to say that public order and personal security mean but one thing at last, and that is government—monarchical government, republican government, aristocratic government, or democratic government, what you will, but still government. Humanity in all times and in all circumstances has adopted only this institution to secure peace and order in their domestic communities. I believe the time will come, I believe the time has come, when as Members of this great Parliament we should do all in our power to advance the day of public order for the community of nations. Experience has provided the form and the way.

"Oh, it can not be done; it is only a dream," says the pessimist, who is "afraid to brush down the cobwebs lest the ceiling may fall." But the trouble with your pessimist is, he dreams just as much as any other dreamer, but he always dreams nightmares. It can be done, say the fathers, who did it for us and who speak to all mankind through the institutions of which we are the human elements to-day. They supplied the form. We must supply the faith. It is the one thing necessary now, I submit. Faith, faith, the faith to act. And that, too, the fathers supplied us by their example in this very matter. All departures, any constructive changes, however well sustained by reason and experience, require faith. No effort can be truly great without it. Said the philosopher Turgot, "I never admired Columbus so much for discovering a new world as I did for going out to hunt for it on the faith of an opinion."

Washington had this faith. It is but the faith of the rational man that civilization can go on making progress in the future as it has done in the past. Columbus had it indeed. If it were not for his kind of faith we might not be here to-day. We can see in his example the ethical elements necessary in men's hearts for our situation. In the words of Webster, "I see him standing on the deck of his shattered bark, the shades of night falling on the sea, yet no man sleeping, tossed on the billows of an unknown ocean; yet the stronger billows of alternate hope and despair tossing his own troubled thoughts, extending forward his harassed form, straining westward his anxious and eager eyes, till Heaven at last granted him a moment of rapture and ecstasy

by blessing his vision with a sight of the unknown world." Is there a leadership in the world now equal to this great occasion? If there is, spirit of Washington bid him step forth. [Loud applause.]

#### APPENDIX.

##### PROGRAM LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE.

"We believe it to be desirable for the United States to join a league of nations binding the signatories to the following:

"First. All justiciable questions arising between the signatory powers, not settled by negotiation, shall, subject to the limitations of treaties, be submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment, both upon the merits and upon any issue as to its jurisdiction of the question.

"Second. All other questions arising between the signatories, and not settled by negotiation, shall be submitted to a council of conciliation for hearing consideration and recommendation.

"Third. The signatory powers shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military against any one of their number that goes to war or commits acts of hostility against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be submitted as provided in the foregoing.

"Fourth. Conferences between the signatory powers shall be held from time to time to formulate and codify rules of international law, which, unless some signatory shall signify its dissent within a stated period, shall thereafter govern in the decisions of the judicial tribunal mentioned in article 1."

##### THE TREATY-MAKING POWER.

The Peace Advocate suggests that several provisions of our Constitution would have to be changed to enable the Senate to ratify a treaty creating an international government with the exclusive power of making treaties, or the powers "to declare war," "raise and support armies," and so forth, now committed to the Senate and Congress. This suggestion overlooks the fundamental distinction between the "law" making and the "treaty" making powers under the Constitution. A law must be in "pursuance" of the Constitution; a treaty is not required to be. The Constitution provides:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

Laws operate only on land over which our Government is an exclusive sovereign, and can thus always so formulate them as to conform to the Constitution. But treaties operate upon other nations, and therefore must conform to the wills of all the signatory powers. For example: Our Constitution guarantees every State a republican form of government. But if a monarchical power were to occupy, say, the State of Maine, and vanquish us in the war, the treaty of peace might have to commit such State to a monarchical form of government through conquest. And no court could nullify such treaty on the ground that it violated the Constitution. This was all within the ken of those who made the Constitution. Therefore while only laws made in "pursuance" of the Constitution are valid, yet "all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States," are valid when properly ratified. Otherwise our first unsuccessful war, involving terms of peace disappointing to some alleged constitutional inhibitions, might find us institutionally impotent to make terms of peace with a superior force. In which event the Government itself would perish, and the whole Constitution with it, in the nature of things, and ex necessitate in case of war, the treaty-making right, or power, can not be subject to any such limitations. It is the right of self-preservation, and must be free footed and free armed.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 20783) making appropriations for the Army.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. SAUNDERS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20783) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Army War College: For expenses of the Army War College, being for the purchase of the necessary stationery; typewriters and exchange of same; office, toilet, and desk furniture; textbooks; books of reference; scientific and professional papers and periodicals; printing and binding; maps; police utensils; employment of temporary, technical, or



special services; and for all other absolutely necessary expenses, including \$25 per month additional to regular compensation to chief clerk of division for superintendence of the War College building, \$9,000.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Yesterday the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] addressed the House, and among other things he made the following statement, and it appears in the RECORD on page 3855. After referring to the present war in Europe, he said:

Now, we may be drawn into the struggle. If we are, whatever opinion we may have had in reference to the propriety of being drawn into the struggle will be merged in a universal opinion to stand for the country in what it determines to do. [Applause.] I want to call attention to this: Suppose we become engaged in the European war, and finally there are overtures for peace from one side or the other. If we are a party to the war, we have got to sit in at the final councils. We will have to help to determine the terms of peace, and at once, at one sweep, we will have abandoned the traditional and long-continued policy of the United States to remain supreme on the American Continent and to keep out of the complications of the European Continent. [Applause.] And when we engage in endeavoring to determine the boundary lines of the various nations of Europe, the terms upon which peace shall be made, the guaranties which will be exacted in reference to the small powers of Europe, we will have placed ourselves in a position where it becomes our duty to endeavor to regulate what Bulgaria or Greece or Serbia or Holland or Belgium or Russia or the great or small powers, wherever they may be, shall do. And when we undertake to enter a policy which requires us to interfere in European affairs we can no longer ask or insist upon the traditional policy of the United States that European countries shall keep their hands out of American affairs. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Illinois bases his statement as to what may occur upon the condition that we get into the European war, and, I suppose, nobody wants to dispute the consequences that might follow the result of our getting into the European war; but the very language used implies that getting into that controversy between the contending parties we will have to be a party to a final peace conference between those Governments, because in no other way can we be called into the final settlement of the issues between them, even down to the adjustment of the boundary lines of a few little Balkan Governments.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman had any idea, or intended to leave the impression, that we could not have an armed conflict with some one of the warring powers, no matter whether it is with an entente ally or with a central power, upon an issue arising simply and solely between that power and ourselves, but that by the very reason of the fact of having done so we would become a necessary party in the final councils as to peace between all the contending powers now in war with one another. In other words, that if we should have a controversy with England, France, Russia, or Germany about an issue exclusively between one of these powers and ourselves that we could not make a separate peace when we adjust that particular difficulty. Such an impression as this going forth to the country causes questions to be asked like those coming to us now by the hundreds in the form of postal cards. I suppose you have all received them. I will just read the first clause of one of these postal cards, which is in parentheses, as follows:

NOTE.—In modifying her war zone note, Germany has offered—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I was so much interrupted I would be glad to have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. Does not the gentleman feel that a discussion of this proposition on the floor of this House is more apt to aggravate the situation than anything else?

Mr. SIMS. I am trying to remove an erroneous representation of the subject that has already occurred.

Mr. EMERSON. Every other gentleman tries to remove it—

Mr. SIMS. You are taking up my time. I think it is proper to discuss it.

Mr. EMERSON. I stated yesterday that I should object to any Member discussing this proposition on the floor of this House until the President came to us and asked us to do so. Now, I am not—

Mr. SIMS. I did not hear the statement.

Mr. EMERSON. I am not going to object to the gentleman having five minutes more, but I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, to the Members of this House that those Members that are afflicted with this diarrhea of words on this subject will have to relieve themselves somewhere else than on the floor of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SIMS. Now, I hope I may have a little order, inasmuch as an ultimatum has been issued.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object, to observe that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr.

EMERSON] is about to go home, and that his objection will not last after he is married to-morrow.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that the gentleman from Pennsylvania reserved his objection too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserved his right to object just at the moment the gentleman from Ohio sat down.

Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SIMS. This postal card starts out by saying:

In modifying her war-zone note Germany has offered safe passage for all American passenger ships which keep to a prescribed course and which our Government guarantees free from contraband.

The first question is:

Do you think we should enter this war in order to uphold our legal right to go into the war zone regardless of these conditions?

That is an absolutely unfair question. It is one that is misleading. "To go into this war" is using the same language as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] used. That is wholly an assumption. Suppose that we resent and resist the violations of international law whereby the lives and property of American citizens are ruthlessly destroyed by Germany and at the same time England comes along and does identically the same thing in some other way and we resent that also, and we get into an armed conflict with both in undertaking to defend our rights as against both? Then what sort of a fix will we be in if sitting down to the final council as pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois? We will be on both sides of it. I do not believe that statement was worthy of the great ability and knowledge of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SIMS. Do not interrupt me now.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] referred to an interesting portion of our history—I was here at the time—when we got into the Spanish-American War, a war of aggression on our part, in which we invaded the soil of a foreign country on account of the treatment by that foreign country of its own citizens under its own flag on its own soil.

In that great war—not great except in the purpose for which it was waged—no referendum, by postal card or otherwise, was submitted to this Congress or demanded of it, and two distinguished gentlemen—I remember it well, because they have both been named in the House debate recently—one the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GARDNER, and the other the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Bryan, without compulsion, without this country having been invaded or even threatened with invasion, voluntarily joined the forces of the United States to invade a foreign country, to wage war upon Spain, because Spain did not regulate the conduct of her subjects according to the standards and ideals of the American people; and no referendum was asked, and no reproach has been put upon any man who went into that war for the purposes for which we waged it.

I think we did right as a matter of principle. We should stand for what is right, regardless of the size of the nation that invades our country or disregards our rights, whether on land or on sea. An invasion is usually referred to when a land attack is made, but you can invade our rights at sea as well as on land. These postal cards are so written and the question is so asked as not to get real information, but to get a misleading reply, and I think instead of helping us to keep faith with and uphold our President it is stirring up strife. Suppose the question was this: "Would you use the armed forces of the United States to save the lives and property of American citizens and their rights, guaranteed under the Constitution, against the unlawful encroachments of foreign powers?" They would say "Yes" every time.

We do not want war. The President does not want war. We are not seeking war. We may be forced into it. But we will not have to settle the boundary of Montenegro or any of the small nations of Europe, because we are defending our own rights on sea as well as on land. [Applause.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I want to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire, first, what the gentleman from Tennessee proposes to do?

Mr. KEATING. He proposed to strike out the last word in the paragraph just read by the Clerk, and I am always opposed to that amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, what is the matter with the American Army? That is a question that is frequently asked in this House and throughout the country in connection with our plans for national defense.



For some reason the American boy will not enlist in any great numbers in the American Army; and if he does enlist, he gets out of the Army as soon as possible.

Now, what is the trouble?

A great many gentlemen have appeared before committees of this House to answer that question.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. KEATING. I regret I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. KEATING. A great many gentlemen have attempted to answer that question. I want to submit to the House this morning the views of a man whose opinions, in my judgment, are entitled to respect. He is not a "mollycoddle." I do not think he is a "milksop." He is a man who has served perhaps 20 years in the Military Establishment of this country. For his years, I presume, he has seen as much actual service and has been under fire as often as any other man connected with the Military Establishment. The gentleman to whom I refer is Maj. William C. Harlee, of the Marine Corps.

In presenting his testimony before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, Maj. Harlee described his military service as follows:

I belong to the Marine Corps, the soldier corps of the Navy. I have served in the Volunteer Army as private, corporal, sergeant, and first sergeant during the Philippine insurrection, and as a cadet at the Military Academy at West Point for two years, and for 17 years as an officer of the Marine Corps, appointed from civil life.

Instead of attempting to militarize America and to bring America to the ideals of the present military orthodoxy, why not Americanize our military institution and bring it to the ideals of America?

When you have brought the military system in harmony with things American, you will find a different attitude toward it and no necessity for such drastic measures as compulsory or universal service.

The American people are not pusillanimous; they have not lost their military virtue; they need no system bolstered up by courts, jails, and military constabularies to bring them to a proper preparation for national defense.

Our present military institution violates some of our best American traditions. Purge it of the distasteful things, make it businesslike, adopt in it accepted American methods, and you will find thousands of willing men—more than you can take care of for military training. They are not willing, however, to enter it as it now stands. I interpret it as a protest against our methods and not as any indication that American manhood is on the decline.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Did the major describe what the American military methods are that he proposed to establish?

Mr. KEATING. Oh, yes, indeed. He describes them in detail, and at the request of the members of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs he has even prepared a bill; and with the consent of the House I will insert it in the RECORD, so that Members may read it. It is a soldier's bill, not prepared with the skill of a lawyer, but it states in plain language what a soldier believes is necessary in order to Americanize the American Army.

Mr. MADDEN. If a soldier has the ability to manage the forces of the American Army, he will probably be the general of the Army and not a private.

Mr. KEATING. Why, not at all. The gentleman from Illinois will understand that in order to secure promotion in the American Army at the present time the man above you must either resign or die, and military men do not resign, and they do not die in any great numbers.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that there are 1,700 vacancies in the American Army to-day.

Mr. HOWARD. Those are caused by the Hay bill. Those vacancies have never been filled.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, I am not going to enter into that. The gentleman knows as well as I do and a great deal better the methods of promotion in the American Army. He knows, as a matter of fact, that it is in the main a case of the other fellow dying or resigning.

Mr. TILSON. Or retiring.

Mr. KEATING. Or retiring.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not likely that a man who has served, as this man has served, in the ranks, knows something at least of the men who are to go into the ranks?

Mr. KEATING. That is exactly the value of this testimony. Here is a man of education, with experience as a private and as an officer.

Mr. GARDNER. Maj. Harlee served as a private as a volunteer and not in the Regular Army.

Mr. KEATING. That may be true. He served in the volunteer army as a private, and in various other positions. He has been at the Military Academy at West Point. He has served as an officer in the Marine Corps for 17 years. He knows something about the American Military Establishment. He goes on;

Our military institution is not an American development. It remains substantially unchanged since it was imported at the beginning of our Government from England and continental Europe, from countries where there were two classes of men—gentlemen and common men. The officers came from the gentleman class, the enlisted men represented the common caste. The situation fitted such a social structure, but it does not fit America. There is only one class of men here, except in the Military Establishment.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Has the gentleman examined into the walks of life from which our present American Army officers rise?

Mr. KEATING. It is not a question of the walk of life from which an officer comes, but it is the state of mind in which he emerges from the Military Academy. I know that boys are appointed to the Military Academy who are the sons of hod carriers and the sons of blacksmiths, but when they come out of the Military Academy they feel that their whole social status has been changed.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Certainly.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman has stated that Maj. Harlee was in the Military Academy. Can the gentleman state why he left there?

Mr. KEATING. I do not know, aside from his testimony; but I take it for granted that a man who is now a major in the Marine Corps of the United States severed his connection with the Military Academy in an honorable manner.

Mr. KAHN. I dare say. He may have been dropped, and he would get an honorable discharge for that.

Mr. KEATING. He may have failed in an examination. He may have resigned. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. KEATING. May I have five minutes more, Mr. Chairman, on account of the interruptions?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks an additional five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARDNER. Reserving the right to object, I should like to have 10 minutes in which to answer. I should like to couple this with the gentleman's request.

Mr. KEATING. I scarcely think, Mr. Chairman, that that is a fair proposition. I do not object to it, but I will suggest this: I have sat in this House and have treated the gentleman from Massachusetts with the courtesy to which I felt he was entitled. I have never objected to one of his requests, and have never coupled one of my requests with a request made by him. I trust the gentleman will withdraw his request.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto conclude at the expiration of 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I can not yield, because I am really more anxious to present Maj. Harlee's views to this House than I am to present my own.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to be interrupted.

Mr. KEATING. Maj. Harlee proceeds:

The law recognizes two separate and distinct classes of men in our military service. They are absolutely separate and distinct. There is a line of cleavage between them. Pride and self-respect are the best elements of military character. Caste crushes them both. Napoleon destroyed caste because it injured the business. The impulse which the French Revolution gave to the French Army has never reached the American Regular Establishment.

There was no caste in the Confederate Army nor the citizen army of the United States in the sixties. Why breed it in barracks armies to serve as a model for citizen soldiery?

#### OATH OF ENLISTMENT OBNOXIOUS.

The thing above all others which prevents men from entering the military service is the oath of enlistment. It is an oath of bondage. Any other employer who contracted with men on this basis would be guilty of peonage—a felony under the law of the Nation which practices it itself. In my own experience in recruiting I found men unwilling to subscribe to such an oath. It is not fair to men who are unfamiliar with the military service to ask them to enter into any such agreement and it is not necessary. There is an instinct in young men which in-



spires an ambition to be a soldier, and plenty of men are willing and anxious to be of service if it can only be done in an honorable and respectable way—witness the men who went to Plattsburg—but they are not willing to be branded as men of a lower caste or in time of peace to subscribe to an oath of bondage.

#### DISSATISFIED MEN OF NO VALUE.

Unhappy or dissatisfied men are of no service to a military or any other body, and it is better policy to let them go, and then if everybody should go to inquire into the cause and seek the remedy. I am opposed to universal service or compulsory service or any other kind of service than that rendered by willing men. I am opposed to it, because dumb driven cattle can not be taught or trained. I am too proud to be comrade with Moldy, Shadow, Wart, Feeble, and Bull Calf in a Falstaffian host. Like King Henry rather "proclaim it to the host that he who hath no stomach for the fight, let him depart, for we would not serve in that man's company who fears his fellowship to serve with us." The Persians had universal service. The Greeks did not. It is not the size of your host, but it is the quality of it that adds luster to the arms. Unwilling men burden armies, eat its substance, retard its action, and give it panic. Even if there were enough jails and Federal constabularies to enforce universal service without riots among a people, it would not be good business to do it. The profession of arms ought to be honorable; spare it from contamination by Moldy and Bull Calfs.

There is nothing subtle about military training. It does not require years to train a soldier. The individual instruction is simple. It can be done in weeks, and with the proper machinery developed in less time than any army can cross any ocean. It was done in the volunteer regiments which went to the Philippines in 1899. Nobody there ever discounted the work of our Volunteers. It is done in the Marine Corps all the time. It was done at Plattsburg in a month. To cook, to bivouac, to march, to move from column of march into line of fight, to dig, to shoot, to give first-aid treatment, these are the salient points of a real soldier's instruction. Yet they are not the features practiced in the life of the barracks.

The art of living afield and the art of handling men afield is not learned in the barracks. Compare your mental picture of life and conditions at barracks with your mental picture of life in the trenches, or anywhere in Europe to-day, or life in the armies here in the sixties. Can you see any similarity?

#### BARACKS LIFE INJURES MEN.

The barracks life in idleness impairs the usefulness of a man for the soldier or any other business. It atrophies the talents of its officers. It accustoms all to things not pertinent to the real soldier business and trains men in the wrong habits. It untrains men or over-trains them. Few officers can withstand many years of this so-called training and preserve their usefulness. Grant, Sherman, and Jackson had but few years of this training. Lee, J. E. Johnson, and Longstreet were staff officers and had little of the barracks training. Sheridan, Hood, and Stuart were young men who had received but little of it. Forrest, Hampton, and Gordon were citizens and had none of it.

It is a significant thing how many of the effective officers of both armies of our Civil War fall into these four classes: First, officers who had had a few years' service in the Regular Army—and part of that in the War with Mexico—and then went out into civil life; second, those who, while they remained on the pay roll, were staff officers and avoided the influences of this so-called training; third, young men who had been in but a few years when the war began; and, fourth, men who had always been civilians when the war began. And it is significant how few of those who had spent their lives in the garrisons arose to the occasion in real war.

#### A NEW ACTIVE ARMY EACH YEAR.

My plan for removing the objectionable features and for furnishing a system which will develop habits of organizing real armies and a system of real training is this:

A new army each year. An active army—give it a good name, so it will be proud of its name. Its period of training to be not over six months, perhaps shorter, to accommodate it to the vacation period of colleges. Have no oath of enlistment. Pay its lowest grade respectable pay, but withhold all except a nominal monthly sum until the end of the period. If anyone wants to quit, let him quit, but without compensation. On the other hand, if anyone was not desirable, simply discharge him on the same basis and not resort to jails, etc., to try to reform or make him obedient. One month at barrack's rendezvous for individual instruction, the remainder of the time afield. At the end of the period after marching back to the rendezvous discharge everybody and tie no strings to them.

Equip it with nothing but working clothes, a gun, some ammunition, a bag for carrying rations, suitable cooking utensils, a water bottle, and a blanket.

#### HOW TO SELECT COMMANDERS.

At the time of discharge reappoint the leaders for the next year. Rearrange the present grades so that the commander of 10 men would be officer in as strict a sense as any other commander and as proud of his job. Appoint him in the same way and give him a respectable salary. The other commanders appointed at the same time, each grade selected by the next higher commander under whom they are to serve, and to be selected from the next lower grade, so that an officer must advance a grade each year or go out. This would send into civil life each year officers experienced in all grades, who would have been through the process necessary when we have to form volunteers into armies. It would furnish rapid advancement to young men of demonstrated capacity. Those who select their own subordinates could be relied upon to select the proper men, because their own chances for future selection would depend upon the work of these men. The only route to the command of this army should be through its ranks. This would dignify service in the ranks.

After the discharge of the army and the selection of the next year's leaders these leaders could be organized in a school and taught special subjects and advanced military work and be given a normal course in teaching for their next year's work, and finally a suitable time before the next year's army was to be assembled could be the force which would recruit this army, and if they fail to recruit their armies under this plan, drop them from the pay roll.

#### MANEUVERING IN THE FIELD.

After one month's individual instruction the different parts of the Army to move out without any tents and with but few wagons, and spend the remainder of the time afield in bivouac and on the march, assembling with other bodies forming larger bodies and moving toward the Government reservations of land, where field exercises with actual armies, instead of imaginary armies, would operate against each other.

An army thus afield would accumulate field habits instead of barrack habits, would furnish the staff an opportunity to cater to actual armies and discover their habits and needs. Federal hospitals could be established all over the country connected with such a system and also serve as public hospitals.

This army would have no dress uniform, no dances, no garrison life to foster caste. Most of its officers would be without families or dependents, and there would be no problem of taking care of their families. It would breed no permanent military class to live on the Government forever, for even its generals would have passed through its processes and into civil life before they became too old to begin civilian careers. Some could go into the permanent staff. There would be no retired list. Such an army would commend itself to businesslike Americans. It would not be suspected of loafing. It would have no caste, no bondage. It would be thoroughly American. It would furnish a reliable supply of tested leaders and would accustom us to the practice of efficiently using the material which must inevitably be the material for America's wars.

#### ARMIES DO NOT NEED TENTS.

Training nowadays seems to run to getting into camp with tents. Lee's army had no tents, neither did Napoleon's, and I venture to say that you will find but few tents in Europe to-day—armies which can not live afield without tents are not armies; they are camping parties. Caesar tells us that the Gauls did not sleep under roofs for seven years. An army which intends to move can not encumber itself with tents, and living in tents is not real training for real service.

So little preparation for real service have we had that our field-service regulations anticipate connecting with the wagons for rations every day. Men can carry on their persons a week's supply of a simple ration, and an army whose habits tie it to a wagon train is not the active army I have been picturing to you.

One of the false ideas which develop among peace-time and barrack soldiery is the fetish for regulation equipment. The soldier needs but little equipment, and as soon as he gets afield he quickly divests himself of everything superfluous. He needs a gun, some ammunition, a blanket, something to tote and cook his rations in, and a water bottle. It doesn't make any difference what is the pattern of his bag or his frying pan or even his blanket. The only thing that must be of a standard pattern is that his ammunition must fit his gun. When we get down to real business we will be glad to have him bring his blanket, his bag, and his frying pan from home with him, and we won't quibble over the cut of his uniform. This idea is not strange, if you will picture to yourself the armies of the sixties or the men in Europe to-day.

#### REAL VERSUS FALSE DISCIPLINE.

The true discipline is not the kind which reduces the man to the level of a horse, teaches him to obey and do what he is told and nothing else and makes within him a fear of his officers and of the law. Such a discipline would not serve you in time of danger.

Real discipline is the discipline which comes from comradeship and community of interest. Active armies are always disciplined. Idle bodies are never so. The joy of labor is the panacea for discipline. Men should be trained to give expression to their thought and to depart from instructions in order to accomplish the purpose. An intelligent cooperation is superior to dumb and unreasoning obedience, and men who are trained to abandon reason are not the kind who possess true discipline.

Do not put your faith in any system of organizing reserves. When a man separates from the military service let him go without any strings upon him. No man can tell what his condition of life will be in the future, whether he can abandon his civilian pursuits or not. Industrial life in America is restless; men move from place to place. It is a different operation to collect men after they have gone different ways and identified themselves in different pursuits.

It is easier to start fresh and accept those who offer themselves and want to be accepted. Such a plan automatically accommodates itself to industrial conditions. Only those men who can disengage from industry will then serve. If you attempt to forcibly disengage men from their places in industrial life, you will have friction.

America needs not a nation in arms, for we have seen what a nation in arms has brought to humanity, but needs a system and working habits by which willing men, the only kind who are not a burden to an establishment, can be made by American methods into an efficient army—a system which will furnish leaders and teachers who know how to lead and teach and who have practiced the art of organizing, leading, and teaching real armies for real service.

#### MUST GET RID OF "DEADWOOD."

Whatever machinery you build up, whatever monopolies are created for the ground-floor people, we will find that in true need new men will spring up into leadership; brave and willing men will gather around them, as they did in 1861 and 1898, and unless your machinery is simple and direct it will fall and new and vigorous bodies will spring from the wreckage of your machinery and you will eventually accept them and call for more, but you will lose time and let enthusiasm dissipate while the so-called trained experts on the ground floor are telling you that they are no good.

If war should come now the most serious problem would not be that people would be lacking to bear arms, or would not bear them with credit to themselves, but it would be in working off the old deadwood which has risen to the top of the military service by the passage of time, men who are entrenched there by law, but who are unaccustomed to the habits of active armies. The development of new leaders and the casting off of the old were the real problems of the war of the sixties. Why not develop leaders now by each year organizing armies for an active life outdoors?

The profession of arms is my profession. What I have said to you is not said in hostility, but in a desire to point out a plan which will bring the profession into closer friendship with the people of our country.

Mr. Chairman, the following is the bill prepared by Maj. Harlee at the request of the Senate committee:

#### TITLE.

- Sec. 1. Active Army; authority to raise.
- Sec. 2. Appointment of major generals commanding; duties.
- Sec. 3. Equipment and supplies.
- Sec. 4. Administrative control.
- Sec. 5. Eligibility for service.
- Sec. 6. Composition of active Army.
- Sec. 7. Subsistence.
- Sec. 8. Appointment and promotion of officers.
- Sec. 9. Requirements for enrollment.



- Sec. 10. Issue of clothing, equipment, and arms.  
 Sec. 11. Not persons subject to military laws.  
 Sec. 12. Preference with respect to civil service.  
 Sec. 13. Pay and allowances of officers and men.  
 Sec. 14. No military courts authorized; discharge for misconduct or unsatisfactory service.  
 Sec. 15. Pension status.  
 Sec. 16. The recruitment and instruction of the active Army.  
 Sec. 17. Field training.  
 Sec. 18. Discharge of Army; disposition of property.  
 Sec. 19. Records and returns.  
 Sec. 20. Money appropriated; administration of its expenditure.

An act for making further provision for the national defense by providing for the organization and discharge each calendar year of an active army and for the maintenance of a system of military training designed to develop efficient methods of training and the habit of organizing, equipping, training, and leading citizen soldiery.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, in addition to the forces now authorized by law to constitute the Army of the United States, the President is authorized to raise, organize, equip, train, and maintain a citizen army not to exceed 100,000 men, to be known as the active Army of the United States to be reorganized annually and trained and maintained as hereinafter described.

Sec. 2. That for this purpose he may from time to time divide the United States into such number of divisional districts as he may prescribe, and for each division may appoint by and with the advice and consent of the Senate any person selected by him as a major general commanding, who shall be charged with the duty of organizing, equipping, training, and supplying the division organized in the district assigned to him, and who for these purposes shall have full authority to direct the expenditure and disbursement of the funds allotted for the equipment, maintenance, and supply of the division under his command.

Sec. 3. That the various bureaus of the War Department are authorized to furnish, at actual cost, to be reimbursed by transfer of funds from the moneys available for the active army, any articles required by the division commanders of the active army or their authorized agents. The division commanders of the active army, or their authorized agents under their direction, are authorized to procure services or purchase in the open markets any or all the articles necessary for the equipment, supply, and maintenance of the division under their commands, and competition may be dispensed with in cases authorized or approved by the authority of the division commanders. In equipping or supplying their divisions, division commanders are not restricted to the precise pattern or standard of articles supplied or prescribed by the bureau of the War Department, but in order to expeditiously put their troops afield may accommodate the available articles of trade to the equipment and supply of troops.

Sec. 4. That the administration of the active army shall be vested in the Secretary of War and under his direction, the major generals commanding shall each have administrative control and command within their respective divisions, and the bureau and departments of the War Department, under the direction of the Secretary of War, shall serve and not control the affairs, personnel, and property of the active army.

Sec. 5. That all officers and men enrolled under the provisions of this act shall be taken from citizens of the United States or those who have declared their intention to become citizens, and shall be over 18 years of age: *Provided*, That no person shall be enrolled below the grade of captain who is over the age of 35 years, in the grade of captain who is over the age of 45, or above the grade of captain who is over the age of 64.

Sec. 6. That each division of the active army shall consist of such staff and such number of units of infantry and other troops as the President may prescribe, and that such medical and other personnel and organizations of Cavalry, Field Artillery, Engineers, and auxiliary troops as the President may deem proper may be detached from the Regular Army or other parts of the Army of the United States, including the National Guard in the service of the United States, or the Marine Corps, and assigned to the active army: *Provided*, That the pay, allowances, equipment, supply, and other costs of maintenance, except for subsistence of officers or troops so detached and assigned, will be paid from the appropriations available to the services to which they belong.

Sec. 7. That the cost of subsistence of all troops detached for service with the active army will be paid from funds available to the active army, and when serving afield or present with troops which are furnished subsistence, all officers serving with the active army may be furnished rations in kind: *Provided*, That division commanders are authorized to prescribe from time to time the ration to be issued to officers and troops.

Sec. 8. That the term "officer" as used in this act includes those in and above the grade of corporal in the active army.

The appointment of officers of the active army designated before January 1 of the year for which appointed shall take effect on January 1 of the year for which appointed, or as soon thereafter as practicable, and will expire on December 31 following unless sooner discharged or unless continued in effect by the President.

Officers of the Army or Marine Corps appointed as officers in the active army will not vacate their commissions or prejudice their seniority in their respective services.

For the first annual active army the officers will be appointed as hereinafter prescribed, except without reference to previous service.

The relative rank of officers of the same grade in the active army in each division or regiment will be determined by the date of commission or appointment, and those of the same date of commission or appointment will be determined by the order fixed by the appointing authority.

For the organization of a division, its officers, except as herein provided, will be selected from those who have served previously in the active or Regular Army, National Guard, or Marine Corps in the same grade for which selected, or as follows:

- (a) Officers below the grade of second lieutenant from privates or officers of or above the grade of corporal.
- (b) First lieutenants and second lieutenants from officers of or above the grade of corporal.
- (c) Captains from first lieutenants or second lieutenants.
- (d) Majors from captains.
- (e) Lieutenant colonels from majors.
- (f) Colonels from majors or lieutenant colonels.
- (g) Brigadier generals from colonels.

Vacancies occurring during the year will be filled by promotions in the same company for the grades below the grade of captain. In the same regiment for grades from captain to colonel, and in the same division for the grades above colonel by selections made from the grades herein prescribed and in the same manner as original appointments are made.

The officers selected by the President as major generals commanding to organize and command divisions are authorized to submit to the President the names of officers recommended by them for appointments as brigadier generals or colonels in their respective divisions. Brigadier generals will be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Congress hereby vests with the President alone the appointment of officers inferior to the grade of brigadier general and authorizes the President to vest the appointment of officers below the grade of colonel as follows:

Officers of the grade of lieutenant colonel, major, captain, and staff officers of all grades not included in the regimental organization by the major general commanding, and officers of all grades below captain by the colonels appointed to command regiments.

The following recommendations will be submitted by those designated for appointment or appointed in and for a division of each annual active army. Each brigadier general will submit to his major general commanding the names of those recommended for appointment as colonels and lieutenant colonels in his brigade. Each colonel will submit to his brigadier general the names of those recommended for appointment as lieutenant colonels, majors, and captains in his regiment. Each major will submit to his colonel the names of those recommended for appointment as captains and lieutenants in his battalion, and each captain will submit to his major the names of those recommended for appointment in all grades of officers in his company. All these recommendations will be forwarded with remarks to the appointing officer for his information, but the appointing officer is not restricted to those so recommended.

Sec. 9. That in time of peace no oath of enlistment will be required of those who enroll and serve in the active army, except an oath not to quit the service of the United States after war has been declared by Congress or when in the opinion of the President war or invasion is imminent, and then until discharged by proper authority, and when war is declared or war or invasion is imminent, to consider as binding the oath of enlistment set forth in article 109 of the Articles of War.

An agreement to accept from the United States such pay as is or may be established by law and such rations as may be furnished and to receive such articles of clothing, equipment, and arms as may be issued, and to have the cost of same deducted from the pay, and to forfeit all retained or undrawn pay in the event of quitting the service before being regularly discharged or of being discharged for misconduct or unsatisfactory service will be required of all officers and men alike who are enrolled in the active army.

Sec. 10. That clothing, equipment, and arms issued and paid for by officers and men who are regularly discharged will then become their personal property, but until they are honorably discharged the ownership of such property remains with the United States.

Sec. 11. That those enrolled and serving in the active army, unless otherwise subject to military law, are, except as prescribed in this section, not persons subject to military law and the Articles of War.

Sec. 12. That persons in the active army or honorably discharged therefrom shall receive the same preference with respect to appointments in the civil service and retention therein as is provided by existing law with respect to persons who have been honorably discharged from the military or naval service.

Sec. 13. That in the active army the monthly pay of the various grades shall be as follows:

- Privates and men of other ratings below the grade of corporals, \$30.
- Corporals and officers of other grades below the grade of sergeant, \$60.
- Sergeants and officers of other grades below the grade of second lieutenants, \$90.
- Second lieutenants, \$120.
- First lieutenants, \$150: *Provided*, That 80 per cent of the pay of all men below the grade of corporal and 50 per cent of the pay of all officers below the grade of captain shall be withheld until regularly discharged from the service, except that in time of war or when invasion or war is imminent the withheld portion may be paid monthly to designated beneficiaries for their support.

Officers of all grades above the grade of first lieutenant shall receive the base pay as is now or may hereafter be provided for like grades of the Regular Army, and in addition thereto, when serving afield or present with troops which are furnished subsistence, may be furnished with rations in kind: *Provided*, That the cost of clothing, equipment, and arms issued to men and officers below the grade of captain shall be charged against the withheld portion of their pay.

For service requiring officers or men to be mounted, additional pay of \$10 per month will be paid to officers and men who furnish their own mounts. Forage for such mounts will be provided by the United States. Horse equipment will be issued in the same manner as is provided for clothing, arms, and other equipment.

Officers of the active army when not serving afield or present with troops furnished with subsistence are not furnished subsistence, and officers must provide their own quarters when Government quarters are not available.

When performing travel under orders, officers and men will be furnished with transportation or reimbursed for transportation, including authorized sleeping-car accommodations. Officers and men will be allowed \$1.50 per day for meals while traveling or when employed in recruiting. Recruits enrolled and other men below the grade of corporal may be furnished with quarters and meals at a cost not exceeding \$1 per day when not at a place where subsistence in kind is furnished.

Orders involving travel and expenses for subsistence and quarters connected with the recruiting service may be issued at any time during the year by regimental commanders within the limits of the expenditure of sums allotted for the purpose by the major general commanding.

Sec. 14. That in time of peace or when war or invasion is not imminent no military courts for the active army are established and no officers or men will be imprisoned or confined as a punishment by military authorities, but all officers of the active army are authorized to arrest and deliver to the civil authorities offenders against the law of the land who belong to the active army in grades inferior to their own.

Officers and men of the active army may be discharged from the service for misconduct or for unsatisfactory service, and those below the grade of captain shall forfeit to the United States the retained portion of pay which would otherwise be due them after satisfactorily completing their service.

Men and officers below the grade of captain may be so discharged by the regimental commander upon the recommendation of the company commander, approved by the battalion commander. Officers of the grades of captain, major, and lieutenant colonel may be discharged by order of the major general commanding, upon the recommendation of the regimental commander, approved by the brigade commander. Staff officers and men may be discharged by the major general commanding. Colonels may be discharged by the President. Brigadier generals and



major generals commanding may be relieved from command by the President, and if in their places other officers are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate their appointments will expire.

Sec. 15. That men and officers of the active army come within the pensionable status only when they become subject to military laws and the Articles of War in the time of war or when war or invasion is imminent. At other times their status is the same as any other civil employee of the Government, provided that officers or men of the Army, including National Guard and other parts of the Military Establishment, or Marine Corps serving in or detached for service with the active army do not thereby forfeit the benefits of such status or the benefit of continuous service or any other benefit which would have accrued to them had they remained in their previous service. Officers or men of the Army and Marine Corps serving in the active army do not cease to be persons subject to military law and to the Articles of War. In time of war or when war or invasion is imminent the status of the active army is the same as the Regular Army in respect to the Articles of War. In respect to all benefits so far as the laws and regulations are applicable to officers or men whose permanent retention in the military service is not contemplated by existing laws, and in other respects not herein provided for. No distinction will then be made between the active army and the Regular Army in legal processes.

Sec. 16. That for active armies for training, the months of January, February, and March are designated, as the officers' school period. The month of April as the recruiting period. The months of May and June as the instruction period. The months of July, August, and September as the field period. The months of October, November, and December as the finishing period.

The officers of the active army for training will assemble at their own expense for transportation by regiments at such rendezvous as are designated by the respective major generals commanding on January 1, or by permission of the regimental commander at a following date not later than January 10, and there execute before the regimental commander present the required oath and agreement designated. Those who do not appear at the designated time and place will be considered to have vacated their appointments and their places may be filled by original appointments or promotion. Regimental schools, with the regimental commanders as superintendents, for the practice and theoretical instruction of all the officers in the military arts and the methods of administration and in raising and training the active army for field service will be held during the officers' school period.

The major generals commanding will designate the recruiting rendezvous for each company or regiment. The captain of each company, with the assistance of the officers of his company, will recruit his own company and begin the instruction of each man as soon as he is enrolled.

As soon as possible in the instruction period the companies of each regiment will be assembled at regimental rendezvous designated by the major generals commanding and equipped for service, and a curriculum of instruction, including practical and theoretical instruction in rifle practice, intrenching, field cooking, first-aid treatment, bivouacking, marching, and the necessary field evolutions will be begun, provided that companies may be designated as school, college, or university companies to recruit their privates principally from students in attendance at schools or other institutions of learning, and such companies may be equipped and receive their instruction during the period of instruction at the places where they are organized at hours which do not interfere with the hours of schools, and their assembling at the regimental rendezvous may be delayed until the beginning of the field period. The men of such companies will receive no subsistence until the companies join the regiments, and their privates will be discharged in time to permit them to be present at the beginning of their next school term.

When the officers of a company fail to recruit the company to its minimum required strength by July 1 all the officers may be discharged and the company may be replaced by a company detached from the Army, National Guard, or Marine Corps, or a volunteer company may be accepted and its officers appointed without regard to previous service, or its place may be left vacant. Recruits may be received at any time before the completion of the field period, provided the strength of the company does not exceed the maximum authorized strength. Companies will be subdivided into squads commanded by corporals and sergeants, and the integrity of the squad organization will be preserved by making them when afield the messing units to which issues of rations are made, and by utilizing the squad organization whenever possible in the performance of work and duty.

Sec. 17. That at the beginning of the field period all regiments will be moved out from their rendezvous and assemble afield with the other regiments of their brigade and remain afield during the remainder of the field period or until ordered to their respective rendezvous for the discharge of the privates.

The movement of the armies thus afield will be planned to utilize Government or State reservations or other tracts available at a reasonable cost for field exercises and maneuvers. During the field period the principal method of moving troops will be by marching.

Armies afield will be equipped with the minimum of equipment necessary for instruction and without tents, except for headquarters, medical, and other necessary purposes, and with the minimum amount of necessary transportation. Troops will habitually bivouac or temporarily occupy available buildings, and their movements and stops will be regulated to take advantage of the use of existing storehouses, commercial transportation, and the agencies of commercial supply. Only one kind of uniform will be required of each soldier and officer, and no multiplicity of kinds of hats, shoes, and other articles of clothing will be required. Only such personal property or equipment as can be carried on the persons of men will be permitted, and no baggage will be transported except a limited amount for field and general officers. The accumulation and transportation of property unnecessary for field service will be prohibited.

The brigades of the division will be ultimately assembled for division maneuvers and evolutions, and for the purpose of holding grand maneuvers the President may organize the several divisions into two or more armies under the tactical command of officers who have organized and commanded divisions of the active armies.

Sec. 18. That in the later part of the field period the regiments will return to their respective rendezvous, where the privates will then be discharged by the regimental commanders. No transportation will be furnished to the place of enrollment.

During the finishing period the property will be secured and held ready for use of the next year's field army, and the accounts and records will be completed and submitted. Where an officer has acquitted himself of his accountability and responsibility, he may be granted, upon

his application, by the regimental commander a furlough on full pay of not exceeding one month, and may be discharged to take effect at the end of his furlough, and receive his furlough pay in advance: *Provided*, That no pay will be paid for a period after December 31. During this period the officers present, not otherwise employed, will be instructed in the military arts and science.

The property of the active army may be delivered into the custody of officers of the Regular Army designated by the Secretary of War to receive it, and when so received it will be held in trust for delivery to the succeeding division of the active army without transfer of funds, and such parts of it as are from time to time needed will be transferred, upon request, to the authorized agents of the major general commanding.

Sec. 19. That all returns, muster rolls, and records of personnel of organizations of each division of the active army shall be rendered to its major general commanding, shall be transmitted by him, and filed in the office of The Adjutant General of the Army. Medical records will be kept and filed as required for medical records of the Regular Army.

All money accounts and property returns of officers in each division of the active army will be rendered to major general commanding, who shall have administrative control. He shall make such consolidated accounts and returns to the Secretary of War as the Secretary of War may require, and cause the disbursing officers under his command to make the required returns to the accounting officers of the Treasury Department.

Sec. 20. That the sum of \$40,000,000 be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any money of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of raising, organizing, equipping, training, and maintaining the active army of the calendar year 1918, which sum may be expended in part in each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1918, and June 30, 1919: *Provided*, That this sum will be allotted by the Secretary of War among the several major generals commanding divisions of the active army, to be expended and disbursed in each division under the direction of its commanding general, and for any and all purposes set forth herein, and that the commanding generals are responsible only to the Secretary of War and not to any bureau of the War Department, and the control of the property purchased from the funds of this appropriation remain with the commanding generals of divisions of the active army, and when stored in depots or transferred to officers of the Regular Army for safekeeping it remains in trust for the use of the active army.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Maj. Harlee is a gentleman with ideas which differ conspicuously from those of his associate officers and from the enlisted men.

As I told the House late the other afternoon, I went to the border in November largely with the idea of finding out why men do not enlist in the Regular Army. I went to the El Paso, Tex., district, and subsequently I went down to Colonia Dublan, in Mexico, in order to visit the Regular Army there and see the enlisted men. I began at El Paso by going to the Young Men's Christian Associations of the National Guard and getting in touch with individual National Guardsmen through the Young Men's Christian Association. Then I went to Chaplain Axton, at Fort Bliss. By him I was put in communication with six different enlisted men of the Regular Army who had been on recruiting duty themselves. Recruiting officers stay in an office and attend to the paper work of enlistment and the administration of oaths. The enlisted men on recruiting duty go down on the street corner and argue with the would-be recruits.

After my investigation at Fort Bliss, Tex., I went down to Colonia Dublan, in Mexico, and there I met five more noncommissioned officers and privates who had been actually on recruiting duty. Altogether I met and interviewed 11 noncommissioned officers and privates, representing five different organizations. In no case did they have an opportunity to consult with each other beforehand, because in no case did they know what I wanted to talk about. In one case the arrangements for the interviews were made by the chaplain and in the other case I think that they were made by the son of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER]. When I went down to the border I was imbued with the idea that this Army caste business about which the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] has been talking, had a great deal to do with the shortage of enlistments. I talked with Regular officers with whom I had served, and I pointed out that there was this idea about officers' snobbishness abroad. My friends felt that I had been misled. I said, "I am afraid there is something in it." I went to the border with that idea, but after I had looked into the matter I changed my opinion 180 degrees. In other words, I exactly reversed my former views. The 11 men whom I interviewed were unanimous in declaring that there are two principal reasons for nonenlistment which stand out beyond everything else. One of these reasons is that we do not pay our men enough, and the other reason is because there is too long a contract of service.

Mr. KEATING. If the gentleman will yield, Maj. Harlee has recommended that the pay should be increased, and I agree with him.



Mr. GARDNER. Every one of those enlisted men agreed that these were the principal reasons for the scarcity of recruits, and 10 out of the 11 men agreed to as a deterrent the low pay outweighed the long contract for service. The eleventh thought that as a deterrent the long contract of service outweighed the low pay.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Were the 11 men whom the gentleman interviewed members of the Regular Army or National Guard?

Mr. GARDNER. They were all noncommissioned officers or privates of the Regular Army who had been on recruiting duty. I think that 10 were noncommissioned officers and that 1 was a private.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does the gentleman think that he could have got a candid answer from these men if they felt that they had been degraded by the enlistment, because of the system that prevailed?

Mr. GARDNER. I am quite sure these men were talking to me as they believed, and not trying to conceal their opinion on the caste system. I said, "As a matter of fact, is not there a lot in this caste business? Is it not the fact that the officers have a social air about them and try to put it all over the enlisted men, and when they see you with a lady on the street and you salute, is it not true that they are tophiety and perhaps fail to return the salute?" The soldiers replied that that was all "guardhouse lawyer" talk. I was astounded at the unanimity with which those enlisted men said that there was nothing in this talk that officers' snobbishness impedes enlistment.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. On the subject of the low pay, I have heard that matter raised a number of times. Is it not a fact that the pay of the soldier, taking into consideration all the other elements that enter into it, is about as good as it is outside?

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, nothing like as good. It is \$15 or \$20 less per month than the pay of the average workman. Men are willing to make some sacrifice, but are not willing to do all the sacrificing in the community. A community is nothing but a great group of men. Supposing that a dozen men get together and decide that some one of the lot has got to do the fighting. Here is Jones; he is getting \$95 a month as a bricklayer. Another man gets \$28 and all found as a farm hand, and the next man is getting \$1,000 a year as a clerk. And so they say, "GARDNER, you go ahead and do the fighting." I say, "What will I get as my share if I do the fighting?" "Oh," they reply, "You will get \$15 a month, all found, and take the rest out in patriotism." That is what we are saying to our recruits. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I see by the record that Gen. McCain is quoted as saying that the enlistments are 2,000 a month.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, more than that; they average 4,000 per month. I think that the General testified that we gain about 2,000 men a month, net. But we have only gained 16,500 above our losses in the nine months which have elapsed since we passed the joint resolution of March 17, 1916, authorizing the President to bring the Regular Army up to its full strength, which as we were told, meant an increase of 20,000 men. Instead of getting those 20,000 men promptly, it has taken us over nine months to raise the strength of our Army by 16,500.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman would have to increase the wages of farm hands 50 per cent, if I understood him correctly.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, I know that wages differ in different communities. In Virginia, for instance, white farm laborers get about \$18 a month and bacon and pork and fuel and housing for themselves and families. In some States the pay of farm laborers is higher and in others not so high. I have been over this question with a great many men in the National Guard. I specially tried to find out what the National Guard thought about the Regular Army. I got Gen. Bell to send out a list of questions to every first sergeant of the National Guard in his command, and there were 296 of them; and to every National Guard captain in his command, and there were 296 of them also; and to every National Guard colonel; and to every National Guard major who commanded a separate battalion, making 612 inquiries in all sent out at my request. Under the order issued each reply was to be returned not through military channels but directly to Gen. Bell, with the understanding that the name of the signer was to be held confidential. One of the questions

asked was: "Have you any ideas as to universal military training; and if so, what are they?" Five hundred colonels, captains, and first sergeants replied that they were in favor of universal military training and only 10 opposed it.

Listen to the questions sent out by Gen. Bell and listen to the answers:

Here is Gen. Bell's order:

HEADQUARTERS, EL PASO DISTRICT,  
El Paso, Tex., December 13, 1916.

1. The following questions will be answered by each regimental commander, company commander, and first sergeant of the National Guard.  
2. The answers will be written with a typewriter or pencil and the completed paper will then be sealed in an official envelope and mailed without delay direct to the "Commanding General, El Paso District, Mills Building, El Paso, Tex."  
3. The district commander desires that each man called upon for report express his opinions without consultation with anyone.

By command of Brig. Gen. Bell:

H. H. WHITNEY,  
Lieutenant Colonel, Adjutant General, District Adjutant.

Here are the questions and answers:

No. 1. Question. Would the instruction of the National Guard proceed more rapidly if more Regular officers and noncommissioned officers were detailed for service with the National Guard?

Answer. Yes: Colonels, 18; captains, 190; first sergeants, 180; total yes, 388. No: Colonels, none; captains, 41; first sergeants, 53; total no, 94. Conditional: Colonels, 2; captains, 50; first sergeants, 38; total conditional, 90.

NOTE.—The noes were qualified in about half of the replies by the statement that there were "already enough," meaning that one Regular officer and three Regular noncommissioned officers as at present detailed for the instruction of each regiment were ample.

No. 2. Question. Are the officers and enlisted men of the National Guard desirous of the instruction from the officers and noncommissioned officers of the Regular Army? If not, what is the reason?

Answer. Yes: Colonels, 16; captains, 217; first sergeants, 205; total yes, 438. No: Colonels, none; captains, 12; first sergeants, 30; total no, 42. Conditional: Colonels, 4; captains, 49; first sergeants, 17; conditional, 70.

No. 3. Question. Can you suggest any way in which the officers and men of the Regular Army cooperate more fully with the National Guard in the development of a citizen army?

Answer. The answers to this question may be roughly classified as follows: More cooperation by friendly intercourse and a closer relationship, 122; more careful selection of Regular Army instructors, 28; more instruction from Regular Army, particularly at home stations, 83; sundry suggestions, 50.

NOTE.—Over 70 replies to question No. 3 desired one regular officer with each regiment or separate battalion and one noncommissioned officer with each company instead of only three for the whole regiment, as at present.

No. 4. Question. Have you formed any opinion on the question of universal military training? If so, what are your ideas?

Answer. In favor: Colonels, 16; captains, 250; first sergeants, 234. Total yes, 500. Against: Colonel, 1; captains, 5; first sergeants, 4. Total no, 10.

No. 5. Any additional remarks you may have to make bearing on the above.

Many of these remarks are most valuable. They will be made a subject of special study at Gen. Bell's headquarters.

Many a time in a speech on preparedness I have advocated universal compulsory military training. Every time I have been rewarded with thunders of applause. Moreover, recently when I tried it in the Middle West, in Cincinnati and in Detroit, I had as much applause for compulsory military training as I could have hoped for in my home town.

There are several improvements which I wish I could see made in the lot of the enlisted man. I wish we would pass a law preventing such duty for enlisted men as the grading of the parks around some of the Army posts. I do not believe that that sort of duty is what they enlist for. The larger number of recruits come from the class of men whose necessities require them to take \$15 a month because no better job is in sight. A lad comes to St. Louis, let us say. He thinks that he is going to find a good job on every street corner. Pretty soon he finds that he can not get a good job, and so he is obliged to take a poor job at \$15 per month, unless the I. W. W.'s persuade him to stay away from the recruiting officer. If the recruiting officer persuades the recruit, Uncle Sam takes advantage of the latter's necessities and gets him to work for \$15 a month.

The largest fraction of our recruits are men whose financial necessities are pressing. The second largest element is composed of men of an adventurous spirit, men who want to see the world's wheels go around, men who want a novelty. Prob-



ably the adventurer makes the very finest soldier of them all. A third class is composed of men who are tired of the particular job which they are doing at the time of their enlistment. For instance, a man may be a stonemason. He gets tired of being a stonemason, and he enlists in the Army, not because he is out of a job but because he is tired of being a stonemason. Then there is a fourth class—"snowbirds," as they call them. They come along in December and January, when the cold weather sets in, and they enlist with a deliberate purpose of deserting when the warm weather comes around. Their number is not large. I have gone carefully into those figures of Gen. McCain. It is true that we are gaining soldiers more quickly than we are losing them; but two things must be remembered: In the first place, winter enlistments are always larger. Furthermore, look at the actual figures: From February 29, 1916, to December 31, 1916, 10 months in all, the entire Army, notwithstanding all the reservists called back or held to the colors, was increased by only 16,521 recruits.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingencies, Military Information Section, General Staff Corps: For contingent expenses of the military information section, General Staff Corps, including the purchase of law books, professional books of reference; periodicals and newspapers; drafting and messenger service; and of the military attachés at the United States embassies and legations abroad; and of the branch office of the military information section at Manila; the cost of special instruction at home and abroad and in maintenance of students and attachés; and for such other purposes as the Secretary of War may deem proper; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to subscriptions for foreign and professional newspapers and periodicals to be paid for from this appropriation, \$11,000.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have been very much interested in what both the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] has had to say of Maj. Harlee's statement and the statement of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. Having at one time had a little experience in the Volunteer service, I think I can put my finger on some of the difficulties we are having in the recruiting of men in the Regular Establishment. In the first place, I want to say this—that I think, as these appropriations increase, and they have enormously increased, the people of this country are going to demand a more efficient administration of our affairs, both as to the Navy and the Army. [Applause.]

The business men of this country are paying for this preparedness propaganda, as our revenue legislation will disclose. There is no doubt about that, and I do not mean to say that it is wrong that they should pay for it. Here is one of the great troubles about the Regular Army: In the city of Atlanta, in my district, we have what is known as Fort McPherson. It is a battalion post at this time. We have a battalion of soldiers out there, a minimum-strength battalion. They go out there and they get up in the morning to the same bugle call and go through the same drill the same length of time, see the colonel or the major sitting on the same horse, eat the same food, and then go down and start to play cards, or do anything on the face of the earth to kill the monotony of camp life. It is a fact that a man when he gets into the Regular Army feels that he is there absolutely stagnating for the time that he is in, and that when he gets out he will not be any better prepared for anything else in life than he was when he came in, and, in addition, he has acquired the habit of being trifling and lazy. That is the whole truth about it. Another thing: There is not enough personal interest manifested by the officers in our Regular Army. I agree with my friend KEATING from Colorado. I believe the Army officers and the Navy officers—and I believe it because of overt acts, from their manner, from their method of dealing with the practical questions of life—think that when God Almighty made each one of them he took a day off to do it, and did not do anything else on that day but finish him up. I have been reliably informed that they have got a rule over here at this Naval Academy that if a student's old mother comes to see him on his graduation day, or comes over there at some commencement, and that cadet goes down to the depot to meet his mother, and she has got a hand satchel that weighs 40 or 50 pounds, that that young fellow can not reach down and take his old mother's hand satchel, because it is below the dignity of an officer in the great American Navy to be polite to his old mother and carry a package of any kind. Well, God save the mark if that is the rule. [Applause.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. I think the gentleman is entirely wrong about that proposition.

Mr. HOWARD. Oh, well, I do not know whether I am or not, and I do not think the gentleman knows; I hope I am wrong, but I have seen it stated in the papers and it happens that I have a friend of my family who visited over there last year at commencement and she tells me it is one of the rules. I do not know whether it is or not, but she heard it just like everybody else heard it; but I know they come out of there "feeling their oats" just a little bit more than before they went in. I do not know what is the cause of it but there is something wrong when education makes a fool out of a fellow about some things. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOWARD. Now, I happen to have had the honor of serving on the Committee on Military Affairs of this House for two years and I tried to inform myself about some of the things while I was there. My honest judgment is that with every lump-sum appropriation that is made for the Army or the Navy 33½ per cent of it is lost in the motion of getting that money to the real benefit of both services. Now let us see. We have in the American Army one of the craziest ideas I have ever seen stood for by people who have got any plain ordinary common sense. For instance, an officer will be stationed in New York. He is a first or second lieutenant, and they will issue an order, just like they were moving chess on a board, and they will ship him from New York to San Francisco, and they will take a man in San Francisco and ship him to New York to fill that officer's place. Then they will pick up a fellow in Maine and send him to Texas, his household furniture and everything costing him more, and we lose in absolutely useless transfers of officers anywhere from a million to a million and a half dollars a year. The men do not have time to form any personal attachment for their officers. They are transferring them all the time at the expense of the people for no particular reason.

Why is my distinguished friend from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] so popular with his regiment? It is because he stays with them; they know him; they know what sort of a man he is and love him because he is human and considerate, and they are willing to do anything on the face of the earth he wants them to do. Why not adopt that same sensible system in our Regular Army? Now, another thing. Until we offer the American boy something besides money to serve in the Regular Army you will never get those boys to enlist. I do not care if you raise it to \$24, I do not care if you raise it to \$28 per month, you will not get the men much faster. I will agree that it may stimulate enlistments in hard times, but men would rather work for somebody else after they know what service in the Regular Army is at less wages than to work for the Government. Now, let us see how you can get them. I venture the assertion that if some practical man will work this out and say to the boys in every State in the Union, "We are going to establish an Army post in each State. There is going to be a distinctive, natty uniform; that the years of enlistment are going to be six; that you are going to serve two years with the colors and that during those two years we are not only going to teach you how to drill, how to ride, how to shoot, how to pitch tents and dig trenches, but we are going to teach you something else. We are going to teach you something that will stay with you and benefit you when you go out. We will teach you agriculture, we will teach you how to become a blacksmith, or how to become a mechanical engineer. We will teach you mathematics, and grammar, and writing. Why, these retired officers are running around here doing nothing, and everyone of them could be used in this educational department in each State in the Union, and if you would let the young country fellow know that he can go to his own State, associate with boys of his own State, that he would be near his home while he is being trained as a soldier and that he could get some finishing touches put on his education, you would have to take a baseball bat and stand in front of the recruiting office and beat them away instead of going out and expending millions of dollars to get soldiers for the Regular Army. [Applause.] That is what is the matter with the Regular Army. You do not offer the young Americans anything. They do not want to become drones and you mold them just like you mold bullets.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. FARR. These opportunities the gentleman describes are given to boys in the Navy, and yet we are 25,000 short.



Mr. HOWARD. Yes; that is true in a measure of the Navy; but what would be the condition of your personnel if it had not been for the institution of these schools by Secretary Daniels?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the Record on this particular subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOWARD. Under the leave granted me I desire to incorporate as appropriate to this discussion a copy of an article I wrote last year for one of our daily journals in which I went into detail as to the plan for really building up a standing and reserve army in this country of at least 500,000 trained-to-the-minute men:

"My experience on the Military Affairs Committee has convinced me that there are many abuses, uneconomic policies, and lack of cohesion in the administration of the affairs of the War Department. We get too little for the amount we expend, the per capita cost being in excess of \$1,000 per annum.

"Then, again, our present system creates no nucleus for a reserve army of trained men that may be mustered into the service upon short notice in formidable numbers for defensive purposes.

"Further than this, we are using too many of our officers in purely clerical positions in the War Department. These officers are drawing large salaries; they attained their military training at a cost of \$16,000 each to the people; and in view of the continued shortage of Army officers they should be in the field performing the duties they were educated to perform and leave such departmental service to civilian employees.

"I have collaborated with one of the most brilliant young officers in the American Army on a practical plan for the future Army. I feel that I would be unfair to this splendid officer if I did not state that every professional detail of this plan should be accredited to him.

"The cost of this plan, in my judgment, will not be over thirty millions additional a year. It gives adequate security to the Nation. It will stimulate interest in military affairs; and I confidently submit it to the people as sound from a military standpoint, from a patriotic standpoint, and most economical in every detail.

"A great many measures upon military preparedness, pro and con, will be introduced in Congress, which will tend toward mental confusion; but if each thinking American will make himself conversant with the defects of our present Military Establishment and our military needs, in the light of the recent lessons given us by the present world war, public opinion will soon intelligently express the will of the thinking people, and certain general plans of action will be accepted, others rejected, all of which will tend to prevent the referred-to mental confusion in Congress.

"I propose to first ask you to accept a universally acknowledged military principle, then I will discuss, first, the defects of our present Military Establishment; second, our military needs; third, the present proposed changes to meet these accepted needs; and I will conclude by outlining for your consideration my plan above referred to, and will discuss its merits from every angle.

"Two weeks ago England announced that no troops who have not had at least one year of constant training would be sent to the front. In other words, war has become a science demanding, more so than heretofore, that even the private be scientifically educated and trained, which can not be accomplished in less than one year of continuous service with the colors. This is the acknowledged military principle I must ask you to accept. Since we have been in the past successful in all our wars without acknowledging this principle, a fallacy has grown up in this country that a brave man with a gun is a soldier. Any nation that sends its untrained sons in this day and time to the front to face a scientifically trained and educated army commits ignominious murder. Our military history also proves this principle, but our final successes have caused us not to notice or realize the great unnecessary cost in blood of all our wars. I ask you to accept with me this military principle, not only in order to prevent our sons from being sent untrained to war and ignominiously murdered, but also because the ultimate fate of this Nation might be endangered in any war if we should meet a scientifically trained and educated army with troops of less than one year's training.

"I will now briefly discuss the most glaring defects of our present Military Establishment. A regiment of our Infantry—and Infantry is the backbone of the Army—on paper during peace times consists of 12 companies of 65 men each. A regiment is commanded by 50 officers. This number of officers would

not be increased at the outbreak of war, but each company would be increased by 95 untrained men, making each company 150 men in number of each regiment 1,800 strong. Thus we see the peace efficiency of the Regular Army would be nullified at the very outbreak of war by being swamped with untrained men. Also if 50 officers are necessary to command 1,800 men during war, but only train a regiment of 780 men during peace times, we are not using our plant at its maximum efficiency or speed. During business depressions the recruiting officers have no trouble keeping each company at a strength of 65 men, but during prosperous times men will not enlist, and companies decrease in strength, often as low as 20 men per company, and are officered and trained by, theoretically, 50 officers. Therefore we see our system is extravagant, if we compare the amount of protection it affords us with the money we spend on it. It resembles a commercial plant running at less than two-fifths of its capacity. Such a condition of affairs proves, first, we are not now during peace reaching the proper voluntary enlisting spring of the Nation, and, second, our plant would only be running at two-fifths its capacity, even should we be able to get 65 men for each of our companies.

"The keeping up of our numerous small posts causes unnecessary expenditures from every point of view. Many of them are distant from our great strategical points, which in most cases are our largest recruiting centers, thus causing large transportation expenditures in sending the men to these numerous and distant small posts and at the end of three or four years returning them to the enlisting places. By saving this unnecessary transportation hundreds of thousands of dollars could be saved each year. The country is crowded with small posts, the upkeep of which costs immense sums. By selling these small Army posts, with this money for larger commands, a saving would accrue, because a brigade post could be maintained at a less cost than three regimental posts. Also it is cheaper to feed 1,800 men than it is to feed three groups of 600 men each.

"When we consider the numerous enlistments during hard times and the few enlistments during prosperous times we come to the conclusion that a great part of the Army is recruited from an undesirable element, which has a tendency to cause the profession to be looked down upon by the layman, whereas it should be looked up to. This undesirable element also contaminates a great many young men, especially those from the South and Middle West, who enlist to go abroad to see the country. This deleterious condition should be corrected at once.

"Now we come to a more vital defect. It will be the future policy of this country to rely in time of great national danger upon the discharged soldiers, and during peace the Army should be a school turning out a certain number of trained soldiers each year; these men to constitute the great reserve army to which the country looks for protection when war is declared, and not to the small standing army. Since our Army is turning out trained soldiers at the present time at less than two-fifths its capacity and about 30 per cent of the discharged soldiers reenlist, thus reducing the number available for the reserves, we see that the present system if continued will never supply us with a reserve army, and we will be forced to send our untrained sons forth to fight our battles and be defeated and murdered. When we take a pencil and paper and figure the number of trained men our military plant could, by running on a maximum-number basis, transfer to the reserves each year we see that the Army is too small to serve this end, the end being to supply us with trained men for a reserve army of 300,000 men, which our military experts tell us is necessary to make this country secure from invasion. Also when we study the personnel of any regiment we find it composed of men from practically every State in the Union, and a practical mind will at once see the impossibility of keeping 'tab' on these men when they are discharged and return to the four corners of our country. To keep a record of 300,000 discharged soldiers, assigned to and discharged from scattered regiments in the heterogeneous manner that is now in vogue, would require an army of clerks.

"Now, let us discuss our military needs. Our War and Staff Colleges tell us convincingly that in case our fleet was destroyed or rendered useless, say, by being in the Pacific Ocean when it should be in the Atlantic, or vice versa, and the Panama Canal out of commission, certain strong military nations have, individually, sufficient merchant marine to land a complete army of 300,000 men, out of range of our coast defenses, capture them from the rear, and immediately, unopposed, capture the adjacent cities (New York not being excepted), and they notify us that our greatest possible military need is to be sufficiently strong in organized and trained men to render such an invasion from any nation impossible. Hence it is clearly the duty of Congress to provide this Nation with sufficient protection to make such an invasion impossible, and to do so in the most economical manner as regards money and men permanently withdrawn from



civil life. These military experts convince us that to secure the desired amount of necessary protection our mobile army should be increased by 10 regiments of Infantry and 4 regiments of Field Artillery, the National Guard rendered more assistance and thus made more efficient, and that we should have an organized, officered, and trained reserve army of 400,000 soldiers. I think these demands are sufficiently modest, reasonable, and can be economically supplied.

"Then, let us now take up and discuss the different proposed measures which would supply us with the desired Regular Army increase, an efficient National Guard, and a reserve army of 400,000 men. To date all proposed plans for increasing our Regular Army have passed over this vital issue by saying: 'We will increase our Regular Army by 10 regiments of Infantry and 4 regiments of Field Artillery,' but they do not tell us what spring of national impulse or sentiment to press during prosperous times to obtain these additional men or even the present authorized number of men. All of these proposed plans contemplate continuing to operate our expensive Army plant at two-fifths its capacity; they do not attempt to settle the question of selling or abandoning our undesirable posts and placing our small Army at strategic points; they do not correct our present extravagant transportation expenditures by working out a sane plan of assigning and discharging our soldiers, which would also keep them available for reserve use. No plan so far has figured out what economical changes can be effected in our Regular Army, and how this money saving can be used to partially offset the additional expense of increasing the Army. Until these questions are considered and corrected, to increase our regular mobile army would be unwise.

"All appear agreed upon the plan of assisting and improving the National Guard by paying them when in camp from both the State and Federal Treasury, and it is certain that this would be of some assistance. However, I do not think such an expenditure a wise one until we correct certain defects in the National Guard system as it now exists. We should change the National Guard so as to make it dovetail into any radical change in our military policy. The spending of Federal money upon inefficient National Guard troops that can never become efficient should not be allowed, but the spending of the Federal money upon even inefficient National Guard organizations situated so that they can be made efficient should commence at once. By efficient National Guard I mean an efficiency possible of being attained at the end of two years' service, which would be equivalent to a degree of efficiency obtainable by one year of continuous service. You see I adhere, and ask you to adhere, to our accepted principle that we can not use untrained troops in modern wars, and I will not willingly consent to Federal money being spent except in carrying out this principle. No plan of assisting our National Guard proposed to date that I know of takes cognizance of the fact that some National Guard organizations have attained an efficiency almost equal to our Regular Army, while other organizations have for years decreased in efficiency and have been juggled around to meet State and city politics.

"Some cities, having an unusual boosting spirit, have increased their complement of National Guard organizations to such an extent that they have been unable to keep them efficient, because interest soon subsided. To spend Federal money on such organizations would not be to our interest; but to reduce, say, a lightly recruited and inefficient regiment to a battalion which could take care of all the men previously in the regiment and then spend the Federal money in making that battalion as efficient as our Regular Army is highly desirable. The only injustice that such a step could cause would be in the letting out of the National Guard of a great many officers who have spent time and money in the same. However, these men should be taken care of in the reserve army. So instead of enlarging our National Guard and paying it out of our Federal Treasury I favor first putting it in some cases in such condition that it can become highly efficient and then rendering it Federal aid. I believe such a plan would serve best the interests of both the Federal and State Governments and meet with approval from all National Guard officers. This would not affect those splendid regiments of National Guard that have attained a high degree of efficiency but would assist them in the manner they are now asking of Congress.

"Numerous schemes have been proposed for securing our reserve army of 400,000 civilians and securing officers for the same. Most of these plans prove to be theoretical and not practical upon examination. They do not recognize the defects in our present recruiting system, nor do they take into consideration the abnormal amount of interest in this subject caused by the atmosphere being electrified by the present world war and appreciate that this interest will subside when the war

is over. I dismiss Gen. Wood's scheme of using our business men right here by asking if you believe that 10 years from now, when the world war is over and the atmosphere is not electrified with war, will it be possible to get the mayor of New York and 1,000 of the leading men of that city to go to Plattsburg and spend one month under canvas learning to become soldiers? Look back 10 years and see if such a camp was possible. It is also impossible because it violates our accepted military principle by attempting to make reserve officers out of these gentlemen by a month's training each year.

"The scheme now being proposed by the Secretary of War for a reserve army of 400,000 civilians is as follows: Every year 133,000 civilians would be asked to enlist for three years with the colors and three years on furlough, but during the three years with the colors would be required to undergo an intensive service for a short period of one or two months, and the rest of the year they are civilians to all intents and purposes. This plan I consider impractical, for the following reasons:

"First. It does not contemplate using the men we discharge from our expensive Regular Army plant as reserves, nor does it contemplate changing our present Regular Army defect so as to make it possible to use these men or operate the plant at its maximum efficiency.

"Second. As soon as the present abnormal interest aroused in military affairs subsides I do not believe we can enlist 133,000 men a year during prosperous times and ask them to give us one or two months of their time each year for three years—this in addition to the enlistments necessary for our increased Regular Army and our increased National Guard that the plan also contemplates.

"Third. The keeping tab on these 400,000 men would require an army of clerks, and to date no satisfactory scheme has been devised to accomplish it.

"Fourth. It violates our accepted principle and means we would permit them to be murdered if they were ever called upon to face a trained army. Such a scheme has been successfully used in Switzerland, which is a small country, and the complement enlisting each year with the colors includes all the men of a certain age; but 133,000 men each year would not include one-fifth of our available men of any specified age, and this fact alone would defeat its successful application in this country. We know too well how ultra polite each young man would be during prosperous times when the Government would ask for the 133,000 recruits. I fear there would be a great deal of nudging and bowing to the other fellow, with the remark, 'After you, my dear Gaston.' We must recognize the fact that a successful system of a small republic will not of necessity meet the different existing conditions found in a large republic without radical modifications.

"Now, we come to the solution of the problem that I propose to submit to the American people for their consideration. I desire to say that I am in accord with the administration as regards the amount of increase necessary for the Regular Army, also the general idea of the administration as to extending to the National Guard a helping hand and as to the size and necessity of our reserve army. However, I differ with others in that I do not believe that a practical plan that will attain the desired end has as yet been submitted. I would not criticize other plans were I not able, in my opinion, to submit a better one, which is economical as regards money and men withdrawn from civil life, and which hurts no one, but benefits many not at present benefited.

"Recognizing that our present voluntary system of enlistment is a failure during prosperous peace times, we ought to bring other forces to play on the recruiting element of the Nation when we consider increasing our Regular Army. Where can such a force possible of utilization be found? I believe it can be found during peace in State patriotism, loyalty, pride, or enthusiasm. I do not mean to say that we as a Nation have no Federal patriotism, loyalty, pride, or enthusiasm, but I do say that these elements lie dormant within us during peace only to burst forth with fury and make State patriotism secondary when war is imminent. I believe this State spirit is the strongest potential force possible of utilization during peace, prosperous, and hard times that the Government has with which to solve Regular Army, National Guard, and reserve army problems. And I base my entire plan on the possibility of its successful utilization.

"In utilizing this State spirit my plan calls for an Army post in each State, and the Regular Army organizations, after being increased as now contemplated, assigned permanently as Federal troops to the different States. This assignment to States would be on the general basis of the number of recruits now being obtained from the respective States. Understand that the State governments themselves would have nothing whatsoever to do with these organizations. These Regular Army organizations



will be recruited to war strength, the men to serve two years with the colors and to be then placed in the State organized reserves for four years, during which time they would receive a small monthly allowance from the Federal Government and be required once each year to report for field training. These discharged men would constitute my national reserve army.

"I presume you are now asking, 'But how do you propose to get the recruits for this Army?' I will answer this question and probably others by illustrating the general application of the plan in the State of Georgia. From the recruiting data of the State of Georgia, based on both prosperous and hard times, we would at least have assigned to this State our permanent Coast Artillery garrisons and one regiment of Infantry, this regiment consisting of 1,800 men, divided into 12 companies of 150 men each. These men would enlist for six years, but only serve with the colors for two years and then four years in the Georgia reserves. This regiment would forever be called, say, the Twentieth Georgia Infantry. It would forever, when not on foreign service for two years or on the border, be stationed at Fort McPherson, Ga. Let it have a distinctive, natty, inexpensive, full-dress uniform. Let the officers understand that they are permanently assigned to this regiment. All the recruits would be Georgians, and all recruiting officers would be extra Infantry or Coast Artillery officers of the Twentieth Georgia Infantry and the Georgia Coast Artillery companies. Now, what would be the results? Soon all Georgia would take an interest in her regiment of Infantry and Coast Artillery companies and a competitive spirit would spring up between all the States. This would cause a Georgia esprit de corps in this Twentieth Georgia Infantry Regiment, and this esprit would increase as the interest of the State of Georgia increased. The disadvantages of separation from loved ones and family that attend an enlistment in the present Regular Army would not exist, and a father would not object to his son enlisting and receiving the benefits of two years' military training when he knows his son would in all probability reside the two years in the State of Georgia at Fort McPherson and upon the termination of his service would return to him at once. These sons would be given a two weeks' or a month's furlough each year, and could then visit their homes and assist with the crops, and so forth. The very presence of these men on furlough in their home towns, in their natty full-dress uniforms, sober, straight, and erect, would offer positive evidence of the benefits to be derived from military training, would stimulate enlisting, and would quicken the pride of all Georgians. And what is true in Georgia is true in all other States.

"I would add to the now known benefits derived from military training that of teaching each man a profession during his two years at Fort McPherson. I would conduct a school corresponding to any public school in the State; also a school for carpenters, bricklayers, mechanics, blacksmiths, surveyors, typewriting, and so forth. Every man would be required to attend one of these schools. The higher officers of the regiment and recruiting officers would be asked to cooperate with the chambers of commerce, and the spirit of Georgia would then pervade the entire regiment. I would send a crack company to all the large State affairs. I would, as far as practicable, even assign men from the same sections of Georgia to the same companies, so that a young man joining the regiment would be living in the same room and messing at the same table with his friends, and mothers would know their sons to be among friends of the family and cared for by them in case of sickness. If this system presses the desired enlisting spring of the Nation, Georgia would be able to supply, according to recent enlisting data, at least her Coast Artillery companies and two regiments of Infantry each 1,800 strong.

"Of course, as you see, the plan first corrects the enlisting defects of our present Army, and you can not support it unless you believe it corrects this defect. Let us now discuss its application to the reserves. All men would, of course, enlist for six years, two with the colors and four in the reserves, which would cause approximately 900 men to go to the Georgia reserves each year and would give us about 3,600 men, or two reserve Georgia regiments. Most of these men would reside in Georgia, thus making it possible to keep in touch with them and mobilize them in a very short time (possibly not over three days), and certainly in a very economical manner. Their clothing (especially shoes), rifles, and other accouterments would be in perfect condition at Fort McPherson in lockers, and to put our reserves in uniform would be only a question of an hour after their arrival. Each reserve soldier would receive \$2 a month during the four years of his reserve service. This would insure and make possible the keeping track of the whereabouts of each man every month, and the pay of \$2 to every reserve man

would drop into his lap out of a clear sky each month, thus keeping up his interest in his military career and stimulating enlisting in his community. We must not expect something which is efficient and worth having for nothing; if we want the service and protection of 300,000 trained reserve men we must be willing to make a reasonable payment for the same. Some few reserve men would, of course, move out of the State of Georgia; in these cases they would be transferred direct to the reserve of the State to which they moved by the commanding officer of the Georgia reserves. The commanding officer of the Georgia reserve regiments would be a high-ranking Regular Army officer, who should have an office force of not over two assistants, one from the Infantry and one from the Coast Artillery.

"To obtain the necessary number of trained officers to command the two regiments of reserve Infantry and the reserve companies of Coast Artillery of the State of Georgia, I would give preference to the officers of the National Guard of Georgia. When I reduced slightly the number of organizations of the National Guard, there would be an excess of National Guard officers, and to these men I would offer commissions in the reserve regiments and Coast Artillery companies, subject, of course, to mental and physical examination. These reserve officers would, of course, receive a small monthly salary. For the rest of the reserve officers I would take the honor graduates of the military schools of this State, pay them \$100 a month for a year, during which time they would serve as additional lieutenants in the Twentieth Georgia Infantry and Georgia Coast Artillery companies. At the end of the year these officers would be transferred to the reserves and assigned to companies. Once this system is started, the number of men to be accepted as officers from the military institutions of the State would vary according to the vacancies. At the end of the first year of the system we would require sufficient officers to command 900 men, the second year 1,800 men, the third year 2,700 men, the fourth year 3,600 men. So by using one to five honor graduates of each military school each year and the National Guard officers we could have a corps of trained officers sufficient in size at the end of four years to officer the reserve organizations. These officers would know their men, and esprit de corps in each reserve regiment would soon be noticed. An honor graduate assigned to Company A, Twentieth Georgia Infantry, as an additional second lieutenant, upon the completion of his year of training, should be assigned to Company A of one of the reserve regiments. Likewise all enlisted men of Company A, Twentieth Georgia Regulars, upon being transferred to the reserves, should be assigned to Company A of one of the reserve regiments. This system would soon create an esprit de corps in the companies of the reserve regiment. Officers and men would look forward to the yearly maneuvers as a reunion. They would then meet and rub elbows with the men with whom they served for two years; reserve officers would be commanding in many cases the men they commanded during their one year. The entire system would blend toward real efficiency.

"When the President desired to mobilize the Nation's military forces one telegram only to each State would be necessary. The reserves of each State could be mobilized, clothed, and armed certainly within a week, and the President could mobilize a trained and educated army of over 300,000 men at any strategic point on either coast within three weeks from the date of ordering the mobilization. This is brought about because the plan works automatically to this end when we study it. Take New York State, for instance: It is at present our greatest recruiting center; hence it would have the largest number of Regular Army and reserve organizations. The States adjacent to New York are naturally densely populated, and therefore would have a fairly large number of Regular Army and reserve organizations, all of which makes possible the concentration at New York of a large number of troops at a moment's notice and also at a very small cost. Also we find that the system eliminates the present deleterious condition of having the young boys from the farms in the South and West serving with and being influenced by some of the undesirable element enlisting in some of our large cities. It also works our small Army plant at its maximum capacity.

"How would the system work when applied to our foreign-service conditions? Foreign service is very popular with our soldiers. As soon as it is definitely known that a certain regiment is scheduled for a tour abroad the regiment is at once filled with recruits. Hence, when our First Georgia Regiment is scheduled for two years abroad, and at the end of which time is to be returned to us at Atlanta with our sons, we would be only too glad to permit our sons to take advantage of the splendid opportunity of seeing the world. Especially would this be so when we realized the regiment was to be officered by sober, hon-



est, and efficient officers. The system eliminates two very grave existing conditions. It takes the question of where troops are to be stationed and the elimination of many of our undesirable posts out of politics. Each State would have only one post for its mobile army troops; and by mobile army troops I mean all troops except those in the Coast Artillery.

"This system would greatly benefit the National Guard. The discharged reserves would be encouraged at all times in associating themselves with the National Guard. Soon the National Guard organizations would consist mostly of men who would have completed their six years regular service. These men would join the National Guard in order to attend the encampments and see their friends again if for no other reason. Understand that I would at the commencing of this system only reduce the National Guard organization at places where it has been clearly demonstrated that the guard organizations are below the required strength per company or where they are very inefficient. In these cases I would simply request fewer organizations, say the transferring of all the men of a weak regiment into four strong companies or a battalion. However, I would take care of the officers eliminated as mentioned above.

"From an economical standpoint the system is well within reason. The real economy can only be realized when you figure the additional security attained by having the Army plant running at full capacity and a reserve army of 300,000 trained and officered soldiers (not civilians), and compare this class of security and what you pay for it with that attained by having your plant running at two-fifths of its capacity, a reserve of 400,000 citizens, and what it costs you.

"The visible economical features are listed below:

"First. Men to-day are sent from the place of enlistment to different and very often distant regiments, and upon being discharged are returned to the place of enlistment, which averages one-half the distance across the continent. This item of expenditure, which runs into hundreds of thousands of dollars each year, would be eliminated.

"Second. At present each soldier has the same money clothing allowance, because he is liable to be called upon to serve in any climate. Under the proposed plan there would be no occasion for southern troops to have a money allowance for clothing as large as the New England troops. Likewise the money allowance for clothing of the New England troops could be reduced, because they would not require certain articles of clothing necessary for southern wear. By carrying out this idea a large saving could be made.

"Third. Officers would remain with the regiments and the present large officers' mileage expenditures could be practically eliminated.

"Fourth. A corresponding saving on the freight bills for officers' household effects would be made as their mileage expenditures are reduced.

"Fifth. It is cheaper to feed 1,800 men than it is to feed three separate groups of 600 men, as we are doing now.

"Sixth. The cost of keeping up a post for a large command is less per man than keeping up three posts for the same number of men.

"Seventh. The cost of mobilizing troops for maneuvers would be less than it is now, because in practically every State by assembling Regulars, Reserves, and the National Guard a brigade maneuver could be held each year, and by combining the adjacent States a division or corps maneuver could be held every two years, and in each class of maneuvers the distance required to move the troops is less than at present. In other words, there would be a sufficient uniform distribution of our force over the country for this purpose.

"Eighth. By selling the undesirable and useless Army posts sufficient funds could be secured to enlarge the remaining ones and to build the new ones necessary and still have funds on hand. Fully two-thirds of the States have at least one post possible of utilization if we adopt this plan.

"If at any time the Government considered the Army plan turning out too many reserves, it would be reduced by only having 100 or 125 men in each company. Any reduction below 100 men to a company is believed unwise. On the other hand, if it is found that not enough men are supplied for the reserves a limited number could no doubt be attained by calling on civilians to enlist in the reserves, as the President now contemplates. However, if over 20 per cent of the reserves enter thus as untrained civilians, it would reduce the efficiency of the reserves to an undesirable point. Also a provision should be inserted permitting reserve men to reenlist in the reserve when the reserves are not at authorized strength.

"Let us now figure how our plan would work out:

Regular Army.		Number.
Forty regiments of Infantry, at 1,800 each	-----	72,000
Fifteen regiments of Cavalry, at 1,200 each	-----	15,000
Ten regiments of Field Artillery, at 1,000 each	-----	10,000
Two hundred and ten companies of Coast Artillery, at 100 each	-----	21,000
Three battalions Engineer troops, at 500 each	-----	1,500
Medical Department	-----	500
Total	-----	120,000

Two times this number, or 240,000, will give us the strength of the reserve army. The 120,000 in the Regular Army does not include the native regiments in our insular possessions or the special troops, such as those in the Quartermaster, Ordnance, and Signal Corps, and so forth.

"Our National Guard, after being reduced, will amount to a trifle over 100,000. So our total available strength possible of mobilization would be 440,000 men, less those on foreign service. We could eventually increase our militia by 60,000 as the reserve soldiers terminated their six years' service, and then we would have our 500,000 trained and officered soldiers, which amount of preparedness should render us forever free from even the fear of an invader's heel. If we accept this plan we avoid the evils of a large standing Army and at the same time make ourselves secure against attack, at only a small increase over our present military expenditures. We also improve morally, physically, and mentally a large percentage of our population, whose earning capacity will be sufficiently increased to warrant the expenditures."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I would like unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes, and I want to make a statement here before I start. There has been a very serious attack made in this House by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] upon men who hold opinions such as I do, and I desire to proceed for 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAILEY] asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CALDWELL. Reserving the right to object, on what subject?

Mr. BAILEY. On the general subject that is under discussion now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. DENT. Reserving the right to object, unless some other gentleman desires to discuss the question while we are on this paragraph, I will ask that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania all debate on this paragraph be closed.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. That will have to be put as a separate proposition. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAILEY]. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Alabama prefers a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DENT. That at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that at the termination of the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, for one, I wish to hurl back the charge of cowardice flung at the advocates of peace by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. When did I accuse you or any other advocate of peace of cowardice?

Mr. BAILEY. I will quote your language later, if you please. I do not care to be diverted just now.

It takes more courage than was ever conceived of in the philosophy of swashbuckling shoulder-strappers to face the mob and to bring to bear upon it the forces of reason and justice. Is that courage which enables the soldier to march up to the cannon's mouth the only or the greatest courage which men may show? No; a thousand times no. There is a brute courage and there is also a moral courage. There is the courage of the bulldog, the courage of the tomcat, the courage of the cock sparrow, the courage of a reptile which attacks another reptile.



But is this courage such as to inspire our loftiest admiration? Is it the sort of courage we try to develop and strengthen in our children? Who is the greater hero—he that taketh a city or he that conquereth his own soul?

The gentleman from Massachusetts may arrogate to himself a heroism that he denies to men like William Jennings Bryan, Henry Ford, David Starr Jordan, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY]. But I am here to say that any one of these is possessed of a spirit of heroism as far surpassing that before which the gentleman from Massachusetts prostrates himself as day surpasses night. The heroism which enthralles the gentleman from Massachusetts is that of the jungle.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield? I call the gentleman's attention to the rule of the House which says that a Member shall proceed in order and avoid personalities. I do not object to a reasonable amount of criticism.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he proceeded in order the other day when he branded those who stand for peace as cowards and allies of Germany. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. If the gentleman can point out a single case in which I transgressed the rights of the House, all right. I shall ask the Chair to rule that the gentleman proceed in order and avoid personalities. I do not object to a reasonable amount of criticism, but I do not want the whole speech directed toward me.

Mr. BAILEY. What is the particular language the gentleman objects to?

Mr. GARDNER. I call the attention of the Chairman to the rule of the House which says that in debate a Member must avoid personalities.

Mr. BAILEY. I hope this will not be taken out of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GARDNER. I call attention to Rule XIV, which says:

SEC. 734. When any Member desires to speak or deliver any matter to the House he shall rise and respectfully address himself to "Mr. Speaker," and on being recognized may address the House from any place on the floor or from the Clerk's desk, and shall confine himself to the question under debate, avoiding personalities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks, of course, the general rule is perfectly well understood that there must be a measure of decorum and propriety in debate which the Chair must enforce. There is also a latitude of argument and latitude of reply. What is the particular language used by the gentleman from Pennsylvania which is objected to as being an impingement on the rule cited?

Mr. GARDNER. It was the general fact that he seemed to be making me the butt of all his remarks. I never knew the gentleman, even by sight, until the other day, when he was in the chair, and I never mentioned his name on the floor of the House or elsewhere that I know of. Well, I do not care. Let him go on. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I repeat that the heroism which enthralles the gentleman from Massachusetts is that of the jungle. That is what I repeat, and I am willing to stand by it.

That which inspires men like William Jennings Bryan is the heroism of faith, of service, of love, of justice, of human kindness, of all-embracing brotherhood.

Mr. GARDNER. Is there a rule of the House, Mr. Chairman, that requires me to remain and hear the gentleman?

Mr. BAILEY. No, sir; you are excused, with my compliments. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Massachusetts, echoing the voice of the metropolitan press and of the military satrapy which seeks to replace the ideals of the Republic with those of the principalities and powers which are now drinking at the fountains of blood, bewails the fact that the American people are taking counsel among themselves regarding this momentous issue which he wishes to be determined without their knowledge or their consent. He would silence those who can not accept the gospel of the claw and the fang which he preaches with such vehemence. There is to be no counsel save that of the war lords; no voice heard except that of the munition maker; no suggestion offered save by what may be usurped authority. Doubtless he believes with the Washington Post that death should be decreed against every American citizen who dares in this crisis of the Nation to speak the word of soberness in an effort to curb the mob spirit to which militarism always and everywhere appeals. His whole attack on those who believe the people should have some voice in a matter affecting their most vital interests is based on the assumption that only the war lords should be heard in such an emergency. He thinks that only cravens and cowards would question the word of those who settle disputes with the sword and who dispose of issues involving the national honor with 16-inch guns. Yet there is a

bravery above that of the barracks, a courage finer than that of the cavalier, a heroism more splendid than that of the man on horseback. It is the bravery of the man who faces the mob; it is the courage of the man who confronts the serried ranks of prejudice; it is the heroism of the soul which rises superior to the shafts of ridicule and malevolence in the cause of right and justice.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts conjures those who believe in the possibility of a peaceful solution of the pending problem to "stand by the President." But is he "standing by the President"? The President is hoping and striving to avoid war. With a matchless poise and patience he has thrown his incomparable influence on the side of peace. By every means at his command he is endeavoring to steer the ship of state through troubled waters to a safe harbor. Yet here is the gentleman from Massachusetts and those for whom he speaks going to extravagant lengths in their efforts to balk him and to force him to enter the war as an ally of the allies. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes no concealment of his purpose. He is at least frank, open, aboveboard. He does not beat about the bush.

I wish he were here to listen to this tribute.

He hates Germany with a consuming hatred. His heart is with Britain, and he wants to plunge his country into war as an aid to King George in his struggle to destroy Germany. Yet he has the consummate effrontery to stand on this floor before the American people and asperse the good faith of those who wish this country to remain neutral and to avoid a dangerous entanglement with the warring powers. He charges them with placing loyalty to Germany above their loyalty to America.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to this effect, that the gentleman is not talking to the amendment before the House. I agree with the gentleman largely in everything that he says, but I do not think that that last statement is fair or proper.

Mr. BAILEY. It is as fair as the gentleman—

Mr. KING. Therefore I ask for a ruling on the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is addressing the House along the line which he proposed to speak.

Mr. KING. He is not discussing the amendment proposed by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment?

Mr. KING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand when he got permission of the House that he was to discuss the pro forma amendment.

Mr. KING. He said he was going to talk on this bill when he got the consent. The gentleman has no right to accuse any Member of this House of being a subject of King George, no matter who he is.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman raises a question of order—

Mr. KING. I do raise the question.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. POU. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was asked what he was going to speak on, and he said "the general subject." That was a part of and a preliminary condition to the request that he made for unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that is the way he understood the request of the gentleman.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, that was asked by reason of the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] reserved the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not believe unanimous consent was given for the discussion of just a pro forma amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention also to the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania distinctly stated that he wanted to reply to strictures that had been made by gentlemen on his views.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the words I referred to be taken down.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the gentleman is too late. He has made a point of order on the scope of the discussion, and that has been discussed and ruled on, and now it is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would not rule that the gentleman is too late to make the point of order. All this is occurring along the same line. The Clerk will read from the desk the last words to which objection was made.

The Clerk read the words.



Mr. KING. Now, Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is that a proper parliamentary speech in the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have to report that back to the House.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that these remarks will not be taken down if they are made at me. I do not mind the gentleman saying that I have a greater loyalty to Great Britain than to the United States.

Mr. KING. The gentleman can not withdraw my inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will rise.

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having under consideration the bill (H. R. 20783) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, objection was made to certain language used by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAILEY], who had the floor; that a request was made that those words be taken down, and they were taken down, and that he desired to report the words.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk again read the words.

The SPEAKER. What is the will of the House?

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAILEY] be permitted to proceed in order.

Mr. EMERSON. What does the gentleman mean by "in order"?

Mr. HENSLEY. Let the Speaker pass upon that.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the words be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the words complained of be stricken from the Record. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. KING. I demand a division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands a division. Those who are in favor of striking these words from the Record will, when their names are called, answer "aye"; those opposed will answer "no."

The House divided; and there were—ayes 58, yeas 31.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. KEATING. I make the point of no quorum, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On this vote the yeas are 58 and the yeas are 31.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Two or three gentlemen make the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-seven gentlemen are present—not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of striking these words from the Record will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 167, nays 126, answered "present" 24, not voting 116, as follows:

YEAS—167.

Adair	Elston	Hinds	Magee
Anderson	Emerson	Hollingsworth	Mann
Anthony	Esch	Hopwood	Mapes
Austin	Estopinal	Howard	Martin
Bowers	Farley	Howell	Mays
Butler	Farr	Hull, Iowa	Meeker
Campbell	Fields	Humphrey, Wash.	Mondell
Capstick	Fitzgerald	Igoe	Montague
Carlin	Focht	James	Moore, Pa.
Carter, Mass.	Fordney	Johnson, Wash.	Moore, Ind.
Chandler, N. Y.	Foss	Kahn	Morgan, Okla.
Charles	Freeman	Keister	Morin
Coady	Fuller	Kelley	Moss
Cooper, Ohio	Gallivan	Kennedy, Iowa	Mott
Cooper, W. Va.	Garland	Key, Ohio	Nichols, Mich.
Copley	Gillett	Kiess, Pa.	North
Crago	Glynn	King	Norton
Cramton	Good	La Follette	Oakey
Curry	Gray, N. J.	Langley	Olney
Dale, Vt.	Green, Iowa	Lazaro	Palge, Mass.
Dallinger	Greene, Mass.	Lehibach	Parker, N. J.
Danforth	Greene, Vt.	Lenroot	Parker, N. Y.
Dempsey	Guernsey	Longworth	Peters
Denison	Hadley	McAndrews	Platt
Dillon	Hamilton, Mich.	McArthur	Powers
Dowell	Hamilton, N. Y.	McCracken	Pratt
Driscoll	Hangen	McDermott	Ramsayer
Dunn	Hawley	McFadden	Reavis
Dupré	Hayes	McKellar	Ricketts
Dyer	Hcaton	McKenzie	Roberts, Mass.
Egan	Heflin	McLaughlin	Roberts, Nev.
Ellsworth	Hernandez	Madden	Rogers

Rowe  
Rowland  
Sanford  
Scott, Mich.  
Sherley  
Shouse  
Sinnott  
Slomp  
Sloan  
Smith, Mich.

Snyder  
Stafford  
Steenerson  
Sterling  
Stiness  
Stone  
Suloway  
Sutherland  
Sweet  
Temple

Tilson  
Timberlake  
Tower  
Treadway  
Volstead  
Walsh  
Ward  
Wason  
Watson, Pa.  
Watson, Va.

Wheeler  
Williams, T. S.  
Williams, Ohio  
Wilson, Ill.  
Winslow  
Wood, Ind.  
Woods, Iowa  
Woodyard  
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—126.

Abercrombie  
Alken  
Alexander  
Allen  
Almon  
Aswell  
Barkley  
Barnhart  
Bell  
Booher  
Borland  
Brumbaugh  
Buchanan, Ill.  
Buchanan, Tex.  
Burke  
Burnett  
Byrnes, S. C.  
Byrnes, Tenn.  
Candler, Miss.  
Caraway  
Clark, Fla.  
Collier  
Connelly  
Cox  
Crisp  
Crosser  
Davis, Minn.  
Davis, Tex.  
Decker  
Dickinson  
Dill  
Dixon

Doolittle  
Doughton  
Eagle  
Evans  
Flood  
Gallagher  
Gandy  
Garner  
Garrett  
Gordon  
Gray, Ind.  
Gregg  
Griffin  
Hamill  
Hamlin  
Hardy  
Harrison, Miss.  
Hastings  
Hayden  
Helm  
Helvering  
Hensley  
Hilliard  
Houston  
Huddleston  
Hughes  
Hull, Tenn.  
Humphreys, Miss.  
Jacoway  
Jones  
Kearns  
Kenting

Kettner  
Kincheloe  
Kitchin  
Lee  
Leshner  
Lever  
Lieb  
Littlepage  
Lloyd  
London  
McClintic  
McLemore  
Moon  
Morrison  
Neely  
Nicholls, S. C.  
Oldfield  
Overmyer  
Padgett  
Park  
Pou  
Price  
Quin  
Raney  
Raker  
Randall  
Rauch  
Rayburn  
Reilly  
Rouse  
Rubey  
Russell, Mo.

Sears  
Shallenberger  
Sherwood  
Sisson  
Slayden  
Smith, N. Y.  
Smith, Tex.  
Stegall  
Steele, Iowa  
Stephens, Miss.  
Stephens, Nebr.  
Stephens, Tex.  
Sumners  
Tavener  
Taylor, Ark.  
Taylor, Colo.  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Tillman  
Van Dyke  
Vinson  
Walker  
Watkins  
Webb  
Whaley  
Williams, W. Va.  
Wilson, La.  
Wingo  
Wise  
Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—24.

Ashbrook  
Ayres  
Bailey  
Black  
Burgess  
Caldwell

Cary  
Costello  
Dent  
Doremus  
Foster  
Gardner

Harrison, Va.  
Helgesen  
Hood  
Konop  
Lindbergh  
Miller, Pa.

Murray  
Nolan  
Saunders  
Small  
Smith, Minn.  
Stedman

NOT VOTING—116.

Adamson  
Bacharach  
Barchfield  
Beakes  
Beales  
Benedict  
Bennet  
Blackmon  
Britt  
Britten  
Browne  
Browning  
Bruckner  
Callaway  
Cannon  
Cantrill  
Carow  
Carter, Okla.  
Casey  
Chipperfield  
Church  
Cline  
Coleman  
Conry  
Cooper, Wis.  
Cullop  
Dale, N. Y.  
Darrow  
Davenport

Dewalt  
Dies  
Dooling  
Drukker  
Edmonds  
Edwards  
Fairchild  
Ferris  
Fess  
Flynn  
Frear  
Gard  
Glass  
Godwin, N. C.  
Goodwin, Ark.  
Gould  
Graham  
Gray, Ala.  
Griest  
Hart  
Haskell  
Henry  
Hicks  
Hill  
Holland  
Hulbert  
Husted  
Hutchinson  
Johnson, Ky.

Johnson, S. Dak.  
Kennedy, R. I.  
Kent  
Kinkaid  
Kreider  
Lafean  
Lewis  
Liebel  
Linthicum  
Lobeck  
Loft  
Loud  
McCulloch  
McGillcuddy  
McKinley  
Maher  
Matthews  
Miller, Del.  
Miller, Minn.  
Mooney  
Morgan, La.  
Mudd  
Nelson  
Oglesby  
Oliver  
O'Shaunessy  
Page, N. C.  
Patten  
Phelan

Porter  
Ragsdale  
Riordan  
Rodenberg  
Rucker, Ga.  
Rucker, Mo.  
Russell, Ohio  
Sabath  
Schall  
Scott, Pa.  
Scully  
Sells  
Shackleford  
Siegel  
Sims  
Smith, Idaho  
Snell  
Sparkman  
Steele, Pa.  
Stout  
Swift  
Switzer  
Taggart  
Tague  
Talbot  
Tinkham  
Vare  
Venable  
Wilson, Fla.

So the motion of Mr. KING was agreed to.  
During the roll call,  
Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what the words are which it is proposed to strike out.  
The SPEAKER. The roll call has started and can not be interrupted. The Clerk will proceed with the roll call.  
The Clerk resumed and completed the calling of the roll.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:  
Until Monday, February 19:  
Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. BROWNING.  
From February 17 until February 21:  
Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. TINKHAM.  
Until further notice:  
Mr. PATTEN with Mr. BENNET.  
Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.  
Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. MUDD.  
Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. HILL.  
Mr. SCULLY with Mr. MOONEY.  
Mr. BEAKES with Mr. COLEMAN.  
Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. BENEDICT.  
Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. BACHARACH.  
Mr. LOFT with Mr. HASKELL.  
Mr. HULBERT with Mr. HUSTED.



Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. BEALES.  
 Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. BRITT.  
 Mr. BRUCKNER with Mr. BRITTEN.  
 Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. BROWNE.  
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. CANNON.  
 Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. CHIPERFIELD.  
 Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma with Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin.  
 Mr. CASEY with Mr. DARROW.  
 Mr. CHURCH with Mr. DRUKKER.  
 Mr. CLINE with Mr. EDMONDS.  
 Mr. CONRY with Mr. FAIRCHILD.  
 Mr. HART with Mr. FESS.  
 Mr. GRAY of Alabama with Mr. FREAR.  
 Mr. DEWALT with Mr. GOULD.  
 Mr. DIES with Mr. GRAHAM.  
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. GRIEST.  
 Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. HICKS.  
 Mr. FERRIS with Mr. VARE.  
 Mr. HENRY with Mr. HUTCHINSON.  
 Mr. HOLLAND with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.  
 Mr. GARD with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.  
 Mr. LIEBEL with Mr. KINKAID.  
 Mr. LOBECK with Mr. KREIDER.  
 Mr. GLASS with Mr. LAFEAN.  
 Mr. MCGILLICUDDY with Mr. LOUD.  
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. MCCULLOCH.  
 Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. MCKINLEY.  
 Mr. OGLESBY with Mr. MATTHEWS.  
 Mr. OLIVER with Mr. MILLER of Delaware.  
 Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.  
 Mr. PAGE of North Carolina with Mr. NELSON.  
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. PORTER.  
 Mr. RUCKER of Georgia with Mr. RODENBERG.  
 Mr. SABATH with Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio.  
 Mr. SIMS with Mr. SCHALL.  
 Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania with Mr. SELLS.  
 Mr. STOUT with Mr. SIEGEL.  
 Mr. TAGGART with Mr. SNELL.  
 Mr. TAGUE with Mr. SWIFT.  
 Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. SWITZER.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors. The motion of the gentleman from Illinois to strike out the words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAILEY] from the RECORD is agreed to. The committee will resume its sitting.

Accordingly the House again resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 20783) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, with Mr. SAUNDERS in the chair.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania permit me, in the middle of his speech, to ask unanimous consent to address the committee for two minutes on a matter entirely unrelated to any of the matters now pending?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly, with pleasure.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks two minutes for the purpose indicated. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, in a sort of a way the House itself is a grandfather. When Genevieve Clark Thompson was married the Members of the House presented her with a very beautiful wedding present. She is now the mother of a son, Champ Clark Thompson. [Applause.] I think it would be very appropriate for the Members of the House, under the circumstances, to give to this grandson of the Speaker and of the House a little present in the form of a cup, a knife, a fork, and a spoon. This morning I had Mr. Shaw bring up to the Capitol, having received them by directions from New York, these implements in gold, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOYD] and myself, constituting ourselves a committee, went and inspected the articles. If there be no objection from the Members of the House, we ask the Members to contribute voluntarily a dollar apiece. [Applause.] That is in order that we may make this present with the appropriate inscriptions. If there be no objection, we will ask some of the employees of the House to go around to the Members and collect the money. [Applause.] The articles will be displayed before they are sent away.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAILEY] will proceed.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, owing to the very considerable delay that has been occasioned by this tempest in a teapot, and inasmuch as I feel that I have succeeded in making the point that I desired to make, I am going to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the remainder of my speech; and I will say that I will modify it in accordance with the expression of the House. [Applause.]

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Go ahead.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I have taken up enough time already. I do not want to delay the public business, and shall not do so if I am given this permission. Otherwise I will—

Mr. MANN. I think no one will object if the gentleman will say that there will be no personalities left in his speech.

Mr. BAILEY. I have stated that I would modify my remarks in accordance with the expression of the House. I would like to say this, however, that I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] should likewise agree to modify his remarks. [Applause.]

I want to say this, if the Chair pleases—

Mr. GARDNER. In what respect does the gentleman think I should modify my remarks?

Mr. BAILEY. May I proceed, Mr. Chairman, by reading the language to which I refer?

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. I still have time remaining, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will proceed.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] said:

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, William Jennings Bryan proposes that we should prepare ourselves to present a united front to the enemy by first tearing the Nation asunder in a political campaign on the question of peace or war. He and his followers, the pacifists—

Of whom I am one, and I am not ashamed in this presence or any other to attest that fact [applause]—

the extreme socialists, and those who place loyalty to Germany above loyalty to America, are engaged in appealing to the cowardice which lurks in every man's breast.

Mr. GARDNER. Let me ask the gentleman if I said or implied in any way that he or any other pacifist placed loyalty to Germany above loyalty to America?

Mr. BAILEY. I think the language was very plain. It seems to me—

Mr. GARDNER. I do not agree with the gentleman. I said:

He and his followers—

That is, Bryan and his followers—

the pacifists—

There are pacifists—

the extreme socialists—

And there are extreme socialists; that is another kind—other followers of Mr. Bryan—

and those who place loyalty to Germany above loyalty to America—

And there are such people in this country. You are not one, because you are not German. There are many Germans— are engaged in appealing to the cowardice which lurks in every man's breast.

If there is any reflection on the House of Representatives I shall cheerfully withdraw it, and if there is any reflection on any Member of the House of Representatives, if the gentleman will tell me where I had any gentleman in my mind when I spoke, I will cheerfully withdraw that; but I surely said nothing about any pacifist except that he was a follower of Mr. Bryan, and that he was appealing to the cowardice which lurks in men's breasts. I do not imply any cowardice on the part of pacifists. I think the gentleman has missed that point.

Mr. BAILEY. As long as I have agreed to modify my remarks, I think the gentleman should agree to modify his.

Mr. GARDNER. Let me point out this distinction to the gentleman: It was the House, by a vote, that cut out the gentleman's remarks. That was not my case.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; I know.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if the gentleman from Massachusetts would be willing to have a vote taken whether his remarks should go out or not. The inference is perfectly plain that he charges the pacifists with a feeling of cowardice.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD, to be modified so as to conform to the rules of the House. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I want to enter my protest against any requests being made in the language in which the



Chair has just stated it. The presumption is that every Member when he extends his remarks will deal fairly with the House and will put in remarks only that are in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman that he was stating the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania exactly in the words used by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WINGO. I am not criticizing the Chair, but I do not want the RECORD, in view of what has just taken place, to contain language so that when a man reads it, not being familiar with what has taken place, he may be misled. It only adds to the criticism of what has already taken place. I am not criticizing the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman would have to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to modify his request, then.

Mr. WINGO. I am not asking anybody to do anything. I am entering my protest.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WINGO. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman is not in order. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JAMES. I object unless it is understood that personalities are cut out of the speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has stated it as clearly as he can that the gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and in that connection to conform his remarks, as far as personalities may be contained in them contrary to the rules of the House, to the rules.

Mr. WINGO. If the request is put in that language, I shall object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas objects to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD. I think the House will take what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said in good faith.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank God for Woodrow Wilson and William Jennings Bryan in this hour of grave peril to republican institutions. I thank God for those men and women all over the land who refuse to bow at the feet of Mars at the call of the war mongers and the traffickers in munitions. I thank God for those really courageous souls who refuse to be silenced by an envenomed press which gets its inspiration from Wall Street and which would crucify every American who dares to plead in this hour of stress and strain for reason to assert herself rather than passion.

Perhaps the gentleman from Massachusetts thinks that it is cowardice which impels me to vote against monstrous appropriations that must impose heavy burdens upon my people. Perhaps he thinks that it is cowardice that has directed me in protesting against compulsory military service. Perhaps he thinks cowardice explains the fact that all my life long I have stood four square against militarism in all its manifestations. Well, he is entitled to his own opinion in this regard. But how much easier would it be for me, Mr. Chairman, "to go along," to run with the mob, to shout with the hurrah boys, to let the tide of war sweep on unchallenged until it should engulf my beloved land and the ideals which have made it precious to every man who has caught the glowing vision of human freedom. Oh, how little is the courage required of the man who falls in behind the tumultuous crowd as it rushes on its reckless way! How little is the courage one must have to meet the call of the jungle. It is the call of civilization that tries. It is the call of humanity that brings the real test. It is the call of justice which applies the acid to our mettle.

I can understand why dogs fight. They know no better. I can understand why the cock sparrow struggles with his rival until he dies. He is governed by his instinct and not by reason. But I can not understand why men fight, because men know better; they have the gift of reason, they know right from wrong, evil from good, justice from injustice. And men have, indeed, ceased to settle their personal differences by appeal to force. They no longer vindicate their honor by killing some one or getting killed. They no longer measure their valor by the number of victims they have sent to the cemetery. And there is none we so much despise to-day as the bully, the bad man, the chap that carries a gun and looks for trouble. We do not honor him. We do not make him the gorgeous and

glittering center of our social life. He does not occupy the chief seat in our synagogues nor the first place at our feasts. No. We send him to jail. We put him on the rock pile. We drive him out of our peaceful communities. We point him out to our children as a horrible example. And we warn the youth of the land against following in his crooked courses.

Yet we magnify the name of the bully when he wears an epaulette and carries a sword. We hail him as a hero and savior. We decorate him with honors and ascribe to him qualities and aspirations that belong to the gods. We place him on a lofty pedestal and invite our children to look up and admire, if not to worship. We make of him an idol before which all the humble and the patriotic must bow if they would escape calumny.

Neither as a citizen nor as a Member of Congress have I reached the pass where anyone can put a gag in my mouth or a seal on my mind. I am still a free man, an American, a citizen, a soldier of the common good, whose only weapon is the sword of truth, whose only defense is the armor of justice. And in this hour of fear and foreboding I do not falter. My faith is unshaken. My courage is that of one who believes that ever the right comes uppermost and ever is justice done. We can go into this war across the waters or we can stay out of it, and it will take a higher courage to stay out of it than to plunge into it at the call of jingoism. We can go into it and help the kings and princes of the Old World in their mad struggle to strengthen their thrones and extend their dominions. We can get into it and underwrite the securities which Wall Street has taken for the billions loaned the allies. We can go into it and sacrifice the fair youth of our land, your boy and mine. We can go into it and fasten on those who shall come after us a burden of debt which will press them down for generations. We may go into it and say that we are doing it to vindicate a right which might be better vindicated by another appeal than to beak and talon. We can get into it and enrich the soil of Europe with our best blood, while casting a shadow over a million American homes. Yes. We can get into it. We can go into it as we might go to a frolic. We can get into it with banners flying and with music working its magic in the heart of the multitude. But we can not go into it without paying the price. We can not go into it without some sacrifice. We can not go into it without leaving something behind which is more precious than any prize it were possible for us to gain in the trenches. We must leave behind American ideals, American hopes, American possibilities of service to a world gone mad with the lust for blood. We can not take these with us into the trenches. We can take with us thither only the things that flourish there, hatreds and jealousies, misunderstandings and brute passions, malevolent spirits and hearts bursting with a desire to slay and destroy. That is what we must take there. We can not take our good offices, our helping hand, our leaves of healing. No. We must go red-handed, imbued with all that war instills into the hearts of its votaries, bent on achieving the ultimate in the destruction of human life and in the laying waste of fair lands and peaceful cities.

Is that what Americans have in mind? Is that their ambition? Is this the inspiration of the present hour? I say not so. I believe the American people are for peace. I believe they love the ideals of the Republic and hate those which jingoism holds up in its mailed hand. I believe that if the voice of the plain people of the Republic could be heard it would call a halt on the madness which would precipitate us into the very vortex of that maelstrom of blood that a world in its blind rage has let loose. And because I believe this and because I feel in my heart of hearts that the higher patriotism calls for counsels of prudence rather than those of passion, I am exerting all my humble influence, not to excite hatreds, not to multiply prejudices, not to suppress the urgings of reason, not to stimulate the grosser impulses, not to hurry the land into a fateful enterprise on a false quest, but to restrain the forces which make for evil, to check impulses which are sweeping Europe to her doom and to appeal to those loftier aspirations which can find fruitage only in peace.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order. The order was that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania all debate be closed on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Expenses of military observers abroad: For the actual and necessary expenses of officers of the Army on duty abroad for the purpose of observing operations of armies of foreign States at war, to be paid upon certificates of the Secretary of War that the expenditures were necessary for obtaining military information, \$15,000.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the testimony of Adjt. Gen. McCain before the



Committee on Military Affairs in regard to the number of men that have been enlisted. Two or three Members of the House in their remarks have seemed to indicate that they were of the opinion that under the present method adopted enlistments were not up to what was expected. I therefore desire to call the attention of the House to the testimony of Gen. McCain on pages 668 and 671 of the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs. In that testimony Gen. McCain has stated that the enlistments have been very gratifying since the reorganization under the act of June 3, 1916; that in the month of November the enlistments increased 900 over the month from October, and that throughout the five months since the act has been in effect the record of enlistments in the United States Army show there had been an increase of 2,000 a month. This increase takes into account all the men who have gone out of the Army by reason of death, resignation, and discharge on expiration of service or otherwise. He says further that he is satisfied that the increases will be even greater than that, and by the time of the present fiscal year that the United States Army will have all the men provided for in the national-defense act.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. I have noticed in the newspapers within the last few days that since the break with Germany there has been only three men enlisted. Is that true?

Mr. CALDWELL. I have no information on that subject. The rate of enlistment, so far as we have any record, has been 2,024 per month greater than it ever was before.

Mr. KEARNS. I have seen in two different newspapers the same statement, that since the break with Germany there has been only three men enlisted in the Army.

Mr. CALDWELL. I have no information on the subject, but if I can get it I will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. KEARNS. Does this increase of 2,000 the gentleman speaks of include withdrawals?

Mr. CALDWELL. Two thousand over and above all of the withdrawals, deaths, and resignations, and Gen. McCain says that the enlistments during the last two months have been greater than those of the first three months.

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman from New York will pardon me, it would be practically impossible to get the information that the gentleman from Ohio alludes to, because there are so many recruiting stations all over the country; every one would have to report separately, so you could not get the total enlistments at once.

Mr. CALDWELL. I think the gentleman from Ohio refers to one recruiting station.

Mr. KEARNS. Oh, no; I am speaking about the enlistments in the United States. I read it in two different newspapers.

Mr. KAHN. I think the information is erroneous. It takes the War Department 30 days to get reports in from all the recruiting stations to know how many recruits have been enlisted.

Mr. FIELDS. The papers could not possibly have it correct.

Mr. CALDWELL. The newspapers could not have official information, as a matter of fact. It is impossible, for the War Department does not know.

Mr. KEARNS. Remember, I am not claiming that it is true simply because I saw it in a newspaper.

Mr. CALDWELL. We will try to get the information for the gentleman in the course of the day.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, it all depends on what months you take as your standard of comparison. In December the total enlistment was 4,372—not the gain, but the total enlistments. It is true that the November enlistments were about 1,000 more than in October. The enlistments rose from 2,446 in October to 3,467 in November. However, in July the enlistments numbered 4,342, and they fell off nearly 2,000 by October. I hold in my hand a letter from The Adjutant General, dated January 26, 1917. A copy of it will be found in to-day's RECORD in connection with my remarks of February 15. According to Gen. McCain the actual strength of the entire Regular Army on December 31, 1916, based on the best data obtainable, was 109,959.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, according to Gen. McCain's testimony, on page 668, before the Military Affairs Committee, there were on the date the gentleman mentions one hundred and twelve thousand and odd instead of 109,000.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman may be right, but I will allow him to look over my shoulder at the letter which I hold in my hand. Will the gentleman observe the date, January 26, 1917, and the signature, that of Gen. McCain. He says:

The actual enlisted strength of the entire Regular Army on December 31, 1916, based on the best data now obtainable, is approximately 109,959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New York will permit me, I think the figures to which he refers were based on the date of October 31 last year. It is smaller now than it was then.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I telephoned down to The Adjutant General's office and I found that on February 29, 1916, the number of enlisted men altogether was 93,438. I selected the day of February 29 because that was the date of the last enlistment figures before the passage of the joint resolution of March 17, 1916, which aimed to increase the Army by about 20,000 men. That means, in other words, in the 10 months from February 29, 1916, to December 31, 1916, the Army has been increased by 16,521 men. On the average the increase has been at the rate of sixteen hundred and fifty a month.

This letter from Gen. McCain further says:

The authorized strength of the entire Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, under the provisions of the national-defense act is 133,166 men, not including the enlisted strength, 5,733, of the Philippine Scouts.

Yet we have only 109,959 men, not including the Philippine Scouts. Therefore we are about 23,000 men short by the December figures. You can not get around those figures. To claim that you can enlist these men, and the increase of men due this year, at the present rate of pay in the course of the next year and a half seems to me preposterous.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Perhaps I can set the House straight in regard to the number of men we are short in the enlistments. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is mistaken. I was in Gen. McCain's office this morning, and I asked him how many he was short. He said he was short only from ten to twelve thousand of the required number that should be in the Army on June 30, and that the enlistments coming in so far this month exceeded any other time in the last year.

Mr. GARDNER. I think the gentleman has misunderstood The Adjutant General.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I do not think so.

Mr. GARDNER. I think so, because—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. What The Adjutant General probably said to the gentleman was that by June 30, 1917, he hoped and calculated that he would be short only about 11,000 men. The fact remains that at the present time he is 23,000 men short, but there are five months coming, and he thinks that if he can gain 2,000 a month that would make him short only about 11,000 by the end of June—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Will the gentleman go to the telephone and call him up and ask him whether I am wrong?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the discrepancy in figures arises from the fact that the gentleman has not taken into consideration that the department is authorized to carry 8,000 unassigned recruits, which are not given credit for in those figures.

Mr. GARDNER. I do give credit for them. I asked especially that question, perfectly aware of the fact that guards at disciplinary barracks, school detachments, disciplinary companies, recruit companies, and unassigned recruits are all extra. I asked especially what was the entire enlisted strength of the whole business, and the General replied on January 26 as follows:

The actual enlisted strength of the entire Regular Army on December 31, 1916, based on the best data now obtainable, is approximately 109,959, not including 5,549 enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts.

There is the figure. We have 109,959. I asked the General a series of questions. I asked him the authorized enlisted strength of the entire Regular Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917. He replied:

The authorized enlisted strength of the entire Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, under the provisions of the national defense act is 133,166 men, not including the enlisted strength, 5,733, of the Philippine Scouts.

In both cases the Philippine Scouts, between 5,000 and 6,000, are excluded.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.



Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I have somewhat doubted the propriety of Members of Congress speaking on the foreign situation at this time. I should have refrained from doing so myself if it were not for the fact that speeches have been made on this floor during the past several days that I do not think are expressive of the dominant sentiment of the House. We have had one character of speech that seems to be in favor of doing nothing; another character of speech that seems to be in favor of doing everything. I think it would be wise, gentlemen, for Members of this body to take a moment and ascertain just what difficulty confronts this Nation. The appalling conflict on the other side of the sea was instituted without the volition of the United States. We did not start that war. We have no direct and immediate interest in the ultimate issue of that war. There is no belligerent engaged in the war across the water who has designs, so far as surface indications disclose, upon the United States of America. If international law has been violated to our injury, it has not been because the ultimate purpose of England or Germany or any other nation engaged was to injure this country. The injury suffered is merely incidental to the terrific struggle going on between the entente and the central powers. What is the real situation? We have certain rights on the sea to ship, unrestricted, to neutrals, and to ship to belligerents so far as the goods so shipped are not contraband. Those rights have been denied. I wish to say for my part that I am in favor of this Nation defending those rights, but we need not go to war to do so. If we become involved in war; if this body in response to a demand from any source were to pass a declaration of war, we will not accomplish what we desire, which is the freedom of the seas, but we will be adding the influence of our resources, both of life and property, to the accomplishment of what some of the belligerents desire.

If we become a party to this war, we will never get out until it is finished. I believe that the President will ask from Congress the right to enforce an armed neutrality. I believe he has such right without consulting us. There is ample precedent for such course. Twice in the history of the world armed neutrality has been enforced, first, during our revolutionary period in 1780 and again in 1800, and from the action of neutral nations sternly demanding their rights to the sea came the provisions of international law which recognize the right of neutrals to the ocean. None of the nations enforcing those rights became involved in war. I am in favor of either arming our merchantmen or conveying them with our Navy, if need be, to defend the rights which are now denied, and when those rights are obtained I want the United States to be in a position to withdraw. [Applause.] Suppose, on the other hand, we go to war. Suppose we send the youth of America to the blood-drenched fields of Europe to be obedient to the command of a king or a czar, to be the comrade in arms of savages and Hindus, to lay down their lives for a principle which concerns some country not their own. Suppose we send the youth of America to lie stark with white upturned faces upon a foreign battle field, what have we accomplished? Nothing; nothing but to crush the civilization of the world. Gentlemen of this House, in this solemn hour I declare that I will go from this Chamber forever and glory in my going before by my voice or my vote the United States shall unnecessarily become involved in war. [Applause.] The loss of life, the loss of property are comparatively trivial in their consequences. It is the sacrifice of ideals that have controlled America for 150 years. It is the giving up of our exclusive rights to the civilization of this hemisphere; it is becoming a party to the intrigues of Europe; it is sitting about a peace table not only with England, Germany, and France, but with Russia and Japan as well, rearranging the boundary lines of Europe, fixing indemnities, and irretrievably and eternally becoming a party to European affairs. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] stated that the eventualities as enumerated in the address of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] were impossible. There is no man of judgment with the courage to predict where our entrance into this war would carry us. Even as I talk to you in the waning hours of this afternoon, far on the other side of this troubled world the night winds are kissing the folds of Old Glory that was raised over the lonely island in that far away sea as an eventuality of the Spanish-American War, a result that God alone foresaw when the war began. How far we shall go, how far it will take us, no one man can say, and for that reason I favor the cooperation of the United States to the extent of protecting our rights and no further. [Applause.] When that interest is served we may withdraw, not as a belligerent but as a great nation speaking for the neutrals of the world and protecting a common right to the free access and the free use of the highways of nations, the seas. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. Mr. Chairman, the address of

the gentleman from Nebraska is truly inspiring. [Applause.] It is filled with fruitful thoughts, and I am obliged to him for having made it.

I, too, insist that we should assert American rights upon the high seas, and especially in our dealings with neutral countries. I have supported measures in this House, every one of them, I believe, to prepare this country to assert its rights upon the high seas, but I want the rights of the United States upon the high seas asserted against every nation that interferes with or tramples upon those rights. [Applause.]

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. REAVIS. The gentleman did not gather from my remarks that I do not approve of that?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I approve in the main of everything the gentleman said and congratulate him upon what he did say.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But for a question.

Mr. GARRETT. Then I will not interrupt now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have in my hand a letter just received, which I shall proceed immediately to read:

AMERICAN TRANSATLANTIC CO.,  
17 Battery Place, New York, February 13, 1917.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Apropos your remarks to the House of Representatives on last Friday condemning the British efforts to embroil our country in war by circulating false reports, we are calling to your attention the illegal actions of the British Government against our property, indicating another instance of its unworthy object to sacrifice American interests to gain its selfish ends.

Of course, I am not the author of this statement. I am reading a letter:

The American Transatlantic Co. is an American corporation, with every officer, director, and stockholder a citizen of the United States, and owning 11 steamers, which were purchased free of all encumbrance from neutral nations, while under neutral flags. There is no foreign interest, direct or indirect, in this company or its ships.

Over a year ago the British Government blacklisted and seized three of our ships while in transit between the United States and South America, carrying coal for American firms. The reason given for the seizures was that citizens of enemy countries were interested in our company. This belief resulted solely from statements of the United States Commissioner of Navigation, Mr. E. T. Chamberlain, which were based solely on unfounded suspicions.

Our ships were rightfully flying the American flag at the time of seizure, and the Department of State has held and sent notes to England stating that the seizures were illegal and that the ships ought to be released, though it declined to say that the ships must be released, giving as a reason that such a demand would mean war with Great Britain.

Contrary to law, the English Government, after seizing the ships, requisitioned them for their own use, and have been using them for over a year without any compensation to us. The three ships represent a market value of \$3,000,000 and the loss of earnings and cost to us represent a like amount. The British claim that the ships are being held for prize-court proceedings. These proceedings have been postponed time and again, and there is no indication that the case will come to trial before the close of the war.

We are giving you this information that you may know of a specific case showing the disposition of the British Government to further its own interests in any way, regardless of international law or the rights and security of American citizens.

Very truly, yours,

R. G. WAGNER, President.

That, it seems to me, is an important statement affecting American rights. I ask some international lawyer in the House who interprets the phrase "the freedom of the seas" whether the United States ships thus involved are entitled to the freedom of the seas? [Applause.] Let them answer in their own time.

I hold in my hand another letter which I hope I may have time to read. It involves American citizens seized upon the high seas and held in virtual captivity on the other side of the water. I have not time to go into details, but will read only the letter of the Secretary of State of the United States in answer to my request for information as to the status of these American citizens who were evidently denied "the freedom of the seas":

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, June 16, 1916.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of June 1, 1916, relative to the claims of various American citizens against the British Government growing out of their detention at Falmouth, England, on August 4, 1914, as passengers on the steamships *Prinz Adalbert* and *Kronprinzessin Cecilie*, these claims having been presented to the department by Mr. Theodore Cuyler Patterson, of 2213 Delancey Street, Philadelphia.

In reply I have the honor to say that the department has informed Mr. Patterson on a number of occasions to the effect that it does not consider that it is in a position to press these claims at the present time, and it has pointed out to him that it must determine for itself the time and methods for acting in matters of this kind.

This letter is dated June 16, 1916, 20 months after these American citizens had been taken from the high seas by British officers. The Secretary of State continues:

Respecting your inquiry as to whether the communication addressed by the department to Mr. Patterson under date of April 18, 1916, in



which he was advised in the sense just indicated, should be interpreted to mean that "the department dismisses the claims referred to," and as to whether the department knows of any course these claimants may pursue to obtain redress for their grievances, it may be stated that in no communication addressed to Mr. Patterson has the department indicated any disinclination to give these claims proper consideration at the appropriate time.

Eight months have elapsed. I asked the department only recently for further information, but the situation is in statu quo. But as to the rights of Americans upon the high seas and our asserting those rights, read this additional paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more in which to read this.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will read:

The claimants are, of course, at liberty to institute proceedings in the appropriate British tribunals with a view to obtaining indemnity for the injuries which they allege were suffered by them. In this connection the department may call attention to the principle of international law that a claimant against a foreign Government is not as a general rule entitled to the diplomatic intervention of his own Government until he has exhausted his legal remedies in the tribunals of the country against which he makes the claim. I have the honor to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,

ROBERT LANSING.

These American citizens, within their rights upon the high seas, but on a German ship, were not traveling for the mere purpose of a thrill to the war's agitation upon the other side, but their appeal to their own Government for the assertion of that freedom of the seas of which we boast is met in part by the suggestion, even in the midst of these trying times, that they go over yonder into the tribunals of Great Britain and assert their claims. Oh, ye international lawyers who are determining questions for us in this House, will you please tell me how these American citizens who were denied the right to the free seas by one great Government are to obtain redress?

That is not all. Here is a proposition even more serious as affecting the difficulties we seem bound to get into. I have a letter from an American citizen, one of many, who is endeavoring to do business upon the high seas which we think are free, but which seem now to be "bottled up" against every American ship sailing from an American port, whether it goes into a neutral country or whether it does not. [Applause.] This letter intimates that our boasted freedom of the seas to American shipping to-day means that a ship with American commerce or with the flag attached must first obtain the approval of at least one of the great nations before it can make its destination beyond the 3-mile line. The writer says:

I wanted to call your attention to the humiliating position of the American importers of goods from Great Britain and her possessions. It would take a lengthy correspondence to give you the details.

So you will be able to form an idea as to what I am alluding, I inclose three blanks. For identification, I have marked them A, B, and C. Before referring to them I desire to call your attention to the conditions under which importers were allowed to import from Great Britain and her possessions. For a time permission was obtained through the British consul general in the principal ports of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia; then the Textile Alliance (Inc.), New York, acting in conjunction with Messrs. Freshfield, London, for account of the British Government, imposed new conditions, and we were compelled to sign various papers and pay tribute to the Textile Alliance of 1 per cent and one-fourth per cent to certain bankers through whom the documents had to be forwarded. Recently the commission paid to the Textile Alliance was reduced to one-half per cent, but the additional commission to the bankers of one-fourth per cent is still imposed.

I will not give the name of the American association, for it might embarrass them in their desire to continue in the importing business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I hope that I will not use five minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be concluded at the end of 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be concluded at the end of 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will read:

Then application was made in writing, and if approved by them, Messrs. Freshfield, or the British Foreign Office, was advised by cable or mail.

Form A. This is a blank recently distributed to both the already approved and new applicants for permission. This virtually gives the representatives of the British Government the right to examine your books and accounts.

Form B. When properly filled out will give the British Government a complete record of the kind of goods you buy, and to whom you sell, whether it be in the United States or in neutral countries.

Form C. One is obliged to fill out this form in making application for permission to import goods from any one of the ports of Great Britain or her colonies, a separate application being necessary in the case of each shipper.

Can you imagine anything more humiliating than an importer of many years standing being obliged to sign such an agreement in order to keep his business, which has been established for many years, going until affairs become in a more normal condition? I claim that countries who are asking so many favors from us should not be permitted to impose on us such arbitrary restrictions if we want to import from their countries.

France is now also imposing restrictions on goods, shipments direct to the United States, but in some cases she is permitting goods to be forwarded to the United States provided they are shipped from her colonies through French or English merchants, the same to the detriment of the American merchants, who import from those places direct.

As you well know, it is very difficult, particularly in times like the present, to obtain positive information of the actions of other governments, whereby they are discriminating against the favored nation, as in the present, but the circumstantial evidence, up to the present, shows that both Great Britain and France are working together to absorb and control the trade of the United States, to the detriment of the American importers and exporters.

I will not read further from this letter.

It is well known to importers and to exporters that no business can be done by merchants in the United States without receiving the approval of the Textile Alliance, incorporated under Great Britain's auspices in New York and in Chicago. These are the conditions that confront American trade at this time. We talk of "the freedom of the seas" as if it were an actual fact. We discuss international law as if it were a real thing, and yet when we attempt to send our people abroad to travel where they please under protection of their American citizenship, we find that they may be taken from ships, with no redress except to go to their captors for justice, and that their commerce may be requisitioned by those who demand it.

We find that cargoes of coal going to pacific South America can be seized and taken into the port of a belligerent, and that the remedy pointed out to the owner of a vessel or of a cargo is to go into the court of the captor to obtain justice. And yet we say that we insist upon the freedom of the seas and that we will fight to maintain it.

Gentlemen of the Congress, we may punish Germany, and for such crimes as she may have committed against our country I trust she may be held accountable; but if we are to preserve our strength as an independent Nation and are to maintain our rights to sail upon the broad ocean as free as if we were traveling over our own country, then we should at least be just enough and neutral enough to maintain those rights against every nation that assails them, whether upon land or sea. [Applause.]

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to insert in the RECORD with these remarks blanks that are apparently sanctioned by the British Embassy and which American merchants are expected to sign before they can obtain the approval of the Textile Alliance to permit American cargoes to go upon the high seas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting the matter indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following are the blanks referred to:

TEXTILE ALLIANCE BLANKS.

Signed at \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
(Attention of Sir Richard Crawford.)

BRITISH EMBASSY,  
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We hereby make application for our concern to be approved for receipt of British-controlled materials, and hereby certify to the facts below indicated, and guarantee to surrender to you at any time requested the necessary documents to substantiate said facts.

During the two years ending July 1, 1914, the concern known as \_\_\_\_\_, of the city of \_\_\_\_\_, State of \_\_\_\_\_, was in business and (imported \_\_\_\_\_) (for sale to manufacturers \_\_\_\_\_) (purchased from importers) (for use in our own factories) the following imported materials as listed below (and designated by us with an X in the appropriate column), and desires to continue in similar transactions.

	Dealer importers.	Manufacturing importers.	Purchased from dealer importers.
Hides unfinished.....			
Calfskins.....			
Goatskins.....			
Sheepskins.....			
Horsehide and colt skin.....			
Other raw stock.....			
Sole leather.....			
Upper leather.....			
Other leather.....			
Tanning materials (specify).....			



We desire that the name of our concern be appropriately entered on the British approved list and will thank you for confirmation. We hereby guarantee that, if approved, we will upon written request permit a certified public accountant, mutually appointed by yourself and Mr. Cudworth Beye, to verify from our office records the fact of our carrying out the guaranties we make to you from time to time.

Together with other specific guaranties required of us, we do hereby guarantee, for ourselves and for our concern, that our business will in no way be conducted, directly or indirectly, to advantage the enemies of Great Britain so long as the present war continues.

Two signatures required.

President (or other responsible officer of concern).  
 Vice President (or other responsible officer of concern).  
 Secretary (or other responsible officer of concern).  
 Treasurer (or other responsible officer of concern).

The guaranty in the second paragraph above will give to the embassy merely the opinion of the C. P. A. after his examination and will not give the embassy access to private records, directly or indirectly.

The officers of company designated appeared before me this day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1916, and swore to the statement herein above as a true and correct record as shown, exact copy of which I will keep on file as long as the war lasts.

Justice of the Peace or Notary.

Term expires \_\_\_\_\_

[This application in triplicate form.]

No. \_\_\_\_\_

[Textile Alliance (Inc.), No. 120 Milk Street, Boston; No. 45 East Seventeenth Street, New York.]

\_\_\_\_\_, 1915.

APPLICATION.

A. M. PATTERSON, Esq.,  
 President Textile Alliance (Inc.).

SIR: We have your Bulletin No. \_\_\_\_\_, and, pursuant thereto, we hereby request that you have your correspondents abroad assist our agents, as specified below, in securing licenses, if possible, from the British and/or Colonial Governments whereby the kind of merchandise stated below may be shipped by said agents to or through you in the approved manner for our account:

We hereby designate as our agents.	Kind of merchandise to be shipped by said agents.
In Canada	_____
In Great Britain	_____
In Australia	_____
In New Zealand	_____
In South Africa	_____
In East Africa	_____
In Egypt	_____
In India	_____
In Aden	_____
In Cyprus	_____
In Nigeria	_____
In Persian Gulf district	_____

We hereby authorize and empower our said agents, or either of them, on our behalf to execute and deliver such applications, agreements, and undertakings pertaining to the said merchandise as may be requested by the British or Colonial authorities or your correspondents.

In consideration of your labors and the labors of your correspondents and other valuable considerations we hereby agree:

(1) That prior to your releasing such merchandise to us we will enter into such undertakings and agreements as may be required and pay your usual charges.

(2) That you may refuse release to us of any merchandise for our account shipped in your name without license.

(3) That you may, upon request from your correspondents abroad, or any representatives of the British or Colonial Governments, refuse release to us of any merchandise shipped in your name, whether shipped under license or not.

(4) That we will assume all transporting charges, storage charges, and all other charges of whatsoever nature and from whatsoever cause that may accrue against any merchandise from Great Britain or her colonies for our account that may be shipped in your name.

We hereby indemnify and agree to hold harmless the Textile Alliance (Inc.) and A. M. Patterson, individually and as an officer of the alliance, from all liability in connection with the said merchandise or the documents pertaining thereto.

(Signature of applicant.)  
 Per \_\_\_\_\_

In the presence of:

Applications by individuals must have the personal signature of the individual.

Applications by firms must have the firm's signature by a member thereof.

Applications by corporations must have the corporate signature by an officer thereof, showing the title of said officer.

Applicants should furnish their banking and trade references in space provided therefor on the back of application.

APPLICATION OF—

Name of applicant \_\_\_\_\_ Address \_\_\_\_\_  
 Articles to be imported \_\_\_\_\_

REFERENCES.

Name.	Address.	Report (for purposes of Textile Alliance, Inc.).

Remarks \_\_\_\_\_  
 Submitted \_\_\_\_\_  
 Approved \_\_\_\_\_  
 Cabled \_\_\_\_\_

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tully, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 8348) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. POMERENE, Mr. HOLLIS, and Mr. DILLINGHAM as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 703) to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture and the trades and industries; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditures.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolution without amendment:

House concurrent resolution 75.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 703) entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture and the trades and industries; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure," the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to strike out the "name" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "designate or create," in the third line of the second paragraph of section 5 as the same appears in the conference report on said bill and amendment.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes, and ask not to be interrupted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I have been restraining myself for two weeks. I feel that I am now in complete self-control and that I can speak safely.

Let us go to the meat of the situation. A question was asked yesterday of the leader of the minority by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. The astute and brilliant leader of the minority, who is always ready to answer any question thrown at him, thought that the question was embarrassing, and declined to answer it. The thing that the gentleman from Illinois did not dare do I should hardly dare attempt, but as I am younger and can afford to be indiscreet, I shall answer that question.

I contend that the question has already been answered by the American people. One of the belligerents has already denied the freedom of the seas to American commerce, and the great masses of the American people have refused to accept the idea of going to war because of that injury to American commerce. The practical and the concrete question to-day is this: Having refused to go to war with one of the belligerents because a part of our commerce has been driven off the seas, shall we go to war with the other belligerent because the rest of our commerce is being threatened? [Applause.] In other words, shall we fight for the privilege of carrying on commerce with the belligerent nations? That commerce, so far as exports are concerned, is confined principally to the business of supplying the belligerents with munitions.

Is there any doubt that the American people will repudiate the war agitation if the question is honestly presented?

I am not very generous to what we Socialists call the "capitalistic class," but I would readily vote hundreds of millions of dollars into the pockets of the munition traffickers rather than let them shed a single drop of American blood.

The kings and rulers of the Old World have so managed it that every one of the belligerent nations in Europe to-day is fighting for something that appeals to sentiment, that appeals to the spiritual man. Poor little Serbia is fighting against extinction. Austria-Hungary seeks national consolidation and an



unobstructed road to the Orient. Germany is struggling against being crushed by powerful enemies that surround her on all sides. Russia, the giant of the East—a giant without lungs, because it has not a warm-water port—seeks a warm-water port, and says that she has entered the combat to help a weaker Slav brother, Serbia. If Italy gets what she has started out for, she will restore to herself her "Italia Irridente," that portion of northern Italy now possessed by Austria. Roumania will get back some of her territory. Every one of those nations, if it wins the war, will have satisfied some national aspiration, some national ideal. Of course the probabilities are that none of them will have anything to show commensurate with the sacrifices made. What national ideal will the United States satisfy by a war? What will the United States have accomplished if it goes to war and wins? It will have established the right of munition makers to sell munitions. That is the only thing that will be established. It will be a war for cash, a war for commerce. It will be a war for the right of the powder barrel, with the American flag on the barrel, giving it the sanctity of the flag and everything that the flag represents.

Why not face the issue fairly and honestly? And if you face that issue fairly and honestly, there can be only one answer—such a war is inconceivable.

There seems to be a great deal of soberness and sanity in this Congress now—a great deal more soberness and sanity than I expected to find, I will say. I hope that will not be stricken from the RECORD. [Laughter and applause.] It is a safe policy to attack people collectively and not individually, because every one takes it as intended for somebody else and is not offended.

It is self-evident that the United States would have exercised a tremendous influence if, in the council of nations, it would act the part of the arbitrator. It would then be the one great neutral power, the one great Republic, the repository of the ideals of democracy and liberty. But the United States as an ally, the United States as a participant in the war, as a sharer in its spoils, will play only such part as will be justified by her contributions to the final result. When you are in the council of nations after the settlement of a war you are strong only to the extent to which you can lick all your partners. It is only when you can say to them, "These are the terms which you shall accept. If you do not accept them, I will lick you all. Take the course I suggest or I am going to fight you all," that you will count. The average American may believe that he can lick the whole world, but he can not. It is not by licking anybody that America has become what she is to-day. We have made progress because we have developed as a peaceful Nation, engaged in peaceful pursuits, promoting democracy, and to me America is so dear not only for the things that she has accomplished but for the great promise for the future that America holds out to the world. [Applause.] I do not hesitate to declare my faith and my hope in the greatness and glory of America as long as she pursues her ideals. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, I hope we will not be swept off our feet. I have a great admiration for the President of the United States, but I fear that slogan, "Stand by the President." It is a dangerous battle cry when the people cease to be a people and become a mob. "Stand by the President" means a great deal when the President is right. "Stand by the President" is a dangerous slogan when the President is in error. It is a mighty dangerous thing to permit Congress to drift into a state of mind where one man can sweep you off your feet. I call for the greatest exercise of freedom of thought, of speech, and of discussion, and the most earnest application to the problem which confronts us. I am glad that the Congress of the United States is seriously discussing this problem and that we are preparing ourselves to act as sensible men should act in a great crisis. When the framers of the Constitution vested Congress with the power to declare war they did not intend that Congress should in a perfunctory way go through the ceremony of declaring war upon somebody's suggestion. The right to declare war means the right to refuse to declare war. It involves deliberation, study, analysis, the searching of one's conscience, the calling into action of all our mental powers. And if there ever was a time when every Member of Congress should be free and strong and independent, this is the time. [Applause.]

I hope, gentlemen, that we shall be spared the horrors of the conflict. I hope that we will stand by our fundamental principles, Germany is now threatening a portion of our commerce. Germany has violated fundamental principles, not only of international law but of that law which is more sacred than all the textbooks that have ever been compiled by quibbling lawyers. When Germany invaded Belgium, when Germany proceeded to deport the civilian population of Belgium, when Germany sunk the helpless women and children on the *Lusitania*, she committed a crime against civilization, against humanity. We did not fight then,

but now when business is injured people talk of the possibility of war.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLEY. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the President severed diplomatic relations with Germany because of commercial reasons?

Mr. LONDON. We are confronted now with an accomplished fact. I opposed the severance of diplomatic relations during the discussion of the McLemore resolution. I do not want to criticize the President for what he has already done. He has severed diplomatic relations with Germany. He has not severed diplomatic relations with England for various violations of neutral rights.

How much time have I, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes.

Mr. LONDON. Then I can answer the question. I do not forget the fundamental difference between the German situation and the British situation. I like to face facts squarely and speak honestly; if a man can not afford to speak honestly there is no use talking at all, and if a Socialist should not be honest, who would be? [Laughter.] England has accomplished her blockade, and England has deprived the United States and other neutral powers of the freedom of the seas by what has heretofore been recognized more or less as a civilized method of doing things. Germany is striving to obtain the same result by means of the submarine, which threatens human life. That is the fundamental distinction, and it is because of this fundamental distinction that the President said to Germany, "We can not do business with you. You disregard fundamental rights of humanity. You throw away human life ruthlessly, cruelly, without compunction. We can not do any business with you." Whether he was wise or not is immaterial. So far as the great masses of the American people are concerned, so far as the question of war or peace is involved, the question reduces itself to this, Shall we submit to the blockade of England? Shall we not submit to the blockade instituted by Germany? The question of method affects only a small number of individuals. The method pursued by Germany threatens a small number of individuals who engage in that traffic and who find themselves within the war zone. So far as the right to the freedom of the seas is concerned, both belligerents disregard our rights. Is not that so?

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does not the gentleman make a distinction—understand, now, I am taking no part in it, but I want to bring this out—

Mr. LONDON. You have a right to take a part, and ought not to be afraid to take a part.

Mr. CALDWELL. The point I want to get is, Does the gentleman make any distinction between the violation of an international right where human life is involved, and where only property is involved?

Mr. LONDON. Why, of course I draw that distinction. I said so. I started out with that; but so far as the great masses of the American people are concerned it is purely a question to what extent their commerce will be injured.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Does the gentleman mean to maintain that if an American ship is sunk now with Americans on board and American lives are lost by the action of Germany to maintain her blockade, that that presents the same sort of a situation to this country as when England seized our ships on the sea without the loss of human life?

Mr. LONDON. No; it presents a more difficult problem. There is no doubt about that. But do not forget, please, that those lives will be lost after warning has been given not to enter the war zone. If American lives are lost when you get within the range of the guns fired from the walls of a belligerent fortress, you have no complaint. That is what it amounts to. Germany has now surrounded the British Isles by guns which have a longer range than the guns she had before. That is the practical proposition. If you are not within the war zone, your life is not in danger.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States service schools: To provide means for the theoretical and practical instruction at the Army service schools (including the Army Staff College, the Army School of the Line, the Army Field Engineer School, the Army Field Service and Correspondence School for Medical Officers, and the Army Signal School) at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., the Mounted Service School, at Fort Riley, Kans., and the School of Fire for Field Artillery and for the School of Musketry, at Fort Sill, Okla., by the purchase of textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, the purchase of modern instruments and material for theoretical and practical instruction, employment of temporary, technical, or special services, and for all other absolutely necessary ex-



penses, to be allotted in such proportion as may, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, be for the best interests of the military service. Not exceeding \$100 per month may be used for the payment of one translator, to be appointed by the commandant of the Army service schools with the approval of the Secretary of War, \$35,350: *Provided*, That officers in the grade of second lieutenant in the Field Artillery may be assigned, for the period of one year, to batteries stationed at the School of Fire for Field Artillery at Fort Sill, Okla., for the purpose of pursuing courses of practical instruction in field artillery.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word and asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. DENT. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if there are any other gentlemen who want time on this paragraph?

Mr. PLATT. I would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. I would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. FOCHT. I want a little time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that after 30 minutes all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be concluded. I want to say that I think I have been pretty liberal and fair with the committee on this proposition, and I hope that after this we will go on and read the items in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman's request include a desire that the Chair shall recognize the gentlemen who have asked for time?

Mr. DENT. It does.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto terminate in 30 minutes, the Chair to recognize certain gentlemen in the division of the time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, for once we seem to find the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] in absolute accord; for, as I gather from their arguments, they take the position that if Congress shall be called upon to take any action in this present international crisis, that because the executive branch of this Government has failed to maintain our rights against England with reference to property rights, we should refuse to vote to maintain our rights against Germany involving human life.

Mr. Chairman, Congress can not excuse itself from the performance of its duty, if called upon, by pointing to the dereliction, if there be dereliction, of the executive branch of this Government in another case. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in the present crisis with Germany I have felt that the best service a Member of Congress could render his country was to refrain from discussing the matter on the floor until we were called upon to take some action. Unfortunately that has not been done, and extremists on both sides have been freely expressing their opinions until there is a very general belief throughout the country that if Congress is called upon to act at all it will choose between a general declaration of war against Germany, intervening in the European war, and a position that, whatever the provocation may be, we will under no circumstances defend our rights with force.

Believing, as I do, that neither of these positions correctly interprets the position of Congress, the President, or the American people, I think it proper now to give expression to what I believe is the dominant sentiment of the House at this time. I have no authority to speak for anyone but myself, but in conversation with my colleagues I find a very general sentiment in agreement with my own views.

In severing diplomatic relations with Germany the President did only his duty. [Applause.] To have done less would have forfeited any respect the world still had left for us. [Applause.]

By her own admission Germany has made herself an outlaw. She does not pretend that her act which was the cause of the breach can be justified by international law. She asserts that she will sink without warning neutral ships and destroy neutral lives within specified zones. In the case of other neutrals she has actually done so. Any day may bring the news of destruction of American ships and American lives in admitted violation of international law and of the laws of humanity.

If I understand the views expressed by some gentlemen, if this shall come to pass, we must do nothing; that no matter what the provocation may be, under no circumstances must we defend our rights with force. If this is to be the attitude of Congress and the American people, then the days of this Republic are numbered. [Applause.] We will no longer be a Nation, for any people too cowardly to fight for their liberty upon the sea, if need be, will be too cowardly to fight for their liberty upon the land. But, Mr. Chairman, that is not the spirit of the Amer-

ican people, and when the time comes that will not be the spirit of this Congress. Representing the great American people here, we will vote to maintain by force, if need be, our liberties upon the sea; but that does not mean that we will vote a general declaration of war against Germany; it does not mean that we will intervene in the European war; it does not mean that we will send our men to the trenches of Europe; it does not mean that we are to sit in and determine the terms of settlement of European questions. It means only that we are going to settle our difficulty with Germany by compelling her to respect our rights upon the sea. [Applause.] If war must come, it will be a war upon the sea, destroying every German submarine that we can and protecting our own ships until such time as Germany shall cease to be an outlaw upon the sea. When Germany shall again respect our rights our quarrel with her will be over and we will be ready to make peace with her regardless of European nations or European quarrels. [Applause.]

I believe the American people and this Congress will stand for this policy, and that those who would drag us into this world war for reasons other than maintaining our own rights, and those who are for peace at any price, together, constitute a very small minority.

Mr. Chairman, when the contest upon the McLemore resolution arose last year I was against the President, because I believed he was wrong, because I was unwilling to commit myself to the use of force to maintain what the President had himself denominated a doubtful legal right. I never will vote to use force to maintain a doubtful legal right; but there is no doubt about the questions involved in this crisis. They are admitted wrongs, and the only question is whether we shall submit to them without any further effort to correct them.

If we are called upon to act in this matter, it will be the most solemn responsibility ever laid or to be laid upon any of us. If any Member in that hour is influenced in the least degree by party politics, by prejudice, by sympathy for either side in the European war, he will be untrue to the oath of office he has taken here. If ever in our lives we should be American citizens only, it will be then.

I am not so greatly alarmed about possible trouble with Germany as I am about a divided country here. Divisions now may not only prevent a peaceful settlement of our quarrel with Germany but may result in disorder within our own borders, with consequences much more serious than war with any foreign power.

The propaganda now going on throughout the country to avoid war at any cost is a greater peril to the Republic than war with Germany would be. [Applause.] The proposition for a war referendum is likewise a great peril. Suppose at this time a referendum was held; suppose 10,000,000 votes were cast, 5,100,000 for war and 4,900,000 against. If war was declared on that vote, does it require a prophet to foresee possible civil war among ourselves? Or suppose 4,900,000 voted for war and 5,100,000 against, and we refuse then to exercise force to maintain our rights, how long would it be before we would have no place upon the seas anywhere—England with impunity shutting us out when to her advantage, and Germany doing likewise when to her profit?

We each have duties and responsibilities here which we can delegate to no one, chief among which is to do that which will best preserve those liberties which the fathers of the Republic gained for us, and preserve this Union which we have each sworn to support. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, every time throughout the European war that the House of Representatives has officially or by utterance of its membership thrust itself into the problems of the war it has, in my opinion, brought this country nearer to the danger zone. I myself have never discussed the issues of the war or anything pertaining to the European war save upon one occasion, when official duty rendered it necessary—the McLemore resolution being called up for action.

I violate no confidence when I say to this House that the hours just before the action on the McLemore resolution were the darkest hours which the diplomatic branch of this Government has passed through since the present European war began.

I do not rise in any spirit of criticism of gentlemen who have seen fit to so extensively discuss this matter, although I can not but feel that these expressions, or many of them, have been extremely unwise and have been detrimental, not with any bad intention on the part of the utterers, of course, to the best interests of the peace of this country. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted, I shall in this hour, when the House is calm, recall to the membership here the official utterance of the President of the United States. The suggestions so well and so pertinently made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] a while ago are in line with this



official utterance. Such speeches as that made by the gentleman from Nebraska are not subject to the criticism that they injure the peace of the country.

I think it is well to read this now, because I think there are many Members of this House even who have lost sight of what the real issue is and what the President really said. It is perhaps not remarkable that much of the press of the country appears to have lost sight of it. It is not at all strange that the multiplied thousands of private citizens in the country have lost sight of it, but surely it is inexcusable that Members of this body, likely at any time to have the responsibility thrust upon them to act, should lose sight of the issue and drag into the discussion extraneous matter—that is, matter extraneous to the one purpose expressed before us by the Chief Executive of the Government. I shall not undertake to interpret the language; it would not be proper and it is not necessary, because the language interprets itself. I read from the address of the President delivered at a joint session of the Senate and House on February 3:

Notwithstanding this unexpected action of the German Government, this sudden and deeply deplorable renunciation of its assurances, given this Government at one of the most critical moments of tension in the relations of the two Governments, I refuse to believe that it is the intention of the German authorities to do in fact what they have warned us they will feel at liberty to do. I can not bring myself to believe that they will indeed pay no regard to the ancient friendship between their people and our own or to the solemn obligations which have been exchanged between them and destroy American ships and take the lives of American citizens in the willful prosecution of the ruthless naval program they have announced their intention to adopt. Only actual overt acts on their part can make me believe it even now.

If this inveterate confidence on my part in the sobriety and prudent foresight of their purpose should unhappily prove unfounded; if American ships and American lives should in fact be sacrificed by their naval commanders in heedless contravention of the just and reasonable understandings of international law and the obvious dictates of humanity, I shall take the liberty of coming again before the Congress, to ask that authority be given me to use any means that may be necessary for the protection of our seamen and our people in the prosecution of their peaceful and legitimate errands on the high seas. I can do nothing less.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that the time has been limited by unanimous consent. I do not want to ask for any more myself, but I will appreciate it if some gentleman who is to be recognized will be good enough to grant me two minutes of his time.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I will grant the gentleman two minutes of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I have read this simply to show the full extent to which the President has gone. No utterance of the President has suggested war except as it might follow incidentally. What the President has said he and his administration are entitled to be measured by. Public sentiment must be and ought to be consulted, but that sentiment should be formed from an exact knowledge of the issue presented.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. Does the gentleman object to free exchange of opinion upon the subject so as to reach a clear understanding of the situation?

Mr. GARRETT. I do not like to say that I do, but I will say that in my opinion if the McLemore resolution had passed the House of Representatives, or after it had reached a certain stage, if it had not been called up and laid on the table this country would have been at war months and months ago, and my further impression is that there is nothing which will so unerringly and certainly lead toward the preservation of peaceful relations between this country and Germany at the present time under the great tension which exists as will a refraining on the part of gentlemen here in the war-declaring body from intemperate utterances upon this question. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. The gentleman presents a serious question to me. Is it not a fact that our Government warned our people out of the war zone in Mexico, regardless of our rights to trade?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not try to carry me into that discussion. That is a case which stood upon its own bottom. We are dealing now with a situation more tense than any with which the present membership of this House has ever been called upon to deal, and there rests upon us, and I feel it, the gravest responsibility of our lives. I am extremely

anxious that we shall be duly circumspect in the matter. [Applause.]

Mr. PLATT rose.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DECKER). Was the gentleman from New York one of those to be recognized under the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MANN. Was not the gentleman from Pennsylvania to be recognized?

Mr. FOCHT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I do not think the gentleman from Tennessee was to have 10 minutes under the arrangement.

Mr. FOCHT. I want only five minutes.

Mr. MANN. It will be easy enough to correct it.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I agree in general with what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] so well said as to what we could do to fully protect our rights on the high seas without going further into the European war than necessary to protect those rights. I have introduced into the House three bills to carry out just exactly what the gentleman from Wisconsin advocated, and those three bills were once laws of the United States. They were laws that were passed by the Fifth Congress, in the spring and summer of 1798, at a time when the United States of America had a population of only 5,000,000 people. The controversy at that time was almost identically the same as the present controversy. There were no submarines in those days, to be sure, in 1798, but war vessels used to sneak up on merchant vessels under cover of neutral flags and fire upon them, which amounts to practically the same thing as an attack without warning. They sought to capture them rather than to sink them, it is true, and they took on board the crews of the captured vessels, so the practice of those days was by no means so inhuman as the German submarine practice of to-day. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting these three short bills.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if gentlemen have looked into just what was done by the United States in 1798. England and France were at war with each other. Both nations were interfering with the rights of neutrals on the seas as at present, but the French were doing the most damage at that time, and antagonism was aroused chiefly against France, so that our action was taken against France and not against England. One of these laws authorized American merchantmen to arm for defense. Another one shut off all commercial intercourse with France and provided that no ship leaving the United States under any circumstances should go directly or indirectly to France or to any French dependency or trade with anyone resident in France. I have taken that law and copied it almost word for word, substituting the word "Germany" for the word "France." If passed now, it will shut off all commercial intercourse with Germany and will prevent any further disputes with England.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Not at present.

Mr. STAFFORD. Right on that point—

Mr. PLATT. The third law authorized war vessels of America to go out upon the high seas and capture French war vessels or armed vessels wherever found, and substituting the word "German" for the word "French" this bill would give our Navy absolute right to-day to go out and capture or sink German submarines or cruisers wherever they may be found. That is what we did in 1798, when we were a little nation of 5,000,000 people, and surely we can not be afraid to do the same thing to protect our rights now when we are a nation of 100,000,000 people. If we are, are not we justly subject to the charge of cowardice? How can anybody hold otherwise? In these bills I have left out obsolete matter, such as the authorization of privateers, which is, of course, no longer allowed, and a few other things of that sort, but, generally speaking, the bills are word for word as passed by the Fifth Congress in 1798 with the word "France" stricken out and the word "Germany" put in its place.

We could do to-day just exactly what we did then. We did not declare war against France. We did not even formally break off diplomatic relations with France. We had no minister in France at that time it is true, and there was no French minister here, but there was no formal rupture of diplomatic relations. We were nominally neutral, although we went on the high seas and captured or sunk 84 armed French vessels and had two or three fights between frigates, the battleships of that day, that are famous in the annals of the American Navy, nota-



by the fight between the *Constellation* and the *Insurgente*, which we captured.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLATT. I had 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DECKER). The Chair will say to the gentleman there is a mistake in regard to the allotment of time. The gentleman's name is not here, and the present occupant of the chair took the liberty of recognizing him.

Mr. FIELDS. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] was allowed 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for five minutes more.

Mr. PLATT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. When the gentleman was referring to the second bill that he had introduced he said it provided for a cessation of commercial intercourse with Germany, and I want to inquire whether our people have any commercial intercourse with Germany, or have had for two years past?

Mr. PLATT. I think there is still a certain amount of trade with Germany, directly or indirectly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it in the air or in fact?

Mr. PLATT. It is water-borne commerce through neutral countries. It has not been entirely shut off. Right in that connection I want to refer to the letters read a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], letters protesting the shutting off of American commerce going to Germany. He read particularly a statement that Mr. Secretary Lansing had said that the State Department could not act until remedies before the courts in Great Britain had been first tried. I wonder if the gentleman knows that in our own Civil War we did exactly what England is doing now, or almost exactly. We picked up the British ship *Peterhof* off the island of St. Thomas, 1,000 miles away, going to the city of Matamorás, Mexico, a neutral port, and we sent her under a prize crew to New York, and the lower court, the district court, condemned the vessel as a prize, although it was an English vessel, a neutral vessel, going from one neutral port to another neutral port. The *Peterhof* was condemned as a prize by the lower court of New York. We also picked up the ship *Springbok*, going from one English port to another English port—Nassau, Bahama Islands. We sent that ship under a prize crew to New York, and the lower court condemned it as a prize on the theory that the goods in it were destined to the Southern Confederacy. Now, then, we have heard the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] talk about what the Supreme Court decisions were in both of those cases. The owners of this vessel appealed to the British foreign office, just exactly as the case the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] referred to, and asked the foreign office to make violent protest to the American Government, but Lord Russell, the English foreign secretary, said to the owners of those vessels, "You have got to try your remedies in the courts of the United States first." There was then an appeal to the Supreme Court, and in both of those cases the Supreme Court overruled the decision of the lower court and the vessels were set free. But when? There is the crux of the whole situation, as far as our case with England goes. These vessels were captured in February, 1863, and they were set free in 1866, a year after the war was over.

Now, that is what England is doing. She is not going as far as we did. She is not condemning these vessels, as a rule, that are captured at sea, but she is simply taking them into port and paying for the cargoes, perhaps not the price the people expected to get, but at fair prices. The shippers are taking money from the English and have not much of a case left. There have been some condemnations, I believe, of goods consigned directly to German ports, and there are many cases pending in British courts. We undoubtedly are entitled to damages, I think, in many of these cases, but England's acts in enforcing her blockade form no justification for the destruction of ships and of human life by the German submarines.

Mr. Chairman, in introducing the bills which would give the President authority to put a stop to the illegal and inhuman German submarine operations without declaring war, I do not mean to imply that I shall not support him if he shall decide to go further. I shall support with my whole energy any adequate measures which the President may recommend for ending the present intolerable situation. The bills referred to are as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20939) to suspend commercial intercourse between the United States and the German Empire.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That no ship or vessel owned, hired, or employed wholly or in part by any person resident within the United States shall hereafter be allowed to proceed directly or from any intermediate port or place to any port or place within the territory of the German Empire or the dependencies thereof, or shall be employed in any traffic or com-

merce with, or for any person resident within the jurisdiction, or under the authority of the German Empire. And if any ship or vessel in any voyage hereafter commencing, and before her return within the United States, shall be voluntarily carried, or suffered to proceed, to any German port or place as aforesaid, contrary to the intent hereof, every ship or vessel, together with her cargo, shall be forfeited and shall accrue to the United States and shall be liable to be seized, prosecuted, and condemned in any circuit or district court of the United States.

Sec. 2. That hereafter no clearance for a foreign voyage shall be granted to any ship or vessel owned, hired, or employed wholly or in part by any person resident within the United States, until a bond shall be given to the use of the United States, wherein the owner or employer, if usually resident or present, where the clearance shall be required, and otherwise his agent or factor, and the master or captain of such vessel for the intended voyage shall be parties, in a sum equal to the value of the ship or vessel and her cargo, with condition that the same shall not, during her intended voyage, or before her return within the United States, proceed or be carried, directly or indirectly, to any port or place within the territory of the German Empire or the dependencies thereof, unless by distress of weather, or by actual force or violence, to be fully proved and manifested before the acquittance of such bond; and that such vessel is not, and shall not be employed during her intended voyage, or before her return, as aforesaid, in any traffic or commerce direct or indirect, with or for any person resident within the territory of the empire above mentioned or any of its dependencies.

Sec. 3. That from and after due notice of the passing of this act, no German ship or vessel, armed or unarmed, commissioned by or for, or under the authority of the German Empire, or owned, fitted, hired, or employed by any persons resident within the territory of the German Empire, or any of its dependencies, or sailing or coming therefrom, shall be allowed an entry, or to remain within the territory of the United States unless driven there by distress of weather or in want of provisions. And if contrary to the intent hereof any such ship or vessel shall be found within the jurisdictional limits of the United States, not being liable to seizure for any other cause, the company having charge thereof shall be required to depart and carry away the same without unnecessary delay; and if they shall notwithstanding remain, it shall be the duty of the collector of the district, wherein and nearest to which such ship or vessel shall be, to seize and detain the same: *Provided*, That any ship or vessel so seized or detained may be taken temporarily into the service of the United States, or may be chartered to any responsible citizen or citizens of the United States engaged in the carrying trade on the high seas: *Provided*, That if, before the next session of Congress, the Governments of the German Empire and all persons acting under or by its authority shall clearly disavow and shall be found to refrain from the aggressions, depredations, and hostilities, and the threats of aggressions, depredations, and hostilities which have been and are encouraged and maintained against the vessels and the citizens of the United States, lawfully traveling or employed upon the merchant vessels of any nation, and against their national rights and sovereignty, in violation of the laws of nations, then and thereupon it shall be lawful for the President of the United States, being well ascertained of the premises, to remit and discontinue the prohibition and restraints hereby enacted and declared, and he shall be, and is hereby, authorized to make proclamation thereof accordingly.

A bill (H. R. 20938) to protect the commerce of the United States.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President of the United States shall be, and he is hereby, authorized to instruct the commanders of the public armed vessels which are or which shall be employed in the service of the United States to subdue, seize, or take any armed German vessel which shall be found within the jurisdictional limits of the United States, or elsewhere, on the high seas; and such captured vessel, with her apparel, guns, and appurtenances, and the goods or effects which shall be found on board the same, being German property, shall be brought within some port of the United States and shall be duly proceeded against and condemned as forfeited, and shall accrue and be distributed as by law is or shall be provided respecting the captures which shall be made by the public armed vessels of the United States.

Sec. 2. That all German persons and others who shall be found acting on board any German armed vessel which shall be captured, or on board of any vessel of the United States which shall be recaptured, shall be reported to the collector of the port in which they shall first arrive, and shall be delivered to the custody of the marshal or of some civil or military officer of the United States, or of any State in or near such port, who shall take charge of their safe-keeping and support, at the expense of the United States.

A bill (H. R. 20940) to authorize the defense of the merchant vessels of the United States against German depredations.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the commander and crew of any merchant vessel of the United States, owned wholly by a citizen or citizens thereof may oppose and defend against any search, restraint, or seizure which shall be attempted upon such vessel, or upon any other vessel, owned, as aforesaid, by the commander or crew of any armed vessel sailing under German colors, or acting, or pretending to act, by, or under the authority of the German Empire; and may repel by force any assault or hostility which shall be made or committed or threatened on the part of such German, or pretended German, vessel pursuing such attempt, and may subdue and capture the same; and may also retake any vessel owned, as aforesaid, which may have been captured by any vessel sailing under German colors, or acting, or pretending to act, by, or under authority from the German Empire.

Sec. 2. That after notice of this act at the several customhouses no armed merchant vessel of the United States shall receive a clearance or permit, or shall be suffered to depart therefrom, unless the owner or owners and the master or commander of such vessel for the intended voyage shall give bond, to the use of the United States in a sum equal to double the value of such vessel, with condition that such vessel shall not make or commit any depredation, outrage, unlawful assault, or unprovoked violence upon the high seas against the vessel of any nation in amity with the United States; and that the guns, arms, and ammunition of such vessel shall be returned within the United States or otherwise accounted for, and shall not be sold or disposed of in any foreign port or place; and that such owner or owners and the commander and crew of such merchant vessel shall in all things observe and perform such further instructions in the premises as the President of the United States shall establish and order for the better government of the armed merchant vessels of the United States.



Sec. 3. That the President of the United States shall be, and he is hereby, authorized to establish and order suitable instructions to, and for, the armed merchant vessels of the United States, for the better governing and restraining the commanders and crews who shall be employed therein, and to prevent any outrage, cruelty, or injury which they may be disposed to commit, a copy of which instructions shall be delivered by the collector of the customs to the commander of such vessel, when he shall give bond, as aforesaid. And it shall be the duty of the owner or owners and commander and crew, for the time being, of such armed merchant vessel of the United States, at each return to any port of the United States, to make report to the collector thereof of any encounter which shall have happened with any foreign vessel, and of the state of the company and crew of any vessel which they shall have subdued or captured; and the persons of such crew or company shall be delivered to the care of such collector, who, with the aid of the marshal of the same district, or the nearest military officer of the United States, or of the civil or military officers of any State, shall take suitable care for the restraint, preservation, and comfort of such persons at the expense of the United States until the pleasure of the President of the United States shall be known concerning them.

Sec. 4. That this act shall continue and be in force for the term of one year, and until the end of the next session of Congress thereafter: *Provided*, That whenever the Government of Germany, and all persons acting by or under their authority, shall disavow, and shall cause the commanders and crews of all armed German vessels to refrain from the lawless depredations and outrages hitherto encouraged and authorized by that Government against the merchant vessels of the United States, and shall cause the laws of nations to be observed by the said armed German vessels, the President of the United States shall be, and he is hereby, authorized to instruct the commanders and crews of the merchant vessels of the United States to submit to any regular search by the commanders or crews of German vessels, and to refrain from any force or capture to be exercised by virtue hereof.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask for how long a time I am recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I to a great extent agree with what has been said by my friend from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] with regard to dealing with this grave question. And yet since we are the war-making body, if there is to be war, we should have a clear, definite, comprehensive idea as to what the people of the country want, and we should know the views of each other. Therefore we must discuss this question, and discuss it freely, but fairly and dispassionately. I believe those wise forefathers who made the Constitution made it designedly to meet just such an exigency as this, and they meant that we should discuss this question of war, and of all things a war with a foreign power, and of all things again, my friends, certainly discuss this situation, since war, if it does come, will be as the ally of some dynasty of Europe and not wholly one of self-defense. Our sacred duty was clearly and lucidly set forth in the immortal speech delivered by George Washington in his Farewell Address, wherein warning against "entangling foreign alliances" constituted a large part of that mighty deliverance.

I have just 10 minutes in which to reply to some assertions that have been made on this floor, and many of them should not go unchallenged. I know it is pretty hard for any man who has been here listening to these speeches, many of them brilliant and comprehensive, and delivered by really profound American statesmen, without forming some idea of what action ought to be taken or where one stands, or, in fact, becoming partial to one side or the other.

I am afraid that those excesses of speech which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] referred to have been indulged in too freely on the floor of this House. I do not believe that personalities should be a part of the discussion of this great question. If any Members want to have a personal controversy, let them go outside. But just a while ago, during the debate of the question of the neutrality rights of this country and the manner in which our neutrality and the neutrality of other nations is treated by Great Britain, one of my dearest young friends of all my years of public life, who has made a worthy name in Pennsylvania, and to whom some day there will be erected a monument of sculptured marble, I am afraid labored under a misapprehension when he scoffed at the idea of the interference by England with American commerce with neutral nations.

I do not have time just now to pay much attention to what is said in the newspaper press, but I want to say to you here, my friends, in all fairness and candor, that my young friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has been stricken hard in the newspaper press of this country simply because he has been courageous. He has been a newspaper man for 30 or 40 years, and he, as well as I, can appreciate and comprehend what newspapers might be capable of doing, carelessly or otherwise, because I myself have been in the business for 35 years. And without even attempting to cast any reproach or odium upon the position taken by any of these papers with regard to the

neutrality rights of the United States, it is sufficient now to say that many important dailies have not been neutral, but boldly and blatantly proally.

My friends the assault that was made in the Washington Times and New York Sun against Mr. MANN and Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania to me sounded entirely too strenuous and as "protesting too much" for whoever wrote these articles to be beyond suspicion. And so it might be with the rest. I am now going to try to make this matter clear to my young friend from Pennsylvania, who might some day be governor, while we are waiting for the monument—that is, in case Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania in his championship of the freedom of speech in Congress, or McFADDEN, might not get there before you, Mr. FARR. I am not going abroad to hunt through any other Member's district and I am not taking the assertion made for or against this proposition in any newspaper. But it is a duty that I owe this House and the country, when I know of definite facts that exist of the wanton and willful interference with American commerce with neutral countries by Great Britain, to say so, and say it specifically, and give my facts and my figures on the question.

In the central part of Pennsylvania there is a great tanning industry on the Juniata River, up at Mount Union, owned and operated by a gentleman named Calvin M. Greene and his two sons. He is a bright, energetic, honorable business man, and his two sons are graduates of a university. They, too, are fair and square men, and I believe are of German descent. Anyhow, they are business men and they are Americans, and I am their Congressman. They have written me this letter, and I want you to know what they say, and to judge whether there is any fake, or farce, or fraud about this talk of interference, or whether we have the freedom of the seas, in order that my young friend FARR may have full enlightenment, if not illumination. This is not of last June, as was the case cited by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This was in December, and the letter reads:

MOUNT UNION, December 18, 1916.

HOB. B. K. FOCHT,  
Lewisburg, Pa.

DEAR B. K.: I inclose two notices from the trade department of the British Embassy, Washington, advising of cabling expenses necessary in order to find if the two parties named therein may have permission from the British Government to receive the goods which we want to send them—

Think of the outrage. An American manufacturer must come to Washington and get consent of the British Embassy to send goods into neutral ports. Is that freedom of the seas? Continuing, the letter reads:

It is very humiliating that American citizens must repeatedly ask Great Britain before any goods can be shipped to the neutral countries of Europe. Great Britain needs a good "beating up." Unfortunately, Germany has not had a square deal through the American press. We are no special descendants of Germany, but our opinion is that she is no worse than Great Britain.

With kindest regards and wishes for a happy Christmas,

Yours, very sincerely,

EDWARD M. GREENE,  
Mount Union Tanning & Extract Co.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FOCHT. I would like to have two minutes in which to read this letter from the British Embassy. I think it is worthy of going into the RECORD.

Mr. DENT. I yield two minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. FOCHT. Thank you very much. It says:

TRADE DEPARTMENT, BRITISH EMBASSY,  
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1916.

MOUNT UNION TANNING & EXTRACT CO.,

Mount Union, Pa.:

(J. H. Goldschmidt, Copenhagen.)

The trade department of the British Embassy beg to advise you that the cabling expenses in connection with your application of the 12th instant amount to \$3.95 and that it would be convenient if you would remit this sum at your earliest opportunity.

Here is another one:

TRADE DEPARTMENT, BRITISH EMBASSY,  
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1916.

MOUNT UNION TANNING & EXTRACT CO.,

Mount Union, Pa.:

(Norwegian Tanners' Association (notify John Jerndahl), Christiansa; A. S. Bergens, Skofabrik, Bergen.)

The trade department of the British Embassy beg to advise you that the cabling expenses in connection with your application of the 12th instant amount to \$6.65 and that it would be convenient if you would remit this sum at your earliest opportunity.

Under my leave to print, and in connection with the above, I beg to submit as part of my remarks the following editorial which I contributed to the Lewisburg (Pa.) Saturday News of February 17, 1917:



## MARKING TIME.

The "overt" act on the part of Germany in the prosecution of her submarine warfare against England and her allies, which many are looking for as the signal to begin hostilities, has not yet been committed. It is the opinion of some, however, that inasmuch as many American ships traverse the prohibited zone something is likely to happen soon, by design or accident, that will precipitate at least some degree of armed conflict.

But since relations with Germany have been broken off there has been a disposition in Washington to "keep cool" and by all honorable means avert war. The President is saying nothing, but in the light of his manner of handling the Mexican situation he is not going to get his page in history as a war President. According to written expressions received in great volume by Members of Congress sentiment against a declaration of war or of engaging in war, excepting in an extreme exigency, is fast crystallizing among the American people.

The feeling is growing that while England has outraged our commerce and Germany criminally violated international law in sinking the *Lusitania*, the warring nations are in no sense hostile to us, and that whatever has been committed against us has not been through any hostile spirit. It is becoming more clearly realized every day that the European nations are in a death grapple, fighting for their very existence, and that any of them are liable to occasionally violate the rules. Hence a week has brought about a very much modified opinion as to the likelihood of war, and just what Congress should regard as sufficient justification for any action that will involve us in the horrors that infest the war trenches of Europe which have shocked the world. There is no division of opinion with reference to ample preparedness, which is proceeding as fast as the genius of American enterprise will permit. But the question Congress may be compelled to confront almost any day is whether or not before the adjournment March 5, and before an "overt" act is committed by Germany, the President is to be authorized in advance to adopt such measures as he may see fit and alone determine what shall constitute sufficient justification for engaging in war. He may not ask this authority in advance, but we feel inclined to forecast such action on his part, and he may have done so before this is in print, for events are moving in rapid succession, though without much noise and bluster.

If it is war, this generation will know how "international law" and "diplomacy," or lack of both, brought us to the gates of blood and horror, and let us hope that there may be such understandings in the future as to preclude such dire possibilities.

But no matter what the cause, not even if many have blundered, no American will falter in his duty. There will be no politics, no section, and no thought other than the preservation of the country's honor and integrity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingencies, headquarters of military departments, districts, and tactical commands: For contingent expenses at the headquarters of the several territorial departments, territorial districts, tactical divisions and brigades, including the staff corps serving thereat, being for the purchase of the necessary articles of office, toilet, and desk furniture, stationery, ice, and potable water for office use when necessary, binding, maps, technical books of reference, professional and technical newspapers and periodicals, payment for which may be made in advance, and police utensils to be allotted by the Secretary of War, and to be expended in the discretion of the commanding officers of the several military departments, districts, and tactical commands, \$7,500.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have listened here for some time and have been watching the reports made by several generals, admirals, and other military experts of the United States with reference to the possibility of getting recruits in our Army and Navy, and no one can deny that every statement that has been made as to the possibility of getting recruits has been challenged and found wanting. There has been no plan offered that would bring the young men of this country into either the Army or the Navy now or at any time when you need them unless it should be in stress of actual war.

It was suggested here by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] this morning—and there was some applause following his statement—that you might do something in the way of educating young men in the Army and Navy and in that way attract them. Mr. Chairman, on the 10th of January, 1916, I introduced into the House joint resolution 93, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 93) authorizing the appointment of a commission in relation to educational, vocational, and military-naval training.

Resolved, etc., That a joint commission be constituted to be known as the joint commission on educational, vocational, and military-naval training, to be composed of three Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the Vice President, and three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker. The said joint commission be, and is hereby, directed, authorized, and empowered to examine, consider, and submit to Congress recommendations upon the following, to wit:

The need of educational, vocational, and military-naval training in the United States.

Whether national grants should be made to the various States to stimulate vocational and military-naval training, or whether schools or colleges should be established under the direct control of the United States and maintained entirely as national institutions.

If the said commission shall recommend that schools or colleges shall be established and maintained by the United States, then to recommend where not less than 20 such schools or colleges should be placed.

Whether a proportion of such schools should be established on the coasts for educational, vocational, and naval training exclusively.

To make recommendations as to the course of instruction in agricultural, trade, and industrial subjects as well as in military and naval training to be given in such schools and colleges, and to recommend the minimum age at which boys shall be admitted to such schools or colleges and the method of selecting the said pupils.

To make recommendations as to the total number of pupils to be received annually and to estimate the annual cost of the maintenance of such schools and colleges.

To make recommendations as to whether pupils who have been trained in such schools or colleges shall be subject to the call of the United States for military or naval services, as the case may be, and the number of years during which this condition of service shall prevail, and whether such pupils shall during such period, when they are so subject to call for service, serve a limited time each year to perfect their military or naval training.

To make all other recommendations pertaining to the subject matter which aid in rendering more efficient a system under the control of the United States Government for educating boys while at the same time preparing them for military or naval service. To report as to whether such training shall be free of all cost to the said pupils and whether any monetary compensation shall be given the said pupils in the event of their being called for annual training after graduating from the said school or college.

The said commission shall report their finding to Congress on or before October 1, 1916, together with a bill embodying their recommendations and establishing such educational, vocational, and military-naval training schools or colleges. The sum of \$10,000 is hereby appropriated, the same to be immediately available, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to defray all necessary expenses of said joint commission, payment of said expenses to be made upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said joint commission, who shall be selected by the commission.

Mr. Chairman, I think my association and acquaintance with the young men of this country and the families of the young men who make up the actual soldiery in times of war is second to that of no man in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GARLAND. Will the gentleman give me a couple of minutes more, just for a few more words?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARLAND. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the national-defense act provides for vocational training in the Army?

Mr. GARLAND. I do not think it does in this kind or manner.

Mr. KAHN. It provides for it in any manner that the Secretary of War desires to indulge in.

Mr. GARLAND. But there is no plan established for it by which the Secretary is directed to make munitions, to train in trades, or is there directions that he put such proposition in the enlistment of men.

Mr. KAHN. This bill carries an appropriation for it.

Mr. DENT. Yes; this bill carries an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. GARLAND. I want to say this, in connection therewith, that 85 per cent of the young men of this country who go to the public schools come out unfinished before they get through the high schools, and all of them come out with the purpose of doing something. At 16 or 17 or 18 years of age they can not go through high school for the reason that their condition at home and the situation of their parents will not permit it. They come out to hunt for something to do in life. If a plan of this kind, teaching them a trade is prepared, and then call on them for three or four years of service at that time of life when they do not have a family on their hands enlistments will come. Let the Government make any or all the material they need in a situation of that kind, and teach the trade there, and pay the boys over and above the cost of their teaching; and in that manner I think you will have no trouble in getting all the young men of the right kind, not the kind that are unfit, but the kind you call on in trouble always—the boys of the mill, the factory, and the farm. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had that permission before.

Mr. BOOHER. I desire to extend my remarks by printing in the Record a letter addressed to myself by the William C. Powell Manufacturing Co., of St. Joseph, Mo., tendering to the Government of the United States, free of charge, the use of their plant in case of emergency. This company is engaged in the manufacture of clothing.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein the document indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the letter referred to:

ST. JOSEPH, Mo., February 14, 1917.

Hon. CHARLES F. BOOHER,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BOOHER: I wish to offer, through you, to the United States Government, without cost, that they can share and be benefited by it, the use of my patent during the life of it for one-piece suits, suitable for work, training, or service garments. Wherein they can have all contractors making up Government goods use same for all uses in-door or out, and in any climate, for United States Government use only.

The garment can be made of any weight fabric. Saves yardage over two-piece suits. Has more freedom; in fact, all or more than the enclosed circular and letter tell about. See what it saves.

Various changes could be made in the make up as to collar, pockets, etc., which would not change the patent. This garment can be handled by any manufacturer of overalls, men's coats, pants, etc. The saving of yardage would mean a great amount, as well as having a practical garment of freedom. I will agree to furnish all details as to prices and patterns, etc.

You will no doubt remember the writer, as you put and had passed a bill in the House abolishing prison labor in the overall industry a few years ago.

Will be glad to hear from you if you think the United States Government would handle, and if such is the case, will have the details prepared for a bill.

Thanking you and hoping to hear from you, I beg to remain,

Very truly, yours,

W. C. POWELL.

Mr. HILLIARD rose.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be considered closed now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments be considered closed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHIEF OF COAST ARTILLERY.

Coast Artillery School, Fort Monroe, Va.: For incidental expenses of the school, including chemicals, stationery, printing and binding; hardware; materials; cost of special instruction of officers detailed as instructors; employment of temporary technical, or special services; extra-duty pay to soldiers necessarily employed for periods not less than 10 days as artificers on work in addition to and not strictly in line with their military duties, such as carpenters, blacksmiths, draftsmen, printers, lithographers, photographers, engine drivers, telegraph operators, teamsters, wheelwrights, masons, machinists, painters, overseers, laborers; for office furniture and fixtures, machinery, and unforeseen expenses, \$10,000.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the gentleman allow this paragraph to be read to the end.

Mr. STAFFORD. It has been read, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KAHN. No. On page 6 there are three-fourths of a page, a part of that paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is mistaken. We are considering this bill by paragraphs, and not by titles.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman has the right to get in now.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the bill is read by paragraphs, and not by sections.

Mr. KAHN. There are quite a number of sections belonging to this paragraph on the next page, down to almost the bottom of the page.

Mr. DENT. Down to line 14.

Mr. KAHN. No; line 23, page 6.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask the gentleman from California this question: We read, commencing with line 13, as I understand it?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California claim that on page 6 down to the "Office of the Signal Officer" it is all one paragraph?

Mr. KAHN. I do. The Chair will notice the punctuation at the end of line 25 of page 5. It is a semicolon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HILLIARD. If the gentleman from California does not want me to speak, all right. I have not hitherto taken up the time of the House.

Mr. KAHN. I have no objection to the gentleman's speaking.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I understand on an appropriation bill the measure is considered by paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood the Chair to rule that in the construction of the pending bill, on pages 5 and 6, the paragraph does not end at the end of line 25, page 5, but continues on to the following page, with succeeding paragraphs. Those items in succeeding paragraphs involve separate and distinct proposals, all pertaining, it is true, to the Coast Artillery, but not to the Coast Artillery school at Fort Monroe, Va. If they all pertained to the Coast Artillery school at Fort Monroe, Va., then they might be held to be a part of the same paragraph; but the items under consideration, and found on page 6, relate to the Coast Artillery service, separate and distinct items, and the mere fact that the punctuation marked at the end of line 25 is a semicolon does not make the succeeding paragraphs a portion of the paragraph found on page 5.

Mr. DENT. I want to suggest that there is no question before the committee at this time, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILLIARD] having withdrawn his request.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] raised a point of order. The Chair asked the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] if it was his contention that all this matter was so related that the paragraph as such continued down to the words "Office of the Chief Signal Officer," and he said it was one paragraph. The Chair, without looking at it, directed the Clerk to read. That is the situation. If no one desires to speak, the Clerk will proceed with the reading.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of engines, generators, motors, machines, measuring instruments, special apparatus and materials for the division of the enlisted specialists, \$7,000;

For purchase of special apparatus and materials and for experimental purposes for the department of artillery and land defense, \$3,000;

For purchase of engines, generators, motors, machines, measuring instruments, special apparatus and materials for the department of engineering and mine defense, \$5,500;

For purchase and binding of professional books treating of military and scientific subjects for library, for use of school, and for temporary use in coast defenses, \$2,500; in all, \$28,000.

Provided, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to subscriptions for foreign and professional newspapers and periodicals to be paid for from this appropriation.

Provided further, That purchase and exchange of typewriting machines, to be paid for from this appropriation, may be made at the special price allowed to schools teaching stenography and typewriting without obligating typewriter companies to supply these machines to all departments of the Government at the same price.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Throughout this bill there are paragraphs containing provisos, some that have relation and others that have no relation to the paragraph preceding. We have now before us an instance of the latter kind. I should like to have a ruling of the Chair whether, for instance, the two paragraphs on page 6, in lines 14 to 23, are to be considered as one paragraph or are they to be considered as two paragraphs as printed in the bill? Each proviso is concluded with a period.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair is going to make a ruling on that subject, I will suggest that a paragraph is a paragraph. I can give the Chair one instance. In the Agricultural bill in one place it carries general language, and without reaching the point of a period it carries the items for the national forests. Most of the items consist of one line each, and each item is considered, and always has been considered, a separate paragraph, because that is the meaning of the word "paragraph." I do not think there is any question about that. The fact that they are related does not make any difference.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, at the end of line 12, on page 6, it says—

In all, \$28,000.

Meaning that all the items in the paragraph amount to \$28,000. I take it that that would mean that the various sections are all a part of the one paragraph.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can find a much longer argument on that subject by turning to page 21, where it says, in line 5—

Total pay of the Army—

So many dollars. So that would be the end of a paragraph. All of the appropriation bills usually provide at the end of a certain office or a certain class, "in all, so many dollars," but that has nothing to do with the paragraphing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that while a heading like this may properly be broken up into small subdivisions, he treats them all as one paragraph. That is the way the Chair is disposed to look at it. The Clerk will continue the reading.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That the sum of \$1,000,000 may be expended out of the appropriations provided by the act of August 29, 1916, for the purchase of sites and construction of buildings for aviation schools.



Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Before passing this item I wish to inquire what is purposed by the department in the item under consideration? I wish to inquire whether the department made any recommendation for an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for purchase of sites and construction of buildings for the aviation school?

Mr. DENT. The department has made a recommendation, and I was just in the act of offering some amendments that would meet the recommendation of the War Department.

In the act of August 29, 1916, we made an appropriation of something over \$13,000,000 for aviation purposes. The Comptroller has ruled that the department can not pay out of that sum any money for the purchase of sites, or for buildings in order to house the machines or to take care of them. The Secretary of War asks that so much of the appropriation made last year as will be necessary for that purpose be made immediately available in this bill out of the appropriation of last year. It does not increase the appropriation that we are giving in this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is generally recognized that the entire amount of the money appropriated last year for aviation purposes will not be used this year, that a good portion of it, \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 or more perhaps, will lapse into the Treasury.

Mr. DENT. They will have about \$6,000,000 left, and they want to use \$4,500,000 of that for these purposes, and I was about to offer an amendment in order to meet the recommendation of the War Department on that subject.

Mr. STAFFORD. Before I withdraw the point of order I would like to hear the amendment read that is proposed to be offered.

Mr. DENT. I will offer the amendment first.

Mr. STAFFORD. The amendment can be read for information, but can not be offered while the point of order is pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send his amendment to the desk and it will be read. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. DENT: Page 8, line 13, strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,000,000"; page 8, line 14, after the word "appropriations," insert the words "for aviation"; page 8, line 16, after the word "the," insert the words "acquisition by," and after the word "purchase" insert the words "condemnation or otherwise"; page 8, line 17, strike out the period and insert a comma after the word "schools," and add the following: "post experimental stations, and proving grounds for the United States Army."

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand, these are read merely for information, Mr. Chairman. I think it is owing to the committee that some explanation be made of this radical amendment increasing the amount from \$1,000,000 to \$4,000,000. Is it purposed to increase these appropriations, as the Naval Affairs Committee increased their appropriation by some \$15,000,000, as the result of afterthoughts of the department?

Mr. DENT. Of course, this does not increase the appropriation which was made last year. It is also true that if this sum is not used by the last of June it will be turned back into the Treasury.

This proposition has been submitted both to the Appropriations Committee and the Military Committee of the House by the Secretary of War, and he writes the following short letter:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, January 6, 1917.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I beg leave to inclose a suggested amendment to be incorporated into the urgent deficiency bill. The development of aviation in the Army of course depends upon suitable grounds, and throughout the United States there is now accumulating a very large amount of valuable property of the Aviation Section for which proper housing appliances are absolutely necessary. The appropriation made last year was a very ample provision for the purpose of machines, but made no provision for exercising grounds, storage facilities, etc. This amendment, if incorporated, will authorize the use of a part of the funds appropriated last year for those purposes and, of course, calls for no new appropriation, but merely larger authority with regard to the appropriation already made. The auditor and comptroller have already ruled that the funds appropriated last year, under the limitations contained in the appropriation bill, can not be expended for these purposes.

Respectfully,

NEWTON D. BAKER,  
Secretary of War.

Now, the Secretary of War not only wrote this letter, but he tells me that he must have this in order to properly house and take care of the machines.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does the Secretary of War state where he desires to spend this increased appropriation?

Mr. DENT. He does not.

Mr. ANTHONY. Is not the whole matter in a very vague condition, and does the gentleman think we ought to appropriate this enormous sum of money for sites until the department states where they want the sites?

Mr. DENT. I think the matter is of such a character that it ought to be left to the discretion of the administrative officers.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the amendment go further than provide sites for aviation? He could use the \$4,000,000 for the purchase of posts and an experimental school for aviation. Further than that, the matter is before the Committee on Appropriations, which is at present considering the estimates by the department for urgent deficiencies.

Mr. DENT. I have recently had a conversation with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who tells me that he would not undertake to put anything of that kind in his bill, and he expects this to be taken care of in the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. CALDWELL. All the money appropriated by us, amounting to millions, has been spent, and a part of it is still under contract in the acquisition of certain aviation machinery that will deteriorate until it is housed. At present there are no houses for these machines, although we have the land for them. They must have the additional appropriation in order that the machinery, perishable property, exposed to the weather, may be properly taken care of—not only that which we have but that which is under contract and that which they expect to buy out of the appropriation.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Has the gentleman any information as to whether it will take one million or four million dollars?

Mr. CALDWELL. I understand the department asked for \$4,500,000.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. For housing this property or acquiring the ground?

Mr. CALDWELL. Both.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there were six million left over of the appropriation of last year?

Mr. DENT. Yes; that is my information.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Then Congress voted that much more money than the department has found use for.

Mr. DENT. The department, as I understand, was under the impression that under the appropriation of last year they could use a portion of the fund for acquiring sites to erect buildings to house the machines. The comptroller has ruled that they can not, and the purpose of this amendment is to utilize the money for that purpose.

Mr. FIELDS. I want to say to the gentleman that \$3,000,000 and over is asked to purchase sites.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The appropriation bill carrying that sum was approved August 9, 1916, so there has been no time to expend the money.

Mr. DENT. That is true; and when we had the Chief of the Signal Corps before the committee the law had been in operation only about five months.

Mr. CALDWELL. There was appropriated \$14,281,000, and there are \$6,000,000 not yet expended; and the comptroller said that under the wording of the bill it could not be used for the structures necessary.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Secretary of War or other officers have submitted any estimate in connection with the letter asking for the increased appropriation?

Mr. DENT. No; they have submitted no definite plan or proposal in regard to it.

Mr. MCKENZIE. They are simply asking that we take \$4,000,000 of the money appropriated last year for the construction of flying machines and turn it over to the War Department to expend in the purchase of land and the erection of buildings to take care of flying machines.

Mr. DENT. That is very true.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Is it not a fact that when the matter was considered before the committee we felt that a million dollars was a very reasonable amount to turn over to them at this time for that purpose, and that we needed flying machines rather than land?

Mr. DENT. It is true that the committee thought that a million dollars would be sufficient, but we did not have any more information about it than the War Department has submitted to us now.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Is it not a fact that they did not state at what point or places in the country the money was to be expended or the land purchased?



Mr. DENT. That is very true.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. I think there was an estimate submitted to the committee of \$3,000,000 to be appropriated out of the funds that were to go for the purchase of land and putting up the buildings during the fiscal year 1918.

Mr. FIELDS. That is correct.

Mr. KAHN. And therefore the War Department took cognizance of this subject in its estimates. The committee thought, in view of the testimony given before it by Gen. Squier, that probably they could utilize a sum of money appropriated last year for the purchase of land and the construction of buildings. In fact, the department or the bureau undertook to do that very thing out of the \$13,000,000 appropriated, but the Comptroller of the Treasury held that under the wording of the law they could not do it. Therefore the department bought the flying machines but had no buildings in which to put them and no place to try them out at the various posts in the country. This money is now intended to allow the bureau to buy the necessary land and put up the necessary buildings to house the machines that will be required.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Has the gentleman any information as to how much of the \$4,500,000 is to be used for buildings and how much for land?

Mr. KAHN. I have not. I have simply the Secretary's letter for my guidance, which I heard the chairman of the committee read.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That gives no detail as to that proposition at all?

Mr. KAHN. No.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It simply asks for the money. Is the gentleman aware that the Government already has hundreds of reservations scattered all over the country?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, yes; I am quite aware of that. There is a reservation at Fort Sill, Okla., but I do not think the Government wants to take these machines out there and try them out. I do not think that would be a proper place for them. I rather think that the Government wants to try these machines out near the seaboard, where they will undoubtedly be used, and where the department will have to have land if they want to use them.

Mr. FIELDS. Is it not stated also that these sites would have to be purchased where the atmospheric conditions were favorable?

Mr. KAHN. That is only for the schools. After the men become expert fliers they can fly in any atmosphere.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Is it not a matter of record before the committee that they have already purchased a large site upon the Potomac?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; I believe at Hampton, Va.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. For something like \$350,000?

Mr. KAHN. I do not know how much they paid for it. There was an appropriation of \$300,000 for that purpose. They have purchased that site; but if the gentleman knows anything about aeronautics, he must know they have to have large tracts of land near the posts where these machines are to be located in order to successfully maneuver and fly them, and those the Government does not happen to have at the present time.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I desire to ask my colleague if, in his judgment, \$1,000,000 would not be sufficient to erect shelter to cover all of the machines that we will have during the year 1918?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, possibly half a million dollars might do that. It might put up the buildings, but that does not get away from the fact that the department must have sufficient land area on which to fly these machines, and that that land must be near the Army posts.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, on page 999 of the hearings Gen. Scriven was before the committee, and the question of the use of this \$3,000,000 which at that time was asked was under discussion. The general testified that in addition to the hangars in which the machines were to be kept there must be provided at Hampton workshops, experimental shops, places for storing ammunition, bombs, etc., and garages for the necessary automobiles and trucks. So that as I understand it this \$4,500,000 they ask for, or the \$4,000,000 proposed in this amendment, is for the purpose of putting up the necessary improvements to the real estate and the purchase of some small amount of land for the purpose

of having the right kind of station or school for the aviation service. We have appropriated some \$14,000,000 which they can spend between now and the 1st day of July, 1917.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. In just a moment. If they go ahead spending the money for tools and for flying machines and all those things, they will have to be kept under canvas, as it is being kept, according to the testimony on the same page, at Columbus. If such course is pursued, we are wasting our money, throwing it away, and under these circumstances I think we ought to have a chance to vote upon it. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I want to ask the gentleman a question. He said this money they could spend. Has it not been demonstrated that they can not spend it, because they want to spend it now for something not appropriated for? They have not been able to find a place to spend it.

Mr. CALDWELL. I do not say that.

Mr. DENT. They were under the impression they could not spend it for this purpose until the comptroller gave his decision.

Mr. CALDWELL. We appropriated it upon their request a year ago, and now they want words put into the statute so that they can spend it as they contemplated a year ago.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, this seems to be a very important subject and the Members ought to hear it. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty Members present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adamson	Edwards	Kearns	Riordan
Bacharach	Elston	Kent	Roberts, Mass.
Barchfeld	Estopinal	Key, Ohio	Rodenberg
Beakes	Fairchild	Kreider	Rowland
Beales	Ferris	Lafean	Rucker, Mo.
Benedict	Fess	Langley	Sabath
Bennet	Fitzgerald	Lee	Schall
Blackmon	Flynn	Lewis	Scott, Pa.
Bowers	Frear	Liebel	Scully
Britten	Freeman	Linthicum	Sells
Browning	Gandy	Littlepage	Shackleford
Bruckner	Gard	Lobeck	Siegel
Burgess	Garner	Loft	Slemp
Burke	Godwin, N. C.	Loud	Small
Callaway	Gordon	McCracken	Smith, Idaho
Cantrill	Gould	McGillcuddy	Snell
Carew	Graham	McKinley	Sparkman
Casey	Gray, N. J.	Magee	Steele, Pa.
Charles	Griest	Maher	Stephens, Nebr.
Chiperfield	Griffin	Martin	Stephens, Tex.
Church	Hamill	Matthews	Stiness
Clark, Fla.	Hart	Miller, Del.	Stout
Coleman	Haskell	Montague	Summers
Connelly	Haugen	Mooney	Swift
Conry	Hayes	Morgan, La.	Taggart
Cooper, Ohio	Helvering	Neely	Tague
Copley	Henry	Nelson	Talbott
Costello	Hicks	Oglesby	Taylor, Colo.
Crosser	Hill	O'Shaunessy	Tinkham
Dale, N. Y.	Hinds	Padgett	Vare
Darrow	Holland	Page, N. C.	Venable
Davenport	Hughes	Paige, Mass.	Watson, Pa.
Denison	Hulbert	Patten	Webb
Dewalt	Hull, Tenn.	Phelan	Williams, W. E.
Dies	Humphrey, Wash.	Pou	Wilson, Ill.
Dooling	Husted	Price	Wingo
Doremus	Hutchinson	Ragsdale	Winslow
Drukker	Johnson, Wash.	Rainey	
Edmonds	Jones	Randall	

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 20783), finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called, whereupon 279 Members, a quorum, answered to their names, and he reported the names of the absentees to be entered on the Journal.

The SPEAKER. A quorum having appeared, the committee will resume its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The parliamentary status at the time the point of no quorum was made was that the gentleman from Alabama had submitted certain amendments to be read for information, and the point of order had been reserved to the section of the bill to which those amendments were directed. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin insist on his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, from the discussion which has taken place since the point of order was reserved, it is apparent from the expressions that a great number of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs are opposed to this radical increase of appropriation from \$1,000,000 to \$4,000,000. I have examined the hearings and I find that the head of the service stated that there are some propositions under consid-



eration which would involve, in case the tracts are purchased, the expenditure of more than \$1,000,000, and unless I can have some understanding with the chairman of the committee that he will not press his amendment to increase the amount I shall feel constrained to make the point of order. Even though I dissent from this \$1,000,000 of appropriation, I shall not oppose it; but I do not believe it is good legislation to come here merely upon the recommendation of the Secretary of War without any full consideration being given by the committee and increase that amount by \$3,000,000.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin accept an amount of \$2,000,000?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I think from expressions of members of the committee that this matter was considered by the committee, and it was decided by the committee that \$1,000,000 should be the amount. In fact, there are members who have not participated in the discussion or given it consideration who are averse to this policy of expending these large amounts of money. I believe that it is necessary to allow the War Department to equip some building with the necessary machinery in conjunction with this aviation school so as to aid the aviation service in connection with the Army.

Mr. DENT. As I understand it they require some appropriation for houses that will house and take care of the machines, and this \$1,000,000 will not take care of them, and if I insist on the amendment the gentleman will insist on the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this is subject to the point of order. The decisions are very clear. I refer the Chair to paragraphs 3591 and 3592 in volume 4 of Hinds' Precedents.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserved the point of order and never stated what his point of order was or to what language it was directed.

Mr. STAFFORD. The point of order is that it is new legislation not authorized by law, and that it is appropriating money carried in another appropriation act for a different purpose than what was stated in the original appropriation act.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I read from decision No. 3591, fourth volume of Hinds' Precedents:

The reappropriation of an unexpended balance for an object authorized by law may be made on an appropriation bill.

And from paragraph 3592 of Hinds' Precedents:

On February 14, 1907, the naval appropriation bill was under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, when the Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 16, insert after the word "articles," "And provided further, That the unexpended balances under appropriations 'Provisions, Navy, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1905, and 1906,' are hereby reappropriated for 'Provisions, Navy, for fiscal year ending June 30, 1908.'"

Mr. JOHN J. FITZGERALD, of New York, made a point of order.

After debate the Chairman (who was the Hon. James Breck Perkins, of New York) held:

"The Chair is of the opinion that the question that has been raised has been covered by previous decisions of those occupying the chair, and in a moment the Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from New York to two decisions which he finds. In one of these decisions it was held: 'That a reappropriation of an unexpended balance for an object authorized by law may be made on an appropriation bill.'

"Now, in answer to the position stated by the gentleman from New York a moment ago, a second decision held 'That a reappropriation of a sum required by law to be covered into the Treasury was not a change of law.'

"It seems to the Chair that these two decisions precisely cover the questions presented. Money has been appropriated for an object authorized by law and is now reappropriated for a similar object. That is the decision made by predecessors in the chair, and it has been held not to be a change of law and a thing that could properly be done upon an appropriation bill, and the Chair therefore overrules the point of order."

The above decision from which I quoted directly says that a reappropriation of an unexpended balance for an object authorized by law may be made on an appropriation bill. The question arises whether this is or is not an appropriation authorized by law. I have not the Book of Estimates here, but the gentleman from Alabama can tell me the law under which the appropriation was made if he will look in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. KAHN. August 29, 1916.

Mr. GARDNER. August 29, 1916.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask in that connection if it is agreed that this sum of \$1,000,000 is an unexpended balance. There is no controversy about that?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the application of that fund is to the purchase of sites and construction of buildings for the Aviation Corps. What is the authority for that application?

Mr. GARDNER. I am not sufficiently familiar with the act of August, 1916, to say from memory, but I can find the section in a minute or two.

Mr. DENT. I have not found it in the estimates. But I was going to make this statement, Mr. Chairman. As I understand it, the appropriation carried in the appropriation bill for the support of the Army, of August 29 of last year, provided generally for so many millions of dollars for this purpose, and the comptroller has ruled that under that appropriation they can not purchase any sites or erect any buildings to house the machines that they may purchase, or lease any of them. There is no way in which to do it. And I want to confess, Mr. Chairman, that, so far as I am concerned, I think it is subject to a point of order, and that is the reason I said that I would withdraw my amendment if the point of order was going to be insisted on.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I would like to call the Chair's attention to the fact that the same appropriation bill which carries this appropriation for aviation purposes carried an appropriation of \$300,000 for the specific purpose for which they now seek to use this money, and that money has been spent for land, showing that it was the intention of Congress when they appropriated that money to have it spent for that specific purpose.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my proposed amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. KAHN. Does the gentleman withdraw the entire amendment?

Mr. DENT. I think the point of order would lie on the other.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman understand that the amendment is withdrawn and the point of order is withdrawn?

Mr. STAFFORD. The point of order is withdrawn on the statement of the gentleman that he does not intend to press the amendment increasing the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman understand the point of order is intended to be withdrawn, and the amendment likewise?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, without objection, that will be done.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I understand now that the point of order having been withdrawn, there are some words—and I do not want to take advantage and ask for a larger appropriation, although I am in favor of one—there are some words that ought to go into this section, even if it carries \$1,000,000. I do not want to take an unfair advantage with the gentleman, who withdraws the point of order. If he means—

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not wish to enlarge the scope of it. I have no objection to the insertion of the word "acquisition."

Mr. CALDWELL. The last one may be grounds for the Army.

Mr. STAFFORD. That extends it away beyond the scope of any mere authorization. I would object to that.

Mr. CALDWELL. The first two amendments, I understand, then, will be in order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will not press the point of order against those amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the agreement of the gentleman?

Mr. CALDWELL. I move to amend by inserting after the word "appropriations," in line 14, page 8, the words "for aviation," and after the word "the," in line 16, the words "acquisition by," and after the word "purchase," in the same line, the words "by condemnation or otherwise."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 14, after the word "appropriations," insert the words "for aviation."

On page 8, line 16, after the word "the," insert the words "acquisition by."

On page 8, line 16, after the word "purchase," insert the words "condemnation or otherwise," so that the proviso as amended will read:

"Provided further, That the sum of \$1,000,000 may be expended out of the appropriations for aviation provided by the act of August 29, 1916, for the acquisition by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of sites and construction of buildings for aviation schools."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, that is all one amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the second amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment. I would like to have the attention of the gentleman



from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], because I do not want to take an unfair advantage of him. After the word "buildings," in line 16 of the same section, I want to add, "the improvement of land and water front contiguous thereto."

The reason I propose that is this: At one of the stations we find we can not use the hydroplanes for the reason that the water is too shallow, and they must do some work in connection therewith. I want to put in these words in order that the work may be done. It will cost only a few dollars, but it ought to be done.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I understand the Committee on Appropriations are providing for hydroplanes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes; for the Army. This is only hydroplanes for the Aviation School, not for the Army.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have seen the station at Absecon, near Atlantic City, and—

Mr. CALDWELL. They do not have the right kind of a place there.

Mr. STAFFORD. They have only 10 feet of shore and a channel right in front.

Mr. CALDWELL. I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will not object.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will not.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I shall object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska objects.

Mr. CALDWELL. I will withdraw the amendment, then.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a third amendment still to be submitted to a vote. The question is on the third amendment, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the fourth amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Provided further, That hereafter motor-propelled vehicles, aeroplanes, engines, and parts thereof may be exchanged in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character, to be used for the same purpose as those proposed to be exchanged.*

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, before we pass from this important section I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, by far the greater portion of the time to-day has been consumed in discussion of matters entirely foreign to the bill supposed to be under consideration. Therefore it seems to me appropriate before we pass from this important section appropriating for the Signal Corps that I, as a member of the committee, submit a few words in explanation of the large appropriation we have proposed here.

The committee has come to the conclusion that everyone who studies military affairs at the present time must come, that aviation is one of the most important factors, if not the most important factor, in modern warfare. There has been a revolution, so far as warfare is concerned, caused by the invention of aircraft.

When we developed the method known as indirect fire for artillery, which was not very long ago, whereby we were able to conceal our batteries behind a sloping hill and fire at an unseen enemy, we thought we had gone a long way in the development of warfare. While yet engaged in completely adjusting ourselves to this new and more scientific use of artillery along comes this new agency, which requires that instead of figuring in two dimensions we must figure in three dimensions. Instead of being able to hide behind a sloping hill, entirely safe from view, it is now necessary, if concealment is to be had, that the battery be concealed either in a building or by trees or by some other method to shield it from view from the sky.

The means of concealing artillery and machine guns as already developed in the European war are varied, ingenious, and extremely interesting. Houses, sheds, and trees wherever available are used. A harmless-looking hut or cabin back of the line upon closer investigation reveals a battery of 75's, one gun on the front veranda, two more in the parlor or bed chamber, and the fourth beside the kitchen stove. Sheds are erected for the purpose, and other sheds to deceive the enemy, while overnight clumps of trees are taken up bodily and transplanted into protecting groups. All possible means of concealment and every imaginable ruse to deceive are resorted to, because the very existence of the guns, as well as the lives of the gunners,

depends upon escaping the watchful eye of the airman and the still more searching eye of his ever-clicking camera.

By the aid of aircraft the commander is now able to send his scouts forward to observe the line of outposts, to locate the line of battle, to see the position of the supports and the reserve. In fact all that valuable information that formerly required reconnaissance, oftentimes reconnaissance in force, or a considerable battle to ascertain can now be secured by sending out one aeroplane to examine the country. With the aeroplane, by the use of photography, it is now possible to locate every object on the ground viewed, so that by means of triangulation the distance of every object on the ground under consideration is known. An aeroplane goes up in the air with photographic instruments and takes a photograph of a certain section of the ground. Another aeroplane takes a photograph of another section, and so on over the whole ground. These photographs are placed together, making a continuous map. The next day another photograph is taken of each section so that there is exact knowledge of what changes are going on from day to day all over the ground. It is absolutely necessary to conceal batteries of artillery and machine guns, for if the enemy knows exactly where they are located, and he will surely know if permitted to send over his aircraft, he is able to land upon them with his artillery fire. It was but a short time since it was a brave saying to "stand by your guns." Nowadays, having ascertained by the use of the aeroplane the exact range of a battery, it becomes impossible to "stand by your guns." That slogan must now give way to another not so inspiring, but under present conditions far wiser, something like this: "When once your range is found take to your dug-outs," which must be prepared in advance.

Within three short years it has come to pass that the aeroplane has become the most important factor in directing not only the fire of artillery, but also the movements of armies; so that the army which is lacking in aircraft is going to be at the mercy of its opponent having superior aircraft.

It was formerly said of the cavalry that it was the eyes of the army. That is no longer true, except in a very different sense. The aeroplane now is the eyes of the army, and without it an army would be not only blind but entirely helpless. For these reasons large appropriations were made last year and large appropriations are proposed in this bill. Our weakness in this all-important service must be remedied. Every effort is now being bent in that direction, because we realize that of all the modern agencies of warfare, the submarine not excepted, the most important one and the one in which we are most deficient is the aeroplane. It is the part of wisdom to understand clearly that unless we make large appropriations, and unless the executive departments in the expending of these appropriations make headway, we shall, in case of war, find ourselves in a sad situation so far as the air service is concerned. While our present situation is far from comforting, nevertheless the prospect ahead of us is very bright. We are indeed fortunate in having come to the head of the Aviation Service at this critical juncture such a man as Brig. Gen. George O. Squier. His unusual ability, training, and enthusiasm for his work, as well as the beginnings he has made are good ground for hope and confidence that we have entered upon a new era in the development of this most important agency for national defense. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for seven minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for seven minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, ever since this bill has been under discussion the House has been entertained from time to time with varying opinions from Members on both sides of this center aisle as to what they think the conduct of this Congress should be in the present international situation. For one I do not believe there is a single Member in the House who has received very much information. It is true that we have been highly entertained by the gentlemen who have spoken; but it has all been without profit, even to us or to the country. A few days ago an editorial came under my notice which appeared in a Boston newspaper, and because it has so much real sound sense in it I propose to offer it at this time as a contribution to the debate which has been going on since the Army bill has been before the House. This editorial appears in the Boston Traveler of Tuesday, February 13, and it is headed "Give the President a chance." It is as follows:



## GIVE THE PRESIDENT A CHANCE.

Give President Wilson a fair and decent chance. To-day he is being pulled and hauled by men who, professing to be good citizens and patriotic Americans, are doing what they can to counteract his influence and to convince other nations that he does not represent the sentiment of this Nation.

Three groups are now deliberately engaged in trying to belittle the President. They may be classified as follows:

First. The professional pacifists, or peace-without-honor patriots, who labor to induce Germany to believe that, no matter what she may do in defiance of our rights as a nation and as plain citizens, the sentiment of the United States is against armed protest.

Second. The violent and seemingly incurable proallies, whose constant demand since the war began has been that we enter the war, not in behalf of our own rights, but as a plutocratic, philanthropic annex of the allies.

Third. A dangerous and unpatriotic element which is conjuring up a war with Japan and fanning every day the flame of Japanese resentment against this country, not because they believe that Japan is anxious to make war against us, but to cover up their own allegiance to Germany, which they are not frank enough publicly to proclaim, but which is as patent as their constructive disloyalty to their own country.

Those three groups represent only a small percentage of the people of the United States; but any one of them can apparently make more noise than all of the pro-Americans combined.

Give the President a chance! Suppress the pro-European shriekers!

Now, Mr. Chairman, because I think I am pronouncedly pro-American, and because I firmly believe that every man in this Congress is for America first, I was one of those who this noon voted to strike from the RECORD the words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAILEY] in which he attacked the loyalty of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. The gentleman from Massachusetts needs no defense at my hands. Ever since his membership in Congress he has shown that he is able to take care of himself at any and all times; but because I am unwilling to subscribe to any such attack, suggesting that my colleague from my State is more loyal to Great Britain than he is to the country of his birth, I gladly and heartily voted to strike those words from the RECORD. [Applause.] If a similar attack is made on any other Member of this Congress I shall cheerfully do as I did to-day. I believe steadfastly in the absolute loyalty and devotion of all my colleagues to this country and the Stars and Stripes, which spread their sheltering folds over the head of our beloved Speaker. [Applause.]

I do not always agree with the ideas of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I might say that in most of his contributions to the discussion which has been engaging the attention of Congress I find myself on the other side. But he is a man of courage, of patriotism, of loyalty, and when the test came in his youth he cheerfully responded to the call to the colors in the Spanish-American War. [Applause.] He will do it again if his country needs him.

While I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it would be monstrous to plunge our country into war because of the sinking of any American ship carrying munitions to the belligerents, and I firmly believe that it would be more than a crime to plunge this country into war for the sake of those so-called "Americans" who go out as cattle valets on steamers sailing from East Boston and New York almost every other day, I am unwilling to believe that the great President of this Republic can be persuaded to any such action. Real Americans have judged already the cattle-boat adventurers, and I dare say there is not a man within the sound of my voice who would give them even a cup of coffee to hide their rum breaths, let alone fight and die for their "honor." These are the types that would bring endless misery on our land, because they would court death defiantly in places where they have no right, save at their own peril. One real American boy is worth tons of these cattle pushers, and I have faith that Woodrow Wilson stands for the American boys.

And, Mr. Chairman, we must not forget another thing that occurs to me at this moment, namely, that we did not permit vessels flying the English or any other flag to pass through the lines of our blockading fleets in the Civil War when they were attempting to carry supplies or cash to the Southern States. We must be on the watch for tricky England in our present crisis. She will "plant" an American on her merchantment, if needs be, an "American" who can be easily bought to sail on a ship loaded with materials of war. But Woodrow Wilson knows more about conditions, in my judgment, than all of us here put together. So I say to you, let us be calm, let us refuse to be either a plutocratic or philanthropic annex of either the allies or the central powers, and, above all, let us give the President a chance. [Applause.]

I want to call to the attention of the House another editorial from a Boston newspaper, the Globe, which appears in to-day's issue over the signature of "Uncle Dudley," one of the ablest and best-posted contributors in this country. It is as follows:

## BETTER FOR US TO LOOK BEFORE WE LEAP.

Many of our American ships are lying idle at their docks. They do not make ready to put to sea. Their owners clamor for protection from Washington. They are told that they may arm, but suitable guns are not to be had in the open market. Meanwhile, freight destined for European ports is congesting the railroads. Many trainloads of provisions are sidetracked. Some of our export trade is waiting for a change in the international situation or for a development in the administration attitude.

In 1798 we adopted a policy of armed neutrality. France and England were at war and the French privateers preyed upon our shipping. The situation became so intolerable that, under President John Adams, an American Navy was created for the express purpose of protecting our commerce from the French privateers. We did not make war on the French or declare war against France, but by means of armed vessels on the sea we protected our commerce with England.

There is no question that we may rightly adopt this very policy to-day. We may serve out 4 and 6 inch guns to our merchant shipping, assist them to secure proper gun crews, and use our Navy to convoy upon their lawful occasions ships belonging to Americans.

The chief difficulty in the way of this course is not German, but British. The blockade which England has established is quite as illegal as that of Germany. There would be no problem in convoying ships to England. But as soon as we dispatched a convoy to England a request might well be made that the Government escort a vessel, say, to Norway, or Sweden, or Denmark, or Holland. In that case the British blockade would come in. England has assumed the right to control all commerce to those nations in order to stop reshipments into Germany. We could not very well send a light cruiser or torpedo boat to attend an American vessel wishing to reach Norway to Halifax and then have our cruiser wait patiently outside for a couple of weeks while the British officials made sure that the cargo of our American merchantman contained nothing they did not like in the way of contraband. We have not recognized the British blockade, and there is no reason why we should. But the moment we began to convoy our shipping a recognition of the blockade would be imminent, and the United States can not recognize the high-handed procedure of the British blockade as legal without defaulting rights we have maintained as just for many years.

Deliberation at this time has certain compensations. A situation in which "enormous quantities" of foodstuffs will be thrown on American markets is forecasted. Most American consumers could endure such a happening. The American table has not been groaning these last few months. No great harm will be done if the dollar is made to resume its former purchasing power. The public will not object to cheaper food. The cattle in New England, now threatened with semi-starvation because of the scarcity of grain in the East, might be treated to a series of square meals. Domestic markets, overlooked since Europe went to war, might be rediscovered.

As for the cause of preparedness, it is making tremendous progress. The Army and the Navy are being put upon a war footing. Boats which will be a great assistance in submarine hunting, should we ever come to it, are being catalogued for quick mobilization. Committees of men of affairs are taking account of our resources. Factory owners are notifying the authorities that their plants are at the disposal of the Government. Nets are under construction for the protection of American harbors. Each day of waiting finds us better ready to face hostilities, if that is to be our lot.

The German submarine campaign, furthermore, is not certain of success. It was undertaken in order to secure the quick peace which the German people desire. If England is not brought to terms very soon, the German authorities may come to the conclusion that their effort with U-boats will not bring about the result desired, and the attitude of Germany toward the United States may then change completely. Washington has given Berlin plenty of room in which to back down. The German note did not say directly that our ships would be sunk without warning. It simply canceled the German pledge to us not to sink our ships without warning.

If the time comes that we do convoy our ships, we must realize that a convoy does not assume that a ship carrying contraband will remain afloat. A ship may, in conformity with international law, be stopped, searched, the safety of the passengers and crew assured by removal, and the ship sunk, without giving any offense to the convoy. If we furnished our ships with escorts their cargoes would not be safe, even though no lives on them were lost. Should we place guns aboard merchant vessels we might endanger the safety and comfort of American citizens in Germany more than that of the German U-boat crews.

Only 10 per cent of our shipments to the allies go in American bottoms. Holding up by delay American merchant ships at this time rather increases the comfort of American citizens here and in no way interferes with our national safety. We deliberated 20 years before going into the War of 1812. We can afford to think twice before making any drastic move at the present time.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that leave by order of the House.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think the Chair is in error; the order was for those "who have spoken."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not so understand it. The Chair understood it was those who had spoken or would speak.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. On page 3879, Mr. Chairman, the RECORD says:

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken upon this bill be allowed five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all the gentlemen who have spoken on this bill have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks. Is there objection?

The CHAIRMAN. That is sufficient. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.



The Clerk read as follows:

Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system: For defraying the cost of such extensions, betterments, operation, and maintenance of the Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system as may be approved by the Secretary of War, to be available until the close of the fiscal year 1919, from the receipts of the Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system which have been covered into the Treasury of the United States, the extent of such extension and betterments and the cost thereof to be reported to Congress by the Secretary of War, \$50,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the Signal Corps, in its operation of military telegraph lines, cables, or radio stations, is authorized to collect forwarding charges due connecting commercial telegraph or radio companies for the transmission of Government radiograms or telegrams over their lines, and to this end it can present vouchers to disbursing officers for payment or file claims with auditors of the Treasury Department for the amount of such forwarding charges.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he does not think that the phraseology should be further limited so that it shall not be operative unless approved by the Secretary of War?

Mr. DENT. What is the gentleman's point?

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought the authorization should not go into effect unless first approved by the Secretary of War, and I was going to suggest to the chairman to insert, after the word "authorized," in line 10, the words "in the discretion of the Secretary of War," and then, in line 13, after the word "and," to insert the words "under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War." I do not think it is advisable to enact into permanent law an authorization to the Signal Corps to collect charges without the Secretary of War having the power to discontinue them or to make regulations governing the subject.

Mr. DENT. I have no objection to those amendments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order and offer the following amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 10, after the word "authorized," insert the words "in the discretion of the Secretary of War," and after the word "and," in line 13, page 9, insert the words "under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] called especial attention to the message of the President to Congress in which he announced the severance of diplomatic relations with Germany. Now, when I heard the President read that vastly significant document I thought, and then remarked, that it contained one error in a statement of fact—an error which seemed to be rather important in the sense that the truth—exact knowledge of the facts—is always important in serious discussion.

The President said:

Let me remind the Congress that on the 18th of April last, in view of the sinking on the 24th of March of the cross-channel passenger steamer *Sussex* by a German submarine, without summons or warning, and the consequent loss of the lives of several citizens of the United States, who were passengers aboard her—

And so forth.

But it is not true that several citizens of the United States lost their lives on that British steamer. I have here a copy of the New York World, and on the first page, right-hand column of that paper for March 28, 1916, are the headlines:

No American life lost on the *Sussex*. Germany ready to disavow the act.

Then follows this dispatch:

WASHINGTON, March 27.

Reports received to-day by the State Department from Ambassador Page, in London, and Ambassador Sharp, in Paris, have established that no American lives were lost on board the channel passenger steamer *Sussex*—

And so forth.

In the same issue of the World appears an editorial, from which I quote the following:

One paragraph in President Wilson's speech at St. Louis February 8 has a peculiar application to the *Sussex* case: "Gentlemen, the commanders of submarines have their instructions, and those instructions are consistent for the most part with the laws of nations; but one reckless commander of a submarine, choosing to put his private interpretation upon what his Government wishes him to do, might set the world on fire."

The editorial continues:

No American lives were lost on the *Sussex*—

And so forth.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I am very much interested in the statement of the gentleman as to past facts. Was there not in that message a statement substantially like this, that it is "taken for granted that all neutral Governments will take the same course" that had just been taken by the President?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is referring to what the President seemed to assume.

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I have been referring to what purported to be a statement of fact.

Mr. SLOAN. I do not think the gentleman gets the purport of my question. He is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and as such must keep in close touch with the actions of the other neutral nations of the world. I want to ask, as a matter of information, whether any neutral nation on earth has followed the course taken by the President of the United States in the severance of the diplomatic relations with Germany?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I can say no more than that my information is that no other nation has followed the lead of the United States in that regard. I can not state positively as a fact that that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICERS OF THE LINE.

For pay of officers of the line, \$11,500,000.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the proviso beginning on line 24, page 9, and ending on line 23, page 10, be read at this point in the bill, instead of and in the place of the words printed in the bill. The proviso should come after the figures "\$11,500,000," which is for the pay of officers, and not after the provision for the additional pay to officers for length of service.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the proviso referred to shall be read and considered immediately following line 22, page 9. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I shall have no objection to that, and to having it read, if the gentleman will then move to rise.

Mr. DENT. I will state to the gentleman that if there is any controversy over the proviso I will.

Mr. MANN. There is a controversy over it.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, let the Clerk read the proviso. The period after the figures "\$11,500,000" should be stricken out and a semicolon inserted, and then the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid to any officer of the line of the Army who shall be appointed or promoted in violation of any of the terms next hereinafter specified: That of the whole number of officers of Cavalry, Field Artillery, Coast Artillery Corps, Infantry, and of Engineers serving with the enlisted force of the Corps of Engineers necessary to fill vacancies created or caused in said arms of the service by reason of the second increment, authorized by said arms by act of Congress approved June 3, 1916, not more than one-fourth shall be appointed or promoted until, exclusive of enlisted men belonging to said arms on June 30, 1916, at least one-fourth of the second increment of enlisted men authorized for said arms by said act shall have been enlisted; not more than one-half of said whole number of officers shall be appointed or promoted until at least one-half of said increment of enlisted men shall have been enlisted; and not more than three-fourths of said whole number of officers shall be appointed or promoted until at least three-fourths of said increment of enlisted men shall have been enlisted. And all officers promoted in accordance with the terms of this proviso shall take rank, respectively, from the dates on which their promotions shall have become lawful under the terms of this proviso.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order upon that, and at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an amendment which I have sent to the desk, which is rather long, the amendment to be considered pending, subject, of course, to any point of order to which it may be subject, without having it read now.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can have it printed in the Record for the information of the House.

Mr. TILSON. I make that request, that it be printed in the Record for the information of the House, and I shall offer it at this point.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, on the amendment I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that the amendment referred to may be printed in the Record for the purpose of information to be hereafter offered at the proper place. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TILSON: Page 10, line 23, after the word "proviso," insert: "Provided further, That in any increase in or additions to the Regular Army of the United States all increases in and additions to the



commissioned personnel of any arm, corps, or department shall be in the lowest commissioned grade of such arm, corps, or department.

"That the present method of promotion of commissioned officers of the Regular Army of the United States to any grade below that of brigadier general shall cease, and that hereafter officers of any grade in the Regular Army of the United States below that of colonel shall be promoted, subject to existing laws as to examination, only on the completion of the following total years of service on the active list as a commissioned officer of the United States, to include service in the Regular Army, the Volunteers, the National Guard or Organized Militia in Federal Service, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, and for officers of the Medical Corps, service as a medical reserve officer on the active list: To the grade of first lieutenant on the completion of a total of 4 years of service, to the grade of captain on the completion of a total of 10 years of service, to the grade of major on the completion of a total of 19 years of service, to the grade of lieutenant colonel on the completion of a total of 24 years of service, and to the grade of colonel on the completion of a total of 27 years of service: *Provided*, That no credit shall be given for time lost through failure on examination for promotion or through sentence of court-martial.

"Those now holding anomalous position through failure on examination for promotion shall lose one year for each such failure; those holding an anomalous position through sentence of a court-martial shall be given the constructive service of the officer whom they now follow on the lineal list. Those hereafter failing on examination for promotion shall lose one year for each such failure.

"Those who now have more than sufficient credit for promotion to the next higher grade shall be promoted as of the date of this act.

"That officers of the Medical Corps, Dental Corps, and chaplains shall be credited with four years' constructive service for all promotions: *Provided*, That chaplains, dental surgeons, and veterinarians shall not be promoted beyond the grade of major.

"That officers of the permanent staff corps or departments originally appointed to the Regular Army in such corps or departments to a grade above that of second lieutenant shall be credited with the constructive service required to reach such grade of original appointment, such constructive service to include any prior service in the Volunteers, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

"That the officers retired and thereafter restored to the active list shall be credited with the constructive service necessary to reach the grade to which restored, such constructive service to include any prior active service.

"That the President may assign officers to command and duties in such manner as the exigencies of the service demand, subject to the rules of seniority provided by this act and existing law and the laws affecting detached service: *Provided*, That, as far as practicable, the assignment of an officer of one arm of the service to another arm shall be avoided.

"That officers in excess of the number otherwise authorized for particular grades shall be assigned to the duties heretofore performed by the officers on the lists of additional and detached officers, and they shall also be used for the purpose of filling any vacancies in typical organizations.

"That the total number of commissioned officers in any arm, corps, or department shall not exceed the total number otherwise authorized for said arm, corps, or department.

"That in time of war officers shall have the rank and pay of any advanced grade or office to which they may be properly assigned for the period of actual service therein; such advanced grade or office to be in conformity with adopted tables of organization for the Army.

"That nothing in this act shall be held or construed so as to discharge any officer from the Regular Army, or to deprive him of the commission which he now holds therein."

Mr. MCKELLAR. Will the gentleman state the substance of his amendment?

Mr. TILSON. The substance is a matter of promotion of Army officers. It deals with the subject of promotions in the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest it is Saturday night—

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20783, the Army appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 11474. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to permit the construction of a public highway through the fish-cultural station in Unicoi County, Tenn.;

H. R. 12541. An act authorizing insurance companies and fraternal beneficiary societies to file bills of interpleader; and

H. R. 12463. An act for the relief of Meredith G. Corlett, a citizen and resident of Williamson County, Tenn.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 703. An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture and the trades and industries; to provide for cooperation with the States in the

preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure;

S. 7872. An act to confirm and ratify the sale of the Federal building site at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

S. 6850. An act authorizing transfer of certain retired Army officers to the active list; and

S. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to grant citizenship to Joseph Beech.

#### WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the reading of the Journal on February 22, Washington's Farewell Address be read by Mr. NEELY, of West Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that on the 22d of February, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the cleaning up of matters on the Speaker's table, that Washington's Farewell Address be read by Mr. NEELY, of West Virginia. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I will not object, but I think there may be a request made by some gentleman to address the House for a little while on Washington.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will not object to that, but on the afternoon before we will agree to meet earlier on the 22d.

Mr. MANN. Very well.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the Agriculture bill, and I ask for the printing of the report and statement in the RECORD under the rules.

Mr. MANN. Is it a complete report?

Mr. LEVER. It is a complete report.

The SPEAKER. The report and statement will be printed under the rule.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1506).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19359) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 10, 14, 21, 24, 26, 29, 30, 44, 45, 48, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 75, 76, 77, 79, 82, 84, 98, and 101.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 25, 34, 35, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 72, 78, 80, 81, 83, 87, 89, 92, 94, 95, 96, 100, 102, and 105, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "establishment" in said amendment insert a comma and the word "equipment," and strike out "\$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 9, line 5, strike out "\$1,468,740" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,455,240"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 9, line 6, strike out "\$1,796,640" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,783,140"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$269,200" insert "\$277,580"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "equipment," in the Senate amendment, strike out the words "and maintenance"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$2,604,956" insert "\$2,613,336"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of



"\$3,445,326" insert "\$3,555,326"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$90,000" insert "\$82,510," and in lieu of "\$15,000" insert "\$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$112,200" insert "\$107,200," and in lieu of "\$14,000" insert "\$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$2,460,530" insert "\$2,480,530"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$3,123,630" insert "\$3,143,630"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Before the figures "\$1,200," in the Senate amendment, insert the words "not exceeding"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Transpose the comma and the figures "\$66,100," following the Senate amendment, to a position preceding said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$1,814,567" insert "\$1,817,567"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$3,261,475" insert "\$3,264,475"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$5,709,275" insert "\$5,712,275"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$2,992,580" insert "\$2,972,580"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$3,127,660" insert "\$3,107,660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$813,395" insert "\$843,395"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$1,688,575" insert "\$1,718,575"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the language "same to be additional to the existing 90 acres now used as a plant-introduction field station," and transfer the paragraph as thus amended to page 24, between lines 18 and 19, of the bill; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$139,500" insert "\$104,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$160,000" insert "\$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$24,581,213" insert "\$24,679,113"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$25,831,213" insert "\$25,929,113"; and strike out the new language added by the Senate amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$480" insert "\$1,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$480" insert "\$1,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$1,000" insert "\$1,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

A. F. LEVER,  
GORDON LEE,  
G. N. HAUGEN,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

E. D. SMITH,  
HOKE SMITH,  
F. E. WARREN,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19359) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of the amendments of the Senate, namely:

On amendment No. 1: This amendment reduces by \$1,680 the appropriation for expenses of the Weather Bureau outside of the city of Washington. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 2: This amendment reduces by \$1,680 the amount which may be expended by the Weather Bureau for salaries outside of the city of Washington. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 3: This amendment increases by \$15,140 the amount which may be expended by the Weather Bureau for special observations and reports. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 4: This amendment provides \$20,000 for the establishment and maintenance of a Weather Bureau station at Greenville, S. C. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment inserting the word "equipment" after the word "establishment," and reducing the appropriation from \$20,000 to \$6,500.

On amendments Nos. 5 and 6: These amendments represent amended totals.

On amendment No. 7: This amendment authorizes repairs and improvements to buildings at quarantine stations. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 8: This amendment increases by \$18,900 the appropriation for animal-husbandry investigations. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment making the amount \$277,580 in order to conform to the action of the managers at the conference on amendment No. 10.

On amendment No. 9: This amendment provides \$15,000 for the purchase of lands in the vicinity of the Morgan Horse Farm, near Middlebury, Vt. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 10: This amendment reduces by \$8,380 the amount which may be expended for experiments in poultry feeding and breeding. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 11: The first part of this amendment strikes out the language relating to ostrich investigations. The second part adds new language and provides that \$12,280 may be expended for the equipment and maintenance of the United States sheep experiment station in Fremont County, Idaho. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out the words "and maintenance" after the word "equipment."

On amendment No. 12: This amendment strikes out the words "investigation of tuberculosis in cattle." The House recedes.

On amendment No. 13: This amendment represents an amended total.



On amendment No. 14: This amendment reduces by \$101,620 the appropriation for meat inspection. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 15: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 16: This amendment increases by \$5,000 the appropriation for fruit-disease investigations, with a proviso that \$8,000 shall be available for pecan-disease investigations. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 17: This amendment adds new language and appropriates \$300,000 for the eradication or control of the white-pine blister rust. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 18: This amendment increases by \$2,500 the appropriation for soil-fertility investigations. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 19: This amendment increases by \$15,000 the appropriation for crop acclimatization and fiber-plant investigations, and provides that this sum shall be used for experiments in cottonseed interbreeding. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment reducing the \$15,000 for such purpose to \$7,500 and reducing the total by a like amount.

On amendment No. 20: This amendment increases by \$10,000 the appropriation for cereal investigations. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 21: This amendment increases by \$10,000 the allotment for black rust and stripe rust investigations. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 22: This amendment inserts after the words "flax straws" the words "and hemp" in the paragraph for paper-plant investigations. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 23: This amendment increases by \$10,000 the appropriation for pomological investigations and provides that \$14,000 shall be available for the investigation and improvement of the pecan. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment reducing the amount for such purpose by \$5,000 and reducing the total by a like amount.

On amendment No. 24: This amendment increases by \$2,500 the appropriation for horticultural investigations. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 25: This amendment increases by \$4,000 the appropriation for the testing and distribution of new and rare seeds and for forage-crop investigations. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 26: This amendment adds new language, authorizing the expenditure of \$4,000 for forage-crop investigations in cooperation with the Washington State Experiment Station. The Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 27 and 28: These amendments represent amended totals.

On amendment No. 29: This amendment reduces by \$1,000 the appropriation for the Coronado National Forest. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 30: This amendment reduces by \$2,000 the appropriation for the Lincoln National Forest. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 31: This amendment strikes out the language authorizing the expenditure of \$1,200, out of any funds hereafter appropriated for the Nebraska National Forest for any fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, for the purchase of land now under lease and used as a nursery site for the Niobrara division of said forest, and inserts new language appropriating \$1,200 for the purchase of the land during the next fiscal year, increasing the total appropriation for the Nebraska National Forest by that amount, and providing that the cost of any building erected at the nurseries on the Nebraska National Forest shall not exceed \$1,000. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment inserting the words "not exceeding" before the figures "\$1,200."

On amendment No. 32: This amendment provides that all moneys received on account of permits for hunting, fishing, or camping on lands acquired under the authority of the Weeks Forestry Act shall be disposed of as is provided by existing law for the disposition of receipts from national forests. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment transposing the position of the proviso so that it appears after the amount of the appropriation.

On amendment No. 33: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendments Nos. 34 and 35: These amendments insert language authorizing the eradication of poisonous plants in the national forests. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 36 and 37: These amendments represent amended totals.

On amendment No. 38: This amendment reduces by \$10,000 the appropriation for poultry and egg investigations. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 39: This amendment reduces by \$4,600 the appropriation for fish investigations. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 40: This amendment increases by \$3,000 the appropriation for table-sirup investigations. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 41 and 42: These amendments represent amended totals.

On amendment No. 43: This amendment increases by \$5,000 the appropriation for the investigation of insects affecting deciduous fruits, with a proviso that \$9,600 shall be available for the investigation of insects affecting the pecan. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 44: This amendment makes immediately available \$10,000 of the appropriation for the investigation of insects affecting southern field crops. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 45: This amendment provides that \$20,000 of the appropriation for the investigation of insects affecting truck crops and stored products may be used for the investigation of diseases of beans and peas. The Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 46 and 47: These amendments represent amended totals.

On amendment No. 48: This amendment restricts the experiments and demonstrations in destroying predatory animals and animals injurious to agriculture to the lands of the United States. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 49: This amendment decreases by \$2,440 the appropriation for general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Biological Survey. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 50 and 51: These amendments represent amended totals.

On amendment No. 52: This amendment strikes out the language limiting the loaning, renting, or selling of films to educational institutions or associations for agricultural education not organized for profit and substitutes a proviso that such institutions or associations shall have preference. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 53: This amendment reduces by two the number of clerks, class 3, in the Bureau of Crop Estimates. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 54: This amendment reduces by one the number of clerks at \$900 each in the Bureau of Crop Estimates. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 55: This amendment reduces by three the number of messengers or laborers at \$720 each in the Bureau of Crop Estimates. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 56: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 57: This amendment provides that hereafter the Monthly Crop Report shall be printed and distributed on or before the 12th day of each month. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 58: This amendment reduces by \$4,078 the appropriation for the field investigations of the Bureau of Crop Estimates. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 59 and 60: These amendments represent amended totals.

On amendment No. 61: This amendment reduces by one the number of clerks at \$900 in the library. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 62: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 63: This amendment reduces by \$4,000 the appropriation for the general expense of the library. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 64: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 65: This amendment increases by \$15,000 the appropriation for miscellaneous expenses. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 66: This amendment provides for the appointment of a joint committee to investigate the advisability of the erection of additional buildings for the Department of Agriculture. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 67: This amendment strikes out the language authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the acts cited in the paragraph. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 68: This amendment increases by \$20,000 the appropriation for the insular experiment stations. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 69: This amendment increases by \$10,000 the allotment for the Hawaii Experiment Station. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 70: This amendment increases by \$10,000 the allotment for the Porto Rico Experiment Station, with a proviso that \$10,000 may be expended for the maintenance of an experimental substation. The Senate recedes.



On amendment No. 71: This amendment increases by \$5,000 the amount which may be expended for agricultural-extension work in Hawaii. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 72: This amendment reduces by \$4,000 the appropriation for home-economics investigations. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 73 and 74: These amendments represent amended totals.

On amendment No. 75: This amendment reduces by \$3,400 the appropriation for general administrative expenses of the Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering. The Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 76 and 77: These amendments represent amended totals.

On amendment No. 78: This amendment makes immediately available \$40,000 of the appropriation for the market news service. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 79: This amendment strikes out the paragraph providing \$50,000 for the investigation of the production and marketing of agricultural food products, and inserts a new paragraph appropriating \$25,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to certify to shippers the condition of fruits and vegetables at points of destination. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 80: This amendment corrects a typographical error. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 81: This amendment reduces by \$5,000 the appropriation for cotton standardization. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 82: This amendment authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to use \$25,000 of the appropriation for grain standardization for the installation of an experimental flour mill and chemical and baking laboratories in Washington to aid in establishing standards for wheat and other grains. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 83: This amendment provides \$4,000 for the administration of the standard basket and container act. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 84: This amendment reduces by \$5,000 the appropriation for general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Markets. The Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 85 and 86: These amendments represent amended totals.

On amendment No. 87: This amendment gives the Secretary of Agriculture power to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 88: This amendment adds new language and appropriates \$35,000 for the purchase, preparation, and irrigation of 150 acres of land at Chico, Cal., as an addition to the existing plant-introduction field station. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out the reference to the existing field station.

On amendment No. 89: This amendment adds new language and appropriates \$50,000 to meet the emergency caused by the existence of the pink bollworm of cotton in the Laguna district of Mexico. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 90 and 91: These amendments represent amended totals.

On amendment No. 92: This amendment authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a quarantine without necessary regard to the determination of the fact of the existence of a dangerous plant disease or insect infestation in the State, Territory, or District quarantined. The other changes consist in the incorporation, for purposes of effective administration, of desirable legislation for enforcing effectively the gypsy moth and brown-tail moth quarantine. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 93: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 94: This amendment increases by \$10,000 the appropriation for demonstrations on reclamation projects. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 95: This amendment increases by \$16,396 the appropriation for experiments in dairying and live-stock production in the western United States. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 96: This amendment reduces by \$250,000 the appropriation for the eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 97: This amendment amends the total carried by the bill for the Department of Agriculture and adds new language imposing certain restrictions upon the expenditure, in connection or in cooperation with certain corporations and individuals, of the funds appropriated to the department. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment making the amount of the total \$25,929,113 instead of \$25,831,213 and striking out the new language.

On amendments Nos. 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, and 104: The effect of these amendments is to lower the limit of salary to which the percentage increases shall apply from \$1,800 to

\$1,000, and to provide a 15 per cent increase in salary for employees receiving \$480 or less and a 10 per cent increase for employees receiving more than \$480 and not exceeding \$1,000. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment raising the salary limit to which the increases shall apply to \$1,500 and providing a 10 per cent increase for employees who receive salaries of \$1,000 or less and a 5 per cent increase for employees who receive salaries of more than \$1,000 and not exceeding \$1,500 per annum.

On amendment No. 105: This amendment authorizes the President to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates to the International Farm Congress, to be held at Peoria, Ill. The House recedes.

A. F. LEVER,  
GORDON LEE,  
G. N. HAUGEN,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet at 12 o'clock noon to-morrow, Sunday, February 18, 1917.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Columbia River at the town of Hood River, Oreg. (H. Doc. No. 2064); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of harbor at Mackinac Island, Mich., with a view of extending the east breakwater a distance of 400 feet (H. Doc. No. 2065); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Virgin River, Nev., between its intersection with the east line of the State of Nevada and the Colorado River, with a view to confining such river within its channel and the protection of the banks against erosion (H. Doc. No. 2066); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Tchula Lake, Miss. (H. Doc. No. 2067); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental schedules of papers, documents, etc., on the files of the Treasury Department which are not needed or useful in the transaction of public business and have no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 2068); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination for a breakwater at Sea Gate, Coney Island, N. Y., and connecting waters from Gravesend Bay to Ambrose Channel (H. Doc. No. 2069); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FLOOD, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20755) to carry out the provisions of the treaty of August 4, 1916, for the purchase of the Danish West Indian Islands, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1505), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEENERSON requested, and it was agreed to, that the resolution (H. Res. 477) requesting the Attorney General of the United States to inform the House in regard to proceeding against the binder-twine monopoly, reported adversely February 14, 1917 (Rept. No. 1494), be taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 1792) for the relief of settlers



on unsurveyed public lands, reported the same favorably without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1207, pt. 2).

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. FLOOD, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20512) to admit Marguerite Mathilde Slidell d'Erlanger to citizenship, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1504), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 20947) to prohibit interstate and foreign commerce in certain products of female labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 20948) providing for the marking and protection of the battle field known as Dade's Massacre, in Sumter County, Fla., and for the erection of a monument thereon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20949) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Zephyrhills, Pasco County, Fla., two bronze or brass cannon, with projectiles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY. A bill (H. R. 20950) granting old-age pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 20951) to include certain lands in the counties of Modoc and Siskiyou, Cal., in the Modoc National Forest, Cal., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 20952) for the relief of disbursing officers of the Naval Militia of the United States and of the National Naval Volunteers, and specifying certain dates on which Naval Militia are entitled to pay from Federal funds; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 20953) to pension the survivors of the War with Spain and Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20962) to provide for increasing the rates of pension of totally disabled, needy, and helpless soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: Resolution (H. Res. 510) to pay Gist Finley one month's salary; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LAZARO: Resolution (H. Res. 511) authorizing the Committee on Enrolled Bills to employ additional clerks; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MURRAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 372) to change the name of the Danish West Indies to Monroe Isles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 373) requesting the President to invite the sovereign governments of the world to a conference to discuss a government for the international community; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New York, favoring appropriation by Congress of \$1,395,275 for the transfer to the Federal Government of the quarantine establishment at the port of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New York, favoring appropriation by Congress of \$1,395,275 for the transfer to the Federal Government of the quarantine establishment at the port of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring an appropriation for the transfer of the quarantine establishment at New York to the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New York, favoring an appropriation by Congress of \$1,395,275 for the transfer to the Federal Government of the quarantine establishment of the port of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 20954) to appoint Allen M. Sumner a captain on the active list of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 20955) to reimburse Robinson Bros., of Merced, Cal., for range feed destroyed by fire; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 20956) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAZARO: A bill (H. R. 20957) granting an increase of pension to Andrew P. Grubaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20958) granting an increase of pension to John Erwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20959) granting an increase of pension to Charles Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 20960) for the relief of John E. Osborne; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 20961) granting a pension to Carrie C. Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of Missouri, urging the passage of the Federal woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of sundry citizens of Holstein Evangelical Jesus Church of St. Louis, Mo., and sundry citizens of Springfield, Mass., against the United States in war with any country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY: Memorial adopted by the Blair County (Pa.) Pomona Grange, No. 37, supporting legislation permitting cities, townships, and boroughs to own and operate coal mines, coal yards, dairy stations, and public markets for the distribution of farm produce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL: Petition of Horace L. B. Atkinson, of Washington, D. C., for \$1,000 for services rendered in election contest of Aaron P. Prioleau v. Hon. Richard S. Whaley; to the Committee on Elections No. 2.

By Mr. BROWNE: Petitions of sundry church organizations of Wisconsin, favoring a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: Petitions of 185 people of the Baptist Church, Allendale; 256 people of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, Allendale; 30 people at a public meeting of the Baptist Church, Blackville; 28 people at a public meeting, Martin; 300 or more of all denominations at a religious meeting, Edgefield; 130 people of the St. Paul Sunday School, Saluda; 200 people of the Red Bank Baptist Sunday School, Saluda; 50 people of St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church South, Graniteville; 30 people at a public meeting of the Baptist Church, Warrenton; 23 people at a public meeting of the Ridgeland Baptist Church, Ridgeland; 23 people at a public meeting in Methodist Church, Denmark; 16 representatives of Methodists and Baptists, Plum Branch; 55 people at a public meeting in Baptist Church, Ward; 33 people of the Woman's Missionary Society, Aiken; 43 people at a public meeting, Ehrhardt; 80 people at a public meeting in the Baptist Church, Saluda; and 65 people at a public meeting in the town hall, Allendale, all in the State of South Carolina, favoring a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of sundry employees of the Post Office Department of the State of California, urging the passage of House bill 17806; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of sundry citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., opposing the passage of House bill 17606, known as the Kitchin bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of citizens of Medford, Mass., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial of the Union League Club of the city of New York, indorsing the recent act of the President in severing diplomatic relations with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: Petition of citizens of Waynesboro, Pa., and St. Thomas, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Produce Exchange, Philadelphia, Pa., opposed to House bill 20573; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 20425, for the relief of Edward H. Harpster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Memorial of the Swedish Branch, Socialist Party of Rockford, Ill., opposing a declaration of war until first sanctioned by a vote of the people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.



Also, petitions of Rev. B. F. Fleetwood, D. D., of Sycamore, Ill.; Dr. A. M. Harrison and C. E. Sovereign, of Rockford, Ill.; and W. E. Prichard, of Ottawa, Ill., for prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of J. E. Lewis and H. C. Wood, of De Kalb, Ill., for the Chamberlain bill, Senate bill 1695, for military and naval training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Herman L. Lange, for House bill 15582 and Senate bill 1662, to increase pensions of blind veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petitions of sundry citizens of Boston, asking a referendum vote before Congress declares war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Boston, Dorchester, Roxbury, and Mattapan, Mass., favoring a retirement law and an increase of salary for letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Massachusetts Branch of the League to Enforce Peace, relative to the adoption of the league's proposals by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of members of the Convention of New England Electrical, Civil, and Mechanical Engineers, pledging themselves to support the President regarding war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of National Housewives' League, signed by Jennie Dewey Heath, favoring the passage of the Stephens-Ashurst bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, protesting against the increase in the present tax on life insurance funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Boston Post Office Clerks' Association, Branch No. 5, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, indorsing House bill 17806; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HINDS: Memorial of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, Portland, Me., opposing the proposed tax of 8 per cent on the excess profits of corporations and copartnerships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Messrs. J. W. Cruikshank, H. E. Zaring, R. G. Pentecost, C. E. Mayhew, and H. H. Willock, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., with reference to the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OAKLEY: Memorial of Central Pomona Grange No. 1, Patrons of Husbandry, of Connecticut, against amendment reducing the tax on colored oleomargarine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWLAND: Petitions of sundry church organizations of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHOUSE: Petitions of 43 people at a public meeting at Minneola, Kans., and 90 people of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Ashland, Kans., favoring a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of the retail druggists of Rome, N. Y., for legislation permitting the mailing of poisonous drugs to persons fitted to receive them; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New York, protesting against the passage of the Kitchin bill, to regulate check collection; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Memorials adopted by the 453 mechanical engineers of the New England Branch of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, in reference to the attitude of the President and Congress on the submarine issue, and pledging loyal support; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of Church of the Brethren, Fruita, Colo., favoring a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 114 people of the Congregational Church, Fruita, Colo., favoring a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of certain citizens of Grand Junction, Colo., protesting against shipment of liquors from the United States to west coast of Africa; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, memorial of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Fruita, Colo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Francis Willard Union, representing 200 people, of New Castle, Pa., favoring the Sheppard-Gallinger-Webb-Smith joint resolution for a prohibitory amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of College Hill Union, numbering 124 people, of Beaver Falls, Pa., favoring the Sheppard-Gallinger-Webb-Smith joint resolution for a prohibitory amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 25 members of the Cross Creek Grange, No. 954, Washington County, Pa., opposing Senator UNDERWOOD'S amendment to the revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial adopted by the Commercial Club of Larimore, N. Dak., urging upon Congress the necessity of the early designation, construction, and maintenance of a system of national highways; to the Committee on Roads.

## SENATE.

SUNDAY, February 18, 1917.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 14, 1917.)

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

### MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR CLARKE.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, pursuant to the notice heretofore given, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk and ask for their adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

#### Senate resolution 363.

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. JAMES P. CLARKE, late a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

*Resolved*, That is a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay proper tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the notable career of the late Senator JAMES P. CLARKE, of Arkansas, was closed by sudden death on October 1, 1916. Within four months after his demise the legislature of our State adopted a resolution providing for the erection of his statue in Statuary Hall in commemoration of his services to Arkansas and to the Nation.

Mr. CLARKE was born in Yazoo City, Miss., August 18, 1854. He studied in the common schools and other local educational institutions of Mississippi and graduated in law at the University of Virginia in 1878. He entered upon the practice of his profession at Helena, Ark., in the following year. In 1886 his political career began with service in the lower house of the general assembly. In 1888 he was elected to the State senate for a term of four years, becoming president pro tempore of that body and ex officio lieutenant governor. In 1892 he was elected attorney general of Arkansas, and in 1894 governor of that State. Three years later he resumed the practice of law at Little Rock and actively pursued his profession until his election to the United States Senate in 1902. His service in this body began March 4, 1903, and his influential activities here continued until his death.

The action of the General Assembly of Arkansas in authorizing the statue of Senator CLARKE to be placed in our national hall of fame within so short a time following his departure, is an unusual tribute. Considered in connection with the fact that he had many personal antagonisms and political controversies, the enmities of which must have survived him, this tribute to his character and services is the more pronounced. This honor was prompted by appreciation of the personal integrity and marked ability which characterized the private and public career of Senator CLARKE rather than by affection and gratitude. There are other names associated with the progress of Arkansas that thrill her people with loving memories. Gen. Patrick Cleburne ranks with Jeb Stuart, Bedford Forrest, and Stonewall Jackson in courage and daring. The songs of Albert Pike, his chivalric, knightly character and striking personality, render him immortal.

Augustus H. Garland was among the Nation's greatest lawyers and statesmen. James K. Jones led his party for many years with courage, fidelity, and distinction. U. M. Rose was for the lifetime of a generation the most cultured man at the American bar. His knowledge of literature and art was not greater than his comprehension of the principles of justice and equity, which form the basis of our social, industrial, and political system. Any two of these are worthy of places in Statuary Hall, and it has been the difficulty of choosing among them that has kept vacant one of the niches reserved for Arkansas. Any man who