

Also, a bill (H. R. 14649) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sonora, Cal., two German cannon or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 14650) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of East Liverpool, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece and one machine gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 14651) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of North Manchester, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14652) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Miami, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 14653) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New Richmond, county of Montgomery, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 14654) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the cities and towns of Selmer, Henderson, Jackson, Lexington, Decaturville, Linden, Camden, Huntingdon, Paris, and Savannah, Tenn., each one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 14655) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Alva, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14656) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Woodward, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 14657) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of McKee, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14658) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Booneville, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14659) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Whitesburg, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14660) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hazard, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14661) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hindman, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14662) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Paintsville, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14663) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Salyersville, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14664) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Prestonsburg, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14665) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Inez, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14666) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pikeville, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Resolution (H. Res. 506) providing increased compensation to the official reporters of debates and to the assistant to the official reporters of debates; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 388) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate a large cannon to the city of Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 14667) granting an increase of pension to George W. Lampkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 14668) granting a pension to Maria Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 14669) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. McKee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14670) granting a pension to Mary A. Brace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 14671) granting a pension to Martha C. Eggers; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Petition of citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., relative to converting portion of T. N. T. plant at Ives, Wis., into a zoological garden; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions unanimously adopted by 900 delegates in convention assembled on Saturday evening, January 11, 1919, at Baltimore, Md., with governor of Maryland presiding, supporting and approving President Wilson's high aims to secure a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Resolution by the Lithuanian Women's Progressive Alliance of America, second district of Massachusetts, demanding release of all political and war prisoners; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: Resolutions by Redlands Chamber of Commerce, Redlands, Cal., favoring the nationalization of highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. McKEOWN: Resolutions adopted by Kickapoo Lodge, No. 293, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders, of Shawnee, Okla., relating to Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, January 18, 1919.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 14, 1919.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CURTIS presented petitions of the Southern Railway Federated Trades Council, of Kansas City; of Dewey Lodge, No. 9, International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, of Horton; of Prairie Lodge, No. 404, International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, of Newton; of Local Lodge No. 751, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, of Topeka; of the Industrial Council of Topeka; and of sundry citizens of Chanute, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the proposed extension of Federal control of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Grovier Produce Co., of Hutchinson, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of McPherson County, Kans., praying for the return to private ownership of the railroads of the country, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of Local Grange No. 1566, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ann Arbor, Mich., and a petition of Celery City Lodge, No. 1087, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, of Kalamazoo, Mich., praying for the proposed extension of Federal control of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry retail jewelers of Pontiac, Mich., remonstrating against the proposed increase of tax on jewelry in the pending revenue bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Kiwanis Club, of Muskegon; of the Board of Education of Gladstone; and of the Study Club, of East Jordan, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the establishment of a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Michigan Business Woman's Association, of Bay City, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation granting commissions to nurses, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8625) to accept from the Southern Oregon Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, a reconveyance of the lands granted to the State of Oregon by the act approved March 3, 1869, entitled "An act granting lands to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, in said State, commonly known as the Coos Bay wagon-road grant, to provide for the disposition of said lands, and for other purposes," reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 650) thereon.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 12579. An act to grant to citizens of Malheur County, Oreg., the right to cut timber in the State of Idaho for agricul-

tural, mining, or other domestic purposes, and to remove such timber to Malheur County, Oreg. (Rept. No. 649); and

H. R. 13042. An act providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act (Rept. No. 648).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 5372) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of Ottawa, Kans.;

A bill (S. 5373) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of Atchison, Kans.; and

A bill (S. 5374) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of Newton, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5375) granting a pension to Lydia J. Willis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 5376) granting a pension to Edward S. Seay; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 5377) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Orleans, La., to be installed in the old historic Washington Artillery Hall, one German cannon or fieldpiece; and

A bill (S. 5378) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Monroe, La., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 5379) granting an increase of pension to Carrier Thompson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5380) granting an increase of pension to James F. Duncan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 5381) granting an increase of pension to Floyd E. Driskel (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5382) granting a pension to John C. Cleveland (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 5383) granting a pension to Arabella Roberts;

A bill (S. 5384) granting an increase of pension to William Russell; and

A bill (S. 5385) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Krebs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 5386) granting a pension to Augustus M. Brown (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 5387) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo J. Finch (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING (by request):

A bill (S. 5388) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico (for Mr. KENDRICK):

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 213) relating to the fuel supply of the city of Casper, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

EMPLOYEES OF WAR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 416), which was read, considered, by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate the names of all former civil-service employees of the War Department in the District of Columbia who resigned and volunteered or were drafted into the Army and who have been discharged therefrom and applied for reinstatement to their former positions and not reinstated, and to state why they have not been reinstated under authority of the order of the President issued July 18, 1918.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

On motion of Mr. WARREN, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] be relieved from further service as a member of the Committee on Conservation of Natural Resources, and that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] be assigned as chairman thereof; and

That the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] be relieved from further service as a member of the Committee on Industrial Expositions, and that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] be assigned as chairman thereof.

SPEECH OF GOV. ALLEN, OF KANSAS.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have a copy of the speech of Gov. Allen, of Kansas, in regard to the Thirty-fifth Division going into the Battle of the Argonne Forest with a lack of supplies and without adequate support by artillery and airplanes. I ask that it be noted in the Record and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before that goes in the Record I should like to know what is in that speech.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is the speech of Gov. Allen, of Kansas, with reference to the Battle of the Argonne Forest and the fact that the men of the Thirty-fifth Division were sent into that battle unprepared and without supplies. I wish to have the speech referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, hoping that the committee will give some consideration to and investigate the charges made by Gov. Allen.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think it is all right to refer this matter to the Committee on Military Affairs, and after the committee have passed upon it, if they think it is a matter that ought to go into the Record, well and good; but it is now proposed to put in the Record the speech of a man who is not a Member of this body and not a Member of the other body.

Mr. CURTIS. I did not ask that it be printed in the Record; I asked that it be noted in the Record and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. REED. I misunderstood the request of the Senator. I have no objection in the world to that being done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SALARIES OF JUDGES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12001) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon in the consideration of the pending bill, which was then before the Senate, an amendment was adopted on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] increasing the salaries of the judges as provided in the bill by the House from \$7,500 for district judges and \$3,500 for circuit judges to \$9,000 and \$10,000, respectively. I voted for that amendment, because I think our judges, of all the people in Government service, should be well paid, and I know how insufficient, in my part of the country at least, the present salaries are.

I have consulted, however, with a number of friends of the bill who think as I do that the increase proposed by the amendment might be injurious to the passage of the bill and endanger its passage. For that reason I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota was agreed to.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, since that amendment was adopted the consensus of opinion of the Senate has been taken, and while I do not believe the amount is too high I think Senators generally feel that the amendment should be reconsidered. Under those circumstances rather than imperil the passage of the bill I have no objection to its reconsideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I think there is some question as to whether we should leave the amounts named in the bill as sent from the House or whether they might be increased to \$8,000 and \$9,000, respectively, for district and circuit judges. I should like to have the chairman of the committee state whether he would object to increasing the salaries or whether he deems it advisable to increase the salaries to \$8,000 and \$9,000, respectively.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Personally, I would be glad to see the salaries increased to \$8,000 and \$9,000, but there is a dif-

ference of opinion whether, as a matter of policy with reference to the passage of the legislation, it would be best to retain the House figures or whether we ought to fix the salaries at \$8,000 and \$9,000. I am unable to give an opinion that would be of much value on that point. I am perfectly willing myself to vote for salaries of \$8,000 and \$9,000 and take it into conference, or I am willing to leave the salaries at \$7,500 and \$8,500 and send the bill back to the House without amendment in that respect.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I am inclined to yield my judgment in this matter to the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Georgia and therefore make no motion for an increase. If the Senator from Minnesota thinks it well to make a motion to increase the salaries to \$8,000 and \$9,000, I shall vote for that amendment.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Can that amendment be moved when the bill is in the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It can be.

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not wish to take the responsibility to advise the Senate what it should do in that regard. I made the other motion and I am willing that it should be taken up in the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Johnson, Cal.	Myers	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Smoot
Cole	Kellogg	Overman	Sutherland
Culberson	Kenyon	Page	Swanson
Cummins	King	Pittman	Thomas
Curtis	Kirby	Poinexter	Townsend
Fernald	Knox	Pollock	Trammell
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Pomerene	Underwood
Gay	Lenroot	Reed	Wadsworth
Hale	McKellar	Saulsbury	Walsh
Harding	McLean	Shafroth	Warren
Henderson	McNary	Sheppard	Watson
Hitchcock	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	Weeks
Hollis	Moses	Smith, Ga.	Williams

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. KIRBY. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who is detained on account of illness.

Mr. PITTMAN. I desire to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] are detained on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] on account of illness, and also of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] on account of a death in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. If there be no further amendment as in Committee of the Whole the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, yesterday evening before adjournment I presented an amendment to the bill. I do not believe it has been printed in bill form, but it appears on page 1661 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There was no yeas-and-nay vote, but the vote, on a division, was so close, and so many Senators have importuned me to renew the amendment in the Senate that I do so. I now ask that the amendment be read, and I desire to have a vote on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. ASHURST. I have no objection to concurring in those amendments.

Mr. JONES of Washington. My recollection is that there was an amendment placing the judges of Hawaii and Porto Rico on the same basis as the district judges in this country. I understand the provision as it now stands gives these judges a higher salary than the present United States judges of Alaska get. If that is true then I want to have the Alaskan judges put on the same basis as the others, because to my mind there is much more reason why they should get a higher salary than the judges of Porto Rico and Hawaii.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I did not hear to what judges the Senator refers.

Mr. JONES of Washington. My recollection is that an amendment was adopted placing the United States judges of Hawaii and Porto Rico on the same basis as the other judges. I wish to add an amendment to that amendment placing the judges of the Territory of Alaska on the same basis.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The amendment extended only to district judges, not to general judges.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is all I want.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It was stated at the time that the judges in Alaska already receive \$7,500.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; I think the Senator is mistaken. I understand they receive \$7,000.

Mr. MYERS rose.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Montana, I think, can state what they receive.

Mr. MYERS. My information from authentic sources is that the United States district judges for the Territory of Alaska receive each a salary of \$7,500 per year. I can not vouch for that statement, but I have been so informed. If, as the Senator from Washington says, the salary is \$7,000 a year, then they are already on a pay basis where they will receive the minimum salary that the bill provides.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The minimum is \$7,500, is it not?

Mr. MYERS. I must retract that statement because the Senate committee amendment to the bill was defeated yesterday. I overlooked that fact. The sum of \$7,000 for the Alaskan judges is on a par with what would have been the minimum salary provision of the bill if the amendment of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary had been adopted, but it was defeated. Therefore, I withdraw my statement. I do not know how a salary of \$7,500 per year would compare with the minimum salary provided by the bill in its present form.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand the minimum now in the bill is \$7,500. I am not sure whether the judges of Alaska get \$7,000 or \$7,500; I have not had an opportunity to look it up; but I think they ought to be put on the same basis as the other judges.

Mr. MYERS. I can not speak with positive authority, and therefore I do not make a positive statement about the salaries of the Alaskan Federal judges.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask the Chair if it is in order at this time to propose an amendment to the amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole, or whether after the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole have been concurred in I can offer a new amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the opinion of the Chair, this is so muddled the bill had better go back to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is also an amendment to the House provision.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Iowa suggests to me that the amendments, with reference to Porto Rico and Hawaii, was also made to the text of the bill, and so they are now a part of the House provision if it is adopted by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, we will take the bill back to the Committee of the Whole, and it is now in order to insert "Alaska."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move to insert "Alaska" after "Porto Rico and Hawaii."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The bill now reads as agreed to in Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 2. Each of the district judges, including the judges in Porto Rico and Hawaii, exercising Federal jurisdiction, shall receive a salary of \$7,500 a year, to be paid in monthly installments.

It is now proposed to strike out the word "and," between "Porto Rico" and "Hawaii," and insert a comma, and after "Hawaii" to insert "and Alaska," so that it will read:

Each of the district judges, including the judges in Porto Rico, Hawaii, and Alaska, exercising Federal jurisdiction, shall receive a salary of \$7,500 a year, to be paid in monthly installments.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senate has determined that Hawaii and Porto Rico should be included on the same basis as the other district judges. I think it no more than fair that Alaska should be included as well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Washington is agreed to. Are there further amendments to be offered as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I voted yesterday for the amendment to the House text, and I believe that is the best solution of this problem.

The question has been raised here as to the salaries paid judges in different parts of the country. In my State the supreme court

judges residing and holding court in the city of New York are paid \$17,500 a year, while the judges in that part of the State outside of the city of New York performing the same sort of service and with the same jurisdiction receive the sum of \$10,000 a year. When the judges from districts outside of New York City sit in that city, as they do very often, they receive the same compensation that the city of New York judges do.

Mr. President, the difference in the pay of these judges comes from the fact that it costs a great deal more to live in the city of New York than in other parts of the State. In the city of New York we pay our police magistrates \$8,000 a year, \$2,000 a year more than we pay the United States district judges. We pay our municipal court judges, the judges who pass upon landlord and tenant cases and upon cases involving less than a thousand dollars, the sum of \$8,000 a year. We pay our county judges, who pass on criminal cases almost entirely, \$10,000 a year.

When a United States district judge comes to New York from another State to hold court, and we have them there nearly all the time, we allow them \$10 a day additional and traveling expenses. So their pay while they are holding court in the city of New York is really more than it would be if they were at home, for at home they must take care of their own living expenses.

Why should compensation be higher in New York? There are many reasons, and the same idea is carried out in all sorts of business. I happened the other day to look up the wages paid carpenters in that city. I find that in that city a carpenter working eight hours receives \$6.50 a day, while a carpenter in some other cities of New York State receives \$5 a day, and in the smaller cities to the South and West they receive as low as \$3 and \$4 a day. These are the rates fixed by the labor union, all of these unions being attached to the American Federation.

So the labor unions of the country recognize the difference in cost of living in the larger cities.

I believe also that it is a fact, although I have not the record before me, that the judges in the larger cities, where they are constantly engaged, do more work than do the judges in the small communities, and that ought to entitle them to a larger compensation. But we get back, Mr. President, always to the fact that it costs more to live in the large cities; that is universally recognized throughout the land in every sort of business. For my part, I believe the Senate committee amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New York a question. Why not apply the same rule to Members of the Senate?

Mr. CALDER. Of course, representing in part the most populous State in the Union, I would hardly want to suggest that my pay should be more than that of the distinguished Senator from Michigan; but I will say to him, Mr. President, that, in a sense, that rule ought to apply, because, by reason of the fact that I represent a larger State, I have a great deal more business to attend to than have many other Senators, and I am compelled to-day, as do many judges in the larger communities, to pay out of my own pocket considerable money to provide for my own office force and to take care of the business of my State.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That would apply equally to Senators coming from smaller States; but I want to suggest to the Senator from New York that United States district judges from Michigan sit in the district courts of New York State. They are called there because of their ability, because of their fitness for those posts; and under the plan the Senator proposes one district judge would sit beside another district judge who was getting more pay, and for no reason in the world except that there was a greater population surrounding him than there happened to be surrounding the district judge from Michigan. How can the Senator reconcile such a distinction, when both judges are performing exactly the same service much of the time?

Mr. CALDER. There is much in what the Senator from Michigan says, Mr. President, but I would remind him that when the judges from Michigan come to New York—and we welcome them; the judges of his State are great judges and they perform their services very satisfactorily—the Government allows them \$10 a day extra. That takes care of their living expenses while they are in New York; and it is a very attractive opportunity for them; they delight to come, and we are very glad to have them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, of course New York is a very attractive city, one of the green spots in the desert of Sahara; people like to go there, and in the next few months probably many people will go there who have not been in the habit of going there often, for various reasons; but, nevertheless,

to make that kind of a distinction among jurists who are performing solemn duties and passing upon cases of very great importance—and the litigation in my State is of equal importance with the litigation which confronts the courts in New York; many of the questions are of the utmost importance, and we have on the bench in Michigan men of eminence and character—I think is very unfair, indeed. It is a false basis to make the compensation for judges depend upon the State or the district from which they come.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I should have no objection to amending this bill so as to provide that when judges from Michigan or any other part of the country come to communities where the pay is higher that they should receive that higher pay. I have pointed out that we make the same distinction in my own State between judges living in different parts of that State. The supreme court judges in the rural sections receive \$7,500 a year less than in New York City, but when they come to New York City to hold court they are allowed the same compensation as are judges who reside in New York City.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I want to say further, if the Vice President and the Senator from New York will permit me, that I have been in very great sympathy with the disposition of the State of New York to pay their jurists good salaries; I believe in that; they should be made independent of every other consideration in the performance of such duties as fall to their lot; but I can not agree with the Senator from New York and I am unable to view the situation as he does, that judges holding equally responsible positions in other sections of the country should be paid less than those who happen to live in the more populous regions.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that I can not agree with the Senator from Michigan. But, aside from the Senate committee amendment, I hope that some legislation on this subject will be enacted. If the Senate amendment shall not be passed, then let us pass the House provision. That would be a step in the right direction. We are having a great deal of trouble in New York in securing good men for these places, though that condition may not exist in other parts of the country. Only last year one of the United States district judges in my own district resigned, and within the last four years two of the judges in the southern district of New York, which includes the old city of New York, resigned their places, and in these cases we had great difficulty in getting the right sort of men to fill the vacancies. When we pay a police magistrate in the city of New York \$8,000, the municipal court judge \$8,000, a county judge \$10,000, a supreme court judge \$17,500, and the United States district judge only \$6,000, he having even a more important place than has the New York supreme court judge, then, indeed, you can understand the feeling on this subject in that city.

Mr. President, our State pays into the Federal Treasury very nearly one-third of all the taxes which are collected in the country. We are perfectly willing to contribute a little more toward what we believe to be the very excellent plan proposed in this measure, and I trust it will meet with the approval of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and is still open to amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Senator in charge of the bill requests that I withhold my amendment at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator from Arizona has reserved his amendment in the Senate, and I have suggested to him that he might raise the question involved in his amendment after the bill has passed into the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. That is correct.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I want to ask a question for information from some member of the committee who can give it. There seems to be some doubt about it as the bill now stands. Does the chief justice of the Court of Claims receive more than do the members of that court?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think he does.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the parliamentary situation to be that, so far as the Senator from Arizona is concerned, his amendment was defeated as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ASHURST. That is true; but I reserved the amendment so that there might be a separate vote on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There can be no reservation made. The Senator's amendment was defeated as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ASHURST. But not in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can again offer the amendment when the bill gets into the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What the Senator from Arizona did was to call attention to the fact that he desired to reserve the amendment in the Senate; and when the Senate concurs in all of the other amendments, that by unanimous consent his amendment should be voted on separately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But when an amendment is defeated as in Committee of the Whole it ought to be understood that a vote can not be reserved on it in the Senate, for there is nothing on which to vote. The Senator may reoffer the amendment in the Senate, if he chooses to do so. The Senate has had the bill under consideration as in Committee of the Whole, and has made certain amendments thereto. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before that is done I want to ask why it is that no additional salary is given to the presiding judge in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No additional salary is given to the presiding judge of any circuit court of appeals of the United States.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is no presiding judge in those courts.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; there is a presiding judge. The senior judge is the presiding judge, and acts always as the presiding judge when present. We reached the conclusion that the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia should be classified with the circuit courts of appeals throughout the United States; we are giving them the same treatment in connection with the increase of salary, and as there is no distinction between the presiding judge and the other judges of the circuit courts of appeals of the United States we saw no reason why a difference should exist between the chief justice and the other judges of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As I understand, there is no office called the "chief justice of the circuit court of appeals"; there is a practice under which the senior judge present at any time presides, but there is no chief justice.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia there is a chief justice. Furthermore, I understand that in the bill as it came from the House the chief justice of the Court of Claims was given \$500 additional salary.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We have put that court also in the status of the circuit courts of appeals. As I understand, we have classified the judges of the Court of Claims with the judges of the circuit courts of appeals of the United States; we have classified the judges of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia with the circuit courts of appeals of the United States; we have classified the judges of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with the judges of the district courts of the United States; and, having taken that course, we have followed the practice throughout the United States of not discriminating as to the salaries between the presiding judge and the other members of the court.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is the intention, then, to harmonize the plan so as to equalize the salaries of the judges of the various courts?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is satisfactory to me. If it is done in one case, it should be done in all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is in the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, it will be remembered that on last evening I offered an amendment, which does not appear to have been printed, except in the Record, where it will be found on page 1602. I will not ask that it be read; I believe I can make a statement that will be shorter and consume less time. Moreover, I feel that my argument or statement last night had more heat than light. So, if the Senate will be indulgent for two or three minutes, I will simply state the amendment.

Various bills have been introduced by different Senators proposing to provide for additional judges in States where the work was beyond the capacity of one particular judge. The first case that came before the Judiciary Committee was one from the State of New Jersey. The bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee; a favorable report was made; the bill passed the Senate, passed the House, and became a law. I was on the subcommittee that considered the New Jersey case and I recall distinctly that the courts of New Jersey were working far beyond the capacity that any man could work effectively, especially where serene thought is required.

Then came other bills of a similar character before the committee. One was a bill proposing to create an additional district judge in the State of Montana. The distinguished junior Senator from that State [Mr. WALSH] filed a very illuminating brief showing the necessity for an additional judge there. For the northern district of the State of California likewise an additional judge was provided; for the southern district of Florida an additional judge was provided, the judge of the court there being very much overworked by reason of the proximity of that district to Cuba, and hence frequent cases growing out of infractions of the customs laws—frequent cases of smuggling. In the case of Illinois two additional judges were provided for the northern district. In the case of Arizona there was also provided an additional judge. I will pause long enough to repeat what I said yesterday and what my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona] said, that, with our 300 miles of Mexican border and many smuggling cases, 30,000 square miles of Indian reservations, and 18,000 square miles of forest reservations, the Federal court has many cases before it.

With reference to the State of North Carolina the western judicial district was found by the committee to require an additional judge. In the middle district of the State of Tennessee it was found that an additional judge was necessary; and in the State of Mississippi it was found that an additional judge was necessary.

So, Mr. President, each and every one of those bills passed the Senate, and my amendment is nothing more than a composition or gathering together of those bills which passed the Senate in the Sixty-fifth Congress providing for these additional judges. As I have said, the Judiciary Committee of the Senate considered all those bills. I was on one or two of the subcommittees, and I recall that in one of the cases—I have forgotten which one—the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] was a member of the subcommittee, and the argument had not proceeded 50 minutes when the Senator said, "I am entirely convinced, and I will agree readily to a favorable report on this bill. The present judge should be afforded relief." That was substantially the situation with reference to all of the cases—in the Montana case, in the California case, the Arizona case, the Florida case, and all of them.

If this amendment imperils the bill seriously or jeopardizes the bill in any way, I do not expect it to be insisted upon; but I submit that the people of this country have a right to have speedy adjudication of their litigation, and if Federal judges are needed here or needed there the Senate should grant them.

I said yesterday—I do not know that it is entirely parliamentary, but I will repeat it—that owing to the cluttered condition of legislation in another branch of Congress, I very much fear that this needed legislation covering these eight individual cases will not be acted upon favorably unless they are included as an amendment to this bill. That implies no reflection upon any other branch of Congress, but it is a situation that is always before us at the close of Congress. That is all I have to say upon the subject, and I yield the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona. The middle district of Tennessee is at present without a judge. Tennessee is divided into three grand divisions—the eastern, the middle, and the western divisions. The eastern district has a judge and the western district has a judge, but the middle district does not have a judge, the Federal court in that district being presided over by a judge of the eastern district—Judge Sanford. This is the largest district in the State. The judge of the western district is Judge McCall, who has more than he can do now, as was shown by the evidence before the committee.

The Federal business in the middle district of Tennessee has increased over 100 per cent since 1913. The court is away behind in its docket. The judge can not possibly do the work, and at the same time perform the judicial work in the eastern district, according to all the facts as they have been adduced before the Judiciary Committee of both branches of Congress.

The bill creating a new judge for the middle district of Tennessee was introduced by my colleague [Mr. SHELDON] and brought before the committee of the Senate, which recommended its passage, and later on the Senate passed the bill. At the same time a like bill was introduced in the House. That bill was favorably recommended by the committee, and is now on the calendar of the House; but, in the press of business in the House, it is very doubtful whether it will be reached on the calendar. Most Senators probably will realize the parliamentary situation in the House from having served in that body, and they will know that at this late day it is almost impossible to get a bill of this kind through. The only reasonable opportunity that these bills have to become laws is for

them to be put on a bill of this kind. The Senate having passed all of the bills, I hope that it will agree that they may be placed as an amendment upon this bill, so that they may become laws at this session.

The only cost to the Government will be the salary of the judge. The court room is there. The district attorney, the marshal, and all the other officers of the court are already existing. There will be no expense except the salary of the judge.

In connection with the Tennessee case, Mr. President, there is a very excellent report filed by Mr. NEELY, an able and distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee of the House, which report I ask to have inserted as part of my remarks. I repeat that I hope the amendment of the Senator from Arizona will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report referred to by the Senator from Tennessee will be printed in the RECORD.

The report referred to is as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1836) to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the middle judicial district of the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report it to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The State of Tennessee is divided into the eastern, western, and middle judicial districts. The eastern and western districts each has a judge. The middle district being without a judge, court is therein held by Judge Sanford, of the eastern district. The last annual report of the Attorney General shows that, for the fiscal year 1917, there were in the middle district of Tennessee 102 cases pending, 191 commenced, and 159 terminated. During the fiscal year 1916 there were 51 cases pending in this district, and for several years immediately prior to 1916 there were pending an average of 50 to 60 cases per year. It thus appears that during the year 1917 there was an increase of almost 100 per cent in the number of pending cases over any year recently preceding 1917, and that the docket in the middle district is becoming congested at a rapid rate.

The following letter, written to Hon. JOSEPH W. BYRNS from Hon. Lee Douglass, United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee (found at p. 9 of the record of the hearings in this matter), concisely sets forth the more material facts upon which the committee bases its recommendations in the premises:

COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, January 23, 1918.

Hon. JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I acknowledge your letter of January 3, in which you ask me to write you, giving information as to the present amount of business in the district court at Nashville and Cookeville, etc.

I am very glad, indeed, to give you this information, but before making any use of this letter I wish you would kindly get the permission of my superior, the Attorney General, which I am quite sure he would be glad to give.

On the occasion of the former attempted passage of the act to create a new judgeship for the middle district of Tennessee, I wrote a letter to the Attorney General which I understand was filed with the Judiciary Committee, and, inasmuch as portions of same were published in dispatches from Washington, I feel I am not violating any etiquette in inclosing you herewith a copy of this letter. You will notice that this letter is quite comprehensive and covers the matter fully up to June 23, 1916.

On page 2 of that letter you will notice that I inserted statistics from the published annual reports of the Attorney General showing the number of cases pending, commenced, and terminated in this district for the fiscal years 1913 and 1914, when my predecessor was in office, and for the fiscal years 1915 and 1916, during my administration. These statistics were as follows:

Fiscal year—	Pending.	Commenced.	Terminated.
1913.....	69	88	102
1914.....	55	117	124
1915.....	48	165	162
1916.....	51	264	213

You will note the increase in business in the fiscal years 1915 and 1916.

There has recently been published the Annual Report of the Attorney General for the year 1917. The statistics, as shown by this report for the fiscal year 1917 in the middle district of Tennessee, are as follows: Pending, 102; commenced, 191; terminated, 159.

You will see from this that the volume of business for the year ending June 30, 1917 (which was the fiscal year covered by the above), is substantially the same as the two preceding fiscal years, with this significant fact, that there were pending in 1917, 102 cases, whereas there were pending in 1916, 51 cases, and for the preceding years practically between 50 and 60 cases. In other words, the number of cases pending, due to continuances, etc., is over 100 per cent more than any preceding year.

I may say also that as the Attorney General's report was for the year ended June 30, 1917, it included but one term of court since the declaration of war, and that term was at Cookeville, and so shortly after the declaration of war that practically no cases growing out of a violation of the war statutes were ready for submission to the grand jury.

The espionage act, the selective-service act, the food-control bill, etc., have all been passed since the last term of court embraced in the Attorney General's report, and, of course, this report gives no record in the prosecutions under these various acts. These acts have served to largely increase the criminal business of the district court, which, as I said in my letter of June 23, and which was shown by the record, had steadily increased theretofore. While there was noticeable at the last term of court a small falling off in the number of prosecu-

tions for bootlegging cases (carrying on the business of a retail liquor dealer without Government stamp), nevertheless this was more than offset by the number of prosecutions for violation of the Reed amendment. There were 23 cases at the last term for violation of this last-mentioned statute, and considerable time was consumed in the trial of these cases. As long as Kentucky is wet and Tennessee is dry these prosecutions are going to be inevitable, for the profit in the illicit transportation of whiskey is so great as to tempt many people to violate the law.

At the Cookeville term last April we found it necessary to hold court for the same time as that referred to in my letter of June 23, 1916, and in addition it was necessary for Judge Sanford to hold night sessions.

Of course I do not know, except by reference to the Attorney General's report, of the volume of business that devolves upon Judge Sanford in holding his terms of court in the eastern district at Chattanooga, Knoxville, and Greenville. However, I think I can safely say, from what he has told me, that there has been no decrease in the volume of business at any of these places. An examination of the Attorney General's report shows, however, that my statement in my letter of June 23 still applies when applied to the present. The statement was that there were more criminal prosecutions pending, commenced, and terminated in either the middle or eastern district, presided over by Judge Sanford, than in the western district, presided over by Judge McCall. In other words, Judge Sanford, in his court, actually has more criminal business to dispose of in either one of his two districts than Judge McCall has in his entire district. The Attorney General's report for 1917 shows that in the eastern district there were pending 135 cases, there were commenced 153 cases, and there were terminated 170 cases. I have already shown the record of cases in the middle district. The Attorney General's report for 1917 shows that in the western district, presided over by Judge McCall, there were pending 47 cases, commenced 97 cases, and terminated 84 cases.

In regard to the civil business, I am only in position to speak authoritatively in regard to such civil cases as concern the Government. I believe this character of business is on the increase.

It is true, as you state, that Judge Sanford is a most conscientious judge in the performance of his duty and gives what might be called unusual time and attention to his duties, and I repeat what I said in my letter of June 23, that no one but a judge of his splendid ability and energy could have kept up the work of these two districts in anything like a satisfactory manner during the past two years.

Of course, Judge Sanford would wish to make his own statement about this matter, but I feel at liberty in saying that I have observed the strain which this work is putting upon him and know that it is almost a human impossibility for one man to do what he is trying to do, and I feel that he should have some relief. He has recently written me as follows:

"I can only say that I have been reluctantly driven to the conclusion, by the logic of the situation and the increased volume of business in the Federal courts, that it is impossible for one judge to keep up the work in the two districts with the promptness and thoroughness which the due administration of justice requires, and that, in my judgment, some measure of assistance in this work is required in the public interest."

With kindest regards, I am,
Very truly, yours,

LEE DOUGLASS,
United States Attorney.

It is a matter of common knowledge that, as a result of the war legislation recently enacted by Congress, the duties of every district judge have been multiplied and his labors enormously increased. While the facts as to the increase of business in the middle district of Tennessee by reason of the legislation last referred to are not available, it is nevertheless unquestionably true that the necessity for the appointment of a judge in this district is even more urgent than it was at the time the hearings in the premises were concluded, to wit, March 16, 1918.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there is a great deal of merit in what has been said by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST]. I should like to say a word with respect to the Montana bill. It has twice passed this body and has never had consideration from the other branch of Congress. Not only is the court entirely overburdened with work, but there is in the report which was made to this body a letter sent here by the judge of the district court, who, by the way, was not appointed during this administration and is not politically in harmony with the party now in power, who sets out that the bill, if enacted into law, would operate to save to the Government of the United States \$50,000 a year in the administration of justice in the State of Montana. Accompanying the report there is a statement showing that it costs more to run the United States district court in the State of Montana than in any other State in the Union. It costs almost as much as it does in the largest district in the Territory of Alaska, and the plain reason is that witnesses and jurors and marshals have to travel enormous distances in order to make service of process and to reach the court; so that really that bill is a measure of economy. It does not involve an additional expenditure upon the part of the Government of the United States. It will result in a saving of money to the United States, estimated by the judge of the court to amount to at least \$50,000 a year.

These considerations have usually been persuasive in this body, but we have never been able in the other branch of Congress to get the matter on the floor, for some reason or other—just exactly why, I have never been able very well to ascertain. It occurs to me that this body might very appropriately again express its earnest desire to have these additional judges appointed in the districts in which they seem so very necessary.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, the only doubt I have about the amendment—having none on earth about its

merits—is the apprehension I entertain as to the effect its adoption might have on the ultimate passage of the bill.

I do not know the condition in the other States; but I am glad that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], as he usually does in any case, gets at the very bottom of it in a very short time. He has stated a condition in Montana that appeals to me, as it does to him, because exactly the same condition surrounds the court in my own State. It travels thousands of miles in holding court at four separate places. The marshal, with his writs, travels thousands of miles, and the same is true of the selection of jurors, and so forth; and we made the four districts in order to help out the Federal Government in the discharge of the duties of that court.

I have no doubt that in my State on an average there are 200 prisoners in jail at a time for violating some Federal law, on account, as was suggested by my colleague, of our proximity to Mexico, with 300 miles or more of border line—you know exactly what that means without further statement—thousands, yes, millions on millions of acres of land in Government reserves and in Indian reservations, every one of them with Federal jurisdiction, and that crowds the court to such an extent that I have no fear in saying that we have an average of 200 prisoners in jail all the time. That at \$2 a day would be \$400 a day; and as a matter of simple economy—not only of justice to those poor wretches who are in the jails, but as a matter of economy on the part of the Congress—there ought to be some relief given by the appointment of another judge in that State. It is not a question of the district or of its machinery, but it could afford that when the Government saves thousands of dollars a year by it. So that while my whole sympathy is in favor of the amendment, my only fear is, as is known to all of us who are interested in these different bills, in regard to the effect that its adoption might have upon the bill in the other House, where, unfortunately, they have mixed up mere partisan questions with it that are natural, but are very regrettable under such conditions as these.

Therefore I feel something like my colleague has suggested. I should like to see the amendment agreed to, and I should like to see the Senate keep the amendment on the bill if it can, and I should like the Senate conferees to do their best to keep it on the bill; but, in spite of my fears as to the result, I can not refuse my assent to the amendment.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not adopt this amendment. The object is evident. It is said here that various separate bills have been passed by the Senate creating certain judges in various districts of the country, and they are pending in the House of Representatives. Now, in order to force the House of Representatives to pass those bills, we propose to tack them onto a bill fixing the salaries of the circuit and district judges in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico.

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

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator speaks of forcing the House to pass those bills. I think that is not exactly correct, for this reason: Those bills have all been reported favorably by the House committee, and no doubt will pass the House if, under the rules, they can come up. It is just a question of getting them up, and in this way they will be gotten up.

Mr. KELLOGG. That is forcing the House, then, to take them up.

I think these bills ought to be considered in the House of Representatives and in this Chamber on their own foundation. The practice of lumping a lot of bills together and tacking them onto some other bill is a bad practice, and it is not fair. This bill ought to pass on its merits and ought not to be connected up with the bill creating additional judgeships in various circuits and districts in the United States. That is not the way to legislate, and it will endanger the passage of this bill, and I hope the Senate will not start in on any such practice as that.

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

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I wish to correct the statement made by the Senator from Tennessee. I wish to assure the Senator that I know that there is determined opposition to some of these bills in the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not mean to say that there is not opposition. There has been opposition to the bills all the time. I said that they had been favorably reported by the committee to the House.

Mr. KELLOGG. It might be that there should be a judge appointed in California and that there should not be a judge in some other district. It might be that there should be a judge in Pennsylvania and not in Minnesota. I do not think, however, that there is any claim for an additional judge in the latter

State. But it is proposed here to take the whole, irrespective of the merits, and put them on this bill regulating the salaries of district and circuit judges of the United States and of Alaska, Porto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did not the Senator vote for these very bills that have passed the Senate?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not remember whether I did or not. It does not make any difference. If I voted for every one of them and advocated every one of them, I would not put them on this bill, and I do not think it is good practice.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have been on my feet two or three times trying to ask a question that may guide me in my vote on this amendment.

I am not posted on judicial matters, but I should like to ask the Senator who introduced the amendment, or some one who knows, whether the establishment of these eight judges—I believe there are eight—in the different places will require an additional number of United States district attorneys and marshals and an entirely new set of machinery to handle the courts after the judges are appointed in case they should be? In other words, will these States be redistricted?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will permit me just to call attention to the condition of the Tennessee court—and I assume the condition is probably the same in other States, but I know this is true of Tennessee—there is a district attorney, a district court, a marshal, and all of the other clerks and employees of the court already in existence there. The only effect of the passage of this bill will be the appointment of the additional judge.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I need not say anything further, except to say that in answer to the question the Senator from Tennessee has given correct data. The bills do not create, nor intend nor propose to create, any additional marshals, clerks, or district attorneys.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. And they create no new districts.

Mr. ASHURST. They create no new districts and no new officials except the judges—no new marshals, no new district attorneys, no new clerks.

Mr. McKELLAR. And the courts are already existing. The courthouse, the place of meeting of the court, is already in existence, and there will be no additional expense on account of it except for the judge.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The purpose I had in asking the question was to ascertain whether these things would not naturally follow.

Mr. President, with that assurance I shall vote for the amendment, because from the showing made it seems to be a needed addition to the bill, but not with any intention of voting for the bill in its present form.

Mr. ASHURST. No, Mr. President, because, as has been stated, no new place, no new machinery, is proposed to be created; simply an additional judge.

Mr. McKELLAR. All the rest is in existence now. They have all the rest; it is just simply a judge from another district who sits in the court.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I confess that I am always partial to any proposition that is put forward by my friend from Arizona. I believe I have always voted for every proposition he has presented to the Senate before this. I think he is always right on his fundamentals, and I have no doubt they need a new judge in Arizona, and I am glad the Senate has passed a bill providing for that; but we are interested in a bill to increase the salaries of the Federal judges throughout the United States and the Territories. I am afraid it would defeat the bill if this amendment were adopted, and in spite of my entire sympathy with the vigilant and intelligent Senator from Arizona on this very proposition, I feel obliged to vote against the amendment, and I hope it will fail.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think I have supported in the Judiciary Committee all but one of these bills, and I was absent from the Judiciary Committee when that one was favorably acted upon. I think they are all right; but we passed upon each one separately, and the House is entitled to investigate each one of them separately, and pass upon it separately.

I am afraid that the adoption of this amendment would seriously endanger this bill, and for that reason I shall vote against it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the members of the committee how the bill can be endangered. It has to go to conference; and if there is danger of the defeat of the bill, that matter can be settled in conference. There is no reason why the Senate should not express its opinion on the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Of course, if the Senate does not expect the conferees to stand out for this amendment, it would do no harm; but if we are going to go to conference and really insist upon it, I have not any real hope that the House would accept it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator is mistaken in that. I think there will be a real hope of the House accepting the amendment. Their committees have passed upon all these bills favorably, and I do not see how it could possibly endanger the bills in any way whatsoever.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator thinks, then, that the House would accept the amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. Then I shall vote against it. [Laughter.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, knowing as I do something of the situation in the other body with reference to some of the bills that are included in this amendment, I feel that I ought to say that, in my judgment, if this amendment is adopted it will very seriously endanger the passage of this bill. There has always been a very considerable opposition in the other body to any increase at all in the salaries of Federal judges; and, in my judgment, if this amendment is adopted, even though it may be agreed upon by the conferees, the House will reject the conference report and the entire legislation will fail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST].

Mr. ASHURST. I respectfully request the yeas and nays on the amendment.

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

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], which I transfer to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD] and vote "nay."

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

Mr. HENDERSON (when Mr. PHELAN's name was called). I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] on account of illness. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. He is not present, and not knowing how he would vote I will withhold my vote.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] and vote "nay."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote as I shall vote, and therefore I vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (after having voted in the affirmative). Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], which I transfer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CALDER (after having voted in the negative). Has the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. CALDER. I have a general pair with that Senator and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. HOLLIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY] are detained on official business.

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

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON]; and

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Myers	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Johnson, Cal.	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pollock	Trammell
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Walsh
Cummins	Kirby	Reed	Williams
Fletcher	McKellar	Shafer	
Henderson	McNary	Sheppard	

NAYS—42.

Bankhead	Jones, Wash.	New	Swanson
Borah	Kellogg	Nugent	Thomas
Colt	Kenyon	Page	Townsend
Curtis	King	Penrose	Underwood
Fernald	Knox	Poindexter	Vardaman
France	La Follette	Pomeroy	Wadsworth
Gore	Lenroot	Saulsbury	Warren
Gronna	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	Watson
Hale	McCumber	Smith, Mich.	Weeks
Harding	Martin, Va.	Smoot	
Hollis	Nelson	Sutherland	

NOT VOTING—28.

Baird	Gerry	Moses	Shields
Brandeggee	Goff	Norris	Simmons
Calder	Hardwick	Owen	Smith, Md.
Dillingham	Kendrick	Phelan	Spencer
Fall	Lewis	Pittman	Sterling
Frelinghuysen	McLean	Robinson	Thompson
Gay	Martin, Ky.	Sherman	Wolcott

So Mr. ASHURST's amendment was rejected.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Shall the bill pass?

Mr. TRAMMELL and Mr. NUGENT. I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate five minutes. I simply desire to enter my protest against the passage of this bill. We have passed through a terrible war, and the resources of the country are taxed to the utmost. The cost of living has gone up so that almost every salaried man in the United States feels the trouble. In the distress which prevails, which has been brought about by the war, it does seem to me most unfortunate to undertake now to increase salaries.

But, Mr. President, if we are to increase salaries in the United States I appeal to Senators to begin at the bottom. There are people, as we all know, in this city and throughout the United States in the employment of the United States Government who find it almost impossible to get food and raiment with the salaries now paid them by the Government. They have all been appealing to the Congress for increases in salaries. The appeals come to me every day, and they are most touching in many instances. With due regard for the true interest of the entire country, I have been compelled, with rare exceptions, to turn a deaf ear to those appeals, but nobody will rise here in his seat and say that the judges of the United States are in any trouble about getting food and raiment with the salaries that are being paid them.

The judicial offices of the United States are more sought after, more desired, and more valuable than any other offices in the gift of the American people. There are few Members of Congress who would not resign the seat they hold to get a judicial appointment under the Federal Government. We have had many instances in recent years where able men in Congress have resigned to accept judicial appointments under the Federal Government. I say, without fear of successful contradiction, that the judicial offices of the United States are the most valuable, the most desirable, the most sought after that the Government can bestow upon any of its citizens.

In the name of reason, Senators, if you are going to increase salaries, is it right to begin at the top? You have not heard of any of the Federal judges resigning because the pay was not big enough, and you are not likely to do so. In my own State the judges of the supreme court get \$4,500 a year. They are very able men. There is hardly one of them who would not be an ornament to the Supreme Court of the United States, and they are working for \$4,500 a year, and do more work, in my opinion, than the average judge of a Federal court. In my own State I know the judges of our supreme court do many times the work that is done by the district and circuit judges.

I believe in a well-paid judiciary; if circumstances permitted, I would be willing to see their salaries increased, but I feel that they are the best-paid men in the employment of the United States Government, without a single exception, and it is a position more sought after than any other position that can be bestowed by the Government of the United States.

If we are going to increase salaries, is it right to commence with those who are most favored now by the Government, who do not know what the pinch of want is, who can enjoy every luxury, every comfort, and every pleasure without any serious difficulty? Do you not think we had better commence with those people who are feeling the sting of want, who find it difficult to live on the meager salaries now paid them by the Government of the United States?

I am amazed that the Senate of the United States should be disposed to add to the salaries of the most favored class of people in the United States, without a single exception, and that is what this bill does. I am absolutely opposed to commencing at the top. If we are going to raise salaries, in God's name let us begin at the bottom and begin where there is real want. Let us begin where there is real necessity for an increase and not begin by piling up additional salaries for the best-paid officials that the Government of the United States employs.

That is all I desire to say, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the clarion voice of the Senator from Virginia, who happens at the same time to be the leader of the Democratic Party upon this floor, in such unmistakable terms as I have just heard. The excuse made for all this is the increase in the cost of living. Do Senators forget that the increase in the cost of living bears chiefly upon the taxpayer and not upon the Federal judge, not upon a Senator or Representative in Congress or governor? The increased cost of living renders the taxpayer less able to pay taxes, and war emergencies and the peace reconstruction emergencies render it all the more necessary that he should pay taxes. This is the time of all times that is the wrong time, and yet the time of all times when everybody comes up wanting to pull at the breast of the Treasury of the country in order to get something added to what he hitherto has been receiving.

The Senator from Virginia is exactly right. This bill with these provisions in it ought not to pass this body. This body can not go before the American people with a feeble increase of 10 per cent for the people who are getting \$780 and \$900 a year while it grants these increases to the men who are receiving not only enough to get food and raiment, as the Senator from Virginia says, but, in addition, sufficient to educate their children. When King Henry IV entered the capital of France he said that he wanted to see the day come when every peasant in France should have a fowl in his pot. The utmost any man looks for in this world is the day when everybody can buy food and raiment and educate his children in a respectable way.

Why should you increase the immense financial distances between men? There is not a man in the United States who would not rather be a Federal judge at \$3,000 a year than to be a hod carrier at \$6,000, if the hod carrier could get \$6,000.

This is not demagoguery. I do not think I have ever been a demagogue; I do not think I could be if I tried to cultivate the art. But you all know that men's compensation for their work in this world consists partly in money and partly in honor. Would I, for example, have been a Senator of the United States for the sake of the salary? A whole lot of you never would have been, although the salary was a big thing to me. What appealed to you to come here? It was the idea that your children and your children's children might point to the record and say you had been here in this august body representing a part of the legislative authority of this United States. A man takes pride in the fact that from the Continental Congress down to the present time his family has been represented upon the floor of the legislative body of the United States. Could you get any better men if you paid them \$20,000 a year than you are getting now? No; you would get worse men. You would get men who would come here for the money, and the man who goes anywhere in the front line of battle or in the ranks of honor in this world for money is a bad representative of the American people.

You can not build up a good judiciary of men whose chief aspiration is an increase in salary. If that is a man's chief wish, then he ought to get off the bench at once and go to making money somewhere else without the honor. But if he prefers honor to money, he will stay where he is. If he prefers money to honor, he will resign, as so many have done from the State benches and some few from the Federal benches.

I tell you this whole idea that you can create ability by paying in cash is a lie. You could not have created John Marshall by giving him \$20,000 a year, nor Judge Story, nor Chancellor Kent, nor Chief Justice Sharkey, of the State of Mississippi. There was not a day in the life of either one of those men when they would not rather have had the office with just enough to furnish them food and raiment than not to have had it at all. It was an honor to them, an honor to their children, an honor to their grandchildren, and an honor to their family all the time.

The true aristocracy of the world consists in being able to point back to ancestors who performed public service. These Federal judges are members of the American aristocracy, as is every man who performs a high public service.

It is just as foolish to tell me you can get better judges by paying more money as it is to tell me you can get better Senators by paying more money. You would merely tempt every selfish moneygrubber in the world to run for the Senate, whether he was fit for it or not. If you pay him more money than he could make in his present occupation, he would give up that occupation because he could make more money by holding a seat in the United States Senate. You do not want to tempt men to public service merely with money. You want to give them enough money to carry off the dignity of the situation, and it does not require so awfully much dignity. You want to give them enough money so that out of the salary they can carry themselves and their families respectably in society. But it does not take so awfully much money to do that. John Marshall used to carry his paper parcels through the streets of the city and never considered it a disgrace. Such a thing would be considered a great disgrace in these days; at least it is in many cities, and I suppose it is here. As to carrying a basket or parcel with fish and chickens and oysters in it for the family to eat, that is beneath the dignity of any man now serving in a public place anywhere. He would rather be shot at than be seen performing that duty on the public streets. You can not create legal ability by paying cash for it. It has got to be there; and then, if it chooses to exploit itself as a lawyer, it can sell itself for cash, but you can not create it by giving it cash. How do you create judges? If you create them right, you find a man who has made the best lawyer in his district and you try to make a judge of him. He did not make the best lawyer in his district because some one had paid him money. Let me give you an example. I have gone out of the back door many a day to escape a client coming in the front door, because the practice of law bored me and the money did not interest me. It did, too; but I mean it did not interest me sufficiently to make me stay in.

Here is another man who loves the law. Take the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], for example. He loves a law point as I love a logical syllogism or a mathematical problem. It does not bore him; it interests him. The consequence has been that he has made a great lawyer. Do you suppose, if you were going to put him on the bench to-day, you could make him any better lawyer by giving him \$10,000 a year instead of \$7,500? I imagine you would make a worse lawyer of him, for you might give him a whole lot of luxurious habits that he now has not, and the luxury might lead to laziness, and laziness might lead to intellectual indolence, and intellectual indolence might finally lead to legal inefficiency. I am glad that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] made that little talk. It was the best thing I have heard in this Congress.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I trust I have a sufficient and proper appreciation of the position of the judiciary in our Federal system. I have many times on this floor and elsewhere expressed my views in regard to it, and I have not in any sense modified those views. I also realize that all of the Federal judiciary is insufficiently paid, but I do not believe that it is so insufficiently paid as to justify this bill at this time, when we take into consideration the conditions which now confront us. I realize, of course, that there are men upon the bench who are making a sacrifice, who are not receiving what they would receive if they were in private practice; but if there is anyone in this country who is not making a sacrifice now in a financial way, I do not know who it is.

Business is embarrassed and business men are embarrassed; business men are suffering and business men will go to the wall, owing to the exceedingly great burden which has necessarily been laid upon us by reason of this war; and I do not believe that the Federal judiciary ought to be singled out and have their salaries increased, and I do not believe that the judges of the Federal judiciary, as a whole, expect it. I think that the great body of them are perfectly willing to submit to the situation which now confronts them until they, in common with all their countrymen, can enjoy a better condition of affairs.

I do not see, Mr. President, how it is possible for us to raise these salaries without raising salaries all along the line below these. I do not see what possible answer we can make to the requests which will come to us to raise salaries below this amount, for it comes right down to the question of what is necessary to sustain life and to clothe and to feed a family. There are any number of men in this country who are now serving the public at very much lower salaries than are being paid to the Federal judiciary, and if it is a question of living, if it is a question of clothing and of food and of the education of the family, what possible answer can we make to these men

when they ask for an increase of salary and point to the fact that we have increased the salaries of judges?

You are greatly in error, Senators, if you suppose that the request will not come. It will be here upon short notice; it is here now in a potential way, and we must face it. Are we in a position, therefore, to set the precedent and to establish the example of increasing salaries at this particular time, when everyone is sorely pressed by reason of financial conditions and by reason of heavy taxes? I do not think that we ought to do it, though I have just as high an appreciation of the Federal judiciary, I presume, as anyone could have, and I have just as high an appreciation of the character of the judges who occupy these places. I believe they are willing, and I believe they ought to be, to suffer with the rest until a better condition of affairs arises.

I have been in the Senate, Mr. President, for nearly 12 years. One of the first activities in which I was engaged in the Senate was in opposition to the raising of salaries. I have watched the program ever since. If we raise the salary of a class of officers to-day, to-morrow they point with full justification to the fact that that salary is unfair as compared with the salaries which we are paying to others, and there is no answer to it. Every man wants to be equitable; every man wants to be fair; and when some employees point to the fact that we have raised salaries here and there, and we refuse to raise their salaries, it is an argument which a Senator can not answer. The result of it is that this becomes a law of perpetual motion, and we are constantly increasing salaries regardless of circumstances and conditions which confront us. When employees come here with their \$1,200, \$1,500, \$2,000, and \$3,000 a year salaries and ask for an increase, and say, "We can not live on what we are now getting," what answer will we make when we have raised the salaries of those now receiving \$6,000 and \$7,000 because the officers receiving those salaries can not live upon them?

So, Mr. President, we are entering at this critical time, when people are being taxed beyond any conception of previous years, upon a program of raising salaries all along the line, if we are going to do justice to the entire situation. I know that the Federal judiciary is able; I know that it is patriotic; I know that it is devoted to the interests of this country; I know the judges are men of character and they will understand the situation. We should not ask that this precedent be established at this particular juncture of critical affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate very briefly in saying a few words with reference to this bill. The district and circuit court judges of the United States are receiving the same salaries they have received for many years. Instead of this bill being a precedent for raising salaries, the precedent all along the line is that the salaries of others in similar positions have been raised, while the salaries of these officers have not. The salaries of the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States have been raised; the salaries of Cabinet officers have been raised; the salaries of assistant attorneys in the Department of Justice have been increased; and, all around, men engaged in the same class of work have had their salaries increased, while the Federal judges have not.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Senator might also include Members of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; and, as the Senator says, Members of Congress have had their salaries increased.

Mr. President, I am not generally in favor of increasing salaries; I believe in economy; but there is no class of men in the United States who carry more completely the lives, the liberties, and the property of the people than do our Federal judges. They are of the utmost importance to the people of this country. I believe that a United States court judge should be separated from the ordinary affairs of life even more than a Representative or a Senator, more than a Cabinet officer, more than a district attorney, or an assistant district attorney. The Federal judge can not practice law, no; he can not engage in business, no; he can not engage in trade, no; he can not form business associations without complicating his relations to the litigants in his court. He is put in the position where he must lay the making of money behind him and rely solely on his salary and such little savings as he may make from his salary and invest.

For a number of years past there has been a recognized view that the salaries of Federal judges ought to be increased, but no general plan was adopted. The Judiciary Committee of the House worked out with great care a plan and the House finally adopted one embodying an increase, but not an extravagant one. We were on the point in the Senate of doubling the in-

crease given by the House; but, I am glad to say, this morning the Senate reconsidered its action and went back to the conservative figures given us by the House of Representatives. There was a very close vote in the House as to whether \$7,500 and \$8,500 or \$8,000 and \$9,000 should be the figures; but the almost overwhelming sentiment was that some increase was essential, and this bill finally passed by an overwhelming majority.

There are two other provisions in the bill of substantial importance. We have had district and circuit judges under our present system who passed the age of 70, but did not retire, because they felt that they were able to do something and that retirement and abandonment of all work meant mental and physical collapse. In this bill they are given the opportunity to retire, not to resign, but to continue to serve in judicial life to the extent of their physical capacity. I think that is a most valuable provision.

The bill also provides that if any judge, on account of physical or mental disability of a permanent character, can not perform efficiently all the duties of the office, then the President can appoint an additional judge. We have been embarrassed by this condition frequently heretofore, and this part of the bill perfects, in my opinion, our judicial system.

I trust that, as we have reached such progress in this proposed legislation, it will receive the indorsement of the Senate; and I submit the matter, so far as I am concerned, to your consideration.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I trust that I have sufficient respect for the dignity of the courts of the United States, and I do not presume to speak for any State save my own, but I realize that we are about to establish a precedent here that will be troublesome to the Senate in the future, and not the remote future—not next week or next year—but right now. We have selected a body of public servants who are receiving reasonable salaries, who are to-day receiving sufficient to care for themselves and their families and to educate their children, and are ignoring a large number of public officials who are not receiving sufficient to take care of their families and themselves. I consider it, sir, an outrage to take men occupying high position in the Government, now receiving reasonable compensation, and increase their salaries unless we go the whole length of the line.

In my State we have never been troubled to find men to fill the office of district judge, and I am frank to say, sir, that we have not a lawyer, to my knowledge, in the State of Maine who would not be glad to receive such an appointment to-day and now. I assume that the same condition exists all over New England and, perhaps, all over these United States.

I am opposed to this proposition. Now is a most inopportune time to begin to advance the salaries of high-paid officials. If we must begin, let us begin at the other end of the line. There is not a Senator here, I assume, who is not making some sacrifice. I know of many Senators on this floor who have left salaries much higher than they are receiving here in order that they may have the honor of a position in the United States Senate.

I am very much opposed to this proposition beginning at this end of the line. I can not understand by what legerdemain these officials have been selected, unless we go the whole length and increase the salaries of every other public official. I am of the firm conviction that there are many public officials who ought to have their salaries increased, who are receiving from \$1,600 to \$2,000, which is entirely inadequate to support their families; but if any class of people are to receive an increase in salaries, such increase should begin in a different class than those covered by this bill; and I wish to register my protest, as a business man and as a Senator from Maine, against this proposed increase.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have never been an advocate of high salaries when applied to what we ordinarily term "salaries," but I think I can show a consistent record in favor of the advocacy of pretty liberal wages to be paid to wage earners; but there have been some things said in opposition to this bill which lead me to ask the attention of the Senate for a few minutes.

In the first place, it is said that a good salary will not make a poor judge a good judge. Everybody in the world knows that. The statement was made that a good salary would not make a poor lawyer a good lawyer. The Senate of the United States did not need to be informed of that fact; but it is nevertheless true that, taken first and last, salaries have something to do with the question of whether good lawyers can be induced to leave their practices and devote their lives to the bench. Salaries may become so meager that the bench suffers in the quality

of its membership, or if it does not suffer the occupants of the bench are put to disadvantages that are unfair.

My friend from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]—who, I am sorry to see, has left the Chamber, and who is a business man—states that he can not see any business sense in this proposition to raise the salaries of Federal judges. If this were a business proposition pure and simple, we would not get the men who are on the Federal bench to serve for two or three times their salaries. This is not a business proposition. It is a proposition of what is fair and right and just and what is best for the people of the United States.

To begin with, no man ever ought to be appointed to the Federal bench unless he is a ripe and seasoned lawyer, a man who enjoys and who has been enjoying a large practice, because the only way we can really test out the ability of a lawyer to be a good judge is by his record made for many years in the courts of the land. If a man is an experienced lawyer and an able lawyer and a lawyer with a large practice, then when he enters upon the duties of the Federal bench he must make a very large financial sacrifice, for there are very few lawyers engaged in good practice in the cities of the land to-day who possess the abilities which ought to go upon the Federal bench but who are making a great deal more money than the salaries proposed. Indeed, they frequently make more money in one case than the salaries proposed.

So much for that phase of the question. There is another phase of it.

It of course is true that there are men who have such high regard for the judicial honor that they will make very great financial sacrifices and subject themselves to many great hardships in order to hold such a position; but I believe it to be true that, first and last, taking the whole question and looking at the years together, it will be found that the character of the new appointees upon the Federal bench will begin to disintegrate if we place the salary of a judge at a point where the occupant of the bench can not support his family, educate his family, and have a little money left for his wife and children to live upon when he ceases to occupy the bench.

If the salaries which are now paid were just salaries at the time they were fixed, then the proposed salary is certainly not excessive at this time, because the value of a dollar then was fully twice the value of a dollar to-day. Its purchasing power was fully twice as great at the time these salaries were fixed as that purchasing power is to-day. These Federal courts are becoming more and more important. Their jurisdiction has been vastly enlarged. Their influence upon the national life, because of this enlarged jurisdiction, is much greater than it was a few years ago; and in deciding this question nothing of the demagogic argument ought to be considered. Justice should be done to the occupants of these high positions, and only justice.

Mr. President, I have in mind a case which perhaps may have influenced my judgment a good deal. A few months ago I got a \$1,200 clerkship for the widow of a man who for nearly 20 years sat upon the supreme bench of one of the great Central States of the Union. He was paid a salary of \$5,000. He was expected to maintain a respectable home and to perform those duties—social, public, or otherwise—which fall upon a judge; and they are many. He lived moderately, he had no bad habits, but he kept up the sort of a home which the people would like to have one of the justices of their supreme court keep up, and his little wife spent money moderately; and yet at the end of the year the \$5,000 was gone. It does not go very far when men have to live on a certain plane; and this man, who served his State with distinction and was one of the greatest of the judges of that State, who practically devoted his life to public service—all the ripe years of his life—when he could have made from \$50,000 to \$100,000 a year in his practice, died and left his widow practically without anything. He had expended money in educating some children, which had been a heavy draft upon him; and his widow is here in Washington working for \$1,200 a year at a position that she is not physically capable of holding.

It is all right to talk about sacrifice, and it is all right to talk about economy; but you can go too far in your cry for economy, and you can demand sacrifices to such an extent that you become unjust; you may injure the fiber and character of the men who will hereafter be appointed to these great positions. There are not many of them in the United States, after all. The draft upon the Public Treasury through this will not be great.

We are told that we are about to pass a bill appropriating \$100,000,000 to be expended in foreign lands in charitable acts among people whom we do not even know, and we do not even know in what nations and countries it is to be expended. The interest on that \$100,000,000, at the rate the United States has to pay, would be \$4,500,000 a year. It would many times over pay these salaries and pay this increase. We shall probably

pass that bill. I do not urge that as an argument, further than to call your attention to the fact that sometimes we open the bung-hole with great liberality and at the same time put our thumb upon the spigot with a great deal of parsimony.

Mr. President, I believe that this bill as now drawn is a fair bill. I believe it ought to be passed. It is a poor time to demagogue a case.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think there is one suggestion that ought to be made here before the vote is cast upon this bill, and that is this, and it is simply in addition to the reasons that have been given against the raising of the judges' salaries:

First, in the Swayne trial here it was demonstrated that 50 per cent of the judges of the United States courts charged considerably more than the law actually allowed them when sitting in courts other than at their places of residence. For instance, the law provides that when a judge of a Federal court is called to sit in another court away from his home place or his own district he may charge as expenses the actual expenses, not exceeding \$10 per day. In that case the fact developed that more than 50 per cent, as I remember, put in all their bills for \$10 a day expenses, even though they might not have been more than three or four dollars per day; and there is considerable of this transferring from one point to another done in the country. I do not know whether or not that system is followed now as it was then, but I think it is. I know that it is followed in some courts, because I have looked over the reports that have been sent in, and have been informed that they have followed the rule, no matter what the expenses were, of charging \$10 per day; so whatever profit of that kind there may be is in addition to their salary.

That is not the only way in which the judges have been favored. In the present revenue bill we relieve judges of the Federal courts of any payment of taxes whatever upon their salaries. Senators must pay their proportion of the taxes according to their incomes, whether upon their salaries alone or salaries combined with incomes from outside sources; but no judge of a Federal court, Supreme or district court, is compelled to pay one penny of taxes under the bill as it is now in conference, and, of course, there will be no change in that respect. It may not amount to more than \$400 a year, but that is something of an addition, while everyone else must pay his full taxes. I have never agreed, and I do not agree to-day, with the constitutional objection that is urged that these salaries are not taxable, because I think they are taxable as income, and I have never agreed to the doctrine that levying a tax upon the salary of either the President or a Federal judge was diminishing his income during his incumbency in office.

Take into consideration, also, the fact that after reaching the age of 70 years the ordinary individual must still perform services for the support of his family, while the judge, after having reached that age, may withdraw from any work and his salary will go on during life.

Taking into consideration all of these matters, Mr. President, it does seem to me that it is decidedly unjust to the taxpayer, who must go down into his own pockets to meet these additional salaries, to ask him to pay not only the taxes from which you relieve the judges, but, in addition to that, to increase their salaries beyond what they are at the present time, which amount shall also be nontaxable.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, it was suggested by the Senator in charge of the bill a short time ago that the salaries of others had been increased, including judges of the Supreme Court and other officials in high positions, and that these officers have not received any increase in salary. I may be mistaken, but I have a very distinct recollection that Congress has increased the salaries of these judges within the last 15 years. As I say, I may be mistaken in that, but I do not think I am; but, be that as it may, I do not believe that this is the time to increase these salaries. In normal times and under normal conditions I would vote for an increase in these salaries. But this is the time when everybody is called upon to make sacrifices; everybody is compelled to do it. I am sure that the judges of these courts will not object, in fact I am certain they will be glad to do their part in bearing the burden which this country must bear at this time as a result of the war.

As has been suggested by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], they have a life position. Not only that, but after service of a certain length of time or when they reach a certain age—and it is not a very great age either—they can retire and continue to draw the salary which the law has provided. Many of them prefer to stay on the bench and render service for the Government, but they are not compelled to do so. They do not have to worry anything about the future, so far as ample provision for a comfortable living is concerned, for

themselves and their families. That is a very important thing. I have no doubt it appeals to a great many when positions of this kind are to be filled.

Mr. President, we are having demands presented to the Government for increases of salaries upon the part of almost all the employees of the Government. There are a great many employees of the Government who, in my judgment, are not even reasonably well paid. There are employees in the District of Columbia who have appealed and are appealing to Congress for increases in their salaries. It is true they do not hold the high and responsible positions which these judges hold, but they are entitled to the reasonable comforts of life; they are entitled to have reasonably warm and reasonably good clothing; they are entitled to have a reasonable supply of food; and yet it is really a wonder to me, though it may not be to anybody else, how many of these people actually exist upon the salaries which they get.

If we are going to begin increasing salaries, I think we ought to begin where it is most needed; that is, where the actual necessities of existence require and demand it. If there were anything which at this time under these present conditions would induce me to vote for the passage of this bill, it would be that I would vote for it in the hope that if the Senate did pass it when these other requests came up it could not reject them or refuse them.

We provided an increase during the past year, under conditions everybody is familiar with, of \$120 a year. It is common knowledge that it is proposed to continue this increase for another year and hold down other increases of salary. Of course, Mr. President, that is something, but it is not much. It is suggested here that the purchasing power of the dollar which is paid to these judges is not worth more than 50 per cent of what it was when they were appointed and when the salary was fixed. Grant that, Mr. President. The purchasing power of the dollar of the school-teacher in the District of Columbia who gets \$750 a year is no greater than the purchasing power of the dollar which any judge or any other official receives. We do not propose to increase the salaries of the school-teachers—at least there does not seem to be very much prospect of it—and until we can take care of the actual necessities of those in the Government employ whose salary is not really sufficient to furnish them with the actual necessities and comforts of life I can not get the consent of my judgment to vote to increase the salaries of men who are now receiving that which certainly brings them a comfortable living and assures them a comfortable living during their entire lifetime.

I freely concede the important duties which these judges must perform and the responsibilities of the positions which they occupy, as well as the high standing, character, and ability which they should have, and I think it is entirely out of place to suggest in this argument that there is any Senator who does not appreciate that. We know that we want judges of the highest integrity and of the highest ability, but there is no suggestion here, there is no charge here that we have not that kind of a judiciary now.

It was suggested a moment ago that the judiciary might deteriorate. There is no charge that it is deteriorating.

These salaries have been in existence quite a good many years, and we have practically completed the war; it is practically over, and we hope that in the no distant future conditions will become normal. There has not been thus far any complaint; in fact, I have not heard any complaint by these judges, and as has already been said I do not think they would make any complaint. They are not asking for this increase now. In my judgment it really is an insult to them for us to propose to urge this increase under present conditions.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. A committee for the judges presented the matter very fully before the House Judiciary Committee, and the evidence is printed showing the necessity, as they see it, of these increases.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am sorry to know that the judges have been working for this increase of salary.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not say that they have been working for it, and I hope the Senator will not oppose the bill on that ground.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I hope the judges have not done this. I hope I would have no justification to oppose it on that ground. I did not know they had sent a committee here to urge it. I am sorry if they have. I think that is one of the most reprehensible things that the judiciary could do, and I am satisfied that if that committee came here for the purpose of lobbying for this bill it does not reflect the sentiment, sense of propriety, and the patriotism of the great mass of the judiciary of this country.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I did not say a committee of judges was sent here.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understood the Senator to say so.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Perhaps some of the judges were called, but the committee was a committee of the Bar Association. There was evidence, I think, from the judges, however, as to their financial condition and their expenses.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That makes it a little better. Of course, I knew that some of the Bar Association were urging this legislation. I am sorry they have done so at this time, but I am glad that the judiciary is exonerated from it. I hope that none of the judges have been down here talking to anybody with reference to an increase of salary during these times. I hope there is not a single judge occupying the bench who could so forget the real requirements of his position as to come to Congress or induce anybody to come to Congress to urge the increase of his salary at this time and under these conditions. I hope no judge has tacitly or openly approved the appearance here of any committee on his behalf. I wish they had openly opposed this bill at this time. They would be more highly thought of by the people had they done so.

As I said, I do not believe that the judiciary of the country would indorse anything of this kind or encourage anything of the kind.

I believe they would, in fact, repudiate it if it were brought to their attention. It may be that committees from bar associations and attorneys have come urging it. To do so, in my judgment, places the judiciary in a false light. They are just as patriotic men as there are in the country. They are just as loyal men as we have in the country. They are of the highest character, and they recognize the conditions that confront the people of this country. They are perfectly willing to bear their burdens in this hour of stress and trial. In my judgment they do not ask for this increased salary. They do not seek it, and we are but reflecting upon them when, in the face of all the demands from others throughout the country who need it much more, we propose to increase their salaries and not take care of those who are actually suffering for the necessities and comforts of life.

We fear Bolshevism. We are warned against its growth and development, and ways and means are sought to stop it. Mr. President, things like this promote and foster Bolshevism more than anything else in this or any other country. You will never stop the growth of Bolshevism till you destroy the sense of injustice and discrimination that acts like this arouse.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I should like to know whether it is possible at this parliamentary stage of the bill to move to strike out sections 2 and 3—I think they are—to strike out the sections increasing the salaries of the present judges?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Knox in the chair). The present occupant of the chair thinks, the bill having been read the third time and being on its passage, it is not open to amendment at this stage.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I was of that view myself, but I did not know whether it was the opinion of the Chair or not. I wish simply to say, then, that I am sorry the bill has reached this parliamentary stage. If a vote is taken on the bill as it now stands, I shall vote against it. I am not going to enter into a discussion at any length as to the reasons why, but I have been giving some little attention, in the last few days especially, to this question of the increase of wages. I am a member of a subcommittee that has under consideration now a bill to fix a minimum wage of \$3 a day for Federal employees. Whether such a bill shall become a law or not of course I can not say, but I am greatly impressed with the necessity for some relief to those who receive only small compensation. If anything is to be done in that direction, I agree with various Senators who have expressed their views upon this bill that that is the place to begin. I do not believe that we should increase these salaries now, and if the bill comes to a vote as it is now presented to the Senate I shall vote against it.

There are other provisions in the bill which seem to me to be very meritorious. The other provisions in the bill I have given some attention to for several years. In various districts in the United States there are conditions existing which will require and the public business demands that there shall be some relief, and such relief would be given by the other provisions of the bill. I would like very much to see those provisions become law. But if the question is put up to me whether I shall accept the bill as a whole or not, I shall vote against it. I do not know whether the Senator in charge of the bill desires to put it back into a parliamentary stage where the sole question of an increase in salaries shall be the issue or not, but in the present situation I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I find myself in somewhat of an embarrassing position with reference to this bill. As a matter of fact, I have not only expected to vote for it but I have said in more than one instance that I intended to do so. I did fully expect to do so until within the last very few days.

I believe, as has been very well said by a number of Senators who favored this measure during the discussion of it, that the Federal judiciary is as a class underpaid. I think it has performed very great service for the country in the last few years, that we are beholden to it for great things in the not very distant past, and that we must look to it for perhaps still greater things in the days that are to come. I think the hope of this country lies very largely with the Federal judiciary. I believe that the salaries attached to it should be commensurate with the character and services and the position at the bar of the men who are going to occupy those places. I believe that none but the best of the profession should be appointed to the Federal bench, and as a rule I think that practice has been followed by the Presidents of both parties who have been charged with the responsibility of making these appointments.

As I said at the outset, I believe that as a class the Federal judges are underpaid. When I contemplate the situation in my own State and think of the man who occupies the Federal district bench there I am very sure that that is the case. He is a man who could earn several times in the practice of the law the salary he is now receiving as a judge of the Federal court. But financially he is a poor man, comparatively speaking, and he is making a great pecuniary sacrifice in staying where he is. I have recognized that fact. I realize if that is the case with him it is probably the case with many others.

But, Mr. President, within the last few days I have been impressed with the demands and the righteousness and justice of the demands that are made upon all of us here by many other classes of Federal employees. For instance, of the clerks and secretaries who represent the Senators in this body there is not one who is not underpaid, in so far as the Government is concerned. Every one of us knows that. There is more than one Senator on this floor who goes down into his private pocket, those who are happily able to do so, to piece out the inadequate salaries that are paid to those efficient secretaries and clerks by the Government of the United States.

We have increased the salaries of some by a pittance and only a pittance, and they are living here from hand to mouth, so to speak. Two girls came to my office yesterday afternoon who work in the Library here. They were respectable, nice-looking girls. One of them is receiving a salary of \$50 a month, the other a salary of \$60 a month. How they live here now in the city of Washington respectfully, as their appearance indicated they certainly do, is just a little beyond my comprehension. I do not know how it is possible for them to do it.

Let me add, I have here on my desk a request in behalf of the Federal food and drug inspectors of the United States, something that has just been handed me. They want an increase of salary. I have letters this morning from half a dozen classes of public employees, post-office clerks, letter carriers, rural-route carriers, all asking for an increase, and so far as my opinion goes they are all of them deserving of it. The high cost of living and all that sort of thing has borne down most heavily upon the salaried men and women to-day. There has been no opportunity to increase their income, and their expenses have been added to to such an extent that it is most burdensome and oppressive, and I do not see how they get along at all. The whole business public is protesting against the enormous burden of taxation we are now inflicting upon them, and there is a general demand for conservatism in expenditures, and there is great reason for it. We can not reduce expenditures by raising salaries.

So, Mr. President, it becomes to my mind not a question of the deserts or merits of the case with reference to the Federal judiciary but the opportuneness of this request. At another time I would not only be willing to vote to increase the salaries of the Federal judiciary, but I would gladly do so. At this moment, Mr. President, I hesitate to do it, and I shall decline to do so solely because I feel that the time for it is inopportune.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Chamberlain	Curtis	Gay
Beckham	Colt	Fernald	Gronna
Borah	Culberson	France	Hale
Calder	Cummins	Frelinghuysen	Harding

Henderson	Lodge	Penrose	Smith, S. C.
Hitchcock	McCumber	Polindexter	Smoot
Hollis	McKellar	Pollock	Sutherland
Johnson, Cal.	McLean	Pomerene	Swanson
Johnson, S. Dak.	McNary	Ransdell	Thomas
Jones, N. Mex.	Martin, Ky.	Reed	Trammell
Jones, Wash.	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Underwood
Kellogg	Moses	Shafroth	Varilaman
Kirby	Myers	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Knox	New	Simmons	Warren
La Follette	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.	
Lenroot	Overman	Smith, Ga.	
Lewis	Page	Smith, Md.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] has demanded a yea-and-nay vote on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and withhold my vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. He is not present in the Chamber, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. McKELLAR (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). As I stated on the last vote taken, I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). Transferring the pair which I have with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to announce the temporary absence of the Senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN].

Mr. CALDER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], but upon this question I am permitted to vote. Therefore, I let my vote stand.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I transfer that pair to my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD], and vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (after having voted in the negative). I have voted, but I find that my pair, the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] is absent. Being unable to obtain a transfer of that pair, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. KENDRICK]. He is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FARR].

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

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS].

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]; and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] are detained on official business.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], is detained from the Senate by illness.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—37.

Ashurst	Hollis	Page	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Johnson, Cal.	Penrose	Sutherland
Calder	Kellogg	Polindexter	Townsend
Colt	Knox	Pomerene	Underwood
Culberson	Lewis	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Cummins	Lodge	Reed	Warren
Fletcher	McLean	Saulsbury	Weeks
Frelinghuysen	Martin, Ky.	Simmons	
Gay	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	
Henderson	Overman	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—32.

Beckham	Gronna	Jones, Wash.	McNary
Borah	Harding	Kirby	Martin, Va.
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	La Follette	Moses
Fernald	Johnson, S. Dak.	Lenroot	Myers
France	Jones, N. Mex.	McCumber	New

Norris
Nugent
Pollock

Shafroth
Sheppard
Smith, S. C.

Smoot
Swanson
Thomas

Trammell
Vardaman
Williams

NOT VOTING—27.

Baird
Brandegee
Curtis
Dillingham
Fall
Gerry
Goff

Gore
Hale
Hardwick
Kendrick
Kenyon
King
McKellar

Owen
Phelan
Phelan
Robinson
Sherman
Shields
Smith, Md.

Spencer
Sterling
Thompson
Walsh
Watson
Wolcott

So the bill was passed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. KING, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. BRANDEGEE, and Mr. COLT conferees upon the part of the Senate.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO PRINCETON, IND.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10663) to convey a strip of land on the site of the Federal building at Princeton, Ind. I should like to say merely that this is a bill which it will not take one moment to consider. The bill is purely local in its character, and is to enable the city of Princeton, Ind., to open an alley in the rear of the post office. The passage of the bill is desired by the Government as well as by the city of Princeton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey, by quit-claim deed, to the city of Princeton, Ind., for the purpose of a public alley, and for no other purpose, all the right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a strip of land off the rear of the Federal building site in that city 5 feet in width to provide, in connection with land adjacent thereto, a 10-foot alley, and provides that the city of Princeton shall open the alley and improve and maintain it as other public alleys of the city are improved and maintained.

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

FOOD SUPPLIES FOR EUROPE.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 13708, making an appropriation for food relief in Europe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 13708. Is there objection?

Mr. WATSON. What is the bill, Mr. President?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is a bill proposing to appropriate \$100,000,000 for food for the suffering people in the famine districts of Europe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not intend to interpose an objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia. I anticipate, however, that it will, perhaps, take a little time to dispose of the measure which he has in mind, and I was about to ask recognition of the Chair—in fact, I did rise when the Senator from Virginia rose—that I might ask unanimous consent to have taken up for consideration House joint resolution 289, which I am certain can be passed in one or two minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I yield for that purpose.

NATIONAL HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) for the appointment of four members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution named by him. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "That," to strike out the name "M. T. Dwyer" and to insert "George S. Wood"; and at the beginning of line 5 to strike out the name "Henry Hase" and to insert "Menander Dennett," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That George S. Wood, of Ohio; James S. Catherwood, of Illinois; John C. Nelson, of Indiana; and Menander Dennett, of Wisconsin, be, and they are hereby, appointed members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers of the United States, to succeed George H. Wood, of Ohio; James S. Catherwood, of Illinois; John C. Nelson, of Indiana; and John W. West, of Maine, whose terms of office expired April 21, 1918.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, one error has been made in the printing of the joint resolution, and I therefore move, in line 5, to strike out the name "Wisconsin" and to insert "Maine."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia obtained the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Johnson, S. Dak.	McLean	Shafroth
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Martin, Ky.	Sheppard
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Martin, Va.	Smoot
Culberson	Kellogg	Myers	Swanson
Cummins	Kenyon	Nelson	Thomas
Curtis	King	Nugent	Townsend
Fletcher	Kirby	Overman	Trammell
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Page	Underwood
Gay	La Follette	Poinexter	Wadsworth
Henderson	Lenroot	Pollock	Watson
Hitchcock	Lodge	Pomerene	Williams
Hollis	McCumber	Saulsbury	

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the absence of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] on account of illness, and will ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. McNARY] on account of official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-seven Senators only have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. SMITH of Arizona, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, and Mr. WARREN answered to their names when called.

Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. NEW, and Mr. SUTHERLAND entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to announce the necessary absence of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

FOOD SUPPLIES FOR EUROPE.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I renew my request for unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 13708.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 13708. Is there objection?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I object.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill notwithstanding the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 13708, notwithstanding the objection.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 13708) providing for the relief of such populations in Europe, and countries contiguous thereto, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary; which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments on page 2, line 2, after the word "audited," to strike out the words "where practicable"; in line 3, after the word "Government" to strike out the words "are audited"; in line 7, after the word "receipts," to strike out the word "and"; and in the same line, after the word "expenditures," to insert "and an itemized statement for which expended," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the participation by the Government of the United States in the furnishing of foodstuffs and other urgent supplies, and for the transportation, distribution, and administration thereof to such populations in Europe, and countries contiguous thereto, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President from time to time as necessary, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, in the discretion of the President, there is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$100,000,000, which may be used as a revolving fund until June 30, 1919, and which shall be audited in the same manner as other expenditures of the Government: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall be reimbursed so far as possible by the Governments or subdivisions thereof or the peoples to whom relief is furnished: *Provided further*, That a report of

the receipts, expenditures, and an itemized statement for which expended under this appropriation shall be submitted to Congress not later than the first day of the next regular session.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. JONES of Washington and Mr. KENYON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington first addressed the Chair.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was simply going to say that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] I know is very much interested in this measure. I sent for him awhile ago, but he is not here. I had supposed there would be some discussion of the measure.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator from Washington that there will be some discussion. I understood that the Senator from Virginia was going to explain the bill. I wish to make some few remarks against the bill, and I will make them now or after the Senator from Virginia concludes, as he may desire.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is a rather late hour in the afternoon now, and my idea was not to consume any time unless it was absolutely necessary. I was under the impression that this matter was of such public notoriety and of such great importance that every Senator understood it, but, in view of the suggestion made, while I am not going into details, I will, in a very few words, explain the purposes of the bill.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Under what section of the Constitution does the Senator contend that Congress has authority to raise money by taxation and give it away, practically as a gift, to foreign peoples?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary to go into a constitutional argument this afternoon on this matter.

Mr. MYERS. If the Senator will pardon me, if there is any section of the Constitution authorizing it, I should like to have it cited to me.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Similar action by the Government has been taken many, many times. I have a list of the precedents here.

Mr. MYERS. Where money has been appropriated to the people of foreign nations?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. To the people of foreign nations; yes.

Mr. MYERS. Have they not been loans to foreign nations?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. No; they have been donations to relieve the sufferings of citizens of foreign nations.

Mr. MYERS. I should like to hear some of the precedents.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I have a list here; it is a long one, but I will read a few of the precedents, although I confess that I can hardly see that, in the presence of the starvation of millions of our friends in European countries, the Senate will be very much interested in hearing a constitutional argument. I have no doubt about the constitutional power of Congress to afford relief to these sufferers, and I have no doubt that Congress will do it. As I have said, it has been done many, many times. The last time was in 1909, when \$800,000 was appropriated to relieve the sufferings of destitute people in Italy. The act making that appropriation provided:

That to enable the President of the United States to procure and distribute among the suffering and destitute people of Italy such provisions, clothing, medicines, and other necessary articles, and to take such other steps as he shall deem advisable for the purpose of rescuing and succoring the people who are in peril and threatened with starvation, the sum of \$800,000 is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

In the execution of this act the President is requested to ask and obtain the approval of the Italian Government, and he is hereby authorized to employ any vessels of the United States Navy and to charter and employ any other suitable steamship or vessels.

That was the last precedent, having been made in 1909, appropriating \$800,000, not to any government, but to relieve the suffering of destitute people in Italy.

The first precedent was in 1812, when \$50,000 was appropriated for the relief of citizens of Venezuela who had suffered by an earthquake.

Again, in 1847, relief was given in an act from which I quote the following:

The Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to place at the disposal of Capt. George C. De Kay, of New Jersey, the U. S. S. *Macedonian*, for the purpose of transporting to the famishing poor of Ireland and Scotland such contributions as may be made for their relief.

Again in 1871, again in 1880, again in 1897, and again in 1898, in the case of Cuba, similar action was taken by Congress.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an interruption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I notice that the bill, in line 7, refers to "populations in Europe, and countries contiguous thereto, outside of Germany." Is it intended that the money or any part of it appropriated by this proposed act shall be used in feeding our enemies in Turkey, Bulgaria, and Austria-Hungary?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is not intended to use a dollar of this money for our enemies.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I ask in what countries it is to be used?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The President's first telegram states the countries in which it will be used; but it is distinctly understood that it is not to be used for the relief of our enemies. If any food goes to Germany, it will go there by their purchasing it, not by any donation from the United States. We make no provision for Germany or for German citizens in this bill.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President. I am very much opposed to the appropriation of a single dollar for anybody in Germany, Turkey, Bulgaria, or Austria-Hungary; and if the statement is made that they are hungry or that they are suffering, our reply should be, "If there is a shortage of food supplies, your infamous warfare sank the food supplies to the bottom of the sea."

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The only question that would arise would be about Austria-Hungary, and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has an amendment which he will offer to make that clear. I am as much opposed as the Senator from Arizona can be to anything going to Germany or her allies or cobelligerents.

Mr. KING, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I believe the Senator from Utah first addressed the Chair.

Mr. KING. I just want to suggest to the Senator from Arizona that he certainly did not mean that he would not support a proposition that involved expenditures in Turkey; that is, in Turkish territory. The Armenians are there, and hundreds of thousands of Greeks are there, many of whom are starving.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator will let me answer, of course I may not have been very fortunate in my expression. I meant subjects of Turkey, our late antagonist. I think, instead of feeding the Turk, the Ottoman Turk should have been put to the sword for his long list of crimes about a thousand years in length.

Mr. WATSON and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think the Senator from Indiana first addressed the Chair.

Mr. WATSON. I simply wanted to suggest, in reply to what was said by the Senator from Arizona, that we have never been at war with Turkey, nor have we ever been at war with Bulgaria.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, let me answer that, if the Senator pleases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. Just let me answer that one question. We may not technically have been at war with Turkey, but civilization has been at war with Turkey for about a thousand years.

Mr. KING. And we ought to have been.

Mr. ASHURST. And we ought to have been.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the line of demarcation seems to me to be very clear. It was expressed in the President's telegram, "The liberated peoples of Europe." That means northern France; it means Belgium; it means Serbia; and, although they were Turkish subjects, it also means Armenians, and Palestinians, and Syrians, and Poles, and Jugoslavs, if they need it, and Czecho-Slavs, if they need it. The

language of the President was "the liberated peoples"—the peoples that we, with our allies, together liberated.

The Senator from Indiana is perfectly right in saying that even technically we have never been at war with Turkey nor with Bulgaria; and, although technically, if we had been at war with either it might have included all of their subjects, yet it ought not morally to include those subjects who have been rebelling against Turkey and Bulgaria all the time—the Macedonians, for example, who have been trying to get rid of Bulgaria; the Jews in Palestine; the Arabs in Syria; the Greeks in Asia Minor and the Aegean Islands; the Armenians, who have been cruelly outraged in every way in the world in their mountains, over half of them killed, and the other half left starving. So that the language "the liberated peoples of Europe" seems to me to cover the whole situation. We can trust the men who are going to dispense this fund to see that it does not go to our enemies.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There is absolutely no purpose to use any of this fund for the relief of our enemies.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question on the merits of the proposition?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. This is a gift, as I understand it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is not. It is to be used, as far as possible, as a revolving fund. They are to take obligations and securities from all of the governments where it is used where they can possibly be gotten. There may be some few very distressing cases where it may have to go as charity, but they are very few. In the main, it is to be used as a revolving fund, and it is expected that it will ultimately be repaid to the United States.

Mr. WATSON. I should like to ask whether or not either England or France is contributing a like sum, or any other sum, to the same purpose?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator that England and France have been contributing already, liberally, in advance of this arrangement.

Mr. WATSON. To this purpose?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. To this purpose. In one instance there was a shipment of \$3,000,000 worth of flour to those starving countries. The governments of each of the four leading countries—England, France, Italy, and the United States—appointed two members of what they call a supreme council of supplies and distribution. I think—that is near enough, anyhow—to take charge of this matter. They took up the matter and determined that it was urgently necessary to have \$300,000,000 for this purpose. We are called on to contribute \$100,000,000, and that is to be the basis of the fund to which these other nations are to contribute. Italy is not able to do her full proportion, but France and England and Italy will all do something to make up the \$300,000,000 and add \$200,000,000 to the \$100,000,000 contributed by the United States.

Mr. WATSON. And is it understood that Mr. Hoover is to be in charge of the distribution of all of this fund?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. Hoover and Mr. Davis are at the head of this supreme council.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They represent America on it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. No; they are at the head of the whole business.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know it; but the other countries have representatives, too.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Oh, the other countries each have representatives.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Virginia one other question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator has cited some instances where money has been voted by Congress to the people of other nations. Was any obligation accepted from those nations in those instances for the repayment of the money, and was any of it repaid, or was it a donation?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. We could not well exact an obligation when we had not done anything. America has not contributed a dollar as yet.

Mr. MYERS. I say, in these previous instances, historical instances, years ago?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Oh, no. Those sums were donated for the relief of those people.

Mr. MYERS. Was any obligation accepted from the foreign nations?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. None whatever.

Mr. MYERS. The money was never repaid?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. No. It was a donation to relieve starvation in those countries.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator has cited a number of instances of Congress giving away the people's money to the people of foreign countries, but he cites no section of the Constitution which gives authority for doing so.

I just want to say in this connection, if the Senator will permit me, in response to some questions that have been asked as to whom this money is to go to, that the cablegram from the President says that it is to go to the liberated peoples of Austria, Turkey, Poland, and western Russia, and I think in one of the other cablegrams that was exchanged Bulgaria was mentioned. Now, I do not know whom the President may mean by "the liberated peoples of Austria and Turkey." By "the liberated peoples of Turkey" he may mean the masses of the Turkish people. The Turkish Sultan has abdicated, as I understand, and the President may consider that the people of Turkey are thereby liberated. The Emperors of Austria and Germany have abdicated their thrones, and some people may consider that all the people of those two Empires are liberated from autocratic rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator may speculate as to what may be, but I tell him that we have the assurance of the President that none of this money is to go to the enemies of the United States or the allies.

Mr. MYERS. I do not see it anywhere.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Oh, there are a great many cablegrams. I did not bring here every one of them that has come from the President. There is a file of them that high. [Indicating.] I did not think it was necessary.

Mr. MYERS. I should think that in a matter of this kind, where hearings were had, the committee would set forth in the printed report of the hearings all of the light on the subject and all of the communications on the subject.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator will take the trouble to read the hearings he will find ample justification for the request.

Mr. MYERS. I have read the most of them, and I think it is not only a matter worthy of speculation but a matter worthy of the most specific and definite information, and I think the information contained in the hearings is very vague and unsatisfactory.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Well, it may be my fault; but I say very frankly that I do not feel like being ingenious in trying to find a way not to relieve the suffering and death of millions of people who are our allies in Europe. They are dying by the thousands and by the tens of thousands, almost by the millions.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me just a minute? I agree with him if they are our allies.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. They are. I have assured the Senator of that. Not a dollar of this money will go to any people that have not been our allies.

Mr. MYERS. I can not find anything in the President's cablegrams to assure us of that.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There is plenty of it there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It says "the liberated peoples."

Mr. MYERS. But whom would he consider "the liberated peoples"?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Those that we have liberated.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator consider the people of Turkey liberated because the Sultan has abdicated?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should speak of the Armenians and Syrians as being liberated from the rule of Turkey.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, the President's cablegram specifically states that not a dollar of this money is to go to our enemies. It is to relieve the suffering and starvation of those who have been fighting this battle in Europe with us and with our allies. Nobody contemplates using one dollar of it for any other purpose than purely to relieve the suffering and death of those who have stood in the battle line with us.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the object is to feed the poor, starving people, not only of those countries that were in the battle line, but in other countries also, as I understood the request. In other words, this relief is supposed to quiet the people in the countries in which bolshevism is rampant.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Just wait until I get through.

Mr. MYERS. I should like to ask a question at this point.
Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Virginia yielded to me, and I am making this statement in his time. I think part of this relief is to be used in Austria.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Undoubtedly. The President says so in the cablegram I have in my hand.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, they were not fighting for us in the battle line.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. No; but they were allied with us. They were with us.

Mr. MYERS. I should like to know what people in Austria were allied with us in this war.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Why, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Bohemians contributed in large measure to the victory that has been won. The Czecho-Slovaks were technically Austrian subjects, but we went to all lengths to recognize them, and yet they were part of Austria, and so were the Poles part of Austria.

Mr. MYERS. They are not in Austria now. They have succeeded from Austria.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They are technically part of Austria until the peace conference remakes the map of Europe. They are the liberated peoples of Austria. The Czechs are, and so are the Poles. They are liberated from Germany, they are liberated from Austria, and they are liberated from Russia; and they have been known all through the correspondence and the discussion as "the liberated peoples."

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator what people who were our allies have been liberated from Turkey and Bulgaria?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Armenians are technically liberated, and so are some of the Greeks.

Mr. MYERS. Are they liberated? When were they liberated?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They are liberated in the sense that they are under some protection whereby the Turks have been compelled to stop their persecution of the Armenians; and under the terms of the armistice and undoubtedly at the peace table protection will be given for the Armenians as well as for the Poles and the Czecho-Slovaks and the Jugo-Slavs. They are known as the liberated peoples of those countries, and they have to some extent already a government of their own. The Polish Government has been established; the Czecho-Slovak Government has been established; and each of those Governments will be able to give to the United States either its securities, or possibly even money, to reimburse in part this revolving fund.

It seems to me that it is very clear that the money provided in this bill is intended to be used for the relief of those people who are now struggling into national existence.

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

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I was only taking the time of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to ask the Senator how long we are to keep this feeding going in order to preserve peace in Europe? War may break out again. If so, are we expected to continue to feed these people?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We are not expected to do it at all; but we are now in the act of concluding the war, and as a measure of concluding the war it is important to give an element of permanency to the new governments of the liberated peoples, and food is more important at the present time than bullets. Food will do more than anything else to bring about order and bring about hope and bring about confidence in these struggling peoples who are trying to get upon their feet. I believe it is the cheapest possible expenditure of the war measures; and I certainly think there can be no criticism of the President for having adopted not only a humane but a wise measure to promote peace.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, Mr. SHERLEY, the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, and myself united in a cablegram to the President for information about this matter, and I will read his reply:

I can not too earnestly or solemnly urge upon the Congress the appropriation for which Mr. Hoover has asked for the administration of food relief. Food relief is now the key to the whole European situation and to the solution of peace. Bolshevism is steadily advancing westward, has overwhelmed Poland, and is poisoning Germany. It can not be stopped by force, but it can be stopped by food, and all the leaders with whom I am in conference agree that concerted action in this matter is of immediate and vital importance. The money will not be spent for food for Germany itself, because Germany can buy its food, but it will be spent for financing the movement of food to our real friends in

Poland and to the people of the liberated units of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and to our associates in the Balkans. I beg that you will present this matter with all possible urgency and force to the Congress. I do not see how we can find definite powers with whom to conclude peace unless this means of stemming the tide of anarchy be employed.

I have another cablegram, which was sent to the Secretary of State and sent to me by him:

Extended investigation and consideration of the food situation in certain parts of Europe disclose that especially the urban populations in certain areas are not only faced with absolute starvation during the coming winter, but that many of these populations are unable to find immediate resources with which to purchase their food. These regions have been so subjected to destruction by war, not only of their foodstuffs but of their financial resources and their power of production and export, that they are utterly incapable of finding any resources that can be converted into international exchange for food purchases. While the Secretary of the Treasury can accept obligations of certain Governments, and through these measures their situations can be cared for temporarily, there are still other areas through eastern and southern Europe where such arrangements can not be made. This applies more particularly to the liberated peoples of Austria, Turkey, Poland, and western Russia. In these countries freedom and government will slowly emerge from chaos, and require our every assistance.

The total shipments of foodstuffs from the United States to all parts of Europe during the next seven months will be likely to exceed one and one-half billion dollars, and from our abundance we can surely afford to offer succor to these countries destitute of resources or credit. The minimum sum upon which this work can be carried on for the next six months in the countries above mentioned will amount to at least \$100,000,000 for such services and supplies as we can render, and even this sum contemplates the finding of resources by so much of the populations as can do so and so much assistance as can be given by the allied Governments. The high mission of the American people to find a remedy for starvation and absolute anarchy renders it necessary that we should undertake the most liberal assistance to these destitute regions.

The situation is one of extreme urgency, for foodstuffs must be placed in certain localities within the next 15 or 30 days if human life and order are to be preserved. I therefore request that you should ask Congress to make available to me an immediate appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the broad purpose of providing foodstuffs and other urgent supplies, for the transportation, distribution, and administration thereof to such populations in Europe, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by me from time to time as necessary. I wish to appeal to the great sense of charity and good will of the American people toward the suffering and to place this act upon a primarily humanitarian basis of the first magnitude. While the sum of money is in itself large, it is so small compared to the expenditures we have undertaken in the hope of bettering the world that it becomes a mere pittance compared to the results that will be obtained from it and the lasting effect that will remain in the United States through an act of such broad humanity and statesmanlike influence.

There are many other communications here from Mr. Hoover and from the President; but the sum and substance of it all is that a large part of the people of those countries in Europe which have been friendly and are still friendly to the United States are in a destitute condition. They are without food. They are starving. The men and women, and particularly the children, are dying from starvation; and we are asked to contribute \$100,000,000, which is to be used as far as possible as a revolving fund, and most of it, it is believed, will be returned to the United States ultimately. Doubtless there will have to be an extended credit in some of the countries involved. The question is simply whether or not the people of the United States are willing to advance this \$100,000,000, and, if need be, give a reasonable part of it. Some of it will have to go as charity; but most of it will be returned and will be used as a revolving fund.

The President has presented this matter very strongly, and I have numerous cablegrams here from him, from Mr. Hoover, and from the American mission. I suppose that means our peace representatives. The cablegrams are signed "American mission."

The fact is that anarchy is prevailing there. In many places there is nobody to treat with. There is a practical necessity to rehabilitate these European countries with whom we must soon make a treaty, so that something may be done to stem the wave of bolshevism and anarchy that is following the path of war in Europe. The question is simply whether the United States is willing to make this contribution, with the expectation that almost all of it will ultimately be returned to this country.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Perhaps the Senator has explained this, and I did not hear it on account of the confusion. Do I understand that other nations in Europe are cooperating with the United States in this benefaction?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. They are. England, France, Italy, and the United States have each appointed two commissioners to take charge of this matter. They are cooperating in providing this fund and distributing it to the suffering communities. They do not say exactly what the basis is, but the distinct ar-

arrangement is that they are to contribute along with the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. The first cablegram by the State Department states that it will take \$350,000,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Then they got it down to \$300,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Then the last cablegram that came reduced that amount to \$300,000,000. Upon that basis America is to contribute one-third and England and France and Italy are to divide the other two-thirds among themselves.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do.

Mr. BORAH. So far as these statements are concerned that it will take \$300,000,000 or \$350,000,000, it is just as much speculation on the part of those who sign the cablegram as it is upon our part who vote for this bill. This is just the beginning; that is all.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I think the Senator is entirely mistaken. Men who went into these various countries made an estimate as to the amount that would be required. It is not such a guess as we would make here, but it is an estimate carefully prepared by experts who have been sent into all of these countries to get us information; and I am sure this will be the end of it. There is no expectation that we shall be called upon for any further sum. I have not the slightest idea that we shall be.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator another question. He may have answered it before I came in. Is this money to be expended through a commission?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is.

Mr. TOWNSEND. And that is the commission of which Mr. Hoover is the head?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. He and Mr. Davis, from this country, are the head of that joint commission from the four allied countries.

Mr. TOWNSEND. And they have absolute authority as to its distribution?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. They will have absolute authority, under the direction of the President. The President is responsible for it. It is put under his authority. He delegates it to others, but he is responsible for it to the Congress. This bill provides that he shall account to Congress for it, and he ought to.

I will read another telegram:

The British are already furnishing from Army stocks food and clothing relief to Serbia and Syria; the Italians to south Austria; the British and French are advancing the money for transport Belgian relief. Allies are willing and anxious to do all they can, and have and will contribute to the full extent of their resources, but must be borne in mind that most of the food must be purchased in the United States, and American money would be used for such purchase and transportation.

Your 107 as to using this revolving fund. It would in effect be such a fund, but it must be borne in mind that it would ultimately be absorbed in giving credits possibly over long periods, to such peoples and institutions as our Treasury could not properly advance under the law, and some of it would be lost in sheer charity. This is not to replace Treasury advances to England, Belgium, France, Italy, Serbia, and Roumania Governments for the purchase of American food. The proposed appropriation would be entirely insufficient for these purposes. Might, however, later on be used to partially replace loans to Serbia and Roumania, but their urgent needs must in any event be cared for by the Treasury pending this appropriation. The matter is most urgent, and forms the foundation for any complete arrangement with the allies fixing their participation.

You see the exact per cent which these other countries are to furnish could not be gone into until it was known what we were going to appropriate. If we appropriate \$100,000,000, it is a basis for determination as to what the others will contribute, but they are to make up \$300,000,000.

There needs be great emphasis to all American officials and Congress that the armistice has left us large surplus of food, that if we are to dispose of it we are to give credits, and that as the Nation trying to put peace on high-level ideas on which we went into war, we can not be niggardly in the world's greatest problem to-day; that is, how to get food. I need not repeat that strong liberal relief is to-day the only hope of stemming the tide of bolshevism without the expenditure of lives and vast sums for military action. While it is urgently necessary to dispose of our surplus foods in order to relieve congestion and protect the producers from disaster and the consequent chaotic results, it is most fortunate for the saving of human lives that we have this surplus, and our country can not afford to fail to meet both emergencies.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I stated yesterday when the chairman of the committee made his report that there would be a minority report filed in the matter. I expected then that it would be filed, but the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]

has been confined to his home by sickness and the minority report has not been prepared. He and I had discussed the question of filing such report. I think having made that statement I perhaps owe a duty to the Senate to present the views at least partially that would have been presented in a minority report.

Mr. President, I know how unpopular it is to oppose any appeal for humanity. I think I am moved as much as anyone by appeals to aid suffering and distress, and there is suffering and distress in Europe. I have observed heretofore with what cheerful alacrity we are willing to vote charity out of other people's pockets. The fundamental objection to this whole matter is that we are compelling people in this country through taxation or bonds to give their money to a charity abroad. I say it is unpopular to oppose it. I know it is. I know it is unpopular in portions of my State, but I feel that the matter should be thoroughly discussed, so Congress may be fully advised in voting money for foreign charity.

We may as well be perfectly frank about these appropriation bills. Personally I shall be glad if we do not have to have an extra session, but I am not going to be a party to hurriedly passing appropriation bills through this body as we shall have to do in order to avoid an extra session. These appropriation bills will come over, I suppose, about the middle of February and that will necessitate that they must be immediately passed in order to avoid an extra session, but I serve notice now, as far as I am concerned, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, that the appropriation bills are going to have a very thorough investigation. I know no reason why the appropriation bills should originate in the House. There is no provision of the Constitution providing for that. We have been adjourning here from day to day and when we have been in session it has been chiefly listening to speeches. I do not know why we could not be working on the appropriation bills now. So much for that.

While there is hunger and dissatisfaction abroad and suffering, there is also suffering in this country. There are over 270,000 men out of employment in certain large centers in this country at this moment; and while I believe in aiding the suffering and distress abroad, I think we are rapidly approaching the time when we shall have to pay a little attention to our own country.

The reasons for this appropriation are indefinite. There are a number of telegrams—some from the President, I think one from Mr. Hoover, of the Food Administration, and one from the American mission. Coupling these with the testimony of Mr. Glasgow before the House committee and the Senate committee, it is difficult to get at the real reason for this appropriation. I shall, in my discussion, accept the President's reason for it. No study of the situation in Europe has come to us. They are all indefinite statements. Men who have visited different parts of Europe report to Mr. Hoover and Mr. Hoover in return must report to the President, and the President only knows of this as he gets it from Mr. Hoover.

This, perhaps, is a result of that secret diplomacy that is going on across the sea, which I believe the American people are strongly against and the sentiment of the Senate is strongly against. If I had my way about secret diplomacy I would wish that the President of the United States might serve notice upon those nations there that if they insist in their secret diplomacy against his point for open covenants he with his staff will return to this country and withdraw our Army from Europe and let Europe go ahead and take care of their business through their methods of secret diplomacy. I think that would end secret diplomacy. Strength to the President in his fight against secret diplomacy!

Under these telegrams we may well inquire, Is this money needed because of famine? Is it needed to assist in bringing about peace? Is it to assist in maintaining the prices of surplus products? I do not say that the latter is correct, but I do want to know. Mr. Hoover gets down in his telegram to the proposition that here is a great surplus of products. One telegram mentions pork products in the hands of the packers; further, that the people must be fed, and that we can maintain these steady standards of prices of pork products and at the same time feed those people, a consummation perhaps devoutly to be wished.

I only refer to that because I say this record calls upon us to expend \$100,000,000, which when spent is gone. Do not let us think it is ever coming back. Let us not deceive ourselves about revolving funds. The bill merely provides that it may be a revolving fund. This amount is but a drop in the bucket if we are going to undertake to feed the people of Europe. How long are we to feed them? If we are going to keep on feeding them for months, well and good; let us face it and not deceive ourselves. When the next \$100,000,000 comes along in 60 or 90

days let us not object to that if we are going to set this precedent now. If the world understands that this country is to feed all peoples, whether they work or not, we shall have a very busy time.

There is no arrangement shown by these dispatches with the allies, but there is some reference in the late telegrams which the Senator from Virginia has read of some \$300,000,000 to be divided in some way. One of the other telegrams said: "It is believed that France and England and possibly Italy will unite in this work." They are just as much interested in this work as we are. Why should they not do their share. There ought to be before we appropriate this money, which the taxpayers of this country have to pay, some understanding, if it be appropriated, as to what we are going to do and what the other nations are going to do. Let us get out of the clouds and down to bedrock on this.

There was a statement in the Washington Times a few days ago, which appears in the committee hearings, which has not been denied, as to the real purpose of this appropriation, namely, that England has repudiated her contracts as to buying pork and has secured her meats from Argentina, and consequently there are great products of pork over there that can not be used, and, if lost, would very seriously interfere with the packers' profits as well as be a serious thing for those who need them.

There is no commission provided for the expenditure of this money. There is the organization of the Red Cross, with 5,000 agents in Europe, which has been diligent in feeding those people. They might be able to handle this fund. But, no, it is put in the hands, practically, of Mr. Hoover. I do not join for one instant in the onslaught upon Mr. Hoover. I think he has done a great work. The expenses of his bureau have been enormous—some \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000. The expense of handling this fund in this way will be enormous. A commission would be far better than one man.

Gentlemen are already in Europe with retinues, stenographers, and complete office forces, arranging to take charge of these matters. It may be a good deal like the expenditure of missionary funds, where the cost is so great to get aid to the poor heathen. These are preliminary matters to my main objection.

The basis upon which I place my objection is that Congress has no right to take the money of the people by taxation and give it away in charity outside of this country. I do not feel at all certain that they can do so in this country, though an argument was made in the House in the Russian relief situation away back 18 years ago that while we could not do that for a situation in our own country, where the Constitution applied, we could do it as to a foreign country, because the Constitution did not apply there. That proposition was seriously urged by a very prominent lawyer in the House.

There has never been an appeal to the American people for any charity relating to this war to which they have not responded. If there had been an appeal to the American people for charity and they had not responded and people were starving over there, I think I should be willing to go beyond what I believe is our right under the doctrine that necessity knows no law, because it is pretty hard when there is a surplus of wheat or food in this world to think that people are starving. When we do that, however, and take property in taxes we are engaged in Bolshevik legislation.

But if this matter were made an appeal to the American people there would not be any question about raising this money, and raising it very quickly, by private donations. There is an appeal now for Armenia of \$40,000,000. That will be raised in this country speedily. Under this bill money can be used out of this fund for Armenia, and people who have been patriotic and liberal in raising that money for Armenia will be taxed again just the same.

If the Government is to do these things, why have any funds like the one for the relief of Armenia? Why not levy taxes for the Red Cross and the Young Men's Christian Association and the Knights of Columbus and the Jewish institutions, and every other matter of that sort? Why submit these appeals to the people? In fact, if we start taxation for any of these purposes, why not taxation for all? If it is urgent in one case, it is in the others.

The Senator from Virginia has cited some precedents. It is true we appropriated money to Italy. There may be other instances. I want to call his attention to another precedent. The people of this country raised a large amount of corn and oats in the Middle West in 1892 to send across to Russia. Russia was starving. The Senate passed a joint resolution appropriating \$100,000 for the Government to charter boats and take these grains to the starving people of Russia. That resolution went to the House. The matter is very interesting

as to the position taken by the Democrats of the House, on the fundamental democratic doctrine as there enunciated—that we had no right to tax the people of this country and give away what was secured in taxes to charity.

I am merely referring to this as an historic incident and not in any partisan way. I am not much of a partisan. If Senators had time to follow that debate in the House, and what little there was of debate in the Senate, they would find it, I think, of great interest. In the Senate, Senator HARRISON of Tennessee said:

I shall not object to the present consideration of the joint resolution. It is a charity that is bound to command the respect of all intelligent and charitable people, but believing as I do that I, as a Senator, have no right to tax the people to put money in the Treasury to appropriate to this or any other charity, I shall feel bound to vote against the joint resolution.

There were only nine Senators who voted against it, but when the matter came to the House it received more consideration. Several times there was an attempt to secure unanimous consent for its consideration. It never was secured. The appeal of President Harrison to Congress for the relief of the starving people of Russia was placed in the RECORD. It was just as intense an appeal as is now made by the President.

Mr. Bryan, who is known as a Democrat of standing, made a speech on that question calling attention to the fact that on this same Democratic doctrine, when an effort was made to furnish food to the drought-stricken people of Nebraska, Congress denied it. Mr. Blount, of Georgia, discussed the legal phases of the matter, and Mr. Kilgore, of Texas, remarked that as we seemed to be trying to take care of all the people of the world we had better begin taking care of the people at home. A pertinent suggestion now.

A motion was made to strike out the appropriation of \$100,000. Mind you, the Government was not paying for the grain. That had been donated by the people of Iowa, Nebraska, Illinois, and Minnesota, and all that was asked was \$100,000 of public money to charter ships to take those grains to the starving people in Russia. Senators now in this body who were Members of the House at that time voted to strike out that \$100,000, and it went out, and not one cent was appropriated by Congress for that purpose.

So in my contention that we have no right to do this I am supported by very distinguished precedents of the House of Representatives and almost the unanimous Democratic vote of that body. These matters will all be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 23, Part I, pages 110 to 207.

Mr. President, there is another embarrassing thing about this beside the question of being against the appeals of humanity. I will go into my own pocket in proportion to what I have in this world just as deeply as any other Senator to give to any kind of a charity for humanity, and if my brother in the world is starving and women are hungry and little children are in distress they can have all I possess; but I am not willing to compel somebody else who may have a different view of his rights to give to charity if he does not want to do it.

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

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. May not the illustration or precedent to which the Senator invited our attention, where \$100,000 was asked for the purpose of carrying foodstuffs to Russia, be distinguished from the case at bar? May not the present appropriation rest upon a sounder basis than that of mere charity, if you say that it is necessary and proper as a war measure? To illustrate, we have been at war with Austria-Hungary. Austria-Hungary is now disintegrated, and upon the ruins of that empire there are being erected two or perhaps four independent governments. Unquestionably the prolongation of difficulties there depends largely upon whether or not the people have sufficient for their maintenance. If they are starving there will be unrest, internecine strife, revolution, and warfare. There might be a recrudescence upon the part of the people of that land against the allied Governments, all of which would necessitate our Government retaining troops in Europe for a longer period of time. The same may be true in a measure of Poland. There will be erected, it is to be hoped, a republic, the Republic of Poland. If there shall be war in Poland, if there shall be controversy between Germany and Poland or between the Bolsheviks and Poland, unquestionably that will require American troops to remain longer in Europe.

I suggest for the consideration of the Senator, without expressing any opinion one way or the other, may we not rest this appropriation upon the foundation that it is a war measure, that it conduces to peace and to facilitate the withdrawal of American troops from the Continent of Europe?

Mr. KENYON. Of course, the Senator knows we have loaned to the Czecho-Slovak Government, I think, \$7,000,000. We have

made no such loan to the Jugo-Slavs, because that government has not yet been established. We have loaned to Serbia \$15,000,000, I think. If we loan to these Governments carrying on this work that is a different proposition. What the Senator says is true with reference to the Jugo-Slavs and Poland. Roumania has a Government, and we have loaned to Roumania. We have loaned to those nations as if there were no limit to our pocket-book. I have found no fault with it. It seems to be essential. It is time now to be sure of what we are doing, and the taxpayers of the country have a right to insist that we do know. It is easy to be generous with other people's money.

Mr. THOMAS. Does not the argument of the Senator tend to establish the proposition that those loans were beyond our power to make?

Mr. KENYON. I have thought a good deal about that. Those loans were made strictly during the time of war. The war is now over, according to the President's messages to Congress.

Mr. THOMAS. The armistice has been signed, but the war is technically still in existence.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; the war is technically still existing; that is true. Those loans were for strictly purposes of the war. This donation can not be in any way for the purposes of the war. I might ask the Senator from Colorado if he believes these loans were legal?

Mr. THOMAS. I have had some question about it.

Mr. KENYON. So have I; but it has been one of those things during war times which we were not going to question.

I started to say that in addition to this there is another embarrassment in opposing this measure. It is not a pleasant pursuit. I know it is not going to get anywhere. I suppose there will be very few votes against it. But the charge has been made that it is embarrassing to the President. I have tried to stand behind the President during this war and have realized that he was President and would be for the next two years. I have indulged in a good many eulogies of the wisdom and far-sightedness of the President. I do not want to be placed in a position, and will not be, of embarrassing him in any way; but I do retain the right to speak my views on a matter of this kind, and I am willing to be lectured for not following the President by anyone except those who have voted against woman suffrage, when he stood up here and insisted that he needed that to make the war a success. I draw the line of criticism at any gentleman who did that.

The President in one of his messages speaks of stopping bolshevism. "This is necessary to stop bolshevism." I do not know whether if you feed them they can fight better or whether that is going to stop it, but I like his plan of stopping it by feeding them better than the plan of a distinguished Republican, who would stop it by shooting them. You will stop bolshevism not by feeding them, you will stop it by removing injustices, and that is the way you will stop it in this country. Make no mistake about that.

I want to know further how the other funds which we have been voting here with such cheerful alacrity have been expended. That is a reasonable request. The Fuel Administration has been paying out expenses at the rate of something like \$58,000 a month. The Food Administration has had enormous expenses. The Creel bureau sends us in some kind of a statement from which nobody can figure out what has been expended or to whom. I say we have a right, if we are not going to be told just how this money is to be spent, to inquire how other funds which we have voted here have been spent.

I want to call attention to one thing that was brought up in the House the other day showing how some of it has been spent.

A very interesting corporation was organized in the State of Connecticut, called the War Trade Board of the United States Russian Bureau, Incorporated. I have here the articles of incorporation and a certificate of its incorporation. This was organized to help to feed and to help to transport food in Russia. The chairman of the Democratic National Committee was president of this corporation. I do not refer to that in any partisan sense nor do I attach any importance to the fact that the nephew of the Secretary of State was secretary and treasurer of this corporation. It is a wonderful corporation. Here are some of the things it can do. The name of the corporation is the War Trade Board of the United States Russian Bureau, Incorporated. I will only say in this connection that \$5,000,000 of the funds which we voted to the President were set aside as available to this corporation.

The corporation is to be located in the town of Hartford, Conn.

The nature of the business to be transacted and the purposes to be promoted or carried out by said corporation are as follows:

1. To engage in the business of buying, selling, importing, and exporting goods, wares, and merchandise of every description, and all kinds of personal property, and to carry on a general mercantile and commercial business in any part of the world.

2. To engage in any and all kinds of manufacturing, and to acquire, hold, lease, and sell all lands, buildings, machinery and equipment, and all raw materials and supplies necessary to or useful in the conduct of any such business in any part of the world.

3. To search for, prospect, explore, purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire, own, develop, work, operate, sell, lease, mortgage, or otherwise dispose of any and all agricultural, grazing, timber, or other lands, mineral deposits, mines, mining properties, collieries, and quarries, and the products and by-products thereof, all in any part of the world.

Some corporation, this, to relieve Russia.

4. To cultivate, cut, mine, crush, smelt, concentrate, refine, treat, prepare for market, buy, sell, exchange, export, import, trade and deal in any and all agricultural products, timber and timber products, oil, petroleum, coal, iron, metals, phosphates, nitrates, minerals, precious stones, and materials and products and by-products of all kinds, all in any part of the world.

5. To build, construct, complete, equip, purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire, hold, own, manage, operate, maintain, mortgage, sell, or otherwise dispose of hotels, apartment houses, boarding and lodging houses, restaurants, stores, shops, and places of public entertainment or amusement, all in any part of the world outside of the State of Connecticut.

The only thing they can not do is to operate barber shops, which is the greatest necessity among the Bolsheviki of Russia.

6. To build, construct, complete, equip, purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire, hold, own, manage, operate, maintain, mortgage, sell, or otherwise dispose of railways, telephone and telegraph systems, gas and electric light and power works, plants, and systems, and any other plants, machinery, or works for the production, manufacture, transmission, and distribution of light or energy of every nature and description, and to furnish and sell gas, electricity, steam, and any other kind of substance or energy used for lighting, heating, or power purposes, all in any part of the world outside of the State of Connecticut.

7. To build, construct, complete, equip, purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire, hold, own, maintain, operate, mortgage, sell, or otherwise dispose of, or turn to account, reservoirs, water powers, dams, flumes, watercourses, aqueducts, water rights, canals, irrigation systems, sewage, drainage and sanitary works, waterworks, and to furnish and sell water and water power, all in any part of the world outside of the State of Connecticut.

8. To promote, finance, build, construct, complete, equip, purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire, hold, own, operate, maintain, mortgage, sell, or otherwise dispose of wharves, piers, docks, bulkheads, dry docks, basins, tugs, floats, lighters, storehouses, warehouses, elevators, oil tanks, and other terminal facilities of all kinds, all in any part of the world outside of the State of Connecticut.

9. To build, equip, buy, own, lease, operate, and sell steamships, sailing vessels, and any and all other kinds of craft or instrumentalities used or to be used in the business of transporting freight or passengers upon water, and, in any part of the world outside of the State of Connecticut, to operate the same and engage in the transportation of or in the business of transporting freight or passengers.

What is the use of the Interstate Commerce Committee spending any time on the railroad question? This corporation can handle that except in Connecticut—

10. To take and receive upon deposit, as bailee, for safe-keeping and storage, jewelry, plate, money—

To help Russia—

specie, bullion, stocks, bonds, securities and valuable papers of any kind, and other valuable personal property, and to guarantee their safety, upon such terms and for such compensation as may be agreed upon by it and the respective bailors thereof, and to let out vaults, safes, and other receptacles, all in any part of the world outside of the State of Connecticut.

To help Russia.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. REED. If Connecticut is going to discriminate in this matter, I think we ought to serve notice on the Senators from that State to come to the Chamber.

Mr. KENYON. They probably know about this. This document continues:

11. To make loans or advances, either ordinary or privileged, either with or without security, at such rates of interest as may be agreed upon between the corporation and the borrower, either for ordinary banking or commercial purposes or for the special purpose of facilitating mining, agricultural, and industrial operations and public utilities, all in any part of the world outside of the State of Connecticut.

12. Outside of the State of Connecticut, to act as fiscal or transfer agent of any Government, municipality, or body politic, or corporation, and in such capacity to receive and disburse money, transfer, register, and countersign certificates of stock, bonds, or other evidences of indebtedness.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In that connection I should like again to inquire how much of the money which has been appropriated by Congress has been turned over to this corporation?

Mr. KENYON. Five million dollars of the funds that we voted the President have been made available for this corporation. I do not mean to say that it has been spent, though some of it has been.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should not think that that would be nearly enough to do all of those things.

Mr. KENYON. I do not think it will be enough. I think, perhaps, they may be anticipating more.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Iowa know, as a matter of fact, that the money will not be spent? I am rather amazed to have the Senator criticize this effort which was planned for a peaceful penetration of Russia, having for its purpose the bringing to the Russian people the

commodities they needed and were in dire distress for lack of, when the sole purpose of the corporation was simply to carry out a beneficent purpose of the Government to do those things.

Mr. KENYON. If that be true, I wonder why these articles of incorporation had to apply to any part of the world?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, the Senator knows very well that lawyers drawing up articles of incorporation are sure to make them comprehensive enough to contemplate everything.

Mr. KENYON. I am sure that they did so in this case.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What possible harm has come from that and what possible harm could come from it? It seems to me that the Senator is making a very unfair attack upon an administration which is confronted with the most stupendous difficulties. Some citizens of this country are objecting to a military penetration of Russia, and the Senator stands here now and criticizes the administration for having planned at one time, under the instruction of the President, a commercial penetration of Russia for the purpose of bringing relief to a country that was fairly weltering in distress and misery, many of whose social and political crimes were growing out of that misery, and that misery being availed of by the German enemy to organize the country against the United States and the allied nations. What possible good can come from taking up the time when this bill is before the Senate in criticizing that effort, which finally had to be abandoned?

Mr. KENYON. What relief did this corporation bring to Russia?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from Iowa is very well aware of the strong sentiment in this country that if only the United States could become the instrument of bringing relief to the people of Russia—bringing them shoes and food and clothes and the things that they were without—it would be possible to bring the Russian people to sanity, and that it would be possible to save the Russian people from German domination. Now, the Senator from Iowa stands here and criticizes the Government for making the effort. What does the Senator propose? What has he proposed? One Senator on the other side of the Chamber criticizes the administration for resorting to military force of the mildest sort, and the Senator now stands here and criticizes the administration for resorting to peaceful means in an endeavor to save Russia.

Mr. KENYON. There is no use of getting excited about it. The Senator from Nebraska is throwing more light on this Russian corporation than we have heretofore had. It is very interesting to know why they did not carry out their plans when the money was put at their disposal. Why did they not save Russia, as the Senator has suggested? Why did they not get shoes to Russia? Why did they not get food to Russia? They had plenty of money to do it, but evidently they did not accomplish very much.

Perhaps it may be called criticizing, but I was simply reading the articles of incorporation, if that was a criticism. I do think the articles themselves are a criticism of any board standing for them.

Mr. THOMAS rose.

Mr. KENYON. Just a moment. I am saying that we have the right to an accounting of the way this money goes, and I shall stand here and urge that whenever I feel like doing so.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa state the date of the articles of incorporation?

Mr. KENYON. The articles of incorporation are dated on the 6th day of November, 1918.

Mr. THOMAS. Just a few days before the armistice.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; that is true. The names of the incorporators are in the document, three men who it was stated before the committee were clerks and dummies.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if he knows whether or not in the formation of this corporation the laws of Connecticut were violated, as the laws of the State of New York were violated very clearly, as the evidence before the subcommittee of the Public Buildings and Grounds showed, by the United States Housing Corporation in the manner in which it was incorporated?

Mr. KENYON. I do not know about violating the laws of the State of Connecticut; but I do believe, as a lawyer, that public funds appropriated for the use of the President can not be turned over to a private corporation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me, I desire to say I think that these articles of incorporation were made under the laws of the State of Connecticut.

Mr. KENYON. They were.

Mr. THOMAS. And those laws provide those exceptions for general corporations which apply to the State of Connecticut.

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Generally speaking, as to the corporations created under the laws of the State of New Jersey, under the statutes of the State it is provided that no railroads shall be built within the limits of the State under the provisions of incorporation; so there seems to be a compliance with the laws of the particular Commonwealth in both instances, the exceptions being due to the law and not to the intention or desire of the incorporators.

Mr. KENYON. The corporation was evidently incorporated under the laws of Connecticut, because of the broader power granted by the State of Connecticut, just as many corporations are incorporated in New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS. What I am speaking about particularly is that corporations created under modern statutes in some of the States may comprise every pursuit on the face of the earth—

Mr. KENYON. I think that is true.

Mr. THOMAS. But for the protection of local corporations it is required that the exceptions be expressly stated.

Mr. KENYON. I think that is true; but the Senator does not understand, does he, that the statutes of Connecticut require that all of these things shall be put into the articles of incorporation?

Mr. THOMAS. They do not require that, no; but they permit it.

Mr. KENYON. They permit it, yes; but I see no reason for permitting it if nothing was to be done in this instance except as to Russia.

Mr. THOMAS. I see no reason for permitting it in any event.

Mr. KENYON. No.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will pardon me, the question was raised that this incorporation was brought into being for the purpose of keeping down discontent in Russia. The articles of incorporation were filed in the month of November. Of course, there has been no substantial change in the Russian situation since the month of November, for, while the armistice was signed after the date of these articles of incorporation, nevertheless that armistice had very little to do with the Russian situation. If it was necessary to get relief into Russia at the time these articles were filed, it would seem to me the same physical conditions now exist there. What I am anxious to know is whether this incorporation is going on to meet the conditions and to supply the necessities or whether the corporation has been substantially abandoned, if the Senator from Iowa knows?

Mr. KENYON. I do not know. I have heard the chairman of the committee state that the corporation would be dissolved. That is all I know about it.

Mr. REED. Was the reason stated, if I may inquire?

Mr. KENYON. No; I think not. Perhaps the chairman of the committee can say why.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, a little history of the affair will clarify that very easily.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, I am perfectly willing that the Senator from Nebraska shall interrupt me for a question or for reasonable remarks, but—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will not impose on the Senator's time.

Mr. KENYON. I am about to conclude.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The plan was initiated on the 5th of October, when the President issued an Executive order in which he said:

By virtue of the authority vested in me by an act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1918, appropriating the sum of \$50,000,000 for the national security and defense, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, to be expended at the discretion of the President, I hereby set aside \$5,000,000—

For this purpose. So that the act of the President took place when we were at war with Germany, and it was done under his power, given in the act of national defense for war purposes, that he sought to use this money for the commercial penetration of Russia, for the purpose of quieting Russia, and for the purpose of turning Russia into an ally in the war against Germany. It is very obvious that that purpose ceased when the armistice was signed a short time thereafter.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will pardon a further interruption—

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. REED. Do I understand the Senator from Nebraska to mean—I am not asking this in any controversial manner at all; I want to get at the facts—that the real purpose here was to afford relief to suffering in Russia or was the real purpose to use this money so that the Russians would cease to be an ally of Germany?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I take it it was to use the money for the purpose of converting Russia into friendly territory as against Germany. Germany was making use of the distress of Russia, which bred the Bolshevik idea, and the Bolshevik idea was

working for Germany's interests. The purpose was by this friendly penetration, by the sending of American products into Russia and the bringing of Russian products out of Russia in exchange for them, to promote trade and create a prosperity that could not come about from natural causes.

Mr. REED. And it was proposed to do that with \$5,000,000?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The work was to start with a fund of \$5,000,000, which was to be a revolving fund.

Mr. REED. I do not speak by the card, and I do not believe that anybody does, unless it may be the Senator from Nebraska. All the statements I have ever heard made about the purpose of this corporation were to the effect that there was great suffering in Russia and that it was intended to relieve that suffering. That is the reason I asked the question a few moments ago whether the same physical conditions did not exist to-day in Russia substantially that existed when these articles of incorporation were filed?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But we have come to the end of the war, substantially.

Mr. REED. Yes; but people are starving there; and is it not proposed to use a part of the \$100,000,000 now proposed to be appropriated in parts of Russia, I should like to ask?

Mr. KENYON. It is; yes.

Mr. REED. So that it will not do to say that the necessity for this corporation has ceased if it ever existed. I am not complaining about it, however.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The point I am making is that the President legitimately allocated this \$5,000,000 out of the fund with which Congress provided him for the national defense. He felt that \$5,000,000 used in Russia for the purpose of bringing relief and creating order and converting Russia to friendly territory would be well expended, better expended than if it were put into cannon and other purposes.

Mr. KENYON. I have not reflected at all upon the action of the President.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the Senator has—

Mr. KENYON. I am simply showing how our money goes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The money has not gone.

Mr. KENYON. It is available for this corporation, and some of it has gone.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will say to the Senator that it has not been expended, because the armistice put a stop to the work.

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator say that none of it has been expended?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that \$2,500 has been expended, and it is proposed now to dissolve the corporation.

Mr. KENYON. Why do they not go on in Russia and cure the troubles?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. They do not propose doing it through this agency. They have expended \$2,500, and that is all they expect to expend, and they propose now to dissolve the corporation.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I think I have said in relation to this Russian bureau as much as I wish to say, except that I ask to put into the Record the certificate of organization, showing the officers and directors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the certificate will be inserted into the Record.

The certificate referred to is as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

THE WAR TRADE BOARD OF UNITED STATES RUSSIAN BUREAU (INC.).
CERTIFICATE OF ORGANIZATION.

The undersigned, a majority of the directors of the War Trade Board of United States Russian Bureau (Inc.), located in the town of Hartford, hereby certify as follows:

First. That the amount of the authorized capital stock of said corporation subscribed for is 50,000 shares, being shares of capital stock amounting to \$5,000,000, and being not less than the full amount of \$5,000,000 with which the incorporators in the certificate of incorporation stated the company would begin business.

Second. That the amount paid thereon in cash is \$5,000,000.

Third. That the amount paid thereon in property other than cash is nothing.

Fourth. That \$100 has been paid upon each share subscribed for, excepting no shares.

Fifth. That the name, residence, and address of each of the original subscribers to said stock, with the number of shares subscribed for by each, are as follows:

NAME, RESIDENCE, POST-OFFICE ADDRESS, AND NUMBER OF SHARES.	
Vance C. McCormick, Harrisburg, Pa.	1
J. Beaver White, Washington, D. C.	1
Edwin F. Gay, Cambridge, Mass.	1
Clarence M. Woolley, Washington, D. C.	1
Albert Strauss, New York, N. Y.	1
Alonzo E. Taylor, Washington, D. C.	1
Thomas L. Chadbourne, Jr., New York	1
H. Starr Giddings, Bronxville, N. Y.	1
Stoddard M. Stevens, Jr., Hackensack, N. J.	1
Ralph Royall, New York, N. Y.	1
Vance C. McCormick, chairman War Trade Board, Washington, D. C.	49,900

Sixth. That the directors and officers of said corporation have been duly elected and that its by-laws have been adopted.

Seventh. The name, residence, and post-office address of each of the officers and directors of said corporation are as follows:

OFFICERS.

Name, residence, and post-office address:
President, Vance C. McCormick, Harrisburg, Pa.
Treasurer, John Foster Dulles, Washington, D. C.
Secretary, John Foster Dulles, Washington, D. C.

DIRECTORS.

Name, residence, and post-office address:
Vance C. McCormick, Harrisburg, Pa.
Thomas L. Chadbourne, Jr., New York, N. Y.
Albert Strauss, New York, N. Y.
Alonzo E. Taylor, Washington, D. C.
Clarence M. Woolley, Washington, D. C.
J. Beaver White, Washington, D. C.
Edwin F. Gay, Cambridge, Mass.

Eighth. The location of its principal office in this State is No. 11 Central Row, Hartford, and the name of the agent or person in charge thereof on whom process against it may be served is Lucius F. Robinson. Dated at Washington, D. C., this 13th day of November, 1918.

EDWIN F. GAY,
J. BEAVER WHITE,
ALBERT STRAUSS,
ALONZO E. TAYLOR,
A Majority of the Directors.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
City of Washington, ss:

On November 13, 1918, personally appeared Edwin F. Gay, J. Beaver White, Albert Strauss, and Alonzo E. Taylor, signers of the foregoing certificate of organization, a majority of the directors of the War Trade Board of United States Russian Bureau (Inc.), and made oath to the truth of the same before me.

[SEAL.]

H. MCHUGH,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

My commission expires August 9, 1923.

Approved December 2, 1918.

FREDERICK L. PERRY, Secretary,
By ELMER H. LOUNSBURY.

Mr. KENYON. I do not intend if matters of this character are brought to my attention in the future concerning methods in which money which we vote is being expended to hesitate at all in calling the attention of the Senate and of the country to them. I regard this corporation as nothing less than a scandal.

Under one of the dispatches of the President the question arises, which the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] suggested, as to the use of this money to feed the liberated people of Austria, Turkey, Poland, and western Russia. I suppose the reference to the liberated people of Austria means the Czechoslovaks and the Jugo-Slavs.

A fund is now being raised in this country for Armenia. I have not very much enthusiasm for voting a tax upon the people of our country to keep alive at least that portion of Turkey which has massacred the Christians of Armenia and made the hills and plains of Armenia red with their blood. Of course, as to children and women, that is a different question. Nor am I so much concerned about Austria proper, except as to women and children. If there has to be any starving done in this world, I prefer to see Turkey and Germany and Austria and Bulgaria do the starving before the rest of the world has to starve. Would it not be well, Mr. President, to get around pretty soon to the question of taking care of our own country, or at least paying some attention to our own country. In our affection for the world let us not forget the people of the United States.

There are in this country at this time over 200,000 men out of employment; they will need help. And what of our soldiers? You can go to a hospital within the shadow almost of the Dome of this Capitol and find soldier boys who have been across the sea and who are back here now who have not had a cent of pay for seven or eight months. You can go to St. Elizabeths, a hospital for the insane, and find soldiers suffering from shell shock there in rooms with insane people because we have not money to provide, or at least have not provided, places for those soldiers. If you are going to do this humanitarian work throughout the world, I want us at least to begin at home on something that is not so much a humanitarian work as a work of justice, and not turn these soldiers out, as they are being turned out, with scarcely anything, and some of them without their pay. I want some of this money at least to go to the allotments of the mothers of this country who are being forgotten now the war is over. I have a letter from Sioux City, in my State, from the mother of a wounded boy brought back from France and now in the East who has not had any pay for seven or eight months, and she had to go around and peddle the vegetables she had accumulated in her cellar to get some money to send to him. In this great humanitarian cause of taking care of the whole world, let us pay some attention to getting things straightened out at home. Bolshevism abroad! Yes; if we can stop it let us stop it, and stop it by food if we must, but let us get at some of the causes in our own country that are creating discontent because of injustices.

Mr. President, I did not intend to take this much time, but I have been drawn from one thing to another. The main point I was making was that we do not have the right—though, of course, we can go ahead and act as is proposed regardless of law—to tax the people of this country for charity abroad; and, out of this confusion of telegrams, I accept the statement of the President that this is practically for the purposes of charity, at least a large portion of it. If it is for peace, then it must be that we are to take care of in some way or are to assist Germany with food. We want no peace by tribute. That is an unsettled question, and I do not know about it; the record before us does not show clearly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK rose.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator desire to interrupt me?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I wish to ask the Senator whether he has changed his views on that subject?

Mr. KENYON. What subject?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The expenditure of American money abroad.

Mr. KENYON. I suppose the Senator refers, or is about to refer, to a resolution introduced by me as to France?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I remember hearing the Senator say on the floor of the Senate that he was in favor of giving to France all the money we had loaned to her.

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Which means hundreds of millions of dollars or thousands of millions of dollars.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; I introduced a resolution to that effect.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And now the Senator objects to this expenditure that the President proposes.

Mr. KENYON. I introduced that resolution and spoke on it. If we should go back in the case of France to the time that France loaned us some money, part of which we never repaid, and figure the interest on that money down to this time, it would amount to an enormous sum, not so much, probably, as we have loaned to France, but at least to a considerable portion of it. That was in my mind, although I will say very frankly that, full of enthusiasm for France for what it had done for us in the past and what it had done in this war, I did favor cancelling that debt. That may seem inconsistent with my present position—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the Senator's language was somewhat different from that. He did not qualify it as he does now.

Mr. KENYON. No; I think I did not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Or give any reason of that sort. Will the Senator permit me to quote what he said?

Mr. KENYON. Yes; it was a very good speech, I thought, at the time.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator then said:

It is a great thing, Mr. President, to have part in saving a nation like France. I do not mean by that to have any part in getting back any territory to France. I do not believe we are carrying on war for that purpose; but, as a part of saving civilization, we are saving those poor people of France, and they look up to us as a poor, weak sister to a great, strong brother coming to save her. When this war is over, I have said before, and I reiterate it, I hope this great, rich Nation will say to poor, bleeding France: "Keep all of the money we have loaned you. We ask not for the return of a single dollar."

That was the view of the Senator in January a year ago.

Mr. KENYON. That is the way I felt at that time, and I think I probably gave the same figures that I have given here as to the amount of money that France had loaned to us. I still feel that way.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Now, will the Senator tell us the difference between the proposal which he thought advisable then and the one he denounces now?

Mr. KENYON. It is not the same. The obligations that we owe to France are different from the obligations we owe to any nation on the face of the earth. I do not think we would have had a nation had it not been for France. That money loaned was for war—ammunition and guns to shoot the foes of America.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator did not base his position a year ago on the ground of obligation; he based it on the ground of saving civilization, saving the poor nation of France?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What is the difference between saving those people and saving the starving people to whom the President refers?

Mr. BORAH. Turkey, for instance.

Mr. KENYON. I have given my reasons as best I can give them. I may appear inconsistent; but I feel entirely different about France than I do about the people of Turkey or the people of Austria, and I might, in any event, stretch my conscience more for the people of France than I would for the murderous Turks.

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

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. In connection with the proposal to present to France a cancellation of her indebtedness to us, did the Senator propose, first, to offset it by the very large amounts of money, many millions, that we owe to France, to take that out, and give them the balance, or did he propose to remit their entire indebtedness to us and that we pay them some hundreds of millions of dollars we owe them in addition?

Mr. KENYON. I am really surprised, Mr. President, that my speech attracted so much attention.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator's speeches always do.

Mr. KENYON. I thought at the time it was made there were not over one or two Senators in the Chamber. But I will say about France what I have heretofore said and stand by that proposition. I wish we could do it; I do not know that we can; and, if we make any appropriations of this kind, of course we can not. I have said before that the situation was different. That will not convince unwilling minds.

Mr. WARREN. Still the Senator does not answer the question that I asked him, namely, whether he thinks we should remit to France all that she owes us and still have to pay France many millions of dollars that we owe to her?

Mr. KENYON. No; I do not. I think I figured at that time that, including interest from the date of the loan on the part that we had not returned, it would amount at that time to nearly as much as France owed to us then. Now, what we owe to France arising out of this war I do not know, but I have heard it stated that it would nearly balance the debt she owes us; but as to that I have no specific information.

Mr. LODGE rose.

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I am through.

Mr. LODGE. I do not desire to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I would have concluded earlier had it not been for the questions asked me. I now yield the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to offer two amendments in the same line. They are really one amendment in intent. I send them to the desk and ask to have them stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendments.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, in line 7, after the word "thereto," it is proposed to insert the words "including the Armenians, Syrians, Greeks, and other Christian and Jewish populations of Asia Minor, now subjects of Turkey."

Also, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Germany," it is proposed to insert "German Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the purpose of that amendment is simply to define a little more closely the populations to whom this relief is to be extended.

I do not myself believe in extending aid to those countries which brought all of this misery on the world. I think we ought to save and help the people whom they have brought to this condition. As the bill stands, there is nothing to prevent this money being spent for the maintenance of the Turks. In that, I confess, even at the risk of seeming hard-hearted, I feel but slight interest. But I do want to see the Armenians, the Syrians, and the Greeks, who have all suffered from the Turkish rule, and suffered horribly, aided, and the Jewish and Christian populations of Palestine. I have worded the amendments so as to cover those two points, and also German Austria, Hungary, and Bulgaria, who stand in precisely the same position toward us that Germany does.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I shall be glad to see the amendments adopted. I think they improve the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendments offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I only want to say in conclusion that, of course, my object in seeking to have this amendment added to the bill is to improve, as I think, a measure for which I shall vote and which I think is absolutely necessary as a part of the work of carrying out the conclusion of this war.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it is a thankless, and doubtless many will think a thoughtless, task to oppose the passage of this bill, but there are reasons why the bill in its present form and with the information which we have before us can not receive my support. I do not care to have the RECORD stand without some remarks of explanation.

There may be facts in existence which justify the passage of this bill, but this Congress has not got them. There may be the machinery and the plans by which this money can be carried effectively to Europe, so as to bring about a better condition of affairs in Europe and to stabilize Europe, but this Congress has not got them. There may be a sufficient and conclusive reason as to why this money should be appropriated, as a

part, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] says, of the program of finishing up this war, but the Congress has not any such facts before it.

No one is responsible for the expenditure of this money and for the burden which will be placed upon the people of this country in gathering this money in the way of taxes save and except the Congress of the United States, which is wholly without the facts. We can not hold Mr. Hoover responsible, and neither can the people of this country hold Mr. Hoover responsible in any way for the expenditure of this money under the terms of this bill. It is a wide, latitudinous power given to him to expend \$100,000,000 in what is said to be the regenerating of an entire Continent. We are entirely without information as to how it is to be made effective. We are wholly without facts as to where it is to go, except in a most general way—so general that it furnishes no information at all to you and to me; and yet we are the only people in this entire movement who are responsible to the taxpayers of this country.

I venture to say, Mr. President, that if a man stood at the head of a vast business institution that was authorized to take trust money and had trust funds in its possession and should be asked to transfer them to the use of a cause, however humanitarian and just it might be, with no more protection and no other safeguards than are authorized by this bill, when he was called upon to report upon these trust funds his defense would not be heard in a court of justice. The thing of which I complain, sir, is placing me, as a humble Member of this body, in a position where I must answer, as a Member of this body, to the taxpayers of the country, without giving me any information by which and by means whereof I can report to them at any time in my public career.

This fund is not ours, and there can be no more serious duty devolving upon the Congress of the United States right now than that of adding a further burden to the already harried and overburdened people of this country. The time has passed, Mr. President, when it is no longer a serious matter to appropriate large sums of money in this country. It may be that we are compelled, by reason of the circumstances which surround us and the environments which envelop us, to appropriate these sums of money, but we can only do it, sir, after the most thorough and complete investigation and after the fullest and most complete facts are before us so as to justify us not only in the law but in the court of conscience for having done so.

What reason could we assign if this money should be expended in a profitless way, in a fruitless way, or in territory of which we did not approve? What would be our remedy, and what response would we give to those whose money we had expended?

There is another reason which makes it impossible for me to support this bill. It is an unpleasant one to mention; nevertheless, it is here.

I recognize in Mr. Hoover a man of great ability. It is not my purpose, by anything which I shall say, to challenge his personal integrity; but his viewpoint of things is such that it makes it impossible for me to turn over a hundred million dollars to him to expend in Europe. For the last four weeks I have been making a pretty thorough study of the relationship of the Food Administration to the vast concerns of this country which control and dominate the food supply of this country; and I say here upon the floor, and I challenge successful contradiction, that three of the vast monopolies which control food in this country have, with relation to their commodities, directed and controlled the Food Administration since its organization. I do not mean by that to say, sir, that Mr. Hoover himself has received any personal or individual benefit by reason of that. I simply mean to say that his viewpoint is such that he permits those people to, in effect, fix their own prices and to arrange their own affairs to such an extent that it is a case of an individual dealing with himself in the transactions. I have been utterly amazed at the facts which show how these combines have influenced and controlled the situation.

It is well known, sir, that the meat packers of this country have been one of the great, powerful units in this matter of furnishing food. Now, sir, at a time when the people of this country are hungry, when our own people are suffering, when, according to the Associated Press dispatches a few days ago, hundreds of thousands of children in New York and Chicago and other great cities are not only kept out of school for want of clothes but are actually dying for want of food, when mothers are committing suicide because they can not respond to the lips that are begging for food, it is a fact, demonstrated over the signature of the meat packers themselves, that their profits under Mr. Hoover amounted to all the way from 20 to 40 per cent for the last two years. Shall I be called upon, under my oath as a Senator here, to turn over a hundred million dollars to feed the poor of Europe, when I am notified that out of that

\$100,000,000 those that control the food products of this country will ask, and probably receive, from 25 to 40 per cent profit on their investments?

They say "This is to be turned over to the President." Now, let us be honest and eliminate the President. We know that it is absolutely impossible for the President to know anything about the details of this expenditure. With the stupendous burdens resting upon his shoulders which are now there, with the difficulties which confront him, with the fearful task which is his, do we suppose for a moment that he will be familiar with a single detail in regard to this matter?

It is unfair to the situation and unjust to us to say that the President is responsible. He is not responsible. He will know nothing about it from the beginning to the end. We are responsible. We are the only ones who have the fearful power of drawing this money out of the pockets of the people. If I had the time, sir, I would undertake to show you that the facts are here which make you and me accomplices to the transaction which, if we vote this appropriation, will enable these vast concerns to get a very large portion of the taxes which we are voting.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment.

Now, Mr. President, I want my position to be understood. It may be necessary for us to feed the people of Europe. If the humanitarian call comes to us from Macedonia we can not refuse to listen; but, as a Senator, I am under obligations to know that those upon whom that task devolves are men who have such a viewpoint that they will not only save the starving people of Europe but that they will protect the taxpayers of the United States, because while we are a strong Government and a well-poised people do not forget that bolshevism is not confined to any nation.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Idaho, in connection with the references he has just made to profits on capital and profits on food, to the fact that there is a vast difference between profits on capitalization and profits on the turnover of business. I do not think anybody contemplates or believes that 47 per cent, or 25 per cent, or 10 per cent profit has been made on the food to which the Senator has been referring. It may have been made on the capital of the corporations conducting that industry.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there is a mysterious feature about the "turnover," which I confess the Senator from Massachusetts understands better than I do, and he may be correct; but I want it understood that these corporations which deal in nothing but food supplies, which have nothing to do with anything except that, which is an indispensable part of feeding the people of Europe and of this country, have realized under the administration of Mr. Hoover vaster profits than they have ever realized before in the history of their concerns. I will incorporate some figures later which will satisfy the Senator of the scandalous extortions of these companies from the people of this country. I do not want any man to operate a trust fund by my vote who thinks that those figures represent decency or honesty.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. I call the Senator's attention to the testimony now being taken before the Agricultural Committee on this question, in which Mr. Heney stated that Mr. Cotton, the eminent Wall Street lawyer, who had charge of the meat end of the packing bureau of Mr. Hoover, stated to him that the profits of the packers for 1917 had been nothing less than a scandal.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, was not that before Mr. Hoover took charge?

Mr. KENYON. Mr. Hoover took charge, as I understand, in August of 1917. It was not limited to the time before that. He said for the year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Was not the inference very clearly drawn that the profits were decreased after Mr. Hoover took charge?

Mr. KENYON. I think not.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think that will be borne out by an examination of the record.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have here, and will ask to insert in the Record without reading, a portion of the reports of these concerns, taken from their own records, which seem to me a sufficient basis upon which men may reasonably argue as to what they received.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if the profits to which Mr. Heney referred have reference to a period prior to the actual entry of this country into the war, these reports show, and the statements are made, that those profits, instead of being decreased, have been augmented and enlarged. So, Mr. President, we need not stop here now to discuss the details of this matter as to the shades of profits, or as to when or how the profits are made. The sum total of the fact is that they have been realized during this time in a way that they have never been realized before.

A distinguished member of the Peace Commission, Mr. White, cabled to this country that we had on hand a large store of undistributed foods of different kinds, and that this would enable us to work off the supply at a stabilizing price. I wonder if Mr. White was familiar with the fact that the food supply to which he refers as being on hand and undistributed in this country is now in urgent demand by not thousands but by hundreds of thousands of people in our own country? It is not available, Mr. President, to introduce that kind of an argument in order to move the Congress, because the Congress knows that if any such supplies are on hand there is a ready demand for them in the United States.

But that is not a matter which is controlling with me. I know that \$100,000,000 is just the beginning if we are going to stabilize Europe from the standpoint of feeding the people. The press dispatches already carry the information that not less than \$350,000,000 or \$400,000,000 will be necessary to make a reasonable start. Assuming that England and France do their portion, the three hundred and fifty million or four hundred million, we are already advised, is the beginning. Therefore I ask that the President put the distribution of this fund in the hands of those who have not only the ability but the viewpoint which will compel those who sell the food to share the sacrifice with those who pay the taxes.

Whatever may be the great ability of Mr. Hoover, there is one individual whom he does not know exists in this country, and that is the taxpayer. He seems to think that money comes like manna to the children of Israel from Heaven and not from the sweat and toil and sacrifice of the people. He has no conception of the existence of the taxpayer, and his distribution of foods is utterly regardless of his existence.

For these reasons, Mr. President, under the present circumstances, with no information, no restrictions, no safeguards, no directions, no limitations, we are turning over a hundred million dollars to be distributed and I can not indorse it. In the name of common honesty, of common fairness with those whom we represent, in the name of those who are now positively discouraged by reason of the taxes imposed upon them, to wit, the business men of this country, in the name of the poor, the prices of whose food will be raised by this bill, let us throw around the undertaking the ordinary safeguards of a sane transaction.

Mr. President, I have not argued the constitutional power. I do not think we have the power to appropriate money for any such use. But I have been here too long to hope to succeed in interposing a mere constitutional inhibition against a chance to appropriate \$100,000,000. The odds against the Constitution are too great.

The packers' profits (five companies), as shown by the testimony of a Government expert who testified before the Committee on Agriculture.

1912	\$18,715,000
1913	20,217,000
1914	22,108,000
1915	40,052,000
1916	60,759,000
1917	95,639,000

*Armour & Co.'s profits taken from the same testimony.
(The percentage is based upon capital and surplus.)*

1912	\$5,702,000	Per cent.
1913	6,158,000	6.1
1914	7,640,000	7.3
1915	11,156,000	10.2
1916	22,849,000	19.2
1917	27,137,000	19.8

[Article from Christian Science Monitor.]

CHICAGO, ILL.

The earning power of the smallest of the American meat packers in the present period appears a subject of interest, for one thing because the greatest food distributors in the world to-day are, naturally, more than ever before in the public eye; and then, again, because this packer, the Cudahy Packing Co., is the first of the "big five" to report on the first year under Government profit regulation. By earning power is taken to mean the total earnings of the company, that figure which the Food Administration regulation was set to limit, that amount on which the Federal war tax will be levied. By earning power, in short, is meant, in this connection, the total profit the company made in its dealings with the public.

This earning power of the smallest of the packers was shown in a previous article on the Cudahy annual report in these columns (Dec. 20, 1918) to be larger for 1918 than ever before. Sales of the company also were much larger than in the previous history of the Cudahy Co.

Now, it may be of interest to measure this earning power of the smallest packer against the capital stock, to show what this earning power is equivalent to in terms of the common stock.

The total Cudahy profits, as represented in the term "earning power" as here used, may be assumed to have been \$6,000,000 in 1918. The company's net profit of \$3,376,808.58, plus its big reserve of \$2,785,412.78, set aside for "Federal income and war-profits taxes and contingencies," amounts to more than \$6,000,000, but that round figure may well be taken as representative of the year's total profits or the company's earning power. The capitalization is \$20,000,000, divided into \$2,000,000 of 6 per cent preferred, \$6,550,500 of 7 per cent preferred, and \$11,449,500 of common stock. After paying the regular dividends on the preferred stock the \$6,000,000 profit would represent an earning power of 47.4 per cent on the common stock.

Now, there were two stock dividends declared by the Cudahy Co. in the last three years prior to the end of the 1918 year. The first of these was in November of 1915, amounting to \$2,000,000. The second came a year later, amounting to \$2,724,750. Together they amounted to \$4,724,750. If these two stock dividends be subtracted from the total of the capital stock, which, of course, they helped to bring to its present figure, this leaves a balance of common stock of \$6,724,750. If the 1918 earning power of the company, namely, at the rate of \$6,000,000, were to be computed on the common stock remaining after that portion representative of stock dividends were deducted, it would be equivalent to an earning power of 80 per cent.

Should it be remarked that it is unusual to compute earning power in the sense used against the common stock, because the common stock does not share in such earning power, but only in what remains after Federal taxes are paid, which makes a large deduction from gross earnings, it may be said that this is perfectly true as far as the stockholders are concerned, but the public may nevertheless be interested in such a comparison. Up to the last few years there were no large Federal taxes to make such deductions, and it is possible that within a few years more Federal taxes may be much smaller, in which case that much more of the total profits will go to the stockholders. The public, so students of the packing industry here pointed out, is naturally interested in the total profits packers make and what they may represent as measures against the ownership of the company, because the public makes those profits possible; because, one of these students has put it, "the consuming power of the public is the vital breath of this and every other great corporation."

As to what stockholders do get, after the big tax reserve has been subtracted from profits, leaving net profits of \$3,376,808.58 to be computed against the capital stock, the rate of earning on the common stock is 24.44 per cent.

Then, again, as to the deduction of the amount of stock dividends from the total of common stock and the calculation of rate of return on the remainder, stock dividends have been a favorite device of big corporations to make their profit look small, and a word in general about the usual packer stock dividends will perhaps not be amiss.

A stock dividend represents capitalized profits. It represents money made by the company, over and above cash dividends paid, which remains in the business in the form of surplus, and of which stockholders are given ownership through the issue of so much new stock free to them. This new stock, of course, increases the company capitalization by that much. Since a concern's rate of earning is based on the company's capitalization, particularly on its common stock, given a fixed amount of profits, the rate of earning will appear high or low, according as the amount of the common stock is small or great. For instance, Morris & Co., another of the packers, still retains a capitalization of \$3,000,000, though the business is worth many millions more than that and the company is considerably larger than the Cudahy company. If Morris & Co. made no more profit than Cudahy did in 1918, still it would show more than 100 per cent profit on its capital stock, though the smaller Cudahy company, with a larger capital stock, evidences a very much smaller rate of earning. Hence a stock dividend, by enlarging the amount of the divisor in the fraction, to wit, the capitalization, may have a decided influence on the aspect of profits.

If the two stock dividends of the Cudahy Co. previously referred to be deducted from the common stock, and the rate of return to stockholders be calculated on the basis of the 1918 "net profits"—that is to say, \$3,376,808.58, the amount available for dividends and surplus after provision was made for war taxes, etc.—it is noted to be 41 per cent. The rate of return on the common, without the stock dividend deduction, has already been observed as 24.44 per cent.

Not every stock dividend may be subject to criticism, as, for instance, where a concern has been making reasonable profits and turning back a portion of them into the business, eventually to set up this portion of past reasonable profits into common stock. In the case of several of the meat-packer stock dividends and of the Standard Oil stock dividends, there has been a suspicion on the part of the public that the profit there reposing represented, in the aggregate, an undue amount.

The Cudahy Co. in 1918 showed the largest earning power, as heretofore defined, in its history. Its net profits were larger than in any previous year with the exception of 1917. The company has had some hard sledding in several past years. The Cudahy profit figures are of interest, now and for the future, in the view of local students of the industry, in regard to the Cudahy Co., and more particularly in regard to the earnings of the leaders of the "big five," whose sales and profits ran much higher, indeed, than those of the last of the quintet.

TESTIMONY GIVEN BY FRANCIS J. HENEY BEFORE THE COMMITTEE, AN ATTORNEY SELECTED BY THE PRESIDENT TO MAKE AN EXAMINATION OF THE BUSINESS AFFAIRS OF THE PACKERS.

Mr. HENEY. I can summarize it by saying that the evidence gathered by the Federal Trade Commission convinced me that five large packers—Armour & Co., Swift & Co., Morris & Co., Wilson & Co. (Inc.), and Cudahy & Co.—have what is, in effect, a monopoly of the meat business of the United States, and have it so entrenched by similar control over other meat-producing countries that are tributary to the United States—I refer particularly to South America—that they are able to absolutely overturn the natural law of supply and demand in fixing the prices to the producers as well as in fixing the prices to the consumers.

Senator GRONNA. I want to be pardoned for interrupting you, but we had hearings last year and the question of stock came up. The Federal Government, as you know, had taken control of the packing interests, and Mr. Cotton, of New York, a very able lawyer, was for us and he was asked the question how he arranged the profits for these concerns, and he made the broad statement that he based their

earnings upon the money borrowed; and I think it is very significant that we should understand all these things, because the consumers will know why meat is high.

Mr. HENRY. Senator, the regulation of the packers by Mr. Cotton is a joke. They made more money under the regulations than they made in 1917, and Mr. Cotton told me himself on two occasions that their profits in 1917 could only be described by the word "scandalous."

Senator GRONNA. I am very glad to hear you say that, Mr. Henry, because that was my belief, and I practically said it last winter.

Mr. HENRY. I proceeded in the beginning—

Senator KENYON. How did he happen to be appointed?

Mr. HENRY. I do not know, Senator, but he was selected by Mr. Hoover.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I believe the pending bill has been so amended as to exclude from participation in the benefits of this proposed appropriation all of the people of Germany, German-Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey, and so as to make it specific that Armenia, the Czecho-Slavs, the Jugo-Slavs, and certain other peoples, may participate in the benefits thereof.

I am glad the bill has been so amended. Before it was amended I was bitterly and unspeakably opposed to its passage. Having been so amended, I do not regard it as so objectionable as it would be otherwise, but still I can not see my way clear to vote for it, and I shall vote against it, and I will give what I trust may be a brief statement of my reasons for so doing.

Before the bill was amended undoubtedly it was so worded that the money proposed to be appropriated might be spent for the benefit of the people of any nation on earth except the people of Germany. As the bill was originally worded the money, if appropriated, might be expended for the benefit of murderous Turks, Bulgarians, and Austrians—people who are murderers, thieves, rapists, cutthroats, fiends, and who waged a wicked, criminal, infamous warfare against civilization. There was nothing that I could find in the printed report of the hearings on the bill which would show either how the money was to be expended or to whom it was to go. Of course, it has been wisely restricted by the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] and which has been adopted; but still I know of no constitutional authority for making this appropriation—for taxing the people of this country to raise money and giving it as a gift to the people of foreign countries—and I speak of this as a proposed gift, because I firmly believe at least nine-tenths of it will be a gift—an act of charity. I do not believe we will ever get the one-tenth part of it back. I think it is recognized that by far the greater part of it is intended to be a gift, and I know of no constitutional authority for taking hard-earned tax money, wrung from the struggling people of this country, and giving it away with a lavish hand to the people of foreign countries.

I subscribe very heartily to the doctrine enunciated on this floor last year by the very able and distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox], who is deservedly recognized as high constitutional authority, when he said that, the Constitution having given Congress the power to declare war, Congress undoubtedly had the implied power to do anything necessary to win the war; that it would be an idle thing to give Congress the power to declare war without giving it also all power necessary to win that war. That is my belief, and I have acted on that theory during the entire period of our participation in the European war. I have had that theory in mind and supported it in every vote I have cast in voting on measures for the prosecution of the European war.

But the President has told us that the war has ended. On the 11th day of November the President appeared before Congress and said "the war thus comes to an end," and we know that so far as hostilities are concerned war is at an end; so I do not feel this can be considered as a war measure. I do not consider it a war measure. I do not believe there is a Senator in this presence who considers it a war measure.

We were never at war with Turkey. We were never at war with Bulgaria. We only declared war upon Germany and Austria. Theoretically, that war is in existence, because permanent peace has not been declared, but is there a Senator here who will arise now and say that the appropriation of this money is necessary for the winning of the war against Austria? Is there a Senator here who will arise and say that the enactment of this measure is necessary for the winning of the war against Germany? Is there a Senator here who will arise and say that unless we enact this measure there is danger that Austria will win this war against the United States? Is there a Senator here who will arise and say that unless we appropriate this money there is danger that Germany will defeat us in this war? No; there is not one who will do so. Then, if those are not facts, this is not a necessary war measure.

I can not find it in me; I can not find it in my conscience, my convictions, or my judgment to vote \$100,000,000 of the money of the people of this country for the benefit of the people of

foreign countries, when there is no apparent constitutional warrant for it, while the cost of comfortable living in this country is far beyond the reach of thousands of our own people, and when every hundred million dollars' worth of food that is taken out of this country and sent to the peoples of foreign countries, we all know, enhances the cost of living and makes the price of food rise still further in this country and puts the necessities of life still further beyond the reach of some of our own people.

A few days ago I read an article in a newspaper which stated that a poor woman in New York City, the mother of two children, found the price of milk was beyond her means and that she was unable to buy milk for her children. The poor woman, discouraged and disheartened, in the agony of her soul at the thought of her children suffering for the want of milk hurled herself out of a second-story window to the pavement beneath and killed herself. That is only an instance. It is only one instance of dire poverty and distress of thousands that exist in this country due to the high cost of living.

There will soon be great unemployment in this country, I believe. I am informed that in Butte, Mont., there are now 8,000 unemployed men and they know not where to go to obtain employment. There are thousands upon thousands of unemployed in other sections of the country and the list of unemployed is mounting higher every day. I believe we owe something to our own people. I believe we should consider our own to some extent. If the time comes in the near future when there are many thousands of people in this country out of employment and out of means, what are we going to do? Shall we turn loose the Federal Treasury for their benefit and make appropriations out of the Federal Treasury to support everybody who can not make a living in this country and in all the world? If we are going to stretch the Constitution at all, I believe in doing it in behalf of our own people first. Attend to our own first, and when there is no suffering here, when everybody's wants here have been supplied, then let us see to supplying the wants of needy peoples in Europe.

I suppose this bill will pass, but if so, it will set a precedent which will be bad. I believe it will rise to plague us in the future. I believe this is only the beginning, and the end is not anywhere in sight. I believe it will only be a short time until we will be called upon to appropriate another hundred million dollars for people in Europe. I believe in the near future we will be called upon to appropriate money for people in Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey—our enemies—in our undertaking to save the civilization of the world.

If I were to vote for this bill, I would consider that I was violating my oath of office and my duty to the people of America, and I can not conscientiously do it. I have very clear, conscientious objections against it.

There are other reasons why I can not see my way clear to vote for the bill. In the cablegrams which have been laid before the Senate committee and before the Senate in support of the appropriation provided for in the bill it is stated with emphasis that one of the objects of the bill, I may say the principal object, is to stem the tide of bolshevism in Europe; to keep the people of Austria, Bulgaria, Turkey, and Poland from becoming Bolsheviks. Are we to hire people, with criminality in their hearts, to abstain from criminal acts? Are we to hire people to abstain from assaults upon organized society? Are we to hire people to abstain from assaulting civilization? Are we to hire people to be law-abiding? Are we to hire people not to be criminals? Are we with food to buy people to be good and not to commit crime? Are we to take the taxpayers' money and use it in buying the peace of the world? Is peace so dear that we must buy it? If so, the world has come to a sorry plight. The idea is repugnant to me and to my sense of right and fairness. I do not believe in yielding to the clamor of people that unless we feed them they will commit depredations, upset law and order. If we do it this year, we may have it to do next year.

If we are to do that, then we have thousands and thousands of I. W. W.'s, Bolsheviks, and other anarchists in this country whom we might as well begin to hire to be good. We do not have to go away from home to do it. We might as well turn loose Debs and Mooney, Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman. We might as well liberate the 100 I. W. W.'s who were convicted at Chicago a few weeks ago and put in the penitentiary. We might as well turn loose and free the 46 I. W. W.'s who were convicted a few days ago in a Federal court in California and sentenced to the penitentiary. We might as well say to all of them, "You do not need to go to the penitentiary; we will hire you to be good; we will keep you in idleness; we will give you food; we will give you everything you want."

That may be one way to stop I. W. Wism. It may be one way to stop bolshevism. It may be one way to stop anarchy. But is it the proper and right way? Is it right to do it? Is it just to do it? Would it be justice to law-abiding, upright people, who stand for organized society and civilization, to tax them and take their money away from them by force and give it to the criminal minded to keep the latter from acts of criminal violence against organized society?

If we are going to embark on this then we might as well appropriate \$100,000,000 to give to Lenin and Trotzky in Russia. I suppose we could for a short time stop bolshevism in Russia by giving them millions of dollars, by taking a shovel and scooping out to them millions of dollars of our taxpayers' money and saying, "We will support you in idleness; we will give you food." Suppose we could stop bolshevism in Russia that way. Would it be just and right to do it? Would it be just to the people who maintain organized society, who uphold civilization, who stand for law and order, and who pay the taxes, to take their money away from them by force and give it to the criminally minded who wave aloft the torch of incendiarism and hold a bowie knife at the throat of civilization?

I do not like the grounds upon which the proposed appropriation is asked. I decline to have the highwayman's dagger put at my heart to make me give up. I decline to have the murderer's bowie knife put at my throat to make me vote other people's money in order to keep them from indulging in criminal assaults upon the civilization of Europe. It is a wrong principle in my opinion. It is not founded on justice and right. I earnestly and sincerely protest against it.

In opposing this bill from a sense of duty I do so with all respect to the President of the United States. I know the President has asked for this appropriation, but I do not believe the Congress has been given sufficient specific, definite information to justify the Congress in making the appropriation. It is, at least, not sufficiently enlightening to me. I feel we should be very careful in such matters.

In all that I say I speak with the highest respect for the President of the United States, for whom I have warm regard, and in whose motives and good intentions I have every confidence. I know his high-minded ideals and the generous impulses of his heart. I know his intentions are good and in this matter I differ from him, with my present light, with the greatest respect. However, in this matter I have firm convictions of my own.

In the prosecution of this war it has been my fortune and honor to stand without exception, invariably and unwaveringly, behind the President of the United States in support of his measures. Not one thing for which he has ever asked in the prosecution of the war have I declined to vote for. With almost no exception of great consequence, it has been my pleasure to support all the policies of the President of the United States in time of peace, as well as war, up to this time. In peace and war almost invariably it has been my good fortune to view the issues which were presented to us as he viewed them. However, the President tells us the war has ended, and we all know it has practically ended. It is finally ended unless it should be renewed, and at this time I see no prospect of that. I know of none of our foes who have the power or the resources to renew the war and wage it afresh.

I have some very fixed, firm, and settled convictions about the policy to be pursued by us toward the people of the nations that waged a wicked, infamous, criminal warfare against civilization. I have some fixed, firm, and settled convictions about the policy to be pursued toward European peoples, now that peace has come. I have some fixed, firm, and settled convictions about my duty toward the American people, now that peace has come to the people of this country.

I know that we spent money with reckless prodigality during the prosecution of the war. Millions of dollars of money were doubtless spent in lavish, even extravagant, ways where they could have been expended more economically had there been no need for haste, but I had no serious objection to that. With me, it was anything to win the war. Winning the war was the paramount object with me in the dark days during which civilization trembled in the balance. The liberty of the world was at stake. With me, winning the war was above economy and above every other consideration. Now, however, that the days of actual, if not theoretical, peace have returned, I believe we ought to be rigidly careful about the expenditure of the people's money. I believe we ought to be seriously careful and thoughtful about the constitutionality of our appropriations. I believe we ought to be careful to remain within the bounds of prudence and constitutional safety, and that we ought to think first of the American people above all other peoples of the earth. I do not say that if it were properly, specifically, and definitely shown to the Congress that people of foreign lands

who befriended us in this war, who stood steadfastly by our side in waging warfare for the preservation of civilization, who were our allies and our friends, were suffering for the necessities of life, starving, dying, I would not under any circumstances vote to appropriate money for them. But I am not willing to do it when confronted with the threat of a highwayman that "unless you feed us we will turn Bolsheviki and set the world afire." I will not do it under compulsion of any highwayman's threat. I will not do it to prevent bolshevism in Europe or in this country or in any other country on the face of the earth. I will not do it to hire people to desist from crime. When I do so it will be because I am convinced of the necessity, constitutionality, justice, and humanity thereof; not to keep people who have criminal instincts restrained from venting them.

Against this threat that unless the people of Europe are fed they will turn Bolshevists and make assaults upon the civilization of the world I simply stand by my ideals of right and civilization. I take my stand upon the side of law and order, and if right and civilization must go down before the assaults of criminals, anarchists, Bolshevists, I say let us go down standing for the right, standing by our colors, and with colors flying.

If the time ever comes in this country when there is room for only two political parties—one that stands for organized society and one that stands for anarchy—I shall take my stand with the one that stands for organized society and stay with it. I do not believe in compromise with crime. I will not yield to threats of people who have criminality in their hearts, who say that unless they have their way they will turn Bolshevists.

For these reasons I can not see my way clear to vote for this appropriation. I make this statement in order to make clear my views on the matter. I am a long way yet from being convinced of the necessity for and justification of this proposed appropriation. I think it is merely a beginning, that we will be called upon for other hundreds of millions of dollars, and that we should know more about what kind of a beginning we are making before we make the beginning, and should know more about where the end is to be. I must have more impelling and what I consider better reasons for the proposed appropriation before I can conscientiously give it my sanction.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR HUGHES.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I give the following notice, which I ask the Secretary to read.

The Secretary read as follows:

That on Sunday, January 26 next, following the exercises in memory of the life, character, and public service of the late Senator BROUSSARD, the Senate will consider resolutions upon the life, character, and public service of WILLIAM HUGHES, late a Senator from the State of New Jersey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The notice will be entered.

RECESS.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, notice has been given for memorial exercises in honor of the late Senator GALLINGER, of New Hampshire, and the late Senator BRADY, of Idaho, on to-morrow at 11 o'clock. I move that the Senate take a recess until that hour.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Sunday, January 19, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, January 18, 1919.

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

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

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, for this moment in the day's proceedings; since the human heart is like that of a musical instrument, touched by a master hand it brings forth sweet melodies, rich, deep harmonies.

Touch our hearts, we beseech Thee, with the Holy Spirit, that they may respond in deep, full harmony to life and its far-reaching purposes, unperturbed by the discordant sounds around us; that we may fulfill our appointed mission, to the honor and glory of Thy Holy Name. 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 passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, had requested a conference with the

House on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. ASHURST, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE LATE THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 16, 1919.

The Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose for the information of the House of Representatives a translation of a telegram addressed by the president of the House of Representatives of Cuba to the President of the House of Representatives of the United States, quoting a resolution adopted by the Cuban House of Representatives expressing its sympathy in view of the death of the late Theodore Roosevelt, former President of the United States. A copy of the telegram has been communicated to this department by the Cuban minister at this Capital.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

FRANK L. POLK,
Acting Secretary of State.

[Translation.]

HABANA.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington:

The House of Representatives, assembled in solemn and extraordinary session, has to-day unanimously agreed to enter in its journal the profound sorrow of the Cuban people on account of the death of Theodore Roosevelt, the best friend of Cuban independence and one of the greatest figures of modern times.

The house also voted to express to you that it shares with your illustrious body this immense misfortune, and in order to associate itself with the feeling of sadness of the noble American people it expresses the wish that the memory of the illustrious Roosevelt may serve to cement more, if possible, the fraternal bonds which have united in glorious days the two peoples.

MIGUEL COYULA, President.

UNEMPLOYMENT.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes, in order that I may have a telegram read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the edition of the Washington Post of yesterday, January 17, 1919, we see the headline "Bread line by May 1." Then follows a report of a statement made by Mr. Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, in which he names various cities in the United States where there is a large list of unemployed men. Youngstown, Ohio, my home city, was one of those in which he said there were 5,000 unemployed men. I desire to have the following telegram read which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the telegram in the time of the gentleman from Ohio.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, January 17, 1919.

Hon. JOHN G. COOPER: Five thousand unemployed men would represent practically 10 per cent of working population, and such a condition positively does not exist in Youngstown, Ohio. Absolutely no foundation for statement of Morrison regarding this community. Fact of the matter is there was a temporary lay off by a local industry of about 2,500 men for a few days so as to readjust an operating division during transition from war to peace basis. All industries working practically on normal basis. Discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines being absorbed by industries and commercial organizations as fast as they return, according to applications. Urgently recommend this denial be referred to House Committee on Immigration.

FRED A. LABELLE,
Secretary Youngstown Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am requested by the Youngstown Chamber of Commerce to present these facts to the House, as they believe the statement of Mr. Morrison has attracted a great deal of uncomplimentary comment regarding the industrial conditions at present in the city of Youngstown, Ohio.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. 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. 14078, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

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 legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered for the Department of Commerce when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed the sum of \$25.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. This bill carries something like \$100,000,000. While it seems to be the tendency of legislative bodies to look after the interests of the tax spender more than the taxpayer, I desire to congratulate the chairman of this committee, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, and the ranking Republican on the committee, Mr. STAFFORD, both of whom are very amiable and agreeable and hard-working gentlemen, for the efforts they have made, and the efforts the entire committee have made, in holding down the appropriations in this bill.

The lack of food caused the bolshevism in Europe, but can not cause it in America, as we have the food.

Two things, however, may cause bolshevism here.

First. The high cost of living, which is caused partly by profiteering.

Second. Lack of employment.

Congress and the entire Government must devote its utmost energies to prevent this.

Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, states that we will have bread lines in this country by May 1.

I think and hope he is wrong, but he may be right.

In time of opportunities we should prepare against bolshevism.

I will read the statement of Mr. Morrison:

BREAD LINES BY MAY 1—FRANK MORRISON GIVES LABOR SURVEY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE—OPPOSES MORE IMMIGRATION—WANTS IT PROHIBITED FOUR YEARS—LIST OF CITIES WHERE LARGE NUMBERS ARE UNEMPLOYED IS GIVEN—HOPES BUILDING WILL PICK UP IN THE SPRING AND TAKE SOME MEN.

"When the men in the Army are demobilized," said Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, yesterday before the House Immigration Committee, "we are going to have bread lines in every industrial center by May 1. After that date it is hoped that building will pick up and take some of the men."

Surveys of industrial conditions in many cities showing unemployment were presented by Mr. Morrison in urging legislation prohibiting immigration for four years. Labor leaders, he said, made the survey Tuesday at his request.

The estimated number of unemployed given by the survey included:

LIST OF THE CITIES.

Los Angeles, 8,000; New Britain, Conn., 2,000; Chicago, 75,000; Louisville, Ky., 2,900; New Orleans, 20,000; Boston, 20,000; Grand Rapids, 5,000; St. Paul, 8,000; St. Louis, 15,000; Kansas City, 2,000; Trenton, 2,500; New York City, 20,000; Cincinnati, 5,000; Cleveland, 40,000; Portland, Oreg., 9,000; Toledo, 17,000; Youngstown, 5,000; Aberdeen, Wash., 3,000; Milwaukee, 7,000.

Charleston, S. C., and Wilmington, Del., reported no unemployment; Jersey City said there was "no notable distress because of unemployment"; Newark, N. J., reports "five men for every job"; Duluth, Minn., reported a fair demand, and Jacksonville, Fla., that supply and demand were equal.

Millions of men were unemployed before the war, Mr. Morrison said, and the demand did not equal the supply until 3,000,000 had been called into the Army. Steel companies and packers, he declared, caused the oversupply by importing men to get cheap labor.

We must practice economy in all public expenditures, for I find that all legislative bodies pay too much attention to the tax spender and too little to the taxpayer.

The taxpayer seems to have no friend at court.

No one seems to consider that the taxpayer finally has to pay for all these bonds and taxes.

The idea seems to be spend, spend, spend, and let the taxpayer foot the bill.

The time has come when we must consider the rights of the taxpayer. It seems to be a standing joke that it costs the Government more to do anything than it would cost private parties.

There should be developed in this country a tendency toward economy, not toward extravagance; toward efficiency, not toward inefficiency; toward care and caution in the expenditure of public money, not toward shiftlessness.

The greatest question now confronting this country is reconstruction, and the most important feature of that reconstruction is the readjustment of industry, the discharge of soldiers in the Army, the employment of labor, the control of the food supply and the control of food prices, the handling of the transportation situation, so that we may prevent disorganization and depression.

We must demobilize the Army in such a way that we will assist industry as much as possible and disturb it as little as possible.

We must build up American trade abroad, extend American commerce, and, above all, not interfere with American industries that desire to extend their trade abroad.

We must devote more time to this country and conditions here and less to countries abroad. We must teach and practice Americanism. American ideas must always prevail here. We should as much as possible use American goods, and "Made in America" should be on everything we use.

It is estimated that before the United States entered this war there were not more than 300,000 bondholders in the country. The four liberty loan campaigns added nearly 30,000,000 more to that list; or, in other words, just so many more people in the United States have been taught the habit of saving.

We must protect these bondholders. We took 100 cents on the dollar from these bondholders for the bonds they purchased, but if they wanted to sell most of these issues they would have to sell them at less than par.

The last loan is now selling at about 95 cents on a dollar, and there should be some legislation of some kind that would bring these bonds to par, especially as we expect more liberty loans to be made and floated.

I will insert for the benefit of the House a statement concerning the price of liberty bonds:

LIBERTY BONDS.

[Quoted by Otis & Co.]

There are seven classes of liberty bonds on the stock exchange. When a higher rate liberty bond is issued in exchange for a lower, the bond issued in exchange has the same maturity and interest dates as the bond turned in.

In the table below first 4s are 4s which have been issued in exchange for 3½s. First 4½s are 4½s issued in exchange for 3½s or for first 4s. Second 4s are the original bonds of the second loan. Second 4½s are 4½s issued in exchange for second loan 4s. Third 4½s are the third loan original bonds. Fourth 4½ bonds are the fourth loan original bonds.

Accrued interest to time of sale or purchase in addition to these prices.

January 15.

		High.	Low.	Close.	Net change.
Liberty 3½s.....	\$495,000	98.32	98.16	98.16	-.14
Liberty 1st 4s.....	49,000	92.70	92.60	92.70	+.10
Liberty 2d 4s.....	410,000	92.48	92.20	92.30	+.13
Liberty 1st 4½s.....	59,000	96.30	96.10	96.10	-.18
Liberty 2d 4½s.....	1,053,000	95.10	95.00	95.10
Liberty 3d 4½s.....	1,510,000	96.06	96.00	96.04	-.03
Liberty 4th 4½s.....	2,390,000	95.08	95.00	95.04	-.03

	Callable.	Due.
Liberty 3½s.....	June 15, 1932	June 15, 1947
Liberty 1st 4s..... do..... do.....
Liberty 2d 4s.....	Nov. 15, 1927	Nov. 15, 1942
Liberty 1st 4½s.....	June 15, 1932	June 15, 1947
Liberty 2d 4½s.....	Nov. 15, 1927	Nov. 15, 1942
Liberty 3d 4½s.....	(C)	Sept. 15, 1923
Liberty 4th 4½s.....	Oct. 15, 1933	Oct. 15, 1933

¹ Not callable.

We should establish a merchant marine in some form in order that the ships we have built may be utilized to help build up American trade abroad.

We must give pensions to the soldiers who have fought the battles of the Republic in this war with Germany and take care of their widows, orphans, and dependents.

The soldiers who have been injured in battle or in the line of duty must be treated honorably and justly by this Government.

We must see to it that preference is given our soldiers in the matter of employment, especially as against those alien slackers who refused to do their bit toward the preservation of democracy and humanity. I would go as far as to make it a crime for any person, firm, or corporation to give preference of employment to an alien slacker as against a patriotic son of America.

Likewise, all aliens who served this country should be made citizens immediately upon being honorably discharged from the Army or Navy.

We finally will find that there can be no great success here industrially or internationally without a strong, healthy, and well-developed national life.

We do not compare our workmen with those of any other country. They are better paid, better fed, better clothed, better housed, better educated, and demand more for their families than the workmen of any other country in the world, and they do not ask these things as a matter of charity but they do ask the right to work and earn them.

Simply feeding an American workman does not satisfy him; he demands something more.

One of the most important things this Congress should do is to punish profiteering, which is the main cause of high prices in the matter of foodstuffs.

There may have been some small justification for high food prices during the war, but there is none now.

We produce more foodstuffs than we consume, and they should cost less because of that fact.

I will insert as a part of my remarks tables furnished by the Bureau of Markets, Department of Agriculture, which show that there is much more meat in cold storage than there was a year ago.

This is also true of other food products.

Congress can prevent this hoarding of food products in the cold-storage warehouses by legislation.

I introduced at the last session of Congress a bill fixing the price of cotton, and it caused a panic in the southern cotton market, because there was no justification of the high price of cotton at that time.

If Congress would show a disposition to regulate these cold-storage plants, the price of meat would drop instantly.

With the large number of people now out of employment, which will be augmented as spring approaches, there will have to be a great reduction in the prices of food products or many people in this country will be up against starvation.

Hunger and starvation have been the cause of the Bolshevism in Europe. Let us see to it that they do not cause it here.

We have set an example for the world in the matter of free government. We have set an example for the world in the matter of civilization. We have set an example for the world in the matter of charity. Let us now set an example for the world along the lines of industrial achievements.

I will now read from the Ohio Republican:

THE H. C. OF L.

The National Industrial Conference has reported that the cost of living between July, 1914, and November, 1918, has gone up from 65 to 70 per cent. The increase in the cost of food has been placed at 83 per cent; shelter, 20 per cent; clothing, 93 per cent; fuel and light, 55 per cent; sundries, 55 per cent.

For example, increases in the cost of woolen yarn goods ranged from 90.4 per cent for poplin to 131.5 per cent for serge. Then cotton ranged from 87.9 per cent for voile to 264.4 per cent for percale.

Men's and women's coats selling for \$10 in 1914 cost from \$19 to \$20 in November, 1918, and suits retailing at \$15 in 1914 showed an increase of about 75 per cent. Hosiery went up 90 to 95 per cent. Men's shoes at \$3.50 in 1914 were frequently selling for \$6 in 1918. Women's \$3 shoes brought \$5.75. Children's shoes doubtless advanced in similar proportion, although the report does not specify.

Such abnormal increases in cost must of necessity work hardships on all families save those which have shared largely in the prosperities of the war. It must be kept in mind that unless this war is different from all others, the period of inflated prosperity will be in time succeeded by a period of reaction and depression, which may or not reach panic conditions. Such periods will again affect the average family, and thus we find it being whipsawed by the high prices of a war prosperity in which it may or may not have shared, or by the hard-times reaction in which it seldom avoids sharing.

The happiness and welfare of the American family is one of the basic objects of our Government. Unfortunately the average home is commonplace. It lacks all the glamour of great issues. It lacks all the enchantment which comes from distance. Its simple necessities secure no councils of the great, no royal banquets, no regal processions.

Yet it is apparent that the conditions of living in the United States call for the gravest, wisest, and most immediate consideration by the Government. The happiness and even the welfare of a nation may depend upon such prosaic things as the price of a beefsteak, the cost of a pair of children's shoes, the amount asked for a ton of coal. For a people to be happy they must be well nourished, reasonably clad, sheltered from the elements. * * *

The present Congress has lifted its voice affirmatively and patriotically, and properly so, to the requisitions of the President and Cabinet heads of the executive branch of our Government when called upon to furnish appropriations of money in unprecedented amounts never before heard of in the history of nations.

The American people likewise have responded patriotically to the flotations of liberty loans and have responded cheerfully, readily, and enthusiastically to the purchase of an amount aggregating \$17,000,000,000, not because of any inducement for investment, but absolutely for the purpose of showing their determination to do all required of them to win the war. It can also be said that the same motive can be applied to the cashing into the Federal Treasury a sum reaching close to a billion more for war-savings certificates and thrift stamps.

The American people have been called upon to support the Red Cross and numerous other sources of donations, and where within the territorial limits of our great Republic has there not been a ready and most generous response?

We are a wealthy Nation; our people are the wealthiest in the world. Our great wealth is not brought to us in ships or any other process of transportation from foreign lands. Our leaders of industry and all those under their direction correctly contend, as we must all contend, that our great wealth is produced by the application of labor and capital to all the forces and resources which God and nature have so abundantly placed within our territorial limits.

The past 50 years of our existence has been one of industrial development exceeding all the previous years of our national life, and yet not until we became involved in the present European conflict did we fully realize the uncovered resources of the public domain. Neither did we realize the accomplishment of industrial activity to turn out in so short a time the vast amount of munitions of war, food, and inestimable supplies, not only for our own national defense but also to supply the needs of all our allies.

Captains of industry, backed up by the ready response of labor, produced these American-made goods from American products by American labor in American workshops over which flew the American flag, and the sustenance of this vast industrial army was produced by the American farmer from American soil.

The splendid teamwork of the manufacturers and their employees, brushing aside self-interest, and even in the whirl of many concessions to be made by the employer as to high remuneration and responded to by concessions of workmen, this magnificent cooperation demonstrated to the entire world the ability, intelligence, and the productiveness of our industrial institutions.

During the months of our active participation in the war our industrial activities have been strained, caused by the great haste with which results were to be accomplished, yet by confidence and unselfish cooperation, the elimination of conflict, our goods were produced and produced with such astonishing rapidity as to be almost beyond conception.

It is our duty to keep a friendly understanding between employer and employee, and thus prevent any friction unnecessarily between them.

This conflict has had a tendency of bringing men of all walks of life closer together. It has been the means of opening up and the development of many of our national resources.

It should bring to a larger extent a more equitable distribution of wealth and a higher wage scale for our workmen.

Congress has ungrudgingly opened up the public exchequer and allowed the executive branches to have their will.

Whether it has been wisely expended or not must be determined when the people through their Representatives in Congress demand an accounting.

However, I am at the moment more impressed with the difficulties arising by the imposition of the heavy burden of taxes to be levied for lifting the burden.

We have created the debt, now we must create the way to pay it. Do not lose sight of the burdens imposed upon the American people since this war began. We must consistently use and occupy every avenue of revenue that will relieve the taxpayer.

Our industries must keep their wheels and trip hammers in motion, and labor must keep up the high standard it has been capable of maintaining since the war commenced.

Our products must be marketed, but we must produce the products to be marketed.

It is evident during the days, weeks, months, and probably years of reconstruction our markets will supply the wants of the nations of Europe now undergoing reconstruction.

To meet the demands of our consumption and to encourage production, not only of long-established industries, but likewise those which have sprung into existence since the declaration of war against Germany, this Congress must build suitable barriers of protection. As has been well said, "When we have turned our backs to the sea and our faces to the land we have come into our own true inheritance and built up this great and fabulous wealth," and it can be said doubling itself every five years.

One of the channels for the production of revenue is the revision of the tariff that will consistently and reasonably protect, not only for the protection of industry but as a source of revenue income to assist in liquidating the debt incurred during the successful prosecution of this war.

I here insert as a part of my remarks a report from the United States Bureau of Markets.

Stocks of frozen poultry and frozen and cured meats on Jan. 1, 1919, with comparisons of the stocks on Jan. 1, 1918, and Jan. 1, 1917, by sections.

Section.	Reported for Jan. 1, 1919.		Comparison of stocks (includes totals of all storages reporting) for both dates.			
	Storages reporting.	Pounds.	Storages reporting.	Jan. 1, 1918.	Jan. 1, 1917.	Increase (+) or decrease (-).
Fowls:						
New England...	26	2,579,629	23	553,172	667,401	+ 23.6
Middle Atlantic...	55	5,645,295	51	2,332,507	5,462,624	+134.2
South Atlantic...	14	433,395	13	113,237	310,660	+174.2
N. Central (E)...	42	10,074,335	35	8,060,991	9,719,790	+ 20.6
N. Central (W)...	46	5,118,937	44	1,922,235	5,017,106	+161.0
South Central...	19	694,229	18	591,343	694,299	+ 33.5
Western (N)...	18	470,934	14	130,233	308,277	+136.7
Western (S)...	19	713,107	14	284,784	394,709	+ 38.3
Total.....	239	25,732,892	212	13,898,550	22,574,866	+ 62.4

Stocks of frozen poultry and frozen and cured meats, etc.—Continued.

Section.	Reported for Jan. 1, 1919.		Comparison of stocks (includes totals of all storages reporting) for both dates.			
	Storages reporting.	Pounds.	Storages reporting.	Jan. 1, 1918.	Jan. 1, 1917.	Increase (+) or decrease (-).
Turkeys:						
New England...	23	1,443,683	21	91,944	431,818	+353.7
Middle Atlantic...	52	2,486,495	49	900,351	2,404,338	+167.0
South Atlantic...	17	153,078	16	87,432	129,530	+ 48.1
N. Central (E)...	42	2,318,982	36	2,200,102	2,225,363	+ 1.1
N. Central (W)...	41	1,057,579	39	665,765	1,037,964	+ 55.9
South Central...	23	790,205	23	463,292	770,206	+ 70.6
Western (N)...	21	155,632	15	86,931	138,660	+ 59.5
Western (S)...	27	471,819	21	248,415	331,229	+ 33.3
Total.....	245	8,877,474	220	4,744,233	7,489,108	+ 57.9
Miscellaneous poultry:						
New England...	26	1,293,072	24	214,101	230,604	+ 35.7
Middle Atlantic...	59	8,441,519	57	6,075,034	8,018,032	+ 32.0
South Atlantic...	12	283,564	11	64,391	276,377	+329.2
N. Central (E)...	50	11,424,505	42	6,566,422	10,827,319	+ 64.9
N. Central (W)...	54	5,211,465	52	1,566,974	5,167,084	+229.7
South Central...	24	576,263	23	496,618	570,013	+ 14.8
Western (N)...	21	372,065	15	271,932	336,477	+ 23.7
Western (S)...	25	331,916	22	142,527	267,690	+ 87.8
Total.....	271	27,934,369	246	15,397,999	25,753,595	+ 67.3
Total frozen poultry:						
New England...	35	10,015,487	32	1,313,931	2,532,522	+ 92.7
Middle Atlantic...	72	27,575,993	68	16,151,057	26,849,233	+ 65.2
South Atlantic...	22	1,102,799	20	433,906	984,268	+115.3
N. Central (E)...	54	41,602,412	49	30,886,647	40,037,083	+ 29.6
N. Central (W)...	57	19,375,732	54	7,606,477	18,415,192	+142.1
South Central...	30	3,416,032	30	1,962,020	3,409,782	+ 73.8
Western (N)...	31	1,367,115	23	625,249	1,048,165	+ 67.6
Western (S)...	33	2,461,720	27	923,279	1,463,324	+ 58.5
Total.....	334	106,917,290	303	59,905,563	94,689,529	+ 58.1
Broilers:						
New England...	17	774,524	16	123,359	166,179	+ 34.7
Middle Atlantic...	53	3,931,023	51	2,585,077	3,920,161	+ 51.6
South Atlantic...	10	119,411	8	93,677	107,329	+ 14.6
N. Central (E)...	39	6,081,544	32	4,722,777	5,862,869	+ 24.1
N. Central (W)...	42	2,441,951	41	1,085,724	2,213,153	+103.8
South Central...	17	955,630	17	362,379	955,637	+163.7
Western (N)...	11	165,939	8	41,423	141,016	+242.5
Western (S)...	21	610,513	17	191,627	310,955	+ 62.3
Total.....	210	15,083,535	190	9,203,040	13,677,287	+ 48.6
Roasters:						
New England...	23	3,924,579	22	331,355	976,520	+194.7
Middle Atlantic...	53	7,071,750	49	4,261,088	7,044,080	+ 65.3
South Atlantic...	6	119,381	5	75,119	110,381	+ 48.9
N. Central (E)...	40	11,703,046	31	9,333,352	11,461,697	+ 22.1
N. Central (W)...	45	5,545,780	44	2,335,779	4,979,885	+110.5
South Central...	13	399,634	13	133,333	399,631	+188.8
Western (N)...	13	202,485	9	94,733	123,735	+ 37.6
Western (S)...	29	334,365	16	55,925	158,749	+183.8
Total.....	213	20,292,020	192	16,658,735	25,194,672	+ 51.2
Frozen lamb and mutton:						
New England...	21	1,326,818	21	998,025	1,326,818	+ 32.9
Middle Atlantic...	57	4,129,637	51	2,418,814	3,713,291	+ 53.5
South Atlantic...	12	189,655	12	86,125	189,655	+123.2
N. Central (E)...	35	3,478,332	30	1,350,940	3,309,092	+144.9
N. Central (W)...	36	2,081,623	30	706,388	1,972,829	+179.3
South Central...	16	332,217	13	42,570	318,553	+648.3
Western (N)...	26	188,257	22	377,763	174,274	- 53.9
Western (S)...	23	538,949	21	238,623	532,629	+123.2
Total.....	226	12,251,508	203	6,219,294	11,537,112	+ 85.5
Frozen pork:						
New England...	35	4,217,362	32	2,824,593	4,014,703	+ 42.1
Middle Atlantic...	81	10,777,544	75	3,738,797	10,593,218	+183.4
South Atlantic...	20	1,570,745	19	645,657	1,568,745	+143.0
N. Central (E)...	65	19,702,838	59	9,896,224	17,019,784	+ 72.0
N. Central (W)...	55	16,662,915	50	5,990,991	10,710,297	+ 79.7
South Central...	29	3,396,682	26	1,500,676	2,496,887	+ 66.4
Western (N)...	27	1,930,617	27	3,261,000	1,900,617	- 41.7
Western (S)...	28	1,716,032	26	2,363,565	1,547,639	- 34.5
Total.....	349	59,854,765	314	30,192,103	49,553,893	+ 65.1
Dry salt pork:						
New England...	20	16,806,093	20	8,931,957	16,806,093	+ 88.8
Middle Atlantic...	75	11,144,226	70	8,295,149	10,940,320	+ 31.9
South Atlantic...	52	5,254,232	51	4,201,893	5,029,644	+ 19.7
N. Central (E)...	111	138,814,616	104	99,976,935	123,736,435	+ 23.8
N. Central (W)...	70	161,698,759	67	101,343,163	160,687,233	+ 58.6
South Central...	43	11,675,491	39	7,038,374	9,972,742	+ 30.6
Western (N)...	29	1,629,247	29	1,459,615	1,629,247	+ 9.4
Western (S)...	37	3,891,812	34	2,297,493	3,058,933	+ 38.6
Total.....	437	350,884,441	414	234,055,592	331,866,617	+ 41.8

Stocks of frozen poultry and frozen and cured meats, etc.—Continued.

Section	Reported for Jan. 1, 1919.		Comparison of stocks (includes total of all storages reporting) for both dates.			
	Storages reporting.	Pounds.	Storages reporting.	Jan. 1, 1918.	Jan. 1, 1919.	Increase (+) or decrease (-).
Pickled pork:				Pounds.	Pounds.	Per ct.
New England...	32	17,885,163	31	20,465,461	17,885,163	- 12.6
Middle Atlantic...	120	26,048,566	115	18,646,220	26,010,916	+ 39.5
South Atlantic...	44	6,488,361	42	5,493,348	6,453,535	+ 17.5
N. Central (E)...	143	120,862,028	132	88,300,574	98,491,181	+ 11.5
N. Central (W)...	75	103,245,223	70	90,223,364	103,165,208	+ 14.3
South Central...	28	9,910,244	25	6,438,330	7,062,786	+ 9.7
Western (N)...	32	7,112,214	32	5,533,493	7,112,214	+ 28.5
Western (S)...	36	6,857,962	35	7,194,611	5,825,523	- 19.0
Total.....	510	298,403,761	482	242,295,401	272,006,526	+ 12.3
Lard:						
New England...	31	10,056,231	30	6,398,198	9,823,671	+ 53.5
Middle Atlantic...	121	8,590,230	116	3,620,851	8,470,898	+ 33.9
South Atlantic...	49	1,584,564	46	962,948	1,497,360	+ 55.5
North Central (E)...	147	44,463,039	140	22,197,312	44,372,304	+ 99.9
N. Central (W)...	80	29,294,781	77	13,664,293	27,746,351	+ 103.1
South Central...	41	3,016,505	35	1,628,589	2,635,104	+ 61.8
Western (N)...	32	1,434,027	31	1,671,119	1,373,475	- 17.3
Western (S)...	40	2,311,063	37	1,730,295	2,114,371	+ 22.2
Total.....	541	100,755,440	512	51,873,806	98,033,534	+ 89.0
Miscellaneous meats:						
New England...	28	6,183,793	13	1,352,349	3,398,353	+151.3
Middle Atlantic...	89	10,068,140	44	3,232,296	6,302,453	+ 95.0
South Atlantic...	35	2,627,050	15	537,139	745,928	+ 38.9
N. Central (E)...	103	52,214,238	67	14,265,184	23,066,163	+ 61.7
N. Central (W)...	65	43,894,205	41	13,293,283	21,843,574	+ 64.3
South Central...	33	5,475,113	19	932,883	1,769,749	+ 89.7
Western (N)...	26	2,452,206	10	375,616	2,029,926	+440.4
Western (S)...	33	5,027,777	17	977,202	2,839,449	+190.6
Total.....	412	127,942,489	226	34,965,952	61,995,595	+ 77.3

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of buildings in the District of Columbia, \$66,500: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, in his discretion, to enter into a contract for the lease for a period not to exceed five years with an option for a period of five additional years, of the Commerce Building, now occupied by the Department of Commerce, at an annual rental not to exceed \$65,500.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. Is it necessary, in view of the many buildings that have been erected for war purposes during the past months, to authorize the rental of a building for this department at \$65,000 per year, when some of these other buildings will presumably be vacated by war bureaus in the near future?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that it is not absolutely necessary, in so far as actual space is concerned, for I am satisfied from the statement made to the committee by the gentleman who was appointed to look into the question of space, that there will be available space, but the gentleman from Massachusetts knows that these buildings are temporary in character, and it is not expected that they will be occupied for an extended period of time. Here is the great Department of Commerce that is occupying a splendid office building on the corner of Nineteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. The lease expires on June 30 of this year. Some disposition has to be made of that department, and the committee thought in view of the importance of the department and the fact that other departments of the Government are placed in buildings of a permanent character that it would hardly be in keeping with the dignity and importance of the department to place it in one of the temporary buildings.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman would not urge that the dignity of a department would warrant—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I shall place it upon the ground of the very great importance of the department.

Mr. WALSH. Is the department any more important than the War Department and its various bureaus have been during the past two years?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. By no means.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman think any of those temporary buildings that have been erected for the War Department and the War Trade Board, and these other bureaus conducting war activities, will be torn down within the next five years?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that the War Department and the Navy Department are now located in two new buildings on Potomac Park, but those buildings are not in the class to which I refer. Those buildings, as the gentleman knows, are of a permanent character.

Mr. WALSH. Erected temporarily?

Mr. BYRNS. As to just when they will be disposed of I do not know, but those are really up-to-date office buildings.

Mr. WALSH. How about the Munitions Building?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The War Trade Building is located down on Fifteenth Street on Government land, and that is a building of more or less durable character.

But the buildings to which I referred are such buildings as are located in Henry Park and Seaton Park and one or two buildings located on leased land near Potomac Park. Those buildings will last 5 or probably 10 years, but they are not of a permanent character.

Mr. WALSH. We have several permanent housing buildings for the activities of the Government during the last two years.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; that is true, and it is expected that these buildings which are more permanent and more suitable will be used during the coming fiscal year, and this bill does not carry any appropriation for rent save this and two or three other items which apply to leases of the Government extending over a period of two or three years.

Mr. WALSH. If that is the case, some of these buildings which were erected for the war activities are of such character that they can be used by other departments of the Government when the need for them on the part of the war activities ceases. Why is it necessary to enter into a lease of five years; why can not you just continue this lease for one year, and perhaps during that time you will find one of these buildings which will be suitable and will come up to the requirements of the dignity and importance of this department?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The reason is I fear that it is very likely that the Secretary of Commerce could not possibly enter into his present arrangements for rent for that building if limited to a period of one year. I will say to the gentleman that when this building was first occupied by the Department of Commerce a more favorable lease was secured than had ever been secured for any up-to-date office building. The rent is about 39 cents a square foot. That is much less than is being paid for other buildings in Washington.

Mr. WALSH. That was before the profiteers were getting in their deadly work in the District. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; that lease was made five years ago.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; and the profiteer did not begin to run amuck until after we declared war, and then the rents both for business purposes and dwelling purposes began to climb up.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But there were no special conditions five years ago which put rents up here in the city of Washington, and, I say to the gentleman, at that time a lease was entered into by the Secretary of Commerce which was more reasonable than any other lease made by the Government, so far as I know, for a building of this character and description.

Mr. WALSH. But in view of the fact and notwithstanding the fact that the Government has erected many buildings for war activities, some of which are of substantial character and sufficient to house this department, because it secured a very favorable lease five years ago we will disregard the facilities that the Government has erected, and give the owner or owners of this property a renewal of their lease for five years.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If this authority is not given to the Secretary of Commerce the best he can do will be to get one of these temporary wooden buildings here in the city of Washington. Now, I am told in the case of one or two of these buildings it has been necessary to shore them up and to make repairs of doors and windows, and I submit to the gentleman that a department of the importance of the Department of Commerce should not be placed in one of those buildings which necessarily are temporary in character. I may say to the gentleman that there is a strong sentiment in some quarters now that some of these buildings ought not to be occupied at all and that they ought to be torn down at once. I do not subscribe to that. I think they should be continued for a period of several years, or at least until the Government can make some other arrangement, because, in my judgment, the Government ought to house its own employees, but I believe in housing its own employees it ought to provide suitable office accommodations. Now, if this department, merely because its lease has expired, is required to take one of these temporary buildings of the character which I have described, why, then, we will do something for this department that we have not done with reference to any other department of the Government. This department occupies now in this building, I am informed, about 175,000 square feet. Now, I do not know whether they could get that much space in any one particular building or not. In addition, these buildings are liable to fire, they are not fireproof, and there are valuable records, for instance, of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Com-

merce, Steamboat Inspection, Navigation, and so forth, in the Department of Commerce, and it seems to me it would be very unwise to transfer those bureaus with those records into a building of that character.

Mr. WALSH. Well, we have had other important departments with valuable records—the War Risk Bureau, scattered around in 13 buildings, the Food Administration and Fuel Administration, and many bureaus of the War Department in those buildings, some of which are more than mere temporary buildings, some of them are on Government land, some of them in the near future, I think, will be likely to be vacated, will be standing idle. I do not know whether any of these will be required to be shored up or not; there are a lot of them it will be necessary, probably, to shore down and destroy. I think the gentleman will find upon inquiry there are some buildings out in the vicinity of the new War and Navy buildings that are of sufficient permanence in their construction which would be suitable for this very important department, and which have facilities for the storage of records and preserving them against fire and other dangers, and it seems to me we ought not to continue this policy of leasing these buildings when the Government has constructed buildings which are sufficiently large and convenient to house the other departments of the Government.

They answer for war purposes, and they were sufficiently permanent in character to house the War Department bureaus and other important bureaus, and it seems to me we ought to make use of them. And it would be cheaper, in my opinion, to continue these buildings and make repairs on them from time to time to add to their permanency of character and construction where they are on Government land and to have them as departmental buildings. I do not believe it is necessary to erect an ornamental structure for any particular department, such as has been done in the case of the Treasury Annex. Now, the Navy Building, we were given to understand, would be a temporary building, but it is more than temporary in its character of construction and it is a very plain building. There are no vast pillars of granite. It is a plain structure, with plenty of light, and I believe there will be plenty of room even in that building.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am informed it is one of the most desirable Government office buildings in the city. But those two buildings to which the gentleman refers are occupied now entirely by the Navy Department and the War Department. The Navy Department has moved out of the War, State, and Navy Building altogether, with the exception of the office of the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, and the library.

Mr. WALSH. They have gotten into that new building, and it requires eighteen guides to find them.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That building will be required for the most part by the Navy Department, but the building adjoining is used by the War Department, which will need additional space, and it is proposed to use such portion of the other building not needed by the Navy Department to take care of this additional space for the War Department. Mr. Dorr stated that he had had requests for 760,000 square feet.

Mr. WALSH. Who is he?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. He is assistant director of munitions. I think that is his position, and he was especially selected by the Secretary of War to take under consideration the question of space in these various buildings which are under the jurisdiction of the War Department. Those requests not only came from the bureaus of the War Department now in rented buildings, but bureaus of the Treasury and other departments. He has allotted some of that space, and he will have an additional amount of space for further allotment. The Bureau of the Census will need a considerable amount of space. It is not proposed to rent a building for the Bureau of the Census, but to place it in one of the buildings down in Seaton Park.

Mr. WALSH. Where is that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is off of Sixth Street.

Mr. WALSH. Is that a fireproof building?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is not a fireproof building, and the Director of the Census says that he will have to build a fireproof vault for the important census records, because the gentleman can realize that it would be very poor business to collect these records at great expense over the country and bring them here and put them in an inflammable building and have them destroyed overnight.

Mr. WALSH. Is it the gentleman's understanding from the information he has acquired that the activities of the War Department and the Navy Department in the future are to be such as to require the utilization of all the space in this new building that has been erected down on Potomac Park?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Both of those buildings; yes.

Mr. WALSH. And while we are going to demobilize the Army, we are not going to demobilize the clerical force of these two departments?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This bill reduces the rent of the Government more than \$600,000. We absolutely cut out that large amount in the next fiscal year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I really believe it would be false economy in the administration of the Department of Commerce to compel them to remove from their present quarters at Nineteenth and Pennsylvania Avenue, a building that was designed especially for the activities of the department, and require them to be moved into various temporary buildings throughout the District.

As the chairman of the committee has said, the concrete buildings in Potomac Park will be utilized and will continue to be needed for the War and Navy Departments. The estimates in this bill for clerical services in the War Department are predicated upon the idea of a standing Army of 500,000 men. We read in the newspapers yesterday where Secretary of War Baker stated before the Committee on Military Affairs that at the present time he would not request the Congress to act upon a permanent policy as to the size of the standing Army during this term of Congress.

But in this bill the authorizations for clerks is predicated upon the idea of a standing Army of 500,000 men. With that as a basis, with a Navy that is going to surpass that of Great Britain, and with an Army of 500,000 men, the clerical force necessary to maintain those activities will need all the space in the concrete buildings in Potomac Park. Now, where is the Department of Commerce, which is now housed in a fireproof building, going to be housed? There are a lot of temporary buildings that sooner or later will have to be removed. I think the policy of the Government should be, as to those temporary buildings, to utilize them during their serviceable life—10 years perhaps—and when they reach that stage of depreciation that the cost of repair is greater than it is advisable to continue, then to discontinue them, and in the meantime provide for permanent modern office buildings, not ornate Government buildings.

To remove the activities of the Department of Commerce to these temporary buildings would cost the Government perhaps \$60,000 to \$75,000; but the damage to the service that would be wrought could only be estimated in hundreds of thousands of dollars. Now, as to this lease, the landlord here is not seeking to increase the rate, which was regarded as a reasonable rate five years ago, when this lease was first negotiated. When the war started and the Government was confronted with the necessity of getting additional buildings an attempt was made to have buildings erected by private contractors, but the rental asked by the backers of these projects was double what the Government had been paying for such character of buildings, such as those occupied by the Department of Justice, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Commerce. If the landlord had attempted to increase the rate on the plea that these buildings had actually gone up in value by reason of the increased cost of construction there might be some ground for the complaint now made; but with the landlord willing to enter into a lease for five years, with the option in the Government for a further lease for five years at the old rate, I can not see where there is any criticism justified in the department remaining in a structure exactly suited to its needs.

Mr. SHERWOOD. The gentleman says it was based on the idea that we should have an Army of 500,000 men. Who has authorized an Army of 500,000 men?

Mr. STAFFORD. There has been no congressional authorization of an Army of 500,000, but the War Department officials came before the committee and said that these estimates were based on the idea of a standing Army of 500,000 men.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, that is only temporary.

Mr. STAFFORD. The idea was that that was to be the permanent force. But that is a matter to be determined in the future. I say these estimates were predicated on the idea of having a force of 500,000 men in the next fiscal year.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Are they certain that that will give privates enough so that all the officers will have a job?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not going into a discussion of the need of a standing Army of 500,000 men nor into the discussion of the tendency to have a large number of officers here in Washington, which has the effect of keeping a large number of clerks constantly on the pay roll of the Government.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I understand the gentleman says he did not want to discuss the proposition of an Army of 500,000 men, but, nevertheless, he is doing it. The gentleman is a hard-working member of the Committee on Appropriations—

Mr. STAFFORD. I decline to admit it.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that the Government has not now buildings which it has erected upon its own land of sufficient permanence and character which in the near future will probably be vacated because of the cessation of activities on the part of the bureaus and departments which now occupy them, which will not afford sufficient floor space and protection for the records of the Department of Commerce and its various bureaus?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do. The testimony before the committee shows that the President has appointed the Assistant Director of Munitions to make a survey of all the available space in Government-owned, temporary Government-owned buildings, and buildings erected by the Government on leased land, and he testifies that all that space will be called for by the present activities of the Government during the next fiscal year, without giving any consideration to the Department of Commerce in the housing of its present force other than the Bureau of the Census.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman is familiar with the new War and Navy Building on Potomac Park and the Munitions Building, so called, is he not?

Mr. STAFFORD. Quite well.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman has been in them, has he not?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have.

Mr. WALSH. And having his familiarity with those buildings in mind, will the gentleman state that during the next five years the Navy Department and the War Department in their activities will require the use and occupancy of each and every one of these entire buildings?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am very guarded in making a statement on this floor, because I do not wish to mislead any Member, much less the astute Member from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman is going to answer my question, I will be satisfied to accept that adjective. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. And in the next fiscal year all the Government buildings will be needed for activities other than those of the Department of Commerce, except those of the Bureau of the Census under that department.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from Wisconsin is fully aware that because of the war emergency the Government has erected a great number of buildings, some of them more permanent in character than others, and some of them will not be required for the activities for which they were erected, and they will either stand vacant or they will be used by some of these departments that will still want to continue their activities after the necessity for them has passed. Here is an opportunity to house the Department of Commerce in one of these buildings on Government land, which would save to the Government in the next five years some \$300,000; and yet the gentleman states that because five years ago there was a landlord fair and just enough to make a reasonable rental rate to the Government, which he has sought to advance for a renewal of his lease, we should continue to lease that building for five years further. I think the truth is that the lease we made five years ago contained a clause giving the Government the option to renew it for five years at the same rental.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, two or three years ago, as I recall, the legislative bill carried an authorization for the Attorney General to enter into a contract for a lease of five years, and the Department of Labor for a similar lease, and it was my suggestion that there should be incorporated a provision giving the Government an option to extend it for another term of five years. That was after we had entered into a lease for the Department of Commerce. But the term of the Department of Commerce was, I believe, for a stated period of five years, without the option of a renewal. At my suggestion in the committee, the option was further incorporated in this authorization.

Permit me to say to the gentleman that these temporary buildings down on New York Avenue, just to the north of the concrete buildings in Potomac Park, are on leased land. I believe that by the terms the lease expires six months after the termination of the war. Certainly there is no provision there for renewal if the landlord does not wish to extend that privilege. Now, for us to move in a haphazard way and say to the Department of Commerce, "You shall find quarters in these temporary buildings, where the whole floor space is all preoccupied by various activities of the Government," would indeed be

a short-sighted policy, would be a policy ruinous to the activities of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, still further reserving the point of order, it seems to me this is an unwise policy to pursue with reference to the utilization of buildings that have been erected by the Government upon its own land, and that here is a chance to make a reasonable saving—

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. WALSH. In the removal of the Department of Commerce into one of these buildings. They are going to be compelled to use one of these buildings apparently for the Census Bureau, and they are going to put that bureau into a building that is apparently not fireproof, and that bureau will have to occupy that building for a considerable length of time. Now, you have erected a number of buildings on Government land, buildings of a sufficiently permanent character, and which can be made fireproof by the addition of fire guards and the installation of fireproof vaults, buildings which will not be removed probably within the next five years, because the gentleman intimates that they could very well remain there for 10 years, and during that time we could repair them and make them available; and if we are going to continue the policy of renting buildings year after year, when we have buildings of our own upon our own land, we might just as well consider that what we have expended for Government buildings has been an utter and sheer waste, outside of the temporary occupancy of those buildings for war bureaus in the conduct of their activities; and I submit that this is not the time to establish the precedent of renewing leases for privately owned buildings for a term of five years, with an option to renew them further for five additional years, no matter how important the department, because we have buildings at present which were erected for war purposes which can be vacated by the 1st of July, and the transfer could be effected by that time. I express serious doubt, whether we have the largest Navy in the world or whether we have a standing Army of 500,000 men, as has been outlined by the War Department officials to the Committee on Military Affairs during the last few years—whether they can in the proper conduct of these departments utilize the entire space of those two new buildings down on Potomac Park. What is going to be the need of the War Department to use the new Munitions Building, so called, simply because we have a standing Army of 500,000 men? Why, we had an Army of over 2,000,000 men on the other side of the water, and even then they did not use all the space in the buildings that they have and they vacated many rooms in the State, War, and Navy Building to which some of these bureaus can very well return. If we are going to keep this immense clerical force here in Washington to carry on these activities during the next five years, then, instead of using the temporary buildings, we will have to increase the rentals and you will have to build more temporary buildings. I submit that here is an opportunity where the Congress ought to indicate a desire on the part of these departments to make use of the Government's own property.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The legislative act of this year makes provision for rental of the Mills Building, the Lemon Building, and various other privately owned buildings. The committee this year absolutely withdrew the authorizations for these buildings, with the desire to force the activities now housed in those buildings to go into these temporary buildings. I believe there is only one instance where we have made provision for rental of private quarters, other than for the three privately owned buildings exclusively used by the three departments. It has been the policy of the committee to force the activities of the Government, so far as possible and practicable, into these temporary buildings. A survey is being made at the present time. That survey shows that it is absolutely impossible to house the Department of Commerce in the available space in the temporary buildings. Now, if in spite of that testimony the gentleman wishes to make a point of order and not to provide any housing for the Department of Commerce, it is his privilege so to do. If the committee had not given very careful consideration to this subject, we would be open to criticism, but we gave it as thorough consideration as was possible and adopted this policy.

Mr. WALSH. I see there is also a provision for rent of quarters for the Department of Justice of \$7,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is where there is a lease in existence, where we are obligated to pay the rental, and the same for the Department of Labor. There are two cases where we have leases for five years, where we are obligated to pay. But in every instance where we could force the activities of any department into these Government-owned buildings, we did so by

cutting out the appropriation for the rental. Now that is the judgment of the subcommittee after a thorough consideration.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order and offer an amendment: Page 135, line 6, strike out the word "five" and insert in place thereof the word "two," and strike out the words "with an option for a period of five additional years."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 135, line 6, strike out the word "five" and insert the word "two"; and in lines 6 and 7 strike out the following: "with an option for a period of five additional years."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I do it for the purpose of asking the chairman a question about the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. I am informed that in that bureau there is maintained a quasi civil-service commission, well organized and officered, and at a great expense; that they hold examinations, or alleged examinations, frequently; and without giving information to the applicants as to the monetary qualifications that every representative as a commercial agent must have before receiving the appointment; that to hold these examinations they invite men to come from all over the country, at great expense, have the result of the examination pigeonholed and do nothing more about it. The appointments are said to be made from men who have the financial qualifications prescribed by the secretary; that it is stated by the secretary that men must have private means to be appointed, and that men without private means of from \$5,000 to \$10,000 a year of their own are not appointed. If this is so, why is a highly organized and expensive civil-service bureau maintained in that department for the purpose of holding these mock examinations? Is the sole purpose that of giving positions to this body of examiners?

Mr. MADDEN. Why, the use of any kind of a regulation, the gentleman must know, is to prevent the fellow from getting the job that they do not want to have it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Men are invited from all over the country to take these examinations, without having it first stated to them that they must have an income of from \$5,000 to \$10,000 a year, even though they be otherwise qualified.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the commercial attachés and agents who are appointed for foreign service receive salaries, as I remember it, ranging from \$3,500 to \$8,000 a year. In addition to that they are given a subsistence of \$5 a day. I agree that in some cases the amount allowed for subsistence may not be entirely sufficient, but I fail to understand that it is necessary for one to have a private income in order to accept one of these positions. I do not understand that is necessary, because the salaries range from \$3,500 to \$8,000 a year, outside of their subsistence.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have here a letter from a responsible man with respect to these examinations. He says:

In the case of the position of commercial agents, I have not only been reliably informed that the chief of the bureau has stated that men are required for this position who could draw on their private income to the extent of five or ten thousand dollars a year in order to maintain their positions, but I have a letter to this effect signed by Secretary Redfield.

That seems to be rather definite and conclusive upon the matter of requiring a financial qualification.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I should be very much surprised if the information of the gentleman from Kansas is correct, because it has never been called to the attention of the committee. The Secretary of Commerce has insisted that the committee should raise the per diem for subsistence from \$5 to \$8 a day upon the ground that it is impossible for some of these agents in foreign fields to provide subsistence for \$5. The committee has declined to do that, but it has never been stated in support of that proposition by the Secretary of Commerce that it had become necessary for him to choose from those who have private incomes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That question aside, is it necessary to maintain a bureau in the Department of Commerce for the purpose of making these examinations, a highly expensive bureau? Why not make these examinations through the regular Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That I would say to the gentleman would be impractical for the reason that these foreign agents are required to have peculiar qualifications. It was for that reason that the law was enacted that the Department of Commerce should appoint these agents after conducting an examination to determine their fitness and qualifications. These

men have to be well versed in the language of the country to which they are assigned. They have to have the necessary business experience and training in order to enable them properly to perform the duties.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The writer of this letter refers to a case of this kind:

In the case of one man who took the examination for special agent, who had studied the trade relations in certain South American countries, a man who has a wide knowledge of affairs in those countries, and speaks the language of those countries fluently, he was informed that, in the opinion of one of the officials of the bureau, his personal appearance did not measure up to the standards set by the bureau. In this connection I might mention that some of the men who have been selected and sent abroad to fill these positions, and probably selected without ever having been required to take the examination for the position as announced have been the butt of ridicule for travelers abroad, as, for example, one whose ability was evidently measured by the amount of whisky he could drink and another one who appeared immediately after his arrival in the Orient in the garb of a native.

These are the men who are passed by this examining commission in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman does not think that a civil-service examination would necessarily prevent anything like that.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. But the gentleman stated that the idea was to select men peculiarly fitted for those positions.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is the idea.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And I am now calling attention to the peculiarly well-fitted men who have been selected by this highly organized commission.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is the idea, I will say to the gentleman; and the Secretary of Commerce conducts an examination more rigid than any that could be possibly conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Why more rigid?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And the same policy is pursued in the State Department. Consular agents are not selected after a civil-service examination, but after an examination held by the department in order to determine their qualifications and fitness for the positions.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Does the gentleman know the expense of maintaining this examining commission in the Department of Commerce?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is none.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I see that the paragraph is not itemized.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think there is any expense, because these examinations are held, as the gentleman has stated, both orally and written, and under the direct supervision of the Secretary of Commerce. In fact, he conducts the examination. There is no expense involved.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, replying to the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], is it not a fact that the State Department must select consuls without the aid of the Civil Service Commission, because under the Constitution Congress would not have the power to direct the selection of consuls by civil-service examination, whereas in the Department of Commerce it is perfectly competent for us to direct that the selection be made under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not question the fact that Congress can dictate just how these appointments shall be made.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Well, does not the gentleman from Tennessee think, in the interest of economy, we should provide that the consular agents and attachés should be examined by the Civil Service Commission rather than by an organization of men maintained in the Department of Commerce?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I do not, for two reasons: In the first place, there is no expense involved, and therefore the question of economy does not arise.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am informed there is expense.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And, in the second place, I am earnestly of the opinion that the examination which is now being conducted by the Department of Commerce in reference to those appointed to this service is one that is much more rigid and much more calculated to bring out the question of whether or not one is fitted properly to represent our Government in foreign countries, because, the gentleman will understand, particular care and attention should be given to the selection of these commercial agents in foreign countries, for much depends upon their tact and diplomacy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee (continuing). As well as upon their business qualifications.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

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

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will.

Mr. FLOOD. Is it not a fact that in the written examination of these applicants for commercial attachés the Civil Service Commission has representatives upon the board?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have no information on that. I am asking what information the Committee on Appropriations has with reference to these examinations, which I am informed are conducted by the Department of Commerce at great expense.

Mr. FLOOD. They have similar examinations in the State Department.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I know, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia, since he has brought the question up, that the Civil Service Commission does have a representative who is on the examining board with the Secretary of Commerce and others.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman have an inquiry made of the Secretary by telephone before we get through with this bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I shall be very glad to inform the gentleman later.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that very much is expended in the matter to which the gentleman from Kansas has called attention. I think, however, that there is a lack of coordination between these two great departments, and that lack of coordination is costing the Government a great deal of money. For example, in 1915 the Secretary of Commerce received for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce \$225,000, and the State Department had for that purpose—that is, for clerk hire here in Washington as carried in the legislative bill—\$352,260, making a combined appropriation of \$577,260 for the same purpose. This year the State Department asks for \$1,577,140 for clerks here in Washington as compared with a quarter of a million five years ago, and the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce asked for \$1,324,000. Now, officials in the State Department came before the committee and said they could do all the work they are now doing and also that the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce were doing, and we asked why they did not get together and economize, and why the President did not enforce the provisions of the Overman Act and cut out this duplication. They gave us no real information and furnished no suggestions to aid the committee in any way to work out some economy.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Then, why did not the committee force the consolidation?

Mr. GOOD. Well, the committee can not do that very well.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Why not?

Mr. GOOD. It is easier said than done.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Cut off the appropriation.

Mr. GOOD. That is still easier said than done. This is an executive function; it is not a legislative function. We can not do that without doing some harm perhaps to commerce.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Simply order the transfer from one to the other and stop this duplication.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. ROGERS. The Acting Secretary of State, when he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs last month, said that he realized that there was this difficulty between the Department of Commerce and the Department of State and that the Department of Commerce and the Department of State ought to get together and that he proposed to see that they did get together, and his suggestion was that representatives of the two departments should come before the gentleman's own committee, the Committee on Appropriations, and thrash the thing out, right then and there. Now, this does not look like the way to get at it. Does the gentleman know whether or not that is to be done?

Mr. GOOD. No; it has not been done, and I do not think it will be done, and it ought not to be done that way. We can not, in the nature of things, get all the information necessary so as not to do some injustice; but I took the floor simply to say that if the President did not do it and this department did not do it, that when they came before the House next year I proposed to oppose an appropriation in both instances until they did do it. I do not know who is right, but I know these departments ought to get together. We passed a law giving the President the power to coordinate and cut out these duplications of service, and if they do not get together the commercial interests can then point their finger to those two great departments and to the Executive as the reason why their appropriations may be in danger.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. Did not Congress by its act create the commercial attachés?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. And has not Congress—

Mr. GOOD. And Secretary of State Bryan came before us and said it was a pretty good thing. It was done with his acquiescence and consent, and, if I mistake not, at his request.

Mr. FLOOD. It was done by Congress and it has been carried by Congress every year, notwithstanding it is subject to the point of order, and the gentleman can not blame the Executive and can not blame the State Department; he has simply to blame the Committee on Appropriations for carrying this appropriation year after year—an item which is increased from year to year for these commercial attachés—which is subject to the point of order and which has not been made.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. To perform a great service in the interests of commerce.

Mr. GOOD. The Secretary of State came before the committee and the Secretary of Commerce also came before the committee and asked for the legislation. These departments got what they asked for. Of course, Congress did not know these departments would, if given the new places they ask for, duplicate the work of each.

Mr. FLOOD. And the Secretary of State has not been before the committee for two or three years, has he?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia whether the appropriation is increased in this bill over that in the current law for the commercial attachés or the foreign-commerce work?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is. I will say to the gentleman it is increased in the case of commercial attachés about \$40,000, and in the case of the extension and promotion of our commerce generally about \$300,000 or more. In other words, the total appropriation for this bureau carries something like \$900,000. The appropriation for the current bill is about \$350,000.

Mr. FLOOD. The appropriation for this bureau is merely the appropriation for the State Department.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No. How much does this bill carry?

Mr. FLOOD. For foreign service?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This is for foreign service distinctly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has the floor.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to the gentlemen proceeding, but I would like to use my time just for a moment.

I made the inquiry because of an incident that recently occurred. A friend of mine in Chicago, a man of high reputation, was going, with his wife, to make a trip to Panama, and wanted to go on to South America; not directly in the interests of commerce, but any information that he would acquire would probably have been for the benefit of commerce. The State Department informed me that it would not grant him a passport unless a physician would certify that he wanted to make the trip to South America for his health. I replied to the department that doubtless he could get a certificate from a physician to that effect, but if he did we would all know it was false, because no man would go down through the Torrid Zone in South America for his health, from Chicago especially. And a passport was refused him. Now, upon what theory do we largely increase the appropriation in order to extend our commerce with South America, in one department, and then have another department of the Government refuse to permit a man to go there? It seems an oddity. And I make the inquiry so that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs may, if he will and has the opportunity, give us the information as to what the regulation is and why it is, when the Diplomatic appropriation bill comes before the House. It seems to me utterly incongruous to largely increase the appropriations for foreign commerce and then refuse passports to reputable, high-charactered citizens to make a trip to South America, where there is no question involved about the war.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of storage space outside the Commerce Building, \$2,000.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the point of order that this is new legislation, I would like to ask a question or two of the chairman. What is it that is to be stored outside?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. These are some records that have accumulated in the department. There is no place in which to store them. They are important, and it is very inadvisable to destroy them or permit them to become lost, and for that reason this provision is carried for \$2,000 to provide a building where they may be stored.

Mr. LITTLE. In view of the fact that we have buildings around here to burn and that we are threatening to tear down, and which would require a great deal of money to tear down, does not the gentleman think it would be better if we would put this stuff in some building of the Government for which we would not have to pay rent?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is one trouble with some of these buildings—they might burn; and, besides, those buildings are to be used for office purposes.

Mr. LITTLE. If I would undertake to find a vacant but useless building that is already belonging to the Government, would the committee be satisfied with that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Here is the statement made with reference to this, which shows that it is a matter of economy to rent this space:

At the present time—

Says Dr. Havenner, who is chief clerk of the department—
we are very much congested in the Commerce Building. We have in there what might be called a good deal of dead storage, much of which is taking up office room, room for which we pay, including upkeep, probably 50 cents a foot. If we were given this item of \$2,000, we could move a great part of this storage out to other places, and it would give us room in the Commerce Building for at least 75 additional clerks.

Then I asked him just what the records were, and he stated:

It consists of files and documents for all of the bureaus housed in the building, duplicate registers and enrollments for the Bureau of Navigation, census schedules from the First Census down to the last, Census Office cards that we can not destroy at this time, etc.

Then he was asked:

Have you any building in view?

He said:

No, sir; we have nothing in view at this time, but the limitation placed by statute upon the rent we will pay would be not to exceed 25 cents a foot for storage space. We are figuring that with \$2,000 we ought to be able to get probably 10,000 square feet outside.

That is what they have done. They now have this building and these important records are stored in it.

Mr. LITTLE. I notice he speaks of it as "dead storage." Whose building is it into which this goes?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is located at Twenty-sixth and E Streets NW.

Mr. LITTLE. It is the old brewery building, is it not?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is called the Heurich Brewing Co.'s stables.

Mr. LITTLE. Is not most of this stuff, in fact, placed in practically fireproof boxes?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No.

Mr. LITTLE. Most of that stuff is.

I think, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we have so much vacant space in these buildings of which we are going to tear a lot down, I feel it is my duty to make the point of order that this is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order?

Mr. LITTLE. That this is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. That it is not provided for by law?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will state that it is not subject to a point of order any more than the previous provision.

Mr. LITTLE. That would have been subject to a point of order if the point of order had been made.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The proviso, I submit, would have been subject to a point of order authorizing a lease of five years, but not for five years additional. But certainly there is every authority for Congress to make an appropriation to house one of the Government departments. Clearly that authority exists.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the Department of Commerce the authority under existing law to rent buildings for departmental purposes?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was just saying, Mr. Chairman, that clearly there is a right on the part of Congress and authority under the law to make provision for the housing of the Government departments. Otherwise, we would be at the mercy of any Member who chose to make a point of order. If we have the right to provide for Government clerks, a right to provide for the personnel of the departments, certainly we have the right to provide a place for them to do their work and a place where the documents of the department can be stored.

Mr. LITTLE. I am not familiar with any statute that the Congress has enacted that authorizes us to rent a brewery to put some waste paper "dead storage" in. If the gentleman can put his finger on such a statute, that will be satisfactory to me. If not, I would like to have a ruling on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest that the Department of Commerce has been created by law and ought to have the right to provide for the housing of its employees and the storage of its papers; that is implied.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; but you provide that there shall be a Committee on Woman Suffrage, and that implies the power to keep a clerk, but in fact it does not, according to the Chair's rulings. If you can imply a power of this kind from a statute such as you speak of, there is not a thing in the world you can not hitch on to this appropriation. There either is a law authorizing this or there is not, and I am going to put the Chair on record about it. The Chair can rule as he pleases, of course, but the facts remain.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the duty of the Chairman to follow the rules of the House.

Section 9 of the act establishing the Department of Commerce and Labor, approved February 14, 1903, provides that the Secretary shall be authorized to expend for the rental of appropriate quarters for accommodation of the department as Congress may from time to time provide. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] raised a question yesterday with reference to Hawaiian circuit court judges, and we passed over the item in order that some information might be secured with reference to it. I ask unanimous consent that we return to that item now.

Mr. WINGO. Before the gentleman does that, I want to ask the gentleman what effort has been made and what is the program with reference to getting out of these apartment houses and high-class places into vacant buildings that we now have?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Secretary of War has selected, in cooperation with the heads of other departments, Mr. Darr, to take into consideration the allotment of space in the temporary buildings that come under the jurisdiction of the War Department. This bill now under consideration cuts out more than \$600,000 for rent paid this year for buildings in which Government departments are housed.

Mr. WINGO. How many apartment houses does this cut out?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know that it cuts out any apartment houses, because I understand that those apartment houses were paid for out of lump sums carried in some of these Army appropriations.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman thinks these apartment houses come within that classification?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. They have had a great deal of space down there ever since this munitions building was first occupied—a great deal of vacant space.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Darr says he has requests for 761,000 square feet of space. This bill, if adopted as recommended by the committee, will provide that all of the governmental activities of the departments shall be housed in these temporary buildings so far as it is possible to do it, and we give the President the right to allot this space.

Mr. WINGO. They have had enough space at the munitions building to take care of all the activities they have and those of some other departments, too. There has never been a time when the munitions building has been full or anywhere near full, and it is a very fine building. You may call it a temporary building, but I do not think it is of a very temporary character.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. What building is that?

Mr. WINGO. I mean the new War Department building. They have never filled up their space down there. One room down there has very nearly as much available space as this Chamber affords, about half as wide and about as long, and I noticed that only five persons were occupying it the other day, and they were not at all busy. There are vacant rooms all over that building. The War Department can not use all of it. Why not make some provision whereby some of these offices of the Treasury can go in there?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We did make provision for those activities. The department has had space in a great many private buildings in Washington, in the old Geological Survey Building on F Street, and in other places occupied by various bureaus, and those forces are now being transferred to the building to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. WINGO. That is the reason I am complaining. I have known all the time, upon personal investigation, that there has been space wasted in the munitions buildings, and yet they were paying high and exorbitant rents for other quarters, and it ought to be stopped. Our committee has said, "Hands off; leave that to the Committee on Appropriations." I would like to know what the Committee on Appropriations has done.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This bill does not go into effect until July 1 this year. The committee has absolutely cut off all rent which is being paid here by the Government in the city of Washington which heretofore has been carried in this bill,

with the exception of certain buildings that are now under lease by the Government for a period of years.

Mr. WINGO. Why does not the Government get a release, which they can do under the contract? There is a demand for all these buildings. The Government could utilize the vacant space in its own buildings.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think these leases provide for cancellation simply because one party may not desire to continue the use of the building.

Mr. WINGO. But other people have found persons who are glad to take the leases over. Take the Southern Building, for example. There never was any excuse for the Government going into that building. Three or four different tenants have been in there in the past year or two. They can sell their lease at a premium in a lot of these high-class buildings.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think where that is true it ought to be done, undoubtedly. I think the gentleman is clearly correct. But the gentleman will understand that on this bill, which goes into effect next July, we can not handle that situation.

Mr. WINGO. If you can not handle it, why can you not? You say to the Expenditures Committee that they must not butt in, that the Committee on Appropriations can do that; but when we ask the Appropriations Committee to do it on this bill they say, "This is for the next fiscal year, and we can not do anything."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, no; if the gentleman will read the hearings this year he will find that the committee went into it very fully.

Mr. WINGO. I do not find where they have cured the evil I am complaining of.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I refer the gentleman to section 9 of this bill.

Mr. WINGO. I have read that section.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have a request for unanimous consent to return to page 108.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield to me for a question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chairman first state the request of the gentleman from Tennessee. He asks unanimous consent to return to the first paragraph on page 108. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I have investigated the matter, and I find that the Hawaiian Territorial law provides that the Territorial legislature may designate the number of courts in Hawaii and also the number of judges to administer those courts. There are now five circuit courts in Hawaii, three judges who preside in the first circuit and one each in the other four circuits, making a total of seven circuit judges. The act specifically names the number who shall constitute the supreme court, and for that reason they are specially set forth here in this bill; but inasmuch as the act leaves it to the Territorial legislature to designate the number of circuit judges this bill has never sought to carry the exact number. The appropriation, of course, can be utilized only for the purpose of paying those who are legally appointed.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then I understand the gentleman to say that this is the same phraseology that has been carried year after year for this appropriation?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Exactly the same.

Mr. TREADWAY. And that the only uncertainty is the number of judges who may be designated by the Legislature of Hawaii to fill the various circuits.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is correct. These circuit judges are appointed by the President, and the laws require that they shall be citizens of the Territory when appointed.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman stated a moment ago, in answer to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo], that this bill saved \$600,000 rent. I would like to know how much the bill carries now for rent in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Something over \$200,000. I will tell the gentleman exactly in a moment.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations one more question in relation to the judges in Hawaii?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If I may answer the question of the gentleman from Georgia first, then I will yield to the gentleman. This bill eliminates in rent here in the District of Columbia \$613,620.88. It carries for rent the sum of \$208,004.12.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield for another question in that connection?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. The provision of section 9 to which the gentleman refers contains this provision:

Appropriations for rent of office space, contained in this or any other act, for the fiscal year 1920, except for space under lease for a term of years expiring after June 30, 1919, shall be available only for obligation for rental of such office space in the District of Columbia as may be determined by the President to be necessary in addition to the space available in Government-owned buildings.

The exception contained in that provision lets through the very abuses that I want to stop. I do not know how the language could be framed, but the committee ought to be able to devise some way by which they can compel these departments to cancel the leases they have in expensive office buildings at a time when they can find plenty of persons to take the leases off their hands, and when the owners of the buildings would be glad to cancel their leases because they can get a higher rental, and these different bureaus ought to be put into the office buildings that the Government owns.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman can offer any more specific language, we would be glad to have the gentleman offer an amendment to that effect. This leaves the proposition with the President of the United States.

Mr. WINGO. For everything except what you have got under lease.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Certainly the United States Government, merely because Congress has the power to do it, ought not to abrogate a contract that it has made.

Mr. WINGO. I am not advocating the abrogating of contracts.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. When we have leases upon buildings here in the District of Columbia which extend to 1921, 1922, and 1923, in some instances, certainly the United States Government should in good faith carry out its contracts.

Mr. WINGO. Nobody has proposed that it shall abrogate those contracts. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to be hard for me to get the floor here to offer my amendment.

Mr. WINGO. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LITTLE: Page 135, strike out lines 10 and 11.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I make the point of order that we have passed that paragraph.

Mr. LITTLE. No; we have not.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to debate his amendment?

Mr. LITTLE. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, here is a splendid chance for Congress to save a little of the people's money. An immense amount of money is allowed to dribble away by just such small items as this. Here is an appropriation of \$2,000 for the rent of storage space outside the Commerce Building. Every man on this floor knows perfectly well that the Government has ample room in this town to store away any documents that it has anywhere.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Not now.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman makes the statement that everybody knows this. I do not know it.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I will take the gentleman by the hand and lead him to them, if it will help him. Everyone knows that you have plenty of empty buildings, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo] has given the example of the Munitions Building. What excuse is there for spending \$2,000 for putting away a lot of dead stuff, as they said themselves in their report, when you can save that money and put it in people's pockets, where it belongs, and put the stuff in some building you threaten to tear down because you do not need it? If such a thing should happen in private business, the man who did it would, of course, be discharged. The Military Committee knocked in the head of the barrel and asked everybody to help themselves and now the Appropriations Committee want it to dribble out at the spigot, a little \$2,000 stream. There is no sense or justice or equity in it. There are buildings around here to burn, places crying for somebody to fill them, and yet you want to spend \$2,000 taking care of some old brewery.

Mr. DYER. Oh!

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman from Missouri says "Oh!" I can well understand why he says that, but I could show him buildings where all this stuff could be stored. This is a plain, ordinary matter. The only question is whether you want to waste \$2,000 or whether you want to save \$2,000 to the taxpayers. This money does not grow on trees. People have to pay it and have to work hard to pay it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman know just how much it would cost the Government to move this stored material?

Mr. LITTLE. I expect that it would cost \$50.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I expect that it would cost the full amount of this appropriation.

Mr. LITTLE. Then \$2,000 would cover it and that would be the end of the rent.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Is it the gentleman's idea that these buildings in Seaton and Henry Parks, and on privately owned land down here in Potomac Park, are going to be maintained indefinitely for a great period of years in the future, or that in the course of a very few years they will be torn down?

Mr. LITTLE. I suppose such of these buildings as are fit for storage will be maintained as long as we have the stuff like this to put in them, and as far as spending \$2,000 to move the papers is concerned, it could only be spent on the theory of and by the same men who suggested this \$2,000. Nobody else would spend that much money on it. These files never will be used. Put them in some Government building you threaten to tear down and save the cost of dismantling them and save \$2,000 a year indefinitely. There is enough of spending without this. It will come in handy some pay day.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I fear that my good, dry friend from Kansas—

Mr. LITTLE. Not any drier than you are now.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, but I have a stock in store, and I do not think the gentleman will publicly announce that he has any. [Laughter.] I fear, as I was about to say, that he has some prejudice to this building that was formerly utilized for the brewing of beer, and is now utilized by the Department of Commerce for storing its old useless files and papers. Anyone who is acquainted with the character of the construction of the temporary buildings in Henry Park and on the leased land to the north of the concrete buildings in Potomac Park that the War and Navy Departments occupy, knows that that character of construction is not suited for storage purposes. In fact, the testimony shows that many of these buildings will have to be repaired because they were erected with green lumber under the exigency of war.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman does not say that the Munitions Building is erected out of green lumber.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, that is a concrete building; but all of the other buildings in Henry Park have been erected out of green lumber, from the first \$2,000,000 that was appropriated for the construction of buildings in Henry Park, in October following the declaration of war.

Mr. WINGO. How long do these experts figure it will take for the defects to appear by reason of green lumber construction?

Mr. STAFFORD. Whether green lumber or seasoned lumber was used the fact is that they are temporary buildings in Henry Park, other than the Munitions Building, which is erected of concrete, and they are unsuitable for storage purposes. As a matter of fact, the Census Office is contemplating taking possession of the Munitions Building, and even there they will have to put in some solid foundations to provide for the machinery that will be needed in operating the various punching and registering machines.

As was suggested by the chairman of the committee, it would be indeed false economy not to continue \$2,000 as rental for storage in a building that can support heavy weights of paper, the removal of which would result in the cost of many thousand dollars. Certainly the Secretary of Commerce, who is asking for the space, would not go to these quarters for storage purpose unless he thought it was an economical proposition. We pay only 25 cents a square foot for the use of this abandoned brewery, and the gentleman's proposition is to utilize space in a modern concrete building worth 50 to 75 cents, and where the Government is paying in private office buildings as high as \$1.25 a square foot. It is false economy that is being advocated by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LITTLE. How does it happen that this end of the Committee on Appropriations says this is a very valuable concrete building and that the other gentleman on the Appropriations Committee tells us that there are not any buildings fit to put this stuff into? The gentlemen ought to get together.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman had read the hearings and was acquainted with the character of construction of the respective buildings he would not ask that question, because there are temporary buildings of wooden construction and there are so-called temporary buildings of concrete construction. Those of concrete construction are admittedly strong enough for storage purposes, but they are designed especially for office purposes and their space is worth to the Government to-day from 50 cents to 75 cents and \$1 a square foot, and the gentleman wishes to utilize that for storage purposes instead of paying 25 cents a square foot for this.

Mr. LITTLE. How did the gentleman from Tennessee get the idea that the Government had no space to put it in that was fit to hold it? Why did not the gentleman give the information before?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have now given the gentleman information, if he sees fit to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commissioners of conciliation: To enable the Secretary of Labor to exercise the authority vested in him by section 8 of the act creating the Department of Labor, and to appoint commissioners of conciliation, for per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding \$4, traveling expenses, and not to exceed \$12,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$175,000.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question. In lines 9 and 10, where it provides for the appointment of commissioners of conciliation, for per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding \$4, and so forth, can the gentleman tell me what these commissioners receive outside of the \$4?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They receive a per diem salary which amounts to from \$8 to \$15 per day—between those figures.

Mr. DYER. In other words, the Secretary can make it \$8 or \$15?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. DYER. My understanding is that he makes it \$15, and they get \$4 besides, which makes it \$19. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; they get \$4 for subsistence; but I will say to the gentleman that most of them receive between \$8 and \$10 a day. There are only two who have received \$15 a day. There are 14 receiving \$11—I am speaking for the fiscal year 1918—17 who receive \$10 a day, and 2 who receive \$8.

Mr. DYER. And they get \$4 in addition to that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. For subsistence.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman know how much will be expended in the current law for this class of work?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, there was expended for the fiscal year 1918 a total of \$173,584.52.

Mr. DYER. That was the appropriation, practically?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. Now, the estimate for the next fiscal year was \$250,000, and the committee has cut it down to \$175,000.

Mr. DYER. I think, Mr. Chairman, the committee has acted very wisely in cutting it down; in fact, it ought to be cut down considerably yet. My understanding is that these commissioners at the present time and probably for the last two years have been selected without much regard to their qualifications or their knowledge of labor questions or of settling labor disputes. In the main, as I understand it, they have been men who have held public office in the past, including ex-Members of Congress, who when they have been retired by the people have gone to the Department of Labor and been put on the pay roll to receive all the way from \$11 up to \$19, as stated by the gentleman from Tennessee—men some of whom in private life can earn about \$2.50 to \$3 or \$4 a day. Those are the class of men that in some instances the Department of Labor has been appointing to these positions. What they have accomplished, if the records and facts could be laid before the House, in settling disputes shows that they have not even earned \$2.50 a day, whereas the department pays these exorbitant salaries for no other purpose, as a general thing, than to put upon the pay roll men who have been relieved by the people.

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

Mr. DYER. I will.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman from Missouri think that the appropriation ought to be largely increased in view of the fact there will be so many retired Members from the Democratic side of the House, in order to do in the future as they have done in the past—take care of those retired Members in this department?

Mr. DYER. I will say to the gentleman that is evident from the recent election and from what will probably happen from time to time. There ought to be something, Mr. Chairman, by

which this committee could check up these expenses. The people are being taxed up to the very limit. The new revenue bill which will become a law shortly is increasing the taxes and burdens upon the people to keep in office men that have been appointed to soft jobs by this Bureau of Conciliation. They do not know how to settle any disputes; very few of them know anything about labor conditions. They have been in Congress, some of them, and have held other offices in various places, but they have not any knowledge, as a general proposition, of labor. They do not settle labor disputes, but, in the main, these men have been appointed because they have been recommended by Democratic politicians and not by labor organizations of repute or by capital and business interests. Both sides are entitled to have competent men act as conciliators, not only capital and business interests but the labor interests as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. May I submit a request for unanimous consent to close debate?

Mr. NOLAN. I would like to have a few minutes on this; I have not taken up the time of the committee on this bill, and I would like to be recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. I would like to have five minutes on this, as this matter is important to my district.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. On this bill?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SNYDER also rose.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 27 minutes, 2 minutes for myself and the rest to be distributed among the gentlemen who have arisen.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 27 minutes, 2 minutes for himself and the other 25 minutes to be distributed between the gentlemen who have arisen—Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. LITTLE, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. FAIRFIELD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much surprised at the lack of information displayed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] regarding the activities of the Division of Conciliation in the Department of Labor. I think the work of this bureau is of too much importance to the people of this country, both capital and labor, to make it a partisan question. Now, the gentleman, in the first place, did not know a thing about the compensation of these men or he would not make this statement here.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. NOLAN. I do, and I am going to say what I know.

Mr. DYER. Did not the gentleman from Tennessee state the fact?

Mr. NOLAN. I am going to state what are the facts.

Mr. DYER. The chairman has already stated them.

Mr. NOLAN. The general pay of conciliators is \$10 per diem and \$4 for expenses, railroad fare and berths.

They get \$14 a day; in other words, for traveling from one end of this country to the other and settling industrial disputes, and it is the only agency we have here in connection with the Government that has been successful during the war in curbing industrial disputes and troubles. The War Labor Board requires months to take up an individual case, but prior to their taking it up the Department of Labor is compelled to do it, and the machinery of the Division of Conciliation is put into motion; and it is only where they can not settle a dispute that the War Labor Board has been asked to act, both during the war and since the armistice has been signed.

I do not know how many ex-Members of Congress are employed, but I know one or two ex-Members of Congress that have done some very important work in connection with our war activities in this very Division of Conciliation. And I know this, that all the men that are employed are not Democrats by any means. If there is one division under the present administration where Democrats and Republicans and Progressives and others are treated alike, it is in the Division of Conciliation of the Department of Labor, and they have done more to prevent industrial disputes and industrial strife and they have settled more disputes in an industrial way than any other agency we have had either in our National or State Governments.

This is a very useful bureau. If you want to center your attack in a partisan way and do it successfully, pick out some other division or bureau. I want to see this bureau made effective, and more effective. It is one of the best agencies we have to bring about industrial peace between employer and employee.

And, Mr. Chairman, I think this bureau, instead of being criticized, ought to be given all the credit which is due it. It

has settled thousands and thousands of disputes both before they took place and after they had gotten started. I think it is ill-timed, especially now when we have a situation in this country that borders on bolshevism, that shows a period of industrial unrest, possibly a period of unemployment coming upon us, to criticize and pick out for our abuse the one agency that is doing more to curb bolshevism and I. W. W.ism than any other agency we have in this Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I know of no function at this time that is more important than the function of a conciliation bureau. I was interested in the arraignment of the bureau by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER]. I confess that I should be very glad if we had more definite knowledge of the personnel of the bureau. I should be very glad, too, if we had a more accurate knowledge with regard to what the bureau has accomplished. But whether or not it has been as effective as it ought to be, my own judgment is that where a conciliation bureau is maintained, so that immediately when there is difficulty in a district and men who are acquainted with the conditions sent there, without waiting for the formality of the gathering of a commission and going through all of the delay that is incident to the bringing together of a commission, there is no more economical way in which to do it than by giving the Department of Labor this power.

If it has not been done honestly, it ought to be done honestly; and I do not know that just because a man has been in Congress he is therefore necessarily incapacitated for any effective service in matters of this kind if he has had experience along those lines. Anyone looking forward to the congestion in the labor market is concerned as to what may arise within the next year. I confess that I am apprehensive of the conditions that may arise in this country, and being apprehensive I think it would be unwise for us without full knowledge, without having investigated the personnel of the men who are engaged in this work, without any knowledge as to how effective they have been, except from general statements, it would be very unwise for us to assail this department by cutting down this appropriation.

Ordinarily it is wise in stress of circumstances such as we have to reduce at every point unnecessary expenses. But I do not believe that this item is an item that should be picked out, unless some man can stand here and show definitely and absolutely that it has been purely a partisan organization, not run with efficiency, but run in the interest of the Democratic Party. I confess until I should be convinced of that fact I would be loath to assail it.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if there is one division of the Department of Labor that has done what you might call excellent work in the last year and a half, it is this conciliation section. I am not familiar with the amount of money that is paid per diem to these conciliators, but on several occasions I have come in personal contact with them, and in each case the matter in question has been handled promptly; and usually when it seemed that a great difficulty would take place in a few days it has been overcome without a strike, which is the most important element in anticipated labor trouble at any time. So, in my judgment, in view of conditions that may arise in this country within the next year or two, and judging from the experience of the past, instead of reducing we ought to maintain what they ask for and, if necessary, give them more. So I favor leaving this item just as it is, without regard to who is employed, whether he might be an ex-Congressman or somebody else, so long as work is performed that is equal to that which has been done by this section in the last 18 months.

What I want to speak about particularly does not seem to be covered by this section. That is the employment bureaus that have been started throughout the country by the Labor Department. These bureaus can do excellent work at this time if they will. There is serious complaint being made to me with regard to their management, however. Of course, it is to be expected that the employment agent in such bureau would be a labor man, but it is also to be expected that he will mete out absolute justice to the men who make application for work, whether they may be union men or whether they may be nonunion men.

One of my experiences is that complaints are being made that the agent will say to the applicant, "Have you got a card?" and if he has not a card the agent has no use for him. So concerns in a community that have had a strike, say, and have gone up against labor organizations and have what they call won out by having beaten the union, and have continued to exist, are being militated against by reason of the fact I have mentioned. And while I am in favor of continuing these bureaus

throughout the country at this time, I think that the Labor Department ought to be more careful in the selection of their men and they ought to be very particular in the orders they send out, so that any man who goes to one of those bureaus should have at least the same kind of treatment; that is, each man should have exactly the same kind of treatment, whether he belongs to a union or whether he does not.

Mr. NOLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. NOLAN. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that for some months past the Employment Service of the United States has turned over to the various State councils of defense or State employment bureaus the conduct of the employment service in the various States?

Mr. SNYDER. I am not aware of that, but I am aware of the fact that—

Mr. NOLAN. And that in the State of New York the New York authorities are cooperating with their own agencies and the Federal Government in sharing in the expense, but all the employment agents in the State of New York are under the control of the State government directly.

Mr. SNYDER. All I want to warn the Labor Department about here at this time is that, without regard to whether a man is union or nonunion, the Government or the State is paying for this service, and every man in the State should have exactly the same treatment when he is looking for a job. [Applause.]

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the attack made upon this bureau of the Department of Labor by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] is a most amazing one. He tells the House that the Bureau of Conciliation is maintained for the purpose of affording a refuge for Democrats who lose out in races for Congress. One would imagine that before a responsible and distinguished Member of this House made that assertion concerning the management of an important bureau of the Government he would endeavor to verify his facts.

Mr. DYER. If the gentleman will yield, I will give him some facts.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman could very readily have secured the facts.

Mr. DYER. I have them now.

Mr. KEATING. All that would have been necessary would have been to consult the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations. On page 977 is a complete list of the commissioners employed by the bureau, with a statement of their former activities, and out of the 37 just 2 are ex-Members of Congress. One is a Republican, a distinguished Republican, the friend of James G. Blaine, minister to Ecuador by virtue of an appointment received from James G. Blaine. The other is a Democrat from the gentleman's own district, and the only thing I know of that can be brought against that gentleman is that he had the temerity to bring a contest on the floor of this House against the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman is mistaken. There is no truth in that statement. The gentleman refers to Mr. Patrick F. Gill.

Mr. KEATING. This is the same Gill.

Mr. DYER. No, sir. He is a personal friend of mine.

Mr. KEATING. It is my mistake. I accept the gentleman's statement. Those are the only two Members of Congress who appear on this list. If the gentleman knows of any other ex-Members of Congress, he should submit their names or else withdraw the charge he has made.

Now, as to the work of this bureau, Mr. Kerwin appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and testified—and there is not anything to contradict this assertion—that between April 6, 1917, up to and including the day of the signing of the armistice, November 11, the Division of Conciliation handled 2,439 cases, involving 4,000,000 workers. That is the work that this Bureau of Conciliation has performed, and it is a most important work, perhaps the most important work performed by the Department of Labor.

Now, as to the qualifications of the men who have acted as conciliators, I have had some experience in my home State. We had a great industrial disturbance there. The Department of Labor selected as one of the conciliators Verner Z. Reed, one of the most substantial business men in our State, and a Republican, and Mr. Reed gave his time to the work.

As another conciliator they selected Judge Musser, the former chief justice of the supreme court of the State, a Democrat, and he gave his services. I do not know how much they re-

ceived, but if they received \$15 a day and \$4 for subsistence they would not have been properly compensated. They settled a great strike in Colorado, and the settlement of that strike was worth hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars to the people of Colorado.

Upon the pay roll of this department there are just two men drawing \$15 a day. One was the former president of the Kentucky Coal Operators' Association, who probably would not enter private employment for \$50,000 a year, and the other is the labor commissioner of the State of Texas, and those two men are charged with the important work of maintaining industrial peace in the State of Arizona, sent there representing the President's Mediation Commission; and they are not only charged with that task, but they have performed that task, and during all the period of the war you had no trouble in Arizona, largely because of the efforts of those two gentlemen.

Yet the gentleman from Missouri charges that this bureau was made a refuge for ex-Members of Congress. I think the gentleman owes it to himself, and I am sure he owes it to this House and to the Department of Labor, to withdraw a charge which is without foundation.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, an ancient maxim says—

For forms of government let fools contest;
That which is best administered is best.

There is some truth in that, and I think it might apply to this very matter. The theory upon which it is founded is beyond question admirable. We ought to sustain it and improve it. I think possibly it might be improved a little by careful selection. I think I know personally of one instance where a trouble of importance was very materially assisted in its determination by these conciliators. I never was involved in the matter, but I understand that that was the fact.

On the other hand, I regret to say that my attention was challenged to another instance in which a gentleman from this bureau or from some similar institution—at this lapse of time I can not exactly be sure—was concerned, but just before the campaign he appeared and went from factory to factory, I am told, taking an active part in the election. The results were such that I had no cause to complain, but I do not think the idea would be a good one to follow out. Of course I know that it is not the intention of the law that should be done, but is there anything in the law that would tend to prevent that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would say to the gentleman that these conciliators are appointed without respect to what party they belong to.

Mr. LITTLE. Is there anything in the statute in regard to that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is nothing of that kind. There is nothing partisan in the service rendered by these men as conciliators.

Mr. LITTLE. Well, there was something partisan in the case I mention.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am quite sure if it were called to the attention of the Secretary of Labor it would have been stopped.

Mr. LITTLE. That is what I rose to inquire about. The Secretary of Labor is the proper person to request attention to such a matter, is he?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. It was not my purpose to call attention to it now. The results in that case were perfectly satisfactory to me. If they kept on in that way and we had the same results, I would not object. [Laughter.]

But since I have the question answered, I trust that there may be some way of impressing upon the department the advisability of explaining to all these gentlemen that their labors are not of a political character, and that they are not sent into districts to interfere with the local situation. The people in most of the districts are quite competent to get along without outside advice, anyway; I know they are in the district I have the honor to represent. I am sure of that. But I want to add this word, that I am highly impressed with the utility of this commission, and I am sure everybody wants to secure the results that it attempts to reach. I think it should be encouraged and upheld, and I hope that in the meantime the Secretary fully understands that it is not a political matter at all, and instructs his representatives accordingly.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to consume the two minutes of my time in order to furnish the gentleman from Kansas some information that he called for a moment ago with reference to the examinations that were held for commercial attachés and special agents. These officials are required first to pass a written examination. Then those who pass that competitive written examination are called to Washington for the purpose of standing an oral examination before a board consist-

ing of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chief of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and two chiefs of division of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and also a representative from the Civil Service Commission. If they pass the oral examination, then they are appointed in the order of their percentage; in other words, those who make the highest percentage are appointed. There is first a competitive written examination.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Held by whom?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is not necessarily held here in Washington. It is held under the auspices of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The Civil Service Commission holds that examination?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. If they pass that, they are called here to Washington for the purpose of standing this oral examination.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. What does the gentleman say with respect to the requirements of appointees to these positions?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand that there are no financial requirements whatever. There is no question or inquiry made as to whether those appointed have a private income, nor is there any necessity for it, since they get salaries ranging from \$3,500 to \$8,000 a year and are also provided \$4 a day for subsistence when traveling. Then I want to say in addition that there is no expense incurred whatever in so far as these examinations are concerned, because the members of the board serve without compensation. That is the only method by which a commercial attaché or a special commercial agent can be appointed.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Are consular agents appointed through a similar examination?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are appointed under an examination held by the State Department which is similar to this. I understand the Secretary of Commerce has adopted the same policy with reference to his foreign appointments that has been followed for many years by the State Department in the appointment of consular agents.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Do I understand that these men receive pay throughout the year, whether engaged in conciliation work or not?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is now referring to the Board of Conciliation.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; they do not. They are paid only for such time as they actually serve.

The Clerk read as follows:

For per diem in lieu of subsistence of special agents and employees, and for their transportation; experts and temporary assistance for field service outside of the District of Columbia, to be paid at the rate of not exceeding \$8 per day; temporary statistical clerks, stenographers, and typewriters in the District of Columbia, to be selected from civil-service registers and to be paid at the rate of not exceeding \$100 per month, the same person to be employed for not more than six consecutive months, the total expenditure for such temporary clerical assistance in the District of Columbia not to exceed \$6,000; traveling expenses of officers and employees, purchase of reports and materials for reports and bulletins of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and for subvention to "International Association for Labor Legislation," and necessary expenses connected with representation of the United States Government therein, \$80,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman from Tennessee why the committee took the lid off the subsistence per diem in this item? In the items for commissioners of conciliation you put the lid on at \$4 a day for subsistence, but in the item for special agents and employees you take the lid off entirely.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is covered, I will say, by the general law.

Mr. MANN. It is in the current appropriation law. Why is it required in one case and not in the other? Certainly the commissioners of conciliation are entitled to as high a rate for subsistence as special agents and employees.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think that it is required to be stated in this bill in any case. It is mere surplusage wherever it has occurred, because the general law on the subject provides for a per diem rate of allowance not exceeding \$4 in lieu of subsistence, and they can not exceed that in any event.

Mr. MANN. That is what I understood. Why do you put it in at one place and take it out in the other?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As I stated to the gentleman, I do not think it is necessary to carry it in this bill. It is surplusage wherever it occurs. It could very properly and safely be stricken out.

The Clerk read as follows:

Children's Bureau: Chief, \$5,000; assistant chief, \$2,400; experts—one on sanitation, \$2,800, industrial \$2,000, social service \$2,000, statistical \$2,000; administrative clerk, \$2,000; editor, \$2,000; special agents—1 \$1,800, 4 at \$1,600 each, 10 at \$1,400 each, 12 at \$1,200 each; private secretary to chief of bureau, \$1,500; clerks—2 of class 4, 4 of class 3, 4 of class 2, 17 of class 1, 10 at \$1,000 each; copyist; messenger; in all, \$108,040.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee why it is that the editor in the Bureau of Labor Statistics is paid \$2,500 a year, and the editor in the Children's Bureau \$2,000, and why the secretary to the commissioner in the Bureau of Immigration is paid \$1,800 a year, while the secretary in the Children's Bureau is paid \$1,500?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the lady from Montana will find those inequalities of salaries running entirely through this bill, and I may say that is one reason that influenced the committee in recommending in this bill the creation of a joint commission to take into consideration the reclassification and readjustment of salaries, so as to place them upon a more uniform basis. Of course, I do not know, but I assume that the editor in the Bureau of Labor Statistics has possibly a great deal more to do than has the editor under the Children's Bureau, because it is a much larger bureau and covers a much larger range of subjects. Their publications are decidedly more numerous, and I fancy that the work performed by one is much greater than the work performed by the other.

Miss RANKIN. Was that taken into consideration when these items were inserted?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; that was not taken into consideration. If the lady from Montana will examine the law, I think she will find that the law fixes the salary of the editor in the Children's Bureau at the sum named, and we have allowed for these salaries exactly what was asked by the Chief of the Children's Bureau.

Miss RANKIN. Does it fix the salary for the secretary to the Chief of the Bureau of Immigration? That salary is fixed at \$1,800.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That has been fixed heretofore in appropriation bills, and has been carried for a great many years.

Miss RANKIN. The secretary to the Chief of the Children's Bureau has a salary of \$1,500.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true, but the Bureau of Immigration is also a much larger bureau than is the Children's Bureau. This bill carries for the salary of the private secretary exactly what was asked.

Miss RANKIN. How does the gentleman mean?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the lady from Montana will look at other provisions in the bill, she will find that there are a great number of private secretaries to chiefs of bureaus who receive no more than \$1,500 and some of them receive less, and I have in mind one position of a private secretary, carried for the first time in this bill, the secretary to the Chief of the Steamboat-Inspection Service. That was fixed at \$1,500, and that is a very important and a very busy bureau also, particularly at this time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the chairman directed the attention of the lady from Montana to the fact that the salaries paid the editor and the private secretary in the Children's Bureau, as carried in the bill, are the amounts recommended by the head of the bureau. Of course, our committee had nothing to do except to grant her request. We did not seek to reduce those amounts. The position of editor is new, and we carried it at exactly the same salary as the head of the bureau requested to be paid to the person filling that position.

Miss RANKIN. Well, I just asked for information, as there seemed to be a discrepancy.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not want to have the impression go abroad that we were discriminating against the fair ladies who comprise the personnel of the Children's Bureau.

Miss RANKIN. I thank you.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered for the Department of Labor when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed the sum of \$25.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I had intended to raise the question when the same item appeared under the Department of Commerce, but my attention was diverted at that time. Why is it proposed to put into the permanent statute a provision that as to those two departments of the Government they are entirely outside of the law in reference to the purchase of supplies by advertisement where the purchase amounts to only \$25 in a particular case? In other words,

here is a department that may purchase \$10,000 worth of stuff in \$25 items, if it wishes to do so, without advertising. Now, the law as it stands authorizes the purchase without advertising whenever an emergency exists. Why should we grant to these departments the right to purchase without advertising as a matter of permanent law, which right, so far as I know, does not apply to the other departments, although I might be mistaken about that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My understanding is most all of the other departments have authority to purchase without the necessity of taking bids, some of them to an amount as high as \$50.

Mr. MANN. There are some provisions as to various branches of the service. The Lighthouse Service—and I think the Revenue-Marine Service, probably—which has boats and has to purchase very quickly at times certain things, is authorized to purchase within a certain limit and then required to make a thorough report to Congress of every purchase which it makes; but this is absolutely taking the lid off, because if a man wants to—I do not think the head of a department would want to do so—but if some man wants to purchase without advertising, all he needs to do is to buy something every day in the amount of \$25; that is a complete transaction and would apply to all small things.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, the Geological Survey and the Reclamation Service have that authority now, and I understand the Department of Agriculture has that authority also.

Mr. MANN. Very likely some of these departments with branches where they are off in the country at some place where they work and not very available to the market have the authority to make purchases without advertising. They frequently have to telegraph for something, and while they could do that under the general law it is a little more convenient to have the power not to have to make a statement that it is an emergency in each case, but this department is not of that character so far as I know.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The District government has the same authority, and this department has some large bureaus, like the Bureau of Naturalization, the Bureau of Immigration, where it is necessary to make these small purchases from time to time, and the committee felt it was requiring a needless waste of time and frequently a very great inconvenience and some expense where these small amounts of supplies are necessary to require them to go through the regular formula of making advertisements.

Mr. MANN. Well, the bulk of these supplies are purchased through this supply committee, or does that still exist; I was away for a while?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That still exists, yes; and most of them are purchased through the General Supply Committee.

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have great hesitation about it and a good deal of doubt, but I will withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rent: For rent of buildings and parts of buildings in the District of Columbia for the use of the Department of Labor, \$24,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday we passed over the item relating to the Bureau of the Census, and I ask unanimous consent to return to that item, which is found on pages 117 and 118. The gentleman from Massachusetts has reserved the point of order.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Massachusetts was called out of the Chamber to attend a hearing in the investigation of the Security League of America he authorized me to say that when this paragraph was returned to that I would withdraw the point of order. The reason why he asked to have the paragraph passed over last evening was to examine the legislative appropriation act for the years 1910 and 1911, to see whether any provision was carried for the statutory roll for those years. It appears that in the appropriation acts following the decennial period for the taking of the Thirteenth Census that no statutory roll was carried, and therefore he desired me to withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know whether the expenses of the previous census were carried in the legislative bill or in the sundry civil appropriation bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. The large appropriation of \$10,000,000 was carried in a special act. The gentleman will recall that Presi-

dent Roosevelt vetoed the first act Congress passed providing for the taking of the Thirteenth decennial census, and it was during the special session of Congress, convened at the instance of President Taft, that in the latter days of the fiscal year a bill was passed carrying \$10,000,000 of appropriations, reported, I believe, from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANN. Well, really, on first blush, I should think the extraordinary expenses of the Bureau of the Census would naturally be carried in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; if the gentleman will permit, in addition to the \$10,000,000 which was authorized by that act in the legislative appropriation act for 1911, an appropriation of \$2,000,000 was carried for this purpose, and again in the legislative appropriation act for the year 1912 an appropriation of two and a half million was carried, so the appropriations have been heretofore carried in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation acts.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Retired judges: For salaries of judges retired under section 260 of the Judicial Code (36 Stat. L., 1161), so much as may be necessary for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask a question or make a remark. I notice the other day that the Senate passed a bill to change the name of a great national park to "Roosevelt National Park." Similar bills have been introduced in the House. At the same time along comes a committee which abolishes, as far as the statute is concerned, a reference to the city named after the Father of his Country. I had supposed I lived in the city of Washington while I attended Congress. Whether there is a legal description of the city or not I do not undertake to say. The post office is "Washington" and the city is "Washington," but the Committee on Appropriations has forgotten "Washington" and abolished the "city of Washington," although they found no difficulty for many years in expending an appropriation providing for personal help in or at the "city of Washington, in the District of Columbia." The Committee on Appropriations found a newspaper article somewhere or acquired information in some other way that there was no legal description of the city of Washington, and they leave it out everywhere in this bill and simply put in "District of Columbia." I think that is a reflection upon the country. Here is the capital of the Nation, named after the first President, the Father of his Country, and without having said a word to the House in explanation of it the committee eliminates "Washington," apparently forgetful of the history of the country. And I do not know, but I suppose some day some sort of a committee might exist that will forget that there was such a thing as the "Roosevelt National Park."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will recall that the question was first raised by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON], who insisted that under the law there is really no city of Washington. He insisted that the law designated the seat of Government in the District of Columbia and not in the city of Washington.

Mr. MANN. That does not make any difference. That is no reason why the Committee on Appropriations should follow that course.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And he called it to the attention of the President, and the President dates his proclamations from the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANN. I think he dates them at the White House. If he leaves out "the city of Washington" he makes a mistake. I think it is a disgrace to the legislators and the Executive to undertake to say that they can not describe anything as being done at the city of Washington, when all the mail they get is addressed to the city of Washington; when they maintain a post office in charge of the mail for the city of Washington; when everyone in the world, nearly, knows where the city of Washington is, except it may be legislators who are living in Washington, and the President, who just at present is absent from Washington, but cables to it every day.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman knows that the law provides that clerks can not be detailed from the outside to serve here in the District of Columbia. In other words, it is necessary for the appropriation bill to specifically provide for the employment of these clerks "within the District of Columbia" in order to comply with the law.

Mr. MANN. I know that the appropriation laws for years had carried the language "in Washington, the District of Columbia," and nobody has ever had any trouble about the expenditure.

of that money. No payment has even been stopped on the ground that that did not correctly describe a locality, because it does correctly describe a locality. Everybody knows it except this distinguished Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I move to strike out the last word.

I understand the President does not date his proclamations from Washington City, but they are dated "The White House."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. "White House, District of Columbia."

Mr. HUMPHREYS. My understanding is that the house in which the President lives is commonly called the "White House." It was always officially designated as the "Executive Mansion" until President Roosevelt became President, and he then called it the "White House," and had stationery printed with "White House" on it, although there was no act of Congress calling it the "White House." Is that correct?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I know of none.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Well, there does not seem to be very much more law for calling it "White House" than there would be for "Washington City."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the gentleman is correct in his statement that the law calls it "Executive Mansion."

Mr. MANN. There was no act of Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Roosevelt said when he was President that he refused to call it the "Executive Mansion" because there are 48 other executive mansions in the United States, and therefore he called it "White House" and had it so put on his stationery. I am glad that official designation of it is accepted, even if it is not in the statute, and even if we do drop "Washington," although it is in the statute.

Mr. LONGWORTH. How long has the name Washington been dropped?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I did not know it had been dropped at all until the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] mentioned the fact.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It has been very recent, has it not?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I do not know. I refer the gentleman from Ohio to the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. About a year ago, I remember, in a discussion on the floor of the House here the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] stated that he had taken up the matter with the President and informed him that there was no such thing in the law as the "city of Washington," but it was the "District of Columbia," and the President said he would use the words "White House, District of Columbia."

Mr. HUMPHREYS. There is just as much authority of law for saying "city of Washington" as there is for saying "The White House."

Mr. LONGWORTH. I know that the President has abolished many other institutions, but I did not know that he had abolished the city of Washington. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Gentlemen, of course, may indulge in such pleasant criticism as they see fit, but the subcommittee was following the House, which, on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky, in a number of instances, in the last legislative appropriation, where the words "city of Washington" occurred, struck out the words "city of Washington" and inserted "District of Columbia."

Mr. MANN. The law in many cases specifically names the city of Washington.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Perhaps not in all, but in a number of cases the gentleman from Kentucky moved to strike out "city of Washington" and insert "District of Columbia," and the House adopted the motion, so that the committee was simply following the instructions of the House, given at the last session.

Mr. MANN. I was not here. I did not know. I suppose there was nobody else in the Chamber when it was done, probably. [Laughter.] Certainly it is a disgrace to Congress to say that we can not refer to the city of Washington as the "city of Washington." We all know that it is here. The Post Office Department can tell you that, although they do not know much about location, unless you put on "District of Columbia" or the State. I think it is disgraceful for our country to say that in the lapse of years we have forgotten the name of George Washington. I know that we have forgotten a great many of his precepts, or discarded them, but, in addition, to forget his name, I think, is going too far.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Court of Customs Appeals: Presiding judge and 4 associate judges, at \$7,000 each; marshal, \$3,000; clerk, \$3,500; assistant clerk, \$2,000; 5 stenographic clerks, at \$1,600 each; stenographic reporter, \$2,500; messenger, \$840; in all, \$54,840.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it may be improper nowadays to use the designation "Washington" as the city where Members of Congress are to be addressed, but I received a letter this morning directed to me at Washington, and the trouble in it seems to be not that it is difficult to receive letters at Washington but that it is difficult to receive letters at Philadelphia. I ask that this letter be read in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, January 14, 1919.

Congressman NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It was with interest I read the article in Saturday's issue of the Cincinnati Commercial Tribune with regard to the "mountains of undelivered mail for the soldiers," etc., and showing an effort on the part of the American postal authorities to fix the blame on the people "over there." But the question which I should like to see agitated is the fixing of the blame for the almost criminal inefficiency in the delivery of mail to sailors in our home ports. Let me state my case:

On July 2 my son, E. P. Romaine, was assigned to a ship, the U. S. S. *Merauke*, in Philadelphia Harbor. Some days later the ship was sent to New York to await convoy. There it lay until July 13 or 14, so I have since learned; then went overseas to St. Nazaire; remained there a short time, probably 10 days or more, and returned to Philadelphia about the middle of September. From the day my son went on shipboard, July 2, although the ship lay in port many days, until he returned to Philadelphia in September not one letter of all those I wrote him reached him. On the last of September he again went abroad, returning on November 19. The conditions with regard to mail were as bad as before, nay worse. For upon returning to harbor he failed to receive a number of my letters, and those he did receive came dribbling in a few at a time in anything but the logical order, as No. 13, then 6, then 15, 7, 8, 14, 5, etc.

All of the above is bad enough, but the worst is what follows: On December 2 I mailed a Christmas box and package to my son. As a matter of fact, it takes 18 hours to go to Philadelphia from Cincinnati on the train. At the time of his sailing, December 6, he had not received either of those packages. Both packages had been insured. I wrote on December 10 to the postmaster at Philadelphia, inclosing 60 cents in stamps and asked him to please return the packages, as I did not want them to lie around the post office awaiting the return of the ship for two reasons: One was, the foodstuffs were perishable, and the other was that one package contained a watch which would be safer here than there. On December 12 Mr. John Thornton replied that he would investigate. I wrote again on December 18 asking that he at least return the 60 cents. I received a letter from him on December 20 stating that he had been unable to trace the packages and advising me to write to the Cincinnati post office, but not returning the aforesaid money. I had already written the full particulars to the Cincinnati postmaster on December 18, and up to date, January 14, I have received no answer.

I am a widow. I have cheerfully and gladly given two sons to the service of my country just at the time when they were getting able to provide for me. They were not dragged off to war, but enlisted. They went not from a spirit of adventure, but with a high and noble ideal of service in their hearts, and the gratitude of the Government they serve is manifested by such indifference and inefficiency as this.

Trusting that Congress may succeed in "fixing the blame," I am, my dear sir,

Most respectfully,

CORA M. ROMAINE.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I submit that for the RECORD without comment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Ohio, and in reply ask the Clerk to read the letter which I now send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLACK. Does it require unanimous consent to have letters of this sort read at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. It does to have them read by the Clerk.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I ask that it be read in my time.

Mr. BLACK. I make the point of order that it is out of order on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas objects to its being read by the Clerk.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Can I not read it in my own time?

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I think the rule provides that no paper can be read at the Clerk's desk, except one that the House is called upon to vote on, when objection is made, unless the House requires it by a vote.

Mr. BLACK. I wish to change my objection to a reservation of objection and I will not press my objection at this time, but I want to make this statement: I do not think the reading of individual complaints of this kind during the discussion of a bill which has no relevancy to the subject accomplishes any useful purpose. Of course, instances of bad mail delivery to our soldiers and sailors are deeply to be regretted. We will all agree to that. My experience is that the Post Office Department is always ready and willing to investigate complaints of the kind

that can properly be charged to its jurisdiction. The mail delivery of our soldiers in France has been under the control of the military authorities, and complaints along that line can be properly addressed to them. Members who do not agree to much of the criticism that is frequently voiced on the other side of the House could just as equitably take the time of the House in making a reply; at least could as well afford to do it from the standpoint of justice and fair play, and much of the time of the House would be spent in discussing matters extraneous to the bill under consideration. These instances are, of course, to be regretted, but I think there is a better way to reach whatever trouble there is. I do not object in this instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MOLINE, KANS., January 13, 1919.

HON. P. P. CAMPBELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Believing that you have the interest of the people at heart, and especially the boys who fought and suffered in the great war, I am appealing to you in behalf of my son, Corpl. Glen R. Sawyer, Company I, One hundred and thirty-seventh Infantry, Thirty-fifth Division.

Shortly after war was declared on Germany, at the age of 20, he enlisted in the National Guard at Manhattan, where he was attending college. This company was afterwards drafted into Regular service and his company was thrown with the Wichita company and labeled Company I of the now famous One hundred and thirty-seventh, an all-Kansas regiment, which has been cited for their bravery and deeds of valor at the bloody and nerve-racking battle of the Argonne forest.

On the morning of September 29 my boy was wounded in his left foot by a machine-gun bullet and his right leg by a piece of shrapnel, and about an hour afterwards, while he was trying to crawl back to the first-aid station, he was gassed. After he was wounded and ordered one of his men to take his squad and lead them on he has never (up to December 15, when his last letter was written) seen a familiar face nor learned the fate of the rest of his comrades, nor had a single message from loved ones at home. To add to his misery, his loneliness, and the very pleasant thought that he will always be a cripple is the fact that he is also without money—has not been paid but once since last March, and most of that had been taken up by payments on liberty bonds and his insurance—and I know of no way that I can send him money, letter, or cable, and am appealing to you for help. One lady here paid \$14 for a cable to her wounded boy in France, but he never received the message. The people throughout the country have given up all the money, all the food, and all the men the Government has asked for, and I know that any Kansas farmer has ingenuity enough about him, if he had plenty of men and money at his command, to perfect a system whereby wounded soldiers could get their mail with very little delay. My boy did not enter this war for money considerations, but for home, for country, and for our old flag, and if the Government will send him home we will be glad to relieve it from all responsibility and take care of our boy ourselves, but we don't want him to die in France because he feels that Government and friends alike have forsaken him. Our last letter from him was written December 15, at Base Hospital No. 119, at St. Nazaire, France, where he had been nearly a month waiting to be sent home, and if the President and his wife have not been shopping lately, nor if some of his colored servants haven't been saying some cute things, so that you can get a cablegram through, I want you to find out if my boy is still there; and if he is, get him word that all is well at home and cable him some money; also wire Miss Harriet E. Stanley, No. 257 West Seventy-third Street, New York, if he has arrived there yet, as she is watching for him, and he has had plenty of time to arrive since his last letter.

Now, Mr. CAMPBELL, I know that you haven't the time to bother with this yourself, but for the love of humanity have some one to look after this under your direction and draw on me for all expenses through the Moline National Bank. I am not rich, neither am I what you would call well to do, but, if necessary, I will give a thousand dollars to relieve my boy's mind. He says that he feels just like Robinson Crusoe did when cast on an uninhabited island with no knowledge of what became of friends and home. My boy has given up his education, home, love, and money for his country. He has never complained, found fault, or written a single discouraging or blue letter home, but that shows the kind of stuff the Thirty-fifth Division is composed of.

Thanking you from the bottom of my heart and assuring you that I will do my very best to repay you in the future for any and all your efforts for my boy, I am,

Yours, truly,

E. E. SAWYER.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I could get no information whatever from the War Department. I then went to the Red Cross, and this morning through their assistance have cabled this young man \$60 and the news that his parents were still thinking of him. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the pay of telephone-switchboard operators, assistant messengers, firemen, watchmen, laborers, and charwomen provided for in this act, except those employed in mints and assay offices, unless otherwise specially stated, shall be as follows: For telephone-switchboard operators, assistant messengers, firemen, and watchmen, at the rate of \$720 per annum each; for laborers, at the rate of \$660 per annum each; assistant telephone-switchboard operators, at the rate of \$600 each, and for charwomen, at the rate of \$240 per annum each.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] if the \$120 increase proposed in this bill will apply to those employees mentioned in section 2 which has just been read?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Does it include the charwomen?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They get the increase up to 30 per cent of the salary which they receive.

Mr. DYER. The telephone operators and others will get the full amount?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They will get the full amount.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That all civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia who receive a total of compensation at the rate of \$2,500 per annum or less, except as otherwise provided in this section shall receive, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, additional compensation at the rate of \$120 per annum: *Provided*, That such employees as receive a total of annual compensation at a rate more than \$2,500 and less than \$2,620 shall receive additional compensation at such rate per annum as may be necessary to make their salaries, plus their additional compensation, at the rate of \$2,620 per annum, and no employee shall receive additional compensation under this section at a rate which is more than 30 per cent of the rate of the total annual compensation received by such employee: *Provided further*, That the increased compensation at the rate of \$120 per annum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, shall not be computed as salary in construing this section: *Provided further*, That where an employee in the service on June 30, 1918, has received during the fiscal year 1919, or shall receive during the fiscal year 1920 an increase of salary at a rate in excess of \$200 per annum, or where an employee whether previously in the service or not has entered the service since June 30, 1918, whether such employee has received an increase in salary or not, such employees shall be granted the increased compensation provided herein only when and upon the certification of the person in the legislative branch or the head of the department or establishment employing such persons of the ability and qualifications personal to such employees as would justify such increased compensation: *Provided further*, That the increased compensation provided in this section to employees whose pay is adjusted from time to time through wage boards or similar authority shall be taken into consideration by such wage boards or similar authority in adjusting the pay of such employees.

The provisions of this section shall not apply to the following: Employees paid from the postal revenues and sums which may be advanced from the Treasury to meet deficiencies in the postal revenues; employees of the Panama Canal on the Canal Zone; employees of the Alaskan Engineering Commission in Alaska; employees paid from lump-sum appropriations in bureaus, divisions, commissions, or any other governmental agencies or employments created by law since January 1, 1916; employees whose duties require only a portion of their time, except charwomen, who shall be included; employees whose services are utilized for brief periods at intervals; persons employed by or through corporations, firms, or individuals acting for or on behalf of or as agents of the United States or any department or independent establishment of the Government of the United States in connection with construction work or the operation of plants; employees who receive a part of their pay from any outside sources under cooperative arrangements with the Government of the United States or the District of Columbia; employees who serve voluntarily or receive only a nominal compensation, and employees who may be provided with special allowances because of their service in foreign countries. The provisions of this section shall not apply to employees of the railroads taken over by the United States, and nothing contained herein shall be deemed a recognition of the employees of such railroads as employees of the United States.

Section 6 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved May 10, 1916, as amended by the naval appropriation act approved August 29, 1916, shall not operate to prevent anyone from receiving the additional compensation provided in this section who otherwise is entitled to receive the same.

Such employees as are engaged on piecework, by the hour, or at per diem rates, if otherwise entitled to receive the additional compensation shall receive the same at the rate to which they are entitled in this section when their fixed rate of pay for the regular working hours and on the basis of 313 days in the said fiscal year would amount to \$2,500 or less: *Provided*, That this method of computation shall not apply to any per diem employees regularly paid a per diem for every day in the year.

So much as may be necessary to pay the additional compensation provided in this section to employees of the Government of the United States is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

So much as may be necessary to pay the increased compensation provided in this section to employees of the government of the District of Columbia is appropriated, one-half out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and one-half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, except to employees of the Washington Aqueduct and the water department, which shall be paid entirely from the revenues of the water department.

So much as may be necessary to pay the increased compensation provided in this section to persons employed under trust funds who may be construed to be employees of the Government of the United States or of the District of Columbia is authorized to be paid, respectively, from such trust funds.

Reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next regular session showing for the first four months of the fiscal year the average number of employees in each department, bureau, office, or establishment receiving the increased compensation at the rate of \$120 per annum and the average number by grades receiving the same at each other rate.

During the reading of the foregoing—

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As we are now reading section 6, I ask if amendments should not be withheld until we complete the section?

The CHAIRMAN. This is a general appropriation bill, and is being read by paragraphs.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then I ask unanimous consent that the entire section be read, and that it be then in order to offer amendments or to make any points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the paragraph may be read, after which

amendments or points of order may be made to any part of the section. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the foregoing.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, on page 146, line 18, I move to strike out "\$120" and insert "\$360."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: Page 146, line 18, strike out "\$120" and insert "\$360."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, several gentlemen have expressed a desire to speak on this amendment. I am wondering if it would not save time to make some sort of an arrangement now.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was just going to ask the gentleman from Colorado if we could not agree upon, say, 30 minutes' discussion?

Mr. MASON. I would like 10 minutes, and I would not want to agree to any time which would not give me that opportunity.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the gentleman can get his time under an agreement. It seems to me it would be more in line with what the Members generally desire if we could come to some agreement now, limiting the debate, and I hope we can agree upon some reasonable time.

Mr. KEATING. Say half an hour for our side of the proposition.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It seems to me we ought to close this debate in less than an hour. I would suggest to the gentleman 20 minutes on a side. I do not know how many desire to oppose the amendment.

Mr. BLACK. I should like to have five minutes in opposition.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the time ought to be equally divided between those who are for and those who are against the amendment.

Mr. MASON. I do not want to consent to any agreement unless I can have 10 minutes.

Mr. DYER. Unless there is some agreement arrived at, any Member can move to close the debate after 10 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Why not submit it as a part of the request that my colleague [Mr. Mason] shall have 10 minutes?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think this is practically the only remaining contested portion of the bill, and the gentleman from Colorado has suggested that 30 minutes will be sufficient for those who favor his amendment. I therefore ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in one hour, the time to be allotted by the Chair evenly between those who are for and those who are against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] desires 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not object to that.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask that out of the hour the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] be given 10 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. On which side?

Mr. MASON. I am in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Byrns] asks unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in one hour, one-half the time to be given to those who are in favor of the pending amendment and one-half the time to those who are opposed, and that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] have 10 minutes of that time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And the debate to be confined to the subject matter of the amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Reserving the right to object, I should like to have five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman can get the Chair to put his name down.

Mr. BLACK. I do not know whether my name is on the list or not, but I hope it is.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I should like to have the Chair put my name down for five minutes.

Mr. NOLAN. I should like to be recognized for five minutes in favor of the amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Let us have the request submitted, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Can not gentlemen indicate to the Chair who is to have the time? The Chair thinks an hour will cover all the allowances, but he is not sure.

Mr. AUSTIN. Reserving the right to object, I suggest that we make it an hour and a half.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee which has been stated by the Chair? There was no objection.

Mr. MASON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Keating] is entitled to recognition.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. M. son].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak of the particular locality where I live and the amount of money that is paid to Federal employees there. The pay of the charwomen and the laborers, the elevator men and watchmen in the Federal building in the city of Chicago is so low as to amount to an absolute disgrace to the Government of the United States. Case after case of charity is found among the people who are employed by the United States Government. The assistant custodian of the building has been obliged to advertise, and to do it at his own expense, for help, so many of the employees have left. Sometimes 15 or 20 people reply, but none will take the employment. The charwomen are getting as low as about \$27 a month. Let me call your attention to one case, that of Estelle Austin, who died in an infirmary from tuberculosis one year ago. One of the internes called at the custodian's office afterwards and informed the assistant that the woman contracted the disease because of not receiving proper nourishment, stating that it was a crime to have anyone work for the wages the Government was paying. She had herself and her father to support. Her pay I think was about \$27 a month.

I have here before me a petition, which with the permission of the committee I shall insert at this point in my remarks:

To the United States Senate and House of Representatives:

We, the undersigned, desire to call the attention of your honorable body to the condition of salaries in the custodian service of the Federal Building, Chicago.

Elevator men are receiving only a paltry \$60 per month, and as a result most of the former reliable force has left and now the personnel is constantly changing, a dangerous and annoying condition. For \$60 a month watchmen guarding the building are expected to work seven days a week and buy their uniforms. The laborers and charwomen are in a similar, deplorable condition.

There is now a resolution before the House to grant an increase of \$1 per day to these employees pending the reorganization of the Federal service, and it is our earnest plea that such increase be given, in order to meet in part the very great increase in the cost of necessities, and that Federal employees may enjoy at least a "living wage."

Respectfully submitted.

Kenesaw M. Landis, Arthur L. Sanborn, Geo. A. Carpenter, Judges of the district court; Peter Newton, secretary Civil Service Commission; Chas. Schirmer, examiner Railway Mail Service; J. E. Mansfield, examiner Railway Mail Service; Ed. M. Hodgetts, inspector railway mail cars; C. H. Otis, chief examiner Railway Mail Service; Thomas I. Porter, chief United States Secret Service; Reid Hanna, chief pension examiner; Frank Shoenfeld, chief clerk Railway Mail Service; Benj. E. Carle, chief clerk Railway Mail Service; W. H. Wagner, chief examiner naturalization service; Frederick W. Weber, assistant chief examiner naturalization service; Jno. M. Hubbard, jr., superintendent money-order division (post office); Julius A. Smitanka, collector internal revenue; Walter Greenwood, boiler inspector; Peter Larson, boiler inspector; William Nicholas, chief boiler inspector; Paul Hermes, Treasury agent; Henry J. Cox, weather forecaster; Lewis F. Maser, United States commissioner; Joseph F. Ryan, chief deputy marshal; Charles L. Mitchell, assistant weather forecaster; Arthur E. Claussen, clerk United States court; John H. R. Jamar, clerk United States court; J. V. Shoemaker, clerk United States court; J. E. Fay, clerk United States court; John Felker, clerk United States court; Thomas I. Sell, clerk United States court; C. B. Morrison, master in chancery; P. J. Barry, acting superintendent bureau of investigation; James P. Rooney, special agent bureau of investigation; D. F. Crowley, assistant superintendent Railway Mail Service; D. H. Galbraith, superintendent of mails; Jno. M. Hubbard, assistant postmaster; Frank Boswell, assistant United States attorney; John H. Lally, assistant United States attorney; E. J. Whitty, assistant United States attorney; John B. Boddie, assistant United States attorney; Charles F. Clynne, United States attorney; Joseph D. Flemming, United States attorney.

Think of a man having to support a family, buying his own uniform, trying to educate a family on \$60 a month! The condition of that building is simply a disgrace to the Government of the United States because of niggardly, miserable salaries that are being paid there. A comparison with the pay for the same sort of labor in the City Hall in Chicago would show a very great difference in the wages paid by the city and those paid by the Government. I do not want to encumber the RECORD by inserting all of the letters which I hold in my hand, but my colleagues can see what a number I have. They are letters of men who have resigned from the work simply because they could not live upon the wages paid. To be an employee of the Government of the United States should add some dignity to the employment; but just think of the conditions, when in some cases they are dependent upon the county agents to eke out a living, while doing service for the Government of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed five minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hands 150 letters addressed to Rivers McNeill, custodian, most of them resigning their positions, each one giving as a reason that they could not live on their pay, some of them saying they declined the appointment, and in every case do so on account of poor pay. I insert here rates paid by the custodian of the City Hall, Chicago, and a resolution showing pay of some work in Government building:

Rates of pay prevailing in the custodian service of the city hall, Chicago, Ill.

Designation.	Compensation per month.	Number of hours worked.	Remarks.
Charwomen.....	\$80.00	5½	No Sunday work.
Laborers or janitors:			
First year.....	80.00	7	Do.
After 2 years.....	85.00	7	Do.
Window washers.....	90.00	8	Do.
Elevator conductors.....	100.00	8	And are furnished 2 suits and 2 shirts every year.
Elevator starters.....	125.00	8	Also furnished suits.
Coal passers.....	105.00		
Firemen.....	120.00		
Assistant engineers, 2d class.....	150.00		

Whereas Delegates Charles F. Nagl, Luther C. Steward, and E. J. Newmyer, of the National Federation of Federal Employees, have introduced resolution No. 87 at the convention of the American Federation of Labor held at St. Paul, Minn.; and

Whereas said resolution was prompted by the extremely poor wages now being paid to employees in the Custodian Service in the 1,200 Federal buildings all over the country as shown by the following table:

	Per month.
Charwomen.....	\$27.08
Laborers.....	55.00
Window washers.....	55.00
Elevator conductors.....	60.00
Marble cleaners.....	60.00
Watchmen.....	60.00
Cabinetmakers.....	65.00
Others.....	70.00
Stenographers.....	75.00
Engineer helpers.....	83.33
Foremen.....	83.33

Plus a monthly increase of \$8.12 to charwomen and \$10 to all other employees granted by Congress for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1918, and ending June 30, 1919; and

Whereas readjustments in wages have been made in practically every other department in the Government service except in the Custodian Service, where no heed is given to the appeal of these employees for some aid to meet the ever-increasing high cost of living; and

Whereas this discrimination results in inconsistencies in the rates of pay for employees in the Government service doing the same kind of work and working side by side, and fosters dissatisfaction and inefficiency on the part of the lower-paid employees; for instance, laborers in the post office receive \$1,038 per annum, while the compensation for laborers in the Custodian Service, whose work is harder and more hazardous, is only \$780 per annum; and

Whereas said resolution No. 87 was referred to the committee on executive council's report, who concurred in the cause prompting that resolution and approved the object desired and recommended that the executive council of the American Federation of Labor use all methods and means deemed advisable by them to accomplish that purpose, and this report by the committee was adopted; and

Whereas in view of the lack of results and no report of their actions being submitted by the said executive council, it seems that no action was yet taken by them to obtain relief for the underpaid employees in the Custodian Service of the United States, who find it harder every day to support their families decently and to provide for them comforts necessary to life on the meager wages now being paid to them.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, for 10 years I have been an advocate in this House for readjustment, reclassification, and equalization of salaries. I had hoped to see the time come before my departure when these inequalities which have stood for half a century or more would be removed. In the last appropriation bill an increase of \$10 a month was added. The Committee on Appropriation's proposition now is to continue for another year the \$120 and create a commission to study the question and report legislation to the next Congress. I know that the membership of the House has an open mind upon this question. All seek and desire to do right and justice, not only to the Government but to every employee from the humblest to the highest. In no section of the Republic are living conditions more trying or more expensive than they are in the city of Washington. We require and expect of the Government officials that they will be a credit, not only to themselves but to the great Government they are serving so well and so faithfully.

In the daily Times of this city two days ago appeared an editorial carrying a letter from a mother whose husband is an employee of this Government. I desire to have the Clerk read that letter in my time. It is an appeal which ought to reach the heart and conscience of every man who sits on the floor of this House. All that I ask of my colleagues in the consideration of this proposition and in casting this vote is to place themselves in the position of the Government employee in the city

of Washington. This is an appeal from those who render the highest possible clerical service in all this country. Every one of us is a daily witness to the creditable and efficient manner in which the public business is transacted. It is done so thoroughly, so efficiently, it is certainly worthy of the most careful consideration when we are to pass upon a just and fair compensation for those who perform it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read the letter carried in the editorial which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

I am the wife of a Federal employee who receives the large sum of \$720 per annum, and also the mother of seven dependent children.

I would like to rear my children to be honest and respectable citizens, but how in the name of God can I do it with such starvation wages? As a rule, the poor man has a large family, and it is the poor man that contributes the majority of soldiers and sailors to his country. Uncle Sam expects his soldiers to be strong and brave, but I would like to ask some of these Congressmen how they expect the future soldiers and sailors to be strong and brave when in their infancy they are underfed and deprived of the necessities of life.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I expect to support the recommendation of the committee, as it is already written in this bill to grant salary increases of \$120 to all of those Government employees who receive \$2,500 or less, except certain enumerated exceptions which have been provided for in other bills, such as postal employees. I think my record of votes in the House on these propositions of salary increase is reasonably consistent. Wherever I have thought the increases proposed were reasonable and justified by the services to be performed, I have supported them. Wherever I have thought the increases were unreasonable and not justified, I have voted against them. At the present session I voted against the proposition to increase the salaries of the Federal judges. I did not do so because of any lack of respect for the Federal judiciary, nor because of any undervaluing of their work, but I voted against the proposed increases because I believed the salary which they now receive is a good one and is ample to support themselves and their families in comfort. And I want to pause right here long enough to speak about a matter of criticism which I have recently observed in the press and elsewhere with reference to the salary of \$12,000 paid to our Cabinet officers. Most of the printed discussion which I have seen in the papers was in advocacy of increasing the amount.

I do not agree to that proposition. I think that one of the things most needed in the United States to-day among our rich and well to do is to get back to the old-fashioned simplicity of living which used to be the rule to a much greater extent than it is to-day. I do not know of anything in our modern life which I think is more productive of much of the discontent which exists in the world to-day than the luxury and extravagance which has grown up in the mode of living among some of our rich and well to do. We need to get back to the simple life. The United States, least of all nations in the world, can afford to tolerate caste or class distinction, and I know of nothing that will remove it more quickly and more effectually than simple and modest standards of living among all classes of our people. I merely say this in passing with reference to a condition which may well arrest our thoughtful attention.

Now, back to the question of this salary-increase proposition. It is one of the laws of economics that in a period of war inflation that prices of commodities rise much more rapidly than do wages and salaries, and when that period of war inflation has passed the reverse is true and the prices of commodities fall more rapidly than wages and salaries. Of course, there are some exceptions, but this is undoubtedly the rule. It is well that it should be so, because it is one of nature's evening-up processes of adjusting the equities between the different classes of workers. Now, every sensible man knows that we have been passing through a period of unprecedented war inflation. The prices of commodities have risen rapidly and many of them to very high figures. But it is also undoubtedly true that the period of war inflation has reached its crest, and that there will be a fall in the prices of commodities, and this fall will increase the purchasing power of the dollar and thereby increase the value of the wage. This will within itself amount to an increase in wages in so far as its effect is concerned. Therefore, in view of the facts, present and prospective, and in view of the need for at least a reasonable amount of economy in Government expenditures, I will support the recommendation of the committee to increase these salaries \$120 per annum rather than the amendment now proposed to make the increase \$360 per annum.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. LAZARO. In view of the fact that so much territory that was devoted to production has been converted into—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLACK. My time has expired, and I regret that I will be unable to answer the question which the gentleman was about to propound.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Idaho [Mr. SMITH], if he were here, would be in favor of this amendment. Unfortunately he has been sick for the last two days, and he asked me to have incorporated in the RECORD a letter received from the president of the United States Civil Service Commission and some statistics which he received from the Housing and Health Division of the War Department regarding the appointments and separations from the civil service from the month of March, 1918, to the month of December, inclusive, showing a total of 75,588 appointments and 40,718 separations. Out of the 75,588 employees who came here, 40,718 were dissatisfied and returned to their homes, or approximately that number, figuring those who had been here prior to March of last year, who had separated themselves also. I desire to have that incorporated in the RECORD along with the letter to Mr. SMITH, who would have supported this amendment.

The letter and statement referred to are as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1919.

Hon. ADDISON T. SMITH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: I inclose herewith a statement showing by months the number of appointments to and separations from the Government service in Washington from March to December, 1918, inclusive. This information was prepared by the Housing and Health Division of the War Department from reports of the several departments and independent establishments. The information was not prepared for the earlier months of the year.

There has been much discussion of the inadequacy of salaries paid by the Government, but dissatisfaction with pay received is only one of a number of reasons for resignation from the Government service.

Very respectfully,

JOHN A. McILHENNY, President.

Statement of appointments to and separations from the Government service, by months, from March to December, 1918, inclusive, prepared by the Housing and Health Division of the War Department.

Month.	Appoint-ments.	Separations.	Increase.	Decrease.
March.....	6,567	2,450	4,117
April.....	7,529	3,046	4,483
May.....	6,272	3,251	3,021
June.....	8,233	3,908	4,325
July.....	8,736	3,099	5,637
August.....	8,075	3,736	4,339
September.....	10,943	5,291	5,652
October.....	10,432	6,189	4,243
November.....	5,525	4,755	770
December.....	3,276	4,993	1,717
	75,588	40,718

Mr. NOLAN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Congress to the way we have been treating the employees under our care compared with the way that the employees of the Government under the care and jurisdiction of the various boards created by Congress who have jurisdiction over wages and salaries are treated. The Railroad Wage Board, the Wage Adjustment Board, and the War Labor Board have been active in taking up the question of wages of the employees of the Government of the United States and those employed by contractors on contracts with the Government of the United States, and in many instances the War Labor Board has adjudicated disputes between the employer and the employee in private industry. Now, take the case of the Railroad Wage Board. The Railroad Wage Board gave exhaustive study to the condition of the railroad wages of this country and gave an increase to every man in the employ of the railroads of this country receiving \$3,000 a year and less, giving the largest increase to the poorest-paid employee. The Wage Adjustment Board, the Emergency Fleet Corporation, adjusted wages, and in this instance and in the case of the War Labor Board they based their findings upon the increased cost of living. Now look at the difference between the boards, the institutions created by Congress to deal with employees, and Congress itself. You give a flat increase of \$10 per month to both the lowest-paid employee and those receiving salaries up to and including \$2,500 per annum.

This committee has given no consideration whatever to the actual increase in cost of living of Government employees, whereas the increases allowed by the Wage Adjustment Board, the Railroad Wage Board, and the War Labor Board have been based on increased prices. This is the only fair way to treat this wage and salary question, and if we were as just as our wage boards and commissioners we would be paying a great deal more money to the Government workers than the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado provides for.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I wish the members of the committee would stop and consider one minute what this amendment means. This bill carries in round figures about \$90,000,000. This amendment will add in the neighborhood of \$40,000,000 to this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What?

Mr. Sisson. About \$40,000,000, making the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill about \$136,000,000 instead of \$90,000,000. Now, the next session you gentlemen are going to have control of the House. This is a most radical increase in salaries. The purpose of the committee a year ago in putting the \$120 increase into the bill was for the purpose of taking care of the physical increase in the cost of food.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I have only four minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I only wanted to know if the gentleman referred to the \$120 amendment or the \$360 amendment.

Mr. Sisson. The \$360 amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And that carried \$40,000,000 increase?

Mr. Sisson. Yes; more than the present bill. Now, there is objection made to the fact that everybody gets the \$120 increase, but the percentage of the increase on the lower-paid salaries is very much greater than on the higher-paid salaries. Now, it is a most difficult matter to adjust salaries. If you were to undertake to adjust salaries in all the departments of the Government you have got a man's job for at least a year; and the great difficulty in adjusting salaries is, first, to determine the character of the work done by the employee, and even then you ought to know something about the efficiency of the employee. We have no proper efficiency system in this Government. Now, this \$120 is a gratuity.

I am going to call your attention to one fact: This bill will carry \$360 increase for the teachers of the District of Columbia, and yet the basic salary of the teachers' pay in the bill that just passed the House is higher—the basic salary of the teachers in the graded school—than in any other city in the United States; and, when you add to it the longevity pay, they are the best paid school-teachers in the United States, irrespective of whether you complain about low-paid or high-paid teachers. I have now in my office reports on 20 or 30 cities and from the State superintendents in which they give the basic salary. The city of Philadelphia, in the high-school grades, pays a little better salary than the District of Columbia. In the city of Chicago, in the higher grades, they pay a little better salary than in the District of Columbia; but in what is the graded-school districts the higher salary, irrespective of the regular longevity increase, is paid in the District of Columbia; and if you take the employees in the District of Columbia and compare them with like employees of all the city governments in the United States the average pay and the base pay are higher for like work than in any city in the United States. You may take the clerk hire here and the clerk hire in the city of New York, and in the city of Philadelphia, and in the city of Chicago, and for like work we are paying a higher wage in the District of Columbia now than they pay there; and this committee, in view of the fact that there was a congested condition of population here, in view of the fact that there was a condition here which did not prevail in other cities, notwithstanding the fact that they were getting a higher average pay than other cities, added \$120, which would cost some \$17,000,000 for the employees of this Government. Gentlemen, you had best think before you thoughtlessly adopt the \$360. I hope you will vote it down.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, before it is decided that what the gentleman says is a fact I think it would be well to look up a few of the statistics regarding not only the pay of teachers but the pay of Government employees everywhere—

Mr. Sisson. I have.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Of Government employees particularly. Now, we were very charitably disposed in the early part of this week, and we voted \$100,000,000 to take care of the poor in the Old World, and I was in favor of it. Now, I am one of those who believe that charity should begin at home just the same, and if it is anywhere necessary to do charity I think it is among the poorly paid Government employees of the United States, regardless of what they get or what you propose to give them.

My colleague from Illinois [Mr. Mason] referred to a condition in Chicago. How can a man in a big city who has a family and gets only \$60 a month live upon that amount and support his family? And I would like to know by what kind of reasoning they can be said to be getting good pay. Now, I have a copy of

the petition that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] called your attention to, and I wish to say that they are having the most difficult time to retain people in the Government service in order to do the work that is necessary in the Federal Building at Chicago. It is one of the greatest Government buildings in the country—not the kind of a building that it ought to be; it is a makeshift. The conditions in that building under which these people work are simply deplorable. Now, I am in favor of being half decent, at least, with the employees of the Government. We passed a bill here the other day for \$27,000,000 for the improvement of rivers and harbors—rivers where there is no commerce at all. I did not hear any very great amount of opposition to that bill. That is a waste of money. But whenever there is a proposition here to raise the pay of an employee I have noticed ever since I have been a Member of Congress, when we want to raise wages, there are always people anxious for the time to oppose any such proposition. I hope the amendment will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, Governments, as a rule, rarely pay high salaries, and ought not to do so. The pay is certain. There is no danger of bankruptcy. But while the Government ought not to pay high salaries, a Government which can exist at all ought to be able to do justice to its employees, to the men who work for it. We have been lavish in expenditures of money in many directions, frequently when I was in opposition to the proposition. Can we now afford not to increase the salary, but to refuse to do justice, to the employees of the Government? Everywhere throughout the land in private employment men and women have received an advance in pay much more in proportion than is proposed by the pending amendment—a demand that came and a demand that was conceded because of the great increase in the cost of actual living. It would not perhaps be the best time now to fix permanent salaries of Government employees, because we all hope that the cost of living will be reduced, though I do not apprehend that it will go back to where it was before the war in years to come, if it ever does. We can afford, inasmuch as we are a great Government, to pay living wages to the men and women who work for the Government. We can not afford to pay starving wages to them. It is not right to ask it. It is not right to expect it. It is no answer to say that these men can leave the employ of the Government. The question is, Can the Government itself afford to be just in its dealings with those who work for it? I think the Government can afford to be just, as I think private employers are forced and compelled by circumstances to be just. These people will not lay up great supplies of money even with the increase that is proposed here. But they ought to receive pay enough to give them decent living, allow them to have children, and provide some education for their children. I think we can afford to be economical in many directions, but not by starvation wages to those who work for and really maintain the work of the Government itself. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] said the thing to do was to go back to the simple life. I dare say, the Government employees that are receiving \$60 or \$75 a month would like to see the gentleman from Texas or some one else with mighty power wave his magic wand and bring them back to the simple life. Bring them back to the days—

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I have only two minutes. I wish I could yield, but I can not. Take the things that the poor man has to buy—the man who is working for the Government at \$60 or \$75 a month—to keep his soul and body together and to keep the soul and body of his family together. He has to pay 85 cents a dozen for eggs. All character of vegetables have increased in price from 200 to 400 per cent. Take the case of a family such as that spoken of by the gentleman from Tennessee, consisting of a wife with seven little children, where the wife can not get enough for one day's wage of her husband to enable her to give to each of her children a bite of meat.

That is the condition that is confronting us now, a condition not brought about by these men and women working for these wages, which would seem ample in ordinary times when we were back in the simple life. Yet we see this spectacle to-day in the case of people working on salary, clerks and people under Government employ, who are the poorest paid people in all the United States. The average section hand on a railroad to-day is getting \$90 a month. A car knocker, whose business it is to sound the wheels when the train rolls into the station to see whether the wheels are safe or not, gets \$150 a month. The average jack-leg carpenter gets \$8 a day. Your Government clerks get only \$60 a month—the same as they got before we

entered into this war and before the present high prices of commodities obtained. Something must be done in common justice, in common humanity, to relieve this situation. [Applause.]

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

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I have remaining of my time five minutes. I yield one-half of that to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted for the debate be extended 30 minutes, one-half for and one-half against.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I was very much interested in this amendment, yet I had to keep my time down to three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky objects. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized for two minutes and a half.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment there is justification for this increase from \$120 to \$360 which has been asked for. I have in mind an increase that has taken place in a manufactory which manufactured during the war period a semiessential. The average wage rate in that factory, including men, women, and children, during April, 1917, was \$17.71 per week, some getting more and some less, or \$930.92 per annum, whereas in December last, December 28 of last year, 1918, the average weekly rate for every man, woman, and child was \$27.61, or \$1,425.72, or an average increase per annum of \$494.80.

This proposed increase here, in my judgment, is not more than any employee of the Government should have had to compensate for the difference between the high cost of living at this time and the cost of living previous to the war.

Of course, I am in hope, as every one else is, that during the period that we are now legislating for the necessities will decrease in cost to some extent, and while I shall support the \$360 proposition, yet, in view of the great possibility, in my judgment, of a decrease in the cost of living during the period that we are legislating for, I would prefer to vote for an amendment that would provide for an increase of \$240 instead of \$360.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that there are some inequalities in the pay of some of our Government employees, but a survey had a year ago as to the comparative salaries of those in civil employment with those in public employment, so far as the clerical force was concerned, showed that, notwithstanding the shortage of labor and the mounting prices in civil employment, which were at the peak, yet the Government salaries were greater than those paid in private employment. Yet on top of that the committee came in here and recommended an appropriation of \$120. Now it is sought, because of this organized effort on the part of Federal employees throughout the country, to raise that to \$360.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue has at his disposal in this bill \$21,000,000 for the collection of internal revenue. In the last year, under the authority vested in him, he has revised the pay of all those officials, ranging from \$1,400 up to \$2,500 and above. You plan to give the stenographers in the District here, who are receiving \$1,200 or \$1,400, more than is being paid in private employment, where they are obliged to work with greater intensity and where they are not allowed 30 days' leave, an increase of salary of \$360, amounting to a total drain on the Treasury of \$28,000,000.

Oh, it is easy enough to come and ask for this great increase, but if you vote it you will never withdraw from it, because it will be there always to haunt you.

Now, we are providing for a commission here to equalize salaries. For years in the Committee on Appropriations I have been seeking to raise the salaries of the lower-paid officials, those receiving \$720 and \$840, but my efforts have been unavailing. This year the effort failed by a tie vote. I want to see those salaries raised, but I protest against the unfair method that is being adopted by the organized employees of the country in trying to raid the Treasury now by asking for a higher allowance, when it is admitted that the cost of living will go down. No one who has studied this question can deny but that the Government is a better employer than private employers. No one can deny that in these clerical positions we pay more than private employers.

Oh, true, we pay the charwomen \$240 or \$320 for two hours' work a day. They have other employment. True, we voted to the postal employees \$200 increase. Those employees are persons employed out in the field, who are, in most cases, married; but the great majority of the employees provided for in

this bill are single persons, receiving on an average \$1,200 a year, and now you propose in one fell swoop to raid the Treasury to the extent of \$28,000,000 just because they have become organized. If we are going into Government ownership of railroads and other public utilities, let us here and now establish the record that we will not be stampeded by raids on the Treasury by organizations of Federal employees merely writing to us and asking increased salaries when they are being paid more than private employees, and who are only too glad to retain their Government positions because they are easier and better paid than those in private employment. They do not resign from the Government service, and there is no better proof of the fact that their salaries are better than those in private employment, when there were plenty of opportunities for employment under private employment, than the fact that they did not resign.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. Two minutes and a half.

Mr. MASON. I want to say to the gentleman that he is mistaken and that these Government employees do resign, and that I hold in my hand here a pile of letters written by men working for \$60 a month who left those places to get \$5 and \$6 a day. They do resign; and their resignations impair not only the credit and good standing of your Government, but they impair the service; they impair the sanitation; they impair the care of the public buildings of this country.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield? Is there an official who states that they impair the Government efficiency? Can the gentleman cite one instance where any Government official makes that charge?

Mr. MASON. I can if you will give me the time; I can not in a minute and a half. But I say that in the city of Chicago the Federal building there is not being properly cared for. I do not intend to burden the Record with all these letters of resignation, but I ask leave to make a synopsis of them. It is not true that for the same service the Government is paying as much as private employers in the city of Chicago. Elevator men there in private employment are getting from 50 to 75 and 100 per cent more than they are getting from the Government of the United States and they do resign, and in a way that throws discredit upon the Government of the United States. I understood that the charwomen worked more than two hours a day for \$27 a month; but in the great city of Chicago they have got to pay their car fare, they have got to go at a particular time to do that work, and it is a fact that we are impairing the service and discrediting the good name of the Government of the United States.

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE LETTERS, CUSTODIAN SERVICE.

[Extracts.]

"I am employed at a salary of \$55 per month. I have a wife and two children dependent upon me for support and am compelled to deprive myself and family of all amusements or recreation. My wife is compelled to work in order to make both ends meet."

"I have a wife, three children, and a mother to support. I have to work after office hours, because \$60 per month is not enough to keep my family in health. When I think of what we passed through last winter, I could wish that God would take my children out of their suffering rather than stand by helpless."

"The salary which I am receiving as charwoman does not bear my expenses, and therefore I am compelled to do other work to support myself and three children."

"I am employed at a salary of \$660 per annum. I am compelled to seek work on the outside in order to make both ends meet. Amusements are out of the question. Should I become ill I do not know what would become of my family, because it is absolutely impossible for me to lay aside one cent for any contingency."

"I am employed at a salary of \$60.60 per month and have to do outside work in order to meet my expenses, and they are getting worse. And my wife has to work in order that she may help clothe herself and our child."

"I am a single man endeavoring to take care of my parents, who are becoming feeble with age, and I am unable to live off my present salary of \$60 per month. I am, therefore, forced to seek evening employment, which prevents me from taking rest after the completion of one job."

"I only get \$60.50 a month and have five in the family. My wife has to do laundry work to help when she is able, and after putting in a day's work at the post office I have to hunt other work in order to get by."

"My small salary of \$840 per annum is not sufficient to support my family. In order to make both ends meet, I have been compelled to work from 4.30 a. m. to 8.30 p. m. I am compelled to live in the country at a disadvantage in order to cultivate a few acres of land and raise some chickens. This all means hardship, and even using these means it is a struggle to live. I never know what a day's pleasure or holiday is, for it is work all the time to meet the necessities of life."

"During the last three years I have rented a small farm and begin the day at 4.30 and work until about 7 a. m. and then leave my home for the city, and on returning home in the evening I begin again and work until about 9 o'clock and sometimes 10 o'clock at night, and take all of my 14 days' holiday to work on the farm."

"Employed as messenger at \$840 per annum. I have a wife and five little children, and find the compensation inadequate for the support of my family, even with the utmost economy, and am obliged to seek work at night. Our compensation has not been increased for many years."

"My salary as charwoman is \$25 a month. I have to seek employment outside in order to take care of myself and blind daughter."

(Another employee in the same service writes that his salary being insufficient to support himself and his wife and children, he is obliged to gather rags after office hours when he should be resting.)

"I am employed in the United States public stores, and have not only been forced to do outside work at night in order to live but I have been compelled to take my 15-year-old boy out of school in an effort to keep up, and then I am unable to do so on my present salary of \$70 per month, with a bonus of \$10 for this year only. I have a wife and three children under 16 years of age, and in keeping with American citizenship it is necessary that I keep my children looking decent and respectable, have a comfortable home, keep them comfortably clad during the winter, and give them an education, if for no other purpose than becoming good American citizens, that they may not of necessity become a burden on us or our country. Could you do this with the above salary? Furthermore, I was compelled to utilize the 14 days given me this year as annual leave to work in a packing house at \$4 per day. Is it possible that an individual who works for the United States Government has to go outside to take extra work because of the inadequate salary paid by the Government, and also keep his children out of school (which in itself is a disgrace to the Government) in order to earn the necessities of life?"

Gentlemen, can you tell me how the standard of American citizenship can be attained at the present cost of commodities on a wage of \$70 per month? And how I am to call in a doctor in case of necessity at \$3 or \$5 a visit?"

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have the privilege of casting my vote for such a just and righteous measure as this is. I know from my own experience as a former employee of the executive branch of the Government what conditions in the departments have been and what they are to-day. I would gladly vote to make the increase even larger than this amendment proposes in—

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. No; I can not, as I only have a moment or two.

Mr. GORDON. How much does he think this increase ought to be, if it is too small?

Mr. LANGLEY. I had not finished the sentence. What I had in mind to say was that I would vote even for a larger increase than is proposed in the cases of persons who are in the lower salary grades. There is where the privation really exists. I wish I had time, Mr. Chairman, to state my views more elaborately on these matters to the committee, but since I have not I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Record for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I think it is well not to be swept off our feet touching certain conditions that may need pronounced remedying, to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has referred, and in order to deal with such a situation we ought not to deal with a great many others that do not present anything like the equities that may exist in regard to the cases he speaks of. Now, if you want to increase the compensation of the employees of public buildings over the country the place to do that is in the sundry civil bill when you get to the item that makes provision for the care and maintenance of those buildings; but a desire to deal with that situation is no reason why you should now vote to increase the pay of a great many clerical people who are getting more money than is being paid for the same sort of work out in civil life; and it is not wise for us here to be swept off our feet at the expense of the Treasury to the extent of something like \$30,000,000 or more by these special pleas. [Applause.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Members of the House will not be swept off their feet either by the arguments for or against this amendment. They will not be swept off their feet by the charge that these Government positions are so desirable that no one ever resigns a Government job, when the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] has just quoted figures to show that here in the city of Washington there were 75,000 appointments and 40,000 resignations in the period of a year.

Mr. NOLAN. In less than a year.

Mr. KEATING. In less than a year. That shows how desirable these Government jobs are considered. And yet gentlemen tell you that there is a great scramble for these places.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. No. The gentleman could have quoted these figures when he had the floor. He is perfectly familiar with them.

Now, my friends, this bonus is asked to compensate Government employees for a condition that we know exists, to wit, an increase in the cost of living. It is not necessary to submit statistics. Every man within the sound of my voice knows that since the beginning of the European war there has been an increase in the cost of the necessities of life of at least 100 per cent, and that the Government clerk who was getting \$1,200 a year at the beginning of the European war is now, so far as purchasing power is concerned, receiving only \$600 a year. Within the last year there has been an increase of 18 per cent in the cost of living and prices are still going up.

It is also true that the Government of the United States, dealing with other employees, with those who are on the railroads of this country and in the shipyards of the country, through the War Labor Board, has granted awards on account of the increase in the cost of living that make this proposal seem small indeed. All we are asking you to do is to treat the clerical employees of this Government with the same generosity and the same justice that has been accorded to other employees of the Government.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment will be adopted, because it only does substantial justice to the employees of this Government, and it will add immeasurably to the efficiency of our service.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am sure we do not want to do injustice to the men and women who are engaged in the Government service. Neither do we want to do injustice to the Treasury of the United States. Let us stop a minute and see what it is contemplated to do. We have passed an appropriation bill for the Post Office Department, and in that have given an increase of \$200 to the men who work outside of the city of Washington, but for the 90,000 Government employees in Washington you propose to give an increase of \$360 a year. The statute fixes the pay of common laborers at \$660 a year. We give them 7 legal holidays with pay. We give them 60 days vacation every year with pay. In addition to Sundays and these vacations, you propose now to fix the standard here for common laborers, the commonest laborer, at \$1,020 a year. I say that any man who votes for that and then hires a man in his own employment and pays less than that is a different kind of individual than I think sits on the floor of the House. You propose to pay charwomen by this measure \$440 a year for three hours' work, at a maximum, per day; and any Member of the House who will vote for this proposition and then employ in his own home one of these same charwomen and pay her less than that is unworthy to sit here on the floor of the House. Let us be fair. Let us treat the Treasury with the same consideration that we treat our own pocketbooks. The standard we fix to-day must be the standard that the business men of the country must adopt. When the committee was considering this matter a girl from one of the congressional districts represented by one of the members of the subcommittee, who came here at \$1,200 a year, paid out of a lump-sum appropriation in the War Department, and whose salary was increased to \$1,400 a year, was notified that her services were no longer necessary. She came and asked this Member to get her a job in Washington, and said she would take \$1,000 a year, for that was more than she was getting at home; and yet this amendment would give her and thousands similarly situated \$1,750 per year. Let us think of the Treasury. The Agriculture Department says that next year the guaranteed price on wheat will cost the Treasury \$1,000,000,000, which means, if they are to be relied upon, that the price of all food must come down during the period for which we are making this appropriation. Let us make this appropriation in fairness to the employee, but for God's sake let us think something of the Treasury of the United States at the same time, and let us remember that you and your constituents will be called upon to supply with funds, to buy bonds, to make good the amount that you are voting out to-day. Let us be fair to all of them. I wish we could go into this matter; I wish we might take the time to consider it, so that we could see that the committee has been fair, absolutely fair, to these employees of the Government; and in order to be sure that we were fair we provided for a commission that would go into this whole question and then in a broad way, without taking dictation from any source, determine what was a fair wage for all of these employees in the various departments, and upon that report base legislation that would be absolutely fair to all of our people, both the Government and those who work for it.

Mr. GORDON. When does the increase provided for in this bill go into effect?

Mr. GOOD. It is for the fiscal year beginning July 1 next.

Mr. GORDON. Ending July 1, 1920.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I hope we will look at the proposition presented to the committee in a fair way, with regard not only to the employees of the Federal Government but also the taxpayers who have to foot the bills. I have noticed that in the remarks of these gentlemen who have appeared in support of this amendment not a single reference has been made to the taxpayer whom they represent on the floor of this House. Here is a proposition that contemplates adding \$50,000,000 to the expenses of the Government by way of a bonus to the Federal employees at a time when the people of this country are being taxed billions of dollars to pay the expenses of the war in which we have been engaged, and the interest upon the bonds which have been issued during that war. We are asked to add \$50,000,000 to this bill as a bonus at a time when the revenue bill is now pending in conference, which proposes to tax the people \$6,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year in order to meet the expenses of your Government, and in addition to that we are confronted with the necessity of issuing four or five billion dollars in bonds to make up the deficiency. It is time to call a halt; it is time to take into consideration those back home, who will be required to pay the appropriation you are proposing to make. The question is going to be asked of you when you get back home whether or not you gave them due consideration in these matters.

What are the facts? A year ago this proposition was before the House. It was given a thorough consideration. There was thorough argument made upon the proposition, and the House by vote during war times fixed the bonus at \$120 a year. That, I repeat, was during war times, at a time when the expense of living was certainly higher than it can possibly be during the next fiscal year. You are now asked to fix the bonus at \$360 a year, or three times the former amount, in peace times, during the fiscal year 1920, during which no man on the floor of this House will say the cost of living will be greater than it has been during the present year.

What are you going to tell the people you represent back home when you are confronted with the proposition that you voted to increase that bonus during peace times? How can you explain such a position when you declined to make any such increase during war times? How, under such circumstances, can you justify your action in increasing the Government expenditures \$50,000,000? Now, gentlemen have referred to the fact and they have commented upon the small amount paid to certain employees of the Federal Government. I am in favor of this Government giving a fair compensation and a living wage to everyone whom it employs. I want the United States Government to be a model employer, and I believe the facts will show that in many respects it is a model employer, although, as stated, some of the lower-paid employees—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understood the gentleman from Kentucky yielded me his time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yielded to the gentleman the time which was allotted to me.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will also yield the gentleman what time I have.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for eight additional minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Gentlemen have spoken of the \$60 and \$70 employee. I want to say to you that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado does not take care of him. It takes care of the man who gets \$1,200 and more, for he is the only employee under this amendment who will draw the whole \$360. The man who gets \$2,500 will get \$2,860 if this amendment be adopted; the man who gets \$1,800 will get \$2,160; but the little man, the man whom you and I would like to see helped, does not get the \$360 under this amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do.

Mr. MASON. I ask for information. It does include charwomen who get \$27 a month now?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They do not get the whole amount of \$360 under this amendment that is before the committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield? Does not this bill provide that no person under this clause shall get more than 30 per cent in addition to their present salary?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is the provision to which I alluded.

Mr. MADDEN. So that a charwoman who gets \$240 now will only get 30 per cent of that \$240, or \$72 additional?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Or \$6 a month, just what she is getting to-day and will continue to get during the next fiscal year.

Mr. MASON. Then it does include charwomen?

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do.

Mr. MANN. Under the form of the bill would it not be necessary to make first an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado before amending the other provision?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know what is in the mind of the gentleman from Colorado; I only know what he has offered here to this committee, and I know that he could have included charwomen and the man getting \$60 or \$70 a month in the same amendment if he had desired to do so; but what I am calling attention now to is—

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee (continuing). Is the fact that if we adopt this amendment you are voting to give the man who gets \$2,000 and \$2,500 \$360 extra and you are not taking care of the smaller paid employee to whom the gentleman from Tennessee and others have alluded.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield again—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I can not yield. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that your committee gave this matter very serious consideration. We had hearings upon it, we considered it from every angle, and we felt for the reasons which have been stated here upon this floor, and the fact that during the next fiscal year the cost of living can not possibly be more than it has been during war times, that we would not be justified in reporting to this House a flat provision greater than that which has been carried in war times and which would increase the expenditure of the people \$50,000,000. Now, your committee realize that salaries here in the city of Washington are in many respects—

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not yield. Just let me get through. I do not wish to be discourteous but I will be through in a few minutes. Your committee realize that there are many inequalities in the salaries paid by the Federal Government. Your committee realize that some of these salaries may be too small, but I want to ask whether you are going to give this proposed increase and raise those who are getting the larger salaries on the plea that you are trying to help the little fellow. What your committee propose, and what I hope will be adopted by this House, is a joint commission which will take into consideration this whole proposition and after giving it full consideration report to the House as to what salaries should be allowed these employees, not only to those getting these larger sums, but particularly to those who are getting the smaller amounts.

Mr. AUSTIN. May I ask my colleague a question now?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does not the gentleman think in all fairness that a Member of this House who voted to increase his own secretary's salary \$1,200 should vote for this amendment?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can only say to the gentleman I did not vote to increase my secretary—

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman did not answer my question.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And more than that, I want to say that those gentlemen who voted to increase the compensation for clerk hire did not do so, as I understand it, with a view of increasing the secretary they have now, but they did so with a view of providing for an additional stenographer. And they say that \$1,200 a year is sufficient for a stenographer, and if \$1,200 is sufficient to pay for a busy stenographer, who works all hours of the day here at the Capitol, then I want to ask the gentlemen why they think stenographers in the departments, who get, as the gentleman from Iowa said, 7 days holiday, 60 days leave on full pay, and Sundays, are entitled to more. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment, if it is now in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. By substituting the figures "\$240" for "\$360."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Strike out the figures "\$360" and insert in lieu thereof "\$240."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. If this amendment to the amendment should be defeated and the original amendment should be defeated, would it then be in order to offer as an amendment to the original text of the bill to strike out and insert \$240?

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair it would be.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, upon the proposition of the parliamentary inquiry just submitted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] I understood—

The CHAIRMAN. The proposition submitted, as understood by the Chair, is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] increases the amount from \$120 to \$360. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] offers an amendment reducing that sum to \$240—an amendment to the amendment. The inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was if the amendment and the amendment to the amendment were defeated would it be in order to offer an amendment fixing the amount at \$240.

Mr. MANN. The Chair was right.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the \$240 proposition is defeated, and then the \$360 proposition is defeated, will it be in order to again offer the \$240 proposition?

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair it would be in order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Although it has been voted on one time?

Mr. MANN. But under different conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it would be in order. The question is on the amendment to the amendment, offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY].

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

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 33, yeas 91.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING].

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

Mr. KEATING. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 60, yeas 78.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. KEATING took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 67, yeas 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "\$120," on line 18, and insert "\$240."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 146, line 18, strike out "\$120" and insert "\$240."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that amendment on the ground that the committee has already voted on it and rejected it.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The answer of the Chairman to the parliamentary inquiry was exactly to the contrary.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is in order, there is no limit as to the number of times it can be offered.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The Chair has already held that it would be in order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am not asking my good friend from Louisiana.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The Chair could not mislead the House in that way.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] is one of the ablest men on appropriations who ever sat in the House, but when it comes to parliamentary law he is not so great. The proposition was not whether you would substitute \$240 for \$120, but whether you would substitute \$240 for \$360. Now, the House might have a very different idea between substituting \$240 for \$360 and substituting \$240 for \$120.

The two propositions are entirely distinct. And if the gentleman's point of order is well taken the result would be that the committee would be given no opportunity of voting directly on the particular proposition if it wanted to vote \$240 in preference to \$360.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] propounded the inquiry to the Chair, if it would be in order if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] were defeated, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] were defeated, to offer an amendment to the original text of the bill, increasing the rate of compensation from \$120 to \$240. The Chair answered it would be in order to do so. The amendment offered by Mr. O'SHAUNESSY was to substitute \$240 for \$360, and the sense of the committee was taken on the proposition substituting \$240 for \$360, and the latter proposition was defeated, but the sense of the committee on the direct proposition, to increase the pay of Government employees \$240 instead of \$120, as proposed in the bill, has not been taken, hence the Chair is of opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] is in order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for five minutes on that. I ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on the pending amendment and all amendments to this section was limited to one hour, and the time is exhausted.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. I dislike to do so, but I will have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky objects.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. NOLAN and Mr. O'SHAUNESSY demanded a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 87, noes 73.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee demands tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. NOLAN to act as tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the Nolan amendment.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 94, noes 79.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment.

Mr. SHERLEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend line 25, page 146, by striking out the word "thirty" and substituting the word "sixty." I want to speak to the amendment after it is reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERLEY: On line 25, page 146, strike out the word "thirty" and insert the word "sixty."

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the committee, I wish to say that the effect of this amendment is simply to make consistent the paragraph so as not to penalize the poorer-paid employees. The committee has just voted to give to the employees a bonus of \$240, speaking by and large. As the act was presented by the committee it would have prohibited any bonus that was in excess of 30 per cent, so that although the total amount for the higher-paid employees had been doubled, the effect for the lower-paid employees would be to leave them in just the same situation as they were in. I believe the House, if it wants to increase the pay, wants particularly to increase the pay of the poorer and lower-paid people. Therefore I offer this amendment.

Mr. MANN. I am glad the committee has waked up.

Mr. NOLAN. Would it not have suited better if you had inserted on line 24 the words "who is receiving in excess of \$1,000"?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; because there are some instances in which you would not want to make the total increase \$240, due to the fact that the employees do not devote their entire time to the work. If this is agreed to, in order not to break the curve, where the figures "\$2,620" occur I wish to offer an amendment to make it appear "\$2,740."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, might I ask a question of the chairman, if he will permit me?

Mr. SHERLEY. Very well.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Suppose the House would adopt the original \$120 raise. What shape would that leave the language in?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the House wanted to be consistent, it would vote down the second amendment which has been offered and put the bill back to its former situation. There is no difficulty in the House dealing with the matter, but I take it that the Committee of the Whole having expressed its opinion, it is the duty of those in charge of the bill to undertake to perfect it in accordance with the will of the Committee of the Whole, and that is what I am trying to do. [Applause.]

I offer on page 146, line 20, to strike out the figures "\$2,620" and substitute "\$2,740," and with the permission of the House I will make at the same time the same amendment in line 23.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERLEY: On page 146, line 20, strike out the figures "\$2,620" and insert "\$2,740," and in line 23, same page, strike out "\$2,620" and insert "\$2,740."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHERLEY. On page 150, in line 13, I move to strike out the figures "\$120" and insert "\$240."

Mr. MANN. Page 147?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; that page relates to the \$120 compensation in the previous act, the existing law, and ought not to be changed. But the one on page 150, line 13, I move to strike out "\$120" and insert "\$240."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERLEY: Page 150, line 13, strike out the figures "\$120" and insert "\$240."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how about line 9, on page 127?

Mr. SHERLEY. That \$200 relates to a different proposition entirely. It is not a question of rate of compensation, but it applies to persons who shall receive the compensation.

Mr. MANN. Very well.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Page 148, line 21, after the word "railroads," insert the following language: "telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems," and on line 23 of the same page after the word "railroads," insert the following language "telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems," so that the provision as amended will read:

"The provisions of this section shall not apply to the employees of the railroads, telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems taken over by the United States, and nothing contained herein shall be deemed a recognition of the employees of such railroads, telegraphs, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems as employees of the United States."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify that amendment by adding the words "express companies" before the word "telegraph" in the amendment in both the places where it occurs.

I do not think it is necessary to discuss the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modify the amendment by inserting before the word "telegraph," in both cases, the words "express companies."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That the heads of the several executive departments and other responsible officials, in expending appropriations contained in this act, so far as possible shall purchase material, supplies, and equipment, when needed and funds are available, from other services of the Government possessing material, supplies, and equipment no longer required because of the cessation of war activities. It shall be the duty of the heads of the several executive departments and other officials, before purchasing any of the articles described herein, to ascertain from the other services of the Government whether they have articles of the character described that are serviceable. And articles purchased by one service from another, if the same have not been used, shall be paid for at a reasonable price not to exceed actual cost, and if the same have been used, at a reasonable price based upon length of usage. The various services of the Government are authorized to sell such articles under the conditions specified, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 151, line 9, after the word "repeal," insert the following:

"Provided, That this section shall not be construed to amend, alter, or repeal the Executive order of December 3, 1918, concerning the transfer of office material, supplies, and equipment in the District of Columbia falling into disuse because of the cessation of war activities."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, on December 3, 1918, the President issued an Executive order providing that all the excess materials, supplies, and equipment in the various departments of the Government here in Washington should be turned over to the General Supply Committee, and that departments needing additional office material and supplies should purchase through this General Supply Committee. Now, it has been thought that the provision as written in the bill might serve to repeal the Executive order and that these departments might feel authorized to purchase through the machinery of the department rather than through the General Supply Committee. This amendment is offered in order to guarantee that these purchases shall be made through the General Supply Committee appointed by law.

Mr. RAKER. I understand that these supplies are on hand and that there is much of this material. Will this bill provide a means by which the other departments which need supplies shall take what is on hand rather than go out and buy new material?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is the object of the section and was the object of the order of the President issued on December 3.

Mr. RAKER. When one department gets through with the material that it has on hand, is there any objection to taking care of it until the other department takes charge of it? For instance, down here at Sixth and B Streets, in the Ordnance Department, there is a good deal of material that for the last month or two has not been used in the way of desks and filing cases. Those things are needed in other departments, and they ought to be turned over without selling them at half or one-third price.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is clearly correct, and that is the object of this provision.

Mr. RAKER. I am very glad the gentleman has placed it in this bill. It is fine. It will save the Government a million dollars.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope I may be permitted to divert from the subject before the House for a few minutes. Yesterday morning's Washington Post contained a statement made by Mr. Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, before the Committee on Immigration, in which it is said that there are a certain number of unemployed men about the country. He gave the number unemployed in various cities. Among others he named the city of Aberdeen, Wash., where he is quoted as saying there were 3,000 unemployed laborers. I was under the impression that Mr. Morrison was in error. I happen to be president of a logging company with headquarters in Aberdeen, Wash. I wired to a gentleman in Aberdeen to know as to the correctness of that statement made by Mr. Morrison, and I will ask the Clerk to read a telegram which I received in answer to a question that I asked as to the correctness of the statement. I set forth in detail exactly what Mr. Morrison said.

The Clerk read as follows:

J. W. FORDNEY. ABERDEEN, WASH., January 17, 1919.
499 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Several mills down for repairs; several running nights. Camps not in full operation yet. This is only temporary. Have interviewed the principal banker, the largest logger, the manager of the largest shipyard, and other large employers of labor, also the chief of police, and the consensus of their opinions is that there is employment here now for all men that are available, and that a normal resumption of the lumber industry will develop a shortage of 1,000 men in this district. Our own operation is short-handed, though we have some of the finest camps ever built and are complying with the rates fixed by the spruce production division, ranging from 50 cents to \$1 per hour for an eight-hour day. The metal trades union, representing about eleven hundred men, are on strike at shipyards. They are demanding \$8 for mechanics, \$6 for helpers, and \$5.50 for laborers. They should not be considered as unemployed.

WALTER L. STOUTE.

Mr. FORDNEY. Gentlemen, Mr. Stoute is superintendent of the company of which I am president. That telegram states that we are paying from 50 cents to \$1 per hour for an eight-hour day's work. That means that section hands on the railroad are receiving \$4 a day for an eight-hour day. Other labor in the camps is receiving as high as \$8 a day for an eight-hour day. When Mr. Morrison states that there is a surplus of labor in the

country for which employment can not be found he misstates facts, if he made that statement. There is employment for every man who wants employment to-day anywhere about the country wherever I have information on that subject.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. RAKER. I was present as one of the members of that committee when Mr. Morrison made that statement; and he made this further statement, that a great many concerns, particularly the packing houses and others, claimed that there was not a shortage of labor unless there were four or five men standing at the gate waiting for one man's job.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me tell you where there is a shortage. Go down on Fifteenth Street this afternoon, and in front of Keith's Theater you will find people standing in line for 100 feet outside of the door waiting for an opportunity to buy a ticket to the theater. There is a shortage of seats in amusement places. There is no shortage of employment for men in this country at this time.

Mr. GARNER. We have just voted an increase of salary so that those people can buy additional tickets.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, I am in favor of good salaries and have always paid them all of my life, and I am a workingman myself. There is no shortage of labor. There were American casualties in this war to the extent of about 500,000 men, when the truth is known. That number of Americans have been killed or wounded and put out of commission in this war. To take 500,000 men out of this country, as the war has done, who will be unable hereafter to fill the position of an able-bodied man, with yet more than 2,000,000 men in the Army, and then to make the statement that there is a shortage of employment for labor in this country is to make a statement that is not true. Mr. Morrison's information is wrong.

Mr. MASON. May I ask the gentleman whether it is not true that in the building trades in great cities like Chicago there is a large number of unemployed men?

Mr. FORDNEY. This morning, in my office, I asked an employer of labor, who is a Chicago contractor, about that, and he said that with a fine-tooth comb you can not find unemployed men in Chicago. That is my information this morning. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That a joint commission is created to be known as the "joint commission on reclassification of salaries," which shall consist of five Senators, who will be Members of the Sixty-sixth Congress, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Representatives, who will be Members of the Sixty-sixth Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the entire section may be read, and that at the end of the reading of the section amendments for reservation of points of order may be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the entire section be read at this time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request with reference to section 9, in order that it may not be necessary to do it at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

It shall be the duty of the commission to investigate the rates of compensation paid to civilian employees by the municipal government and the various executive departments and other governmental establishments in the District of Columbia, except the navy yard and the Postal Service, and report, by bill or otherwise, as soon as practicable what reclassification and readjustment of compensation should be made so as to provide uniform and equitable pay for the same character of employment throughout the District of Columbia in the services enumerated.

The commission is authorized to sit during the sessions or recess of Congress, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses, and to employ such personal services and incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

The heads of the various governmental services and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall furnish office space and equipment, detail officers and employees, furnish data and information, and make investigations whenever requested by the commission in connection with the purposes of this section.

For payment of the expenses authorized to be incurred there is appropriated \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be available immediately and to be disbursed upon vouchers approved by the commission, which approval shall be conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Treasury Department.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will reserve it for a moment.

Mr. WALSH. I intend to make the point of order, but I shall reserve it for a moment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, a similar provision to this was adopted on the Post Office appropriation bill with reference to postal employees. It went through without a point of order being made against it. I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order now, because it has been stated here on the floor of the House, and it is true, that there are a number of employees here in the District of Columbia who are getting very small salaries, while there are other employees who are getting salaries that are larger than is being paid for similar clerical services in other departments. In short, there is the greatest inequity, the greatest want of uniformity, running through all of the departments with reference to salaries. I think the next Congress can, after a report is made by a commission consisting of five Senators and five Representatives, pass through here some legislation which will correct these inequalities and do justice to these employees. Members have said on the floor that Government employees are not receiving now the amount of money that is being paid in private employment. That I do not admit; but if it is true, then it can be corrected upon a proper report. I trust the gentleman will not make the point of order, but will permit it to go through, just as he did with reference to the Post Office appropriation bill. I regard this as very important. Let us get the facts and then do the right thing both by the Government and its employees.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that the next Congress, I think, will be able to correct inequities much better than the present Congress, but it will not need a joint commission to furnish information in order that it may do so. The gentleman refers to the Post Office appropriation bill. No one could make a point of order on that bill. One afternoon here when there were very few people present, before any of us knew what was in the Post Office appropriation bill, unanimous consent was granted that everything in the bill should be considered in order notwithstanding the rules of the House. We have just corrected inequities in salaries, at least that was the argument made by those advocating the \$240 increase, and we are not going to further correct those inequities by having a joint commission comprised of five Members of the House and five Members of the other body to report during the next Congress. For all we know, before they get a chance to organize we may be back here at work on the regular work of the Sixty-sixth Congress. I submit to the gentleman that to expend \$50,000 in addition to the great amount of money that will have to be appropriated to carry this \$240 increase will not be worth the candle. I make the point of order.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to withhold it for a moment.

Mr. WALSH. No; I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That the temporary office buildings erected in the District of Columbia for use of the various branches of the Government in connection with the prosecution of the war shall not be removed except as authorized by law, and their care, maintenance, and protection shall be under the direction and supervision of the Superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Building.

Space in said temporary buildings and space available for office purposes in other Government buildings, owned or leased, in the District of Columbia shall be allotted and assigned, upon order of the President, in such manner as to provide for their maximum economic use by Federal activities only, with a view to removing as soon as possible from rented quarters all services that can be housed in the Government-owned buildings.

Appropriations for rent of office space, contained in this or any other act, for the fiscal year 1920, except for space under lease for a term of years expiring after June 30, 1919, shall be available only for obligation for rental of such office space in the District of Columbia as may be determined by the President to be necessary in addition to the space available in Government-owned buildings.

Appropriations or allotments for rent, and for the care, protection, maintenance, and repair of rented quarters, after allowing for the payment of outstanding obligations, shall be covered into the Treasury immediately upon the housing of the respective services in Government-owned buildings for which funds are available for such expenses.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, it is subject to the point of order, and I take there is nothing that I can say to the gentleman to induce him to withdraw his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I am willing to reserve it for a moment, but I will say that I am unalterably opposed to keeping these temporary buildings in the parks where the Government has stolen space that ought to be devoted to park purposes. Here is a provision

that they can not be removed except as authorized by law. That means that they will be there until they fall down.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman think Congress ought to have some authority?

Mr. MANN. Yes; I do.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As to when they shall be removed?

Mr. MANN. Oh, I think they ought to be removed at the earliest possible moment, as far as I am concerned. I do not think the difficulty will be in keeping them there; I think the difficulty will be ever to get them removed. Now, the gentleman proposes to put in permanent legislation a provision that those buildings shall not be moved. Why, I remember the fight there was here for years to get the Pennsylvania Avenue station off the Mall, and various other fights. I went through one in Chicago with my colleague here to get the old temporary post office off the lake front and the old exposition buildings, and year after year that fight continued before they were gotten off, and it will be difficult enough to get them off here. Now, to say by way of legislation that after a building has fallen down that you can not change it merely through making an appropriation to remove it is, to my mind, contrary to what ought to be done.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Is that the only paragraph in this section to which the gentleman has serious objection?

Mr. MANN. I think it is one of the paragraphs.

Mr. GOOD. I will submit to the gentleman that if he will offer a new section there to read, "That the care, maintenance, and protection of the temporary buildings erected in the District of Columbia shall be under the direction and supervision of the superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Building," and then following—

Mr. MANN. I have no objection, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will this meet the objection of the gentleman from Illinois, to strike out the language on page 153, line 1, reading as follows: "Not to be removed except as authorized by law, and their care, maintenance, and protection"—

Mr. MANN. My objection is to the language, "shall not be removed except as authorized by law." I know, as I say, how difficult it is to get laws passed.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then, Mr. Chairman, I understand the Chair sustains the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman to withhold the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understood the gentleman from Illinois to insist upon the point of order, and I was about to offer an amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, may I suggest it has been already called to the attention of the gentleman by my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon], that if he will transpose the language so it will read, "That the care, maintenance, and protection of the temporary office buildings erected in the District of Columbia for use of the various branches of the Government in connection with the prosecution of the war shall be under the supervision of the Superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Building"—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is the amendment I propose to offer.

Mr. STAFFORD. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order of the gentleman from Illinois is sustained.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment for a new section 9, to read as follows: "That the care, maintenance, and protection of the temporary office buildings erected in the District of Columbia for use of the various branches of the Government in connection with the prosecution of the war shall be under the direction and supervision of the superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Building," and the remainder of the language as it appears in the section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee offers an amendment as a new section, on page 152, to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. That the care, maintenance, and protection of the temporary office buildings erected in the District of Columbia for use of the various branches of the Government in connection with the prosecution of the war shall be under the direction and supervision of the superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Building."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. Does the gentleman think that the adoption of this amendment will at all expedite the disposition of these buildings and the return of the sites upon which they are located to their former state?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It will certainly not deter the return and removal of the buildings in any sense. That is what

the committee was trying to do, so far as the original section was concerned, to leave the matter altogether with a future Congress as to whether or not they should be removed. This, however, I will say to the gentleman, I think especially necessary, since some one ought to be put in charge of those buildings. They are there, and if they are vacated some one ought to have the care of them. The Food and Fuel Administrations, and I hope a great many of the employees of the Ordnance and other branches of the War Department in Henry Park, are going to be relieved of their duties very shortly, and those buildings will be left there with no one to look after them.

Mr. WALSH. It seems to me the proposition ought to be taken care of by Congress by specifying when those buildings shall be removed and then compel the occupants of the various departments to get out before that date. If you are going to leave the care of them to somebody's jurisdiction they will use that fact that they are under their care for an excuse and reason for never consenting that they should be vacated or that those buildings should be removed and taken down.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, the gentleman presented a very forceful argument this morning in favor of the Department of Commerce occupying some of these buildings.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman insisted very strenuously that those buildings ought to be occupied by Government employees—

Mr. STAFFORD. That was this morning; this is this afternoon.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I submit that, with all deference to consistency, the gentleman ought not to object to placing the superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Building in charge of those buildings, so that in those buildings, which will be occupied by certain bureaus of the Government, some one will have authority to see that they are properly taken care of and preserved, and I think this is true also of buildings which will be vacated until they are actually removed, for certainly the Government would not want to turn them loose without anyone vested with authority to look after them.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; it is true. The gentleman is correct. I was in favor of the Department of Commerce occupying one of these buildings; but now the gentleman wants to place a building that is not occupied by any Government department under the jurisdiction of the War Department.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, no.

Mr. WALSH. The superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Building. And that will be used as a reason and excuse for neither removing the building nor disposing of it or having it occupied by any other Government department. The way to handle this thing is for Congress to decide what shall be done with these buildings and to fix the date when they shall be vacated and removed.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am not disposed to dispute that point with the gentleman; but Congress will be in session, and Congress can very easily determine when it wants these buildings removed; but in the meantime here are the two buildings in Potomac Park occupied by the Navy Department and the War Department.

Mr. WALSH. Who is taking care of them now?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Building.

Mr. WALSH. There is no authority of law for that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. He is taking care of them while the War and Navy Departments are occupying those buildings. Take the War Trade Board Building, which is located on Government land, a two or three story building, between Fourteenth and Fifteenth Streets, near the Mall. Some one ought to be placed in charge of that building. It does not mean any extra expense; it does not increase the salary of the superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Building, and certainly some one ought to be vested with taking charge of the property of the Government. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to go back to page 39 for the purpose of offering a short amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to return to page 39 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. We can not hear what it was.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I want to go back to page 39 for the purpose of offering a short amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, let the amendment be first reported before consent is given.

Mr. GALLAGHER. On line 17, page 39, I wish to move to change the word "section" to "division" and to add after "chief, \$2,250," "assistant chief, \$1,800."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that that question was under consideration before the subcommittee and that committee decided not to allow it. Therefore I object.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment at the end of the bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WINGO offers an amendment as follows: At the end of the bill insert:

"Provided, That in the case of space under lease for a term of years no appropriation shall be available until the head of the department in each case shall certify in writing that he has made every proper effort to sublet or procure a cancellation by mutual consent where it is possible to procure space in Government-owned buildings or rent other suitable space at a lower rental than that covered by existing laws."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert the words "for rent."

The CHAIRMAN. At what point?

Mr. WINGO. After the words "no appropriation shall be available."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is too important a subject to be considered at this late hour. The subcommittee on appropriations has given very thorough consideration to the question of rental of occupied quarters, and therefore I make the point of order.

Mr. WINGO. On what ground?

Mr. STAFFORD. The point of order, first, is that it is not offered in the proper place in the bill.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order. It is plainly a limitation upon expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that it is entirely speculative as to whether it would be a saving or additional expense.

Mr. WINGO. It is a limitation on the expenditure. It is the very amendment the chairman of the committee challenged me to offer.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, no. I did not make any challenge to the gentleman. I would not do a thing like that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is whether or not it results in the reduction of expense.

Mr. WINGO. It says the appropriation shall not be available except in certain cases, which in itself, on the face of the amendment, reduces the amount of the expenditure in this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not feel called upon to speculate on a question like that in ruling on a point of order.

Mr. WINGO. I simply ask the Chair to read the amendment. On its face it provides for a reduction of the sum to be expended.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Chair can not tell whether there will be a reduction or not. No one can tell—not even the gentleman from Arkansas—whether there will be a reduction.

Mr. WINGO. I would like to start even a tendency to stop these extravagant rentals.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. You would not have anyone to take care of the buildings. What would you do about that?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not offered at the proper place in the bill. It applies to every item relating to rental, and it is a fundamental principle of the House that in the committee, in considering appropriation bills, that when a provision to which an amendment would be in order is passed you can not at

the end of a bill bring up matter that has formerly been considered.

Mr. WINGO. I want to submit this to the Chair: The last thing to which I offered an amendment was a provision relating to rental. All through the bill you find provisions relating to rent. This provision of mine goes to every provision in the bill regarding rent, and requires, wherever possible, that a reduction shall be made in the rent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair made his ruling predicated on the Holman rule, assuming that the gentleman offered his amendment under the Holman rule on the ground that it would result in the reduction of expenditure. Construing the Holman rule Mr. Hay, as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, held:

To be within the Holman rule, the reduction of expenditures must appear as a necessary result of the legislative provision sought to be incorporated.

That ruling was made on January 30, 1915, at the third session of the Sixty-third Congress, page 2748 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, section 3887, page 591, it is held that an amendment—

must not be merely speculative, but must appear on the face of the bill.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be permitted to correct totals in the bill wherever necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to correct totals in the bill wherever necessary. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called clerk-hire amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands a separate vote on the amendment regarding clerk hire.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask for a separate vote on the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] to section 6, and on the amendments of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], which were offered to perfect the section after the adoption of the Nolan amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else demand a separate vote?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, on the so-called clerk-hire amendment there are two amendments.

Mr. MANN. No; there is only one.

Mr. SISSON. One fixes the amount at \$3,200, with a proviso.

Mr. MANN. There is only one amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will let the gentleman from Kansas have his right. Without objection, as to other amendments than those indicated, the Chair will put them in gross. The question is on agreeing to the other amendments.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas raises the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-eight gentlemen are present—not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll, the Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair kindly state what amendment we will vote on?

The SPEAKER. On the amendments in gross which were not segregated.

Mr. MANN. The Speaker announced that those amendments were agreed to. Then the point of order was made that there was not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker announced what?

Mr. MANN. That the amendments not segregated were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Kansas made the point of no quorum.

Mr. MANN. He did not make the point of no quorum on that vote.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. My point of no quorum was made before that question was put to the House, and not upon that question.

The SPEAKER. What is it that the gentleman wants the yeas and nays upon?

Mr. STAFFORD. He does not wish the yeas and nays. He wants a quorum here.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of adopting the amendments in gross will answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 288, nays 0, answered "present" 2, not voting 140, as follows:

YEAS—288.

Alexander	Elston	Kettner	Rayburn
Almon	Esch	Kincheloe	Reavis
Anderson	Essen	King	Reed
Anthony	Fairchild, G. W.	Kinkaid	Robinson
Aswell	Fairfield	Kitchin	Rosenberg
Austin	Ferris	Knutson	Rogers
Baer	Fields	Kraus	Romjue
Bankhead	Fisher	La Follette	Rose
Barkley	Flood	Lampert	Rouse
Barnhart	Fordney	Langley	Rowe
Beakes	Foss	Larsen	Ruboy
Bell	Foster	Lazaro	Sanders, La.
Birch	Frear	Lee, Ga.	Saunders, Va.
Black	Freeman	Lehlbach	Schall
Bland, Ind.	French	Leshner	Scott, Iowa
Bland, Va.	Fuller, Ill.	Lever	Scott, Mich.
Blanton	Gallagher	Lithicum	Sells
Brand	Gandy	Little	Shallenberger
Browne	Gard	Lobeck	Sherley
Buchanan	Garner	Loneragan	Sherwood
Burnett	Garrett, Tenn.	Longworth	Sims
Burroughs	Garrett, Tex.	Lufkin	Sinnott
Byrnes, S. C.	Gillett	McAndrews	Sisson
Byrns, Tenn.	Glynn	McArthur	Slayden
Campbell, Kans.	Good	McFadden	Sloan
Campbell, Pa.	Goodall	McKenzie	Smith, Mich.
Cannon	Goodwin, Ark.	McKeown	Snook
Cantrill	Gould	McKinley	Snyder
Caraway	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stafford
Carter, Okla.	Gray, Ala.	McLemore	Stegall
Cary	Green, Iowa	Madden	Steenerson
Chandler, N. Y.	Greene, Mass.	Magee	Stephens, Nebr.
Chandler, Okla.	Greene, Vt.	Mann	Stevenson
Church	Griffin	Mansfield	Stines
Clark, Pa.	Hadley	Mapes	Sweet
Classon	Hamilton, Mich.	Martin	Switzer
Claypool	Hamlin	Mason	Tague
Coady	Harrison, Miss.	Mays	Taylor, Colo.
Collier	Harrison, Va.	Merritt	Temple
Connally, Tex.	Hastings	Miller, Minn.	Thompson
Connolly, Kans.	Haugen	Miller, Wash.	Tillman
Cooper, Ohio	Hawley	Mondell	Tilson
Cooper, W. Va.	Hayden	Montague	Timberlake
Cooper, Wis.	Hayes	Moon	Van Dyke
Copley	Heaton	Moore, Pa.	Venable
Crago	Hellin	Morgan	Vestal
Cramton	Hensley	Mott	Vinson
Crisp	Hersey	Neely	Voigt
Crosser	Hicks	Nelson, A. P.	Volstead
Currie, Mich.	Hilliard	Nichols, Mich.	Walker
Curry, Cal.	Hollingsworth	Nolan	Walsh
Dale	Houstron	Oldfield	Walton
Dallinger	Howard	Oliver, Ala.	Ward
Davis	Huddleston	Osborne	Wason
Decker	Hull, Iowa	O'Shaunessy	Watkins
Denison	Hull, Tenn.	Overstreet	Watson, Pa.
Denton	Humphreys	Padgett	Watson, Va.
Dickinson	Igoe	Parker, N. J.	Welling
Dies	Ireland	Phelan	Wolty
Dillon	Jacoway	Platt	Whaley
Dixon	James	Polk	Wheeler
Dominick	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pou	Wicks, Me.
Doolittle	Johnson, Wash.	Powers	Williams
Doremus	Jones	Purnell	Wilson, La.
Doughton	Quin	Quin	Wilson, Tex.
Dowell	Kahn	Ragsdale	Wingo
Dupré	Kearns	Rainey, H. T.	Winslow
Dyer	Keating	Rainey, J. W.	Wood, Ind.
Eagan	Kelae	Raker	Woods, Iowa
Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Ramsayer	Woodward
Elliott	Kelly, Pa.	Randall	Wright
Ellsworth	Kennedy, Iowa	Rankin	Young, N. Dak.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Emerson Treadway
NOT VOTING—140.

Ashbrook	Beshlin	Bowers	Brumbaugh
Ayres	Blackmon	Britten	Butler
Bacharach	Booher	Brodbeck	Caldwell
Benson	Borland	Browning	Candler, Miss.

Carew	Godwin, N. C.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Shackelford
Carlin	Gordon	Maher	Shouse
Clarke, Mass.	Graham, Pa.	Moore, Ind.	Siegel
Clark, Fla.	Gray, N. J.	Morin	Slemp
Clary	Gregg	Mudd	Small
Costello	Griest	Nelson, J. M.	Smith, Idaho
Cox	Hamill	Nicholls, S. C.	Smith, C. B.
Darrow	Hamilton, N. Y.	Norton	Smith, T. F.
Davey	Hardy	Oliver, N. Y.	Snell
Delaney	Haskell	Olney	Stedman
Dempsey	Heintz	Overmyer	Steele
Dent	Helm	Paige	Stephens, Miss.
Dewalt	Helvering	Park	Sterling
Dill	Holland	Parker, N. Y.	Strong
Donovan	Hood	Peters	Sullivan
Dooling	Husted	Porter	Sumners
Drane	Hutchinson	Pratt	Swift
Drukner	Johnson, Ky.	Price	Taylor, Ark.
Dunn	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsey	Templeton
Edmonds	Key, Ohio	Riordan	Thomas
Estopinal	Kiess, Pa.	Robbins	Tinkham
Evans	Kreider	Roberts	Towner
Fairchild, B. L.	LaGuardia	Rowland	Vare
Farr	Lea, Cal.	Rucker	Waldow
Fess	Littlepage	Russell	Weaver
Flynn	London	Sabath	Webb
Focht	Lundeen	Sanders, Ind.	White, Ohio
Francis	Lunn	Sanders, N. Y.	Wilson, Ill.
Fuller, Mass.	McClintic	Sanford	Wise
Gallivan	McCormick	Scully	Young, Tex.
Garland	McCulloch	Sears	Zihlman

So the other amendments were agreed to in gross.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. MAHER with Mr. MOORES of Indiana.

Mr. OLIVER of New York with Mr. MUDD.

Mr. OLNEY with Mr. PAIGE.

Mr. PARK with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. PRICE with Mr. RAMSEY.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. SANDERS of New York.

Mr. SEARS with Mr. SANDFORD.

Mr. SHOUSE with Mr. SIEGEL.

Mr. SMALL with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.

Mr. C. B. SMITH with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. T. F. SMITH with Mr. TINKHAM.

Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. GARLAND.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. LEA of California with Mr. ZIHLMAN.

Mr. BOOHER with Mr. TREADWAY.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. BACHARACH.

Mr. ASHBROOK with Mr. PARKER of New York.

Mr. HOLLAND with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. STRONG.

Mr. BENSON with Mr. HUSTED.

Mr. STEELE with Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. DARROW.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. HELVERING with Mr. FARR.

Mr. HELM with Mr. HASKELL.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. LUNN with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. LA GUARDIA.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record upon the new raise in the railroad rates.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record upon the railroad rates. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object for the present. That ought to be done after this legislation is passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first of these amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: On page 19, after line 12, insert the following:

"Clerk hire, Members and Delegates: To pay each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner for clerk hire necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, \$2,000 per annum, in monthly installments, \$880,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Amendment to the amendment—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, that was not the amendment. The Clerk has not reported the amendment correctly. There is but one amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MANN. The committee adopted two amendments, but they are to be reported as one amendment.

The SPEAKER. Give the Clerk a chance to read it.

Mr. MANN. But he commenced wrong.

The SPEAKER. That is true, but he can correct it. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 12, on page 19, insert:

"Clerk hire, Members and Delegates: For clerk hire of each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner for clerk hire necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, \$3,200 per annum, in monthly installments, \$880,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, that was corrected to \$1,408,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. No vote was ever taken on that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Let us see. Had we not better take the Clerk's report rather than a statement from the floor. Does not the gentleman think that is fair?

Mr. MANN. Certainly, but the Clerk was directed to put in the correct amount, and I got the correct amount from the other clerk then doing the work.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Unanimous consent was given to correct the totals?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. If this amendment be not agreed to, will it then be in order to offer a motion to recommit, restoring the language of the bill as reported by the committee?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Undoubtedly.

The SPEAKER. You can put anything in a motion to recommit that is not subject to the point of order. The Clerk will finish reading the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

\$1,408,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part thereof shall be paid to any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. If this amendment should be voted down, what provision would there be then in the bill for the pay of clerk hire to Members?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. That is a judicial inquiry.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

[Cries of "Regular order."]

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It is a question of what would be the status of the bill if it was stricken out.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. Sisson. The amendment as it now stands has two substantive propositions in it, and while it was an amendment adopted to the Stafford amendment, there were two substantive propositions. In the House can a vote be had on the two propositions?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. What two propositions?

The SPEAKER. Certainly they can have a vote on the two propositions, if one of them modifies the other.

Mr. Sisson. What I rose for is to inquire if it is divisible; and if so, I want to ask for a separate vote on the so-called Good amendment to the Stafford amendment or to the amendment increasing it to \$3,200.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, there is only one amendment here. There are two propositions contained in it; first, that it appropriates \$3,200, and next the proviso that this money shall not be paid to the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner. In the Committee of the Whole, in the orderly process of forming the amendment, amendments to the amendment were agreed to; but as finally completed there was but one amendment. That amendment was to appropriate \$3,200 for the pay of clerks to Members with the proviso that it should not, however, be paid directly to the Member. I submit you can not go back and have a separate vote in the House on an amendment to an amendment in Committee of the Whole or on the various amendments which might have been offered perfecting that amendment in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I do not concede that necessarily determines whether there are two substantive propositions in the amendment, because in the Committee of the Whole unquestionably if it had been offered as one you could have divided the question. The test, it seems to me, here is, have you two substantive propositions, although both those propositions might have been added as separate votes in Committee of the Whole to one amendment, and thereby to be called one amendment in the House. In the amendment there are two substantive propositions.

The SPEAKER. What are they?

Mr. Sisson. First, fixing the amount at \$3,200, and second, that the money shall not be paid to the Member himself.

Now, I want a separate vote on these two propositions.

The SPEAKER. Now, that second proposition is simply a modification of the first proposition, is it not?

Mr. Sisson. It is not only a modification, but it is so substantive that a man might be willing to vote for the amendment without the proposition, but unwilling to vote for it with it. That is all I desire to say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mann. Mr. Speaker, the rule is that on the demand of any Member before the question is put the question shall be divided if it includes propositions so distinct in substance that if one be taken away a substantive proposition shall remain. My recollection is that this must apply to each of the propositions, that either one being taken away a substantive proposition must remain upon which action can be taken by the House. In other words, where an amendment is proposed containing two propositions where the House may reject one of them and then might agree to the other having a substantive proposition the amendment is divisible, but that is plainly not this case. The House can not adopt this provision which the gentleman seeks to have voted upon separately and make any sense, "Provided, That no part thereof shall be paid to any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner." I will not say can not, because the House could agree to it; but it means nothing. It is not a substantive proposition by itself. It must, if agreed to by the House, come in with the main proposition making an appropriation and instead of being a substantive proposition it is a subsidiary proposition to the main proposition.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. Sisson. With the amendment offered as it is, it is extremely doubtful whether any money could be paid out under this amendment at all, but it is a substantive proposition to be voted upon in the order in which amendments shall be voted upon in the House. If it is voted down then the \$3,200 is voted directly to the Member.

The SPEAKER. Let me ask the gentleman a question. Suppose the House were to vote down the first proposition and vote in the last proposition. Would there be any sense at all in the amendment?

Mr. Sisson. Absolutely not; and therefore I do not believe the House would do anything like that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows, but the House, can do what it pleases.

Mr. Sisson. But I do not believe it will do anything as foolish as that.

The SPEAKER. It is not divisible.

Mr. Madden. Mr. Chairman, I demand the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. Watkins. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. Watkins. If I may be permitted to answer that question—

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already answered it. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madden] demands the yeas and nays on this amendment.

Mr. Mann. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a unanimous-consent request. I do not know whether there will be any objection to it, but the word "hire" appears in this amendment twice. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be amended by striking out the word "hire" where it appears the second time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks to strike out the word "hire" where it appears the second time. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on ordering the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 150, nays 146, answered "present" 7, not voting 127, as follows:

YEAS—150.

Anderson	Chandler, Okla.	Dyer	Good
Anthony	Clark, Pa.	Eagan	Goodall
Aswell	Coady	Ellott	Goodwin, Ark.
Austin	Connally, Tex.	Ellsworth	Gould
Baer	Cooper, Ohio	Essen	Greene, Mass.
Bankhead	Cooper, W. Va.	Fairchild, G. W.	Greene, Vt.
Birch	Copley	Fairfield	Hadley
Bland, Ind.	Crago	Ferris	Harrison, Miss.
Burnett	Curry, Cal.	Fields	Harrison, Va.
Burrighs	Dale	Fisher	Hastings
Campbell, Kans.	Dallinger	Fordney	Hawley
Campbell, Pa.	Davis	French	Hayden
Cantrill	Denison	Gallagher	Hayes
Caraway	Dill	Gandy	Hersey
Carter, Okla.	Dupré	Garrett, Tenn.	Hicks

Hilliard	Little	Pou	Tillman
Howard	Loneragan	Powers	Tilson
Humphreys	Lufkin	Purnell	Timberlake
Igoe	McAndrews	Rainey, J. W.	Van Dyke
Ireland	McArthur	Raker	Vestal
Jacaway	McFadden	Randall	Vinson
Johnson, S. Dak.	McKeown	Rankin	Walker
Johnson, Wash.	McKinley	Reed	Walton
Kahn	McLaughlin, Mich.	Roberts	Ward
Kearns	McLemore	Rosenberg	Watson
Kelec	Mann	Rouse	Watson, Pa.
Kelley, Mich.	Mansfield	Rowe	Weaver
Kettner	Martin	Rubey	Whaley
Kincheloe	Mason	Rucker	Wheeler
King	Mays	Sanders, La.	White, Me.
Knutson	Miller, Minn.	Schall	Wilson, Tex.
Langley	Mondell	Scott, Iowa	Wingo
Larsen	Mott	Sinnott	Winslow
Lazaro	Neely	Snyder	Wood, Ind.
Lee, Ga.	Nolan	Stevenson	Woodyard
Leibach	Oldfield	Stiness	Young, N. Dak.
Leshner	O'Shaunessy	Tague	
Lanthicum	Phelan	Temple	

NAYS—146.

Alexander	Foss	Lever	Shallenberger
Almon	Foster	Lobeck	Sherley
Barkley	Frear	Longworth	Sherwood
Barnhart	Freeman	McKenzie	Sims
Beakes	Fuller, Ill.	Madden	Sisson
Bell	Gard	Magee	Slayden
Black	Garner	Mapes	Sloan
Bland, Va.	Garrett, Tex.	Merritt	Small
Blanton	Gillett	Miller, Wash.	Smith, Mich.
Brand	Glynn	Montague	Snook
Browne	Gordon	Moon	Stafford
Byrnes, S. C.	Graham, Ill.	Moore, Pa.	Steagall
Byrnes, Tenn.	Gray, Ala.	Morgan	Steenerson
Cannon	Green, Iowa	Nelson, A. P.	Stephens, Miss.
Classon	Griffin	Nelson, J. M.	Stephens, Nebr.
Claypool	Hamlin	Nichols, Mich.	Summers
Collier	Hardy	Oliver, Ala.	Sweet
Connelly, Kans.	Haugen	Osborne	Switzer
Cooper, Wis.	Heflin	Overstreet	Taylor, Colo.
Cramton	Hensley	Padgett	Thompson
Crisp	Hollingsworth	Page	Tinkham
Crosser	Houston	Parker, N. J.	Venable
Currie, Mich.	Huddleston	Platt	Voigt
Decker	Hull, Iowa	Polk	Volstead
Denton	Hull, Tenn.	Quin	Walsh
Dickinson	James	Ragsdale	Watkins
Dies	Jones	Rainey, H. T.	Watson, Va.
Dillon	Juul	Ramseyer	Welling
Dixon	Keating	Rayburn	Welty
Doolittle	Kelly, Pa.	Robinson	Williams
Doremus	Kennedy, Iowa	Rogers	Wilson, La.
Doughton	Key, Ohio	Romjue	Wise
Dowell	Kinkaid	Rose	Woods, Iowa
Eagle	Kitchin	Sanders, N. Y.	Wright
Elston	Kraus	Saunders, Va.	Young, Tex.
Esch	La Follette	Scott, Mich.	
Flood	Lampert	Sells	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Buchanan	Dominick	Heaton	Treadway
Cary	Emerson	Reavis	

NOT VOTING—127.

Ashbrook	Dooling	Johnson, Ky.	Rowland
Drane	Ayres	Kennedy, R. I.	Russell
Bacharach	Drukker	Kless, Pa.	Sabath
Dunn	Benson	Kreider	Sanders, Ind.
Beshlin	Edmonds	LaGuardia	Sanford
Blackmon	Estepinal	Lea, Cal.	Scully
Rooher	Evans	Littlepage	Sears
Borland	Fairchild, B. L.	London	Shackelford
Bowers	Farr	Lundeen	Shouse
Britten	Fess	Lunn	Siegel
Brodbeck	Flynn	McClintic	Slemp
Browning	Focht	McCormick	Smith, Idaho
Brumbaugh	Francis	McCulloch	Smith, C. B.
Butler	Fuller, Mass.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, T. F.
Caldwell	Gallivan	Maher	Snell
Candler, Miss.	Garland	Moore, Ind.	Stedman
Carew	Godwin, N. C.	Morin	Steele
Carlin	Graham, Pa.	Mudd	Sterling
Carter, Mass.	Gray, N. J.	Nicholls, S. C.	Strong
Chandler, N. Y.	Gregg	Norton	Sullivan
Church	Griest	Oliver, N. Y.	Swift
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	Overmyer	Taylor, Ark.
Cleary	Hamilton, Mich.	Park	Templeton
Costello	Hamilton, N. Y.	Parker, N. Y.	Thomas
Cox	Haskell	Peters	Towner
Darrow	Heintz	Porter	Vare
Davey	Helm	Price	Waldow
Delaney	Helvering	Pratt	Webb
Dempsey	Holland	Ramsey	White, Ohio
Dent	Hood	Riordan	Wilson, Ill.
Dewalt	Husted	Robbins	Zihlman
Donovan	Hutchinson		

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:
On this vote:

Mr. NICHOLS of South Carolina (for) with Mr. DOMINICK (against).

Mr. SMITH of Idaho (for) with Mr. REAVIS (against).

Mr. SNELL (for) with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. SABATH with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. HEATON.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. ESTOPINAL. I answered "present," but if I were not paired I would vote "nay."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. NICHOLLS. If he were present he would vote "yea" and I would vote "nay." I am recorded as "present." I want my pair fixed properly.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think on a matter of this sort, where it is so close, involving the membership of the House, there ought to be a recapitulation.

The SPEAKER. I think the gentleman is entitled to his recapitulation. The Clerk will recapitulate the vote.

The vote was recapitulated, and the result found as above recorded.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I understood the Clerk to read the name of Mr. EMERSON as answering "present." I understood him, though I am not clear about it, to come to the desk and change his vote from "present" to "nay." Am I right about that?

Mr. EMERSON. I stated that I was paired with the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. ESTOPINAL, but if I had not been paired I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there are two amendments to section 7, if that is the number of the section.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There are more than two, I think.

The SPEAKER. There were three that were asked to be voted on separately. The Clerk will report the Nolan amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all of those amendments to that section be voted on together.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will permit, that if the House will vote down or vote up the Nolan amendment, the other two amendments will follow, I think.

Mr. MANN. I think it is proper they should go together.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that all these amendments on this subject be voted on together. Is there objection?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I object.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Nolan amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Nolan amendment: Page 146, line 18, strike out "\$120" and insert in lieu thereof "\$240."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Nolan amendment.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 202, nays 81, answered "present" 3, not voting 144, as follows:

YEAS—202.

Anderson	Elliott	Humphreys	Magee
Anthony	Ellsworth	Igoe	Mann
Aswell	Elston	Ireland	Mapes
Austin	Essen	Jacoway	Marlin
Baer	Fairchild, G. W.	James	Mason
Bankhead	Fairfield	Johnson, S. Dak.	Mays
Birch	Ferris	Johnson, Wash.	Merritt
Bland, Ind.	Fields	Juul	Miller, Minn.
Browne	Fisher	Kearns	Miller, Wash.
Burroughs	Fordney	Keating	Mondell
Campbell, Kans.	Foss	Kehoe	Moore, Pa.
Campbell, Pa.	Frear	Kelley, Mich.	Morgan
Cantrill	Freeman	Kelly, Pa.	Mott
Caraway	French	Kettner	Neely
Carter, Okla.	Fuller, Ill.	Key, Ohio	Nelson, A. P.
Cary	Gallagher	King	Nelson, J. M.
Chandler, Okla.	Gandy	Kinkaid	Nichols, Mich.
Church	Glynn	Knutson	Nolan
Clark, Pa.	Goodall	La Follette	Oddfield
Classon	Goodwin, Ark.	Lampert	Osborne
Coady	Gould	Langley	O'Shaunessy
Cooper, Ohio	Graham, Ill.	Lazaro	Overstreet
Cooper, W. Va.	Grav, Ala.	Lea, Cal.	Paige
Cooper, Wis.	Green, Iowa	Leibach	Parker, N. J.
Copley	Greene, Mass.	Leshner	Phelan
Crago	Griffin	Linthicum	Platt
Cramton	Hadley	Little	Polk
Crosser	Harrison, Miss.	Lobeck	Pou
Currie, Mich.	Hastings	Lovergan	Powers
Curry, Cal.	Haugen	Longworth	Purnell
Dallinger	Hawley	Lufkin	Rainey, J. W.
Davis	Hayden	McAndrews	Raker
Dill	Hayes	McArthur	Ramseyer
Dillon	Hersey	McFadden	Randall
Doolittle	Hicks	McKeown	Rankin
Dowell	Hillhard	McKinley	Reavis
Dupré	Hollingsworth	McLaughlin, Mich.	Roberts
Dyer	Huddleston	McLemore	Rodenberg
Egan	Hull, Iowa	Madden	Rogers

Rose	Steenerson	Van Dyke
Rubey	Stephens, Nebr.	Vestal
Sanders, La.	Stiness	Voigt
Schall	Sweet	Volstead
Scott, Iowa	Switzer	Walker
Scott, Mich.	Tague	Walsh
Sells	Taylor, Colo.	Walton
Sims	Temple	Ward
Sinott	Tillman	Wason
Sloan	Tilson	Watkins
Smith, Mich.	Timberlake	Watson, Pa.
Snyder	Tinkham	Weaver

NAYS—81.

Alexander	Dominick	Small
Almon	Doughton	Snook
Barkley	Eagle	Stafford
Barnhart	Esch	Steagall
Beakes	Flood	Stephens, Miss.
Bell	Foster	Stevenson
Black	Gard	Summers
Bland, Va.	Garner	Thomson
Blanton	Garrett, Tenn.	Venable
Buchanan	Garrett, Tex.	Vinson
Burnett	Gillett	Wagsdale
Byrnes, S. C.	Good	Rainey, H. T.
Byrns, Tenn.	Gordon	Robinson
Cannon	Greene, Vt.	Ronjoe
Collier	Hardy	Sanders, N. Y.
Connally, Tex.	Hensley	Saunders, Va.
Crisp	Houston	Shallenberger
Dale	Hull, Tenn.	Sherley
Decker	Jones	Sherwood
Dickinson	Kincheloe	Sisson
Dixon	Kitchin	Slayden

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Emerson	Heaton	Treadway
---------	--------	----------

NOT VOTING—144.

Ashbrook	Donovan	Husted	Riordan
Ayres	Dooling	Hutchinson	Robbins
Bacharach	Doramus	Johnson, Ky.	Rouse
Benson	Drane	Kahn	Rowe
Beshin	Drukker	Kennedy, Iowa	Rowland
Blackmon	Dunn	Kennedy, Ill.	Rucker
Booher	Edmonds	Kless, Pa.	Russell
Borland	Estopinal	Kreider	Sabath
Bowers	Evans	Latuardia	Sanders, Ind.
Brand	Fairchild, B. L.	Littlepage	Sanford
Britten	Farr	London	Scully
Brodbeck	Fess	Lundeen	Sears
Browning	Flynn	Lunn	Shackelford
Brumbaugh	Focht	McClintic	Shouse
Butler	Francis	McCormick	Siegel
Caldwell	Fuller, Mass.	McCulloch	Slemp
Candler, Miss.	Gallivan	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Carew	Garland	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, C. B.
Carlin	Godwin, N. C.	Maher	Smith, T. F.
Carter, Mass.	Graham, Pa.	Moore, Ind.	Snell
Chandler, N. Y.	Gray, N. J.	Morin	Stedman
Clark, Fla.	Gregg	Mudd	Steele
Claypool	Griest	Nicholls, S. C.	Sterling
Clary	Hamill	Norton	Strong
Connelly, Kans.	Hamilton, Mich.	Oliver, N. Y.	Sullivan
Costello	Hamilton, N. Y.	Olney	Swift
Cox	Hamlin	Overmyer	Taylor, Ark.
Darrow	Harrison, Va.	Park	Templeton
Devey	Haskell	Parker, N. Y.	Thomas
Delaney	Healin	Peters	Towner
Dempsy	Helntz	Porter	Vare
Denson	Helm	Pratt	Waldow
Dent	Holwerling	Price	Webb
Denton	Holland	Ramsey	White, Ohio
Dewalt	Hood	Rayburn	Wilson, Ill.
Dies	Howard	Reed	Zihlman

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. SNELL.

Mr. HAMLIN with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.

Mr. MAHER with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.

Mr. DELANEY with Mr. REED.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye." I am paired with the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. BOOHER, and I wish to withdraw my vote of "aye" and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. TREADWAY, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sherley amendment: On page 146, in lines 20 and 23, strike out "\$2,620" and insert "\$2,740," and on page 146, line 25, strike out "30" and insert "60," and on page 150, line 13, strike out "\$120" and insert "\$140."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send it up. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GARD. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the gentleman's motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARD moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 19, line 13, strike out the language of the Stafford amendment as amended and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Clerk hire, Members and Delegates: To pay each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner for clerk hire necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, \$2,000 per annum, in monthly installments, \$880,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary, and Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall be entitled to payment under this appropriation."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a motion.

Mr. GARD. What point of order was made by the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MANN. The point of order was that the amendment proposed to strike out the amendment to which the House has just agreed.

Mr. GARD. The object of the motion to recommit was confined to a part only of the action of the House and not to the entire language of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows; but the gentleman's motion to recommit in the nature of an amendment or instruction would repeal the Stafford amendment that has just been put into the bill by a vote of the House.

Mr. GARD. Only a part.

The SPEAKER. I do not know. If it is bad in part, it is bad in the whole. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Arkansas rise?

Mr. WINGO. To offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send it up.

Mr. WINGO. I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. WINGO. I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 14, yeas 122.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan, for the day, on account of sickness.

To Mr. SMITH of Idaho (at the request of Mr. FRENCH), for the day, on account of illness.

CENSUS BILL.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we take the census bill from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the request for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

Mr. STAFFORD. At this late hour, Mr. Speaker, I think it should go over until Monday.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do at this late hour.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, January 19, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting supplemental estimates of appropriation required by the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1697); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations required for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, by the Public Health Service (H. Doc. No. 1698); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a detailed statement of the refunds of customs duties, etc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918, as required by paragraph Y, section III, of the tariff act of October 3, 1913 (H. Doc. No. 1699); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which have been presented to the Treasury Department and require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 1700); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting record of judgment of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana regarding claim of owners of steamship *Esparta* (H. Doc. No. 1701); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered against the Government by the district courts of the United States which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 1702); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14746) making appropriation for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 945), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 14672) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 14673) to require the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain data to the adjutants general of the several States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 14674) to increase the limit of cost for the construction of the United States public building authorized at Juneau, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 14675) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Martins Ferry, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOODALL: A bill (H. R. 14676) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sanford, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 14677) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wellington, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14678) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Caldwell, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14679) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Conway Springs, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14680) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Halstead, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14681) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Corry, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14682) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Meadville, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 14683) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of New Hyde Park, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14684) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Langhorne, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS: A bill (H. R. 14685) for the erection of a public building at Dallas, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 14686) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chicago, Cook County, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece, to be placed in West Pullman Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 14687) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Providence, R. I., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 14688) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Binghamton, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece, to be placed in the city park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ADOLPHUS P. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 14689) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Shell Lake, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 14690) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to cities in California captured German cannon, fieldpieces, and war trophies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14691) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Elizabeth, in the State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 14692) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Brainerd, Minn., two cannons or fieldpieces of obsolete pattern used in the world war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 14693) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Grants Pass, county of Josephine, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14694) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Roseburg, Douglas County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14695) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eugene, county of Lane, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14696) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Albany, county of Linn, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14697) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Salem, Marion County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14698) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oregon City, Clackamas County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14699) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jacksonville, Jackson County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14700) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Astoria, Clatsop County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14701) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of St. Helens, Columbia County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14702) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hillsboro, Washington County, in the

State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14703) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of McMinnville, Yamhill County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14704) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dallas, Polk County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14705) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Corvallis, Benton County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14706) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tillamook, Tillamook County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14707) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Toledo, Lincoln County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14708) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Coquille, Coos County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14709) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marshfield, Coos County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14710) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gold Beach, Curry County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14711) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Medford, Jackson County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14712) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ashland, Jackson County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 14713) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elwood, county of Madison, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14714) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Winchester, county of Randolph, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14715) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Anderson, county of Madison, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14716) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Muncie, county of Delaware, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14717) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Decatur, county of Adams, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14718) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Portland, county of Jay, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14719) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bluffton, county of Wells, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 14720) to amend section 852, Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to jurors' fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 14721) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Union City, county of Randolph, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14722) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dunkirk, county of Jay, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 14723) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish certain data to the adjutants general of the several States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 14724) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Barnwell, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 14725) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Keokuk, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 14726) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain data to the adjutants general of the several States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 14727) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Auburn, county of De Kalb, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14728) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Angola, county of Steuben, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14729) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Scipio Cemetery, county of Allen, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14730) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Columbia City, county of Whitley, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14731) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lagrange, county of Lagrange, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14732) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Albion, county of Noble, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14733) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ligonier, county of Noble, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14734) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fort Wayne, county of Allen, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 14735) to increase the cost of the public building at Lancaster, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 14736) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Public School No. 87, Middle Village, Long Island, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 14737) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 14738) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marquette, county of Marquette, State of Michigan, to be placed in Presque Isle Park, in the city of Marquette, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 14739) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Enid, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 14740) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and an act in amendment thereto, approved October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 14746) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various tribes of Indians, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 14747) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Newcastle, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: Resolution (H. Res. 507) directing the United States Food Administration to furnish the House of Representatives with certain information; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 390) requesting the Secretary of War to furnish to Congress the records

of the Graves Registration Service of the American Expeditionary Forces in Europe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONDELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 391) relating to the fuel supply of the city of Casper, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SIMS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 392) authorizing and directing the accounting officers of the Treasury Department to allow credit to the disbursing clerk of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 14741) granting a pension to Sarah E. Dillon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 14742) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Cribbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODALL: A bill (H. R. 14743) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of Washington: A bill (H. R. 14744) granting a pension to Loue Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14745) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Simmons; 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 Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of Flora Rose Corner and others, of Topeka, Kans., requesting repeal of the postal zone rate law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Theater Managers' Association, Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the proposed doubling of theater admission tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Sherman Brown, manager of Davidson Theater, Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the increase of the present tax on theater admission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Resolution of City Council of Cambridge, Mass., favoring league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolutions of the Health and Old Age Insurance Commission of Ohio, urging the conversion of war-savings stamps into annuities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Resolutions of Wayland Ladies' Literary Club, urging support of Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of State Veterinary Medical Association of Ohio, favoring increased efficiency and salaries for Bureau of Animal Industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: Resolutions of Dewitt County Farm Bureau, Clinton, Ill., urging United States Department of Agriculture to keep sun time the coming season, as it helps to increase food production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POLK: Resolutions of Chamber of Commerce of Wilmington, Del., on Federal control of the wire system of the country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of Parent-Teacher Association of Selbyville, Del., relative to Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolutions of New Century Club of Wilmington, Del., relative to Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Resolution of A. H. Crane, secretary Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, favoring Government control of railroads and other public utilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Ellery J. Rundle, of Marshall, Mich., favoring Government control of railroads according to Mr. McAdoo's plan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of J. Bolen and 149 citizens of Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of T. J. Barker, cashier Warlen Grocery Co., of Kalamazoo, Mich., protesting against postage rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNOOK: Resolutions adopted by the State Veterinary Medical Association of Ohio, favoring an increase in salary of members of the organization of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and also favoring a permanent and increased appropriation for carrying on the investigation of hog cholera; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAGUE: Resolutions adopted by the Lithuanian residents of the city of Worcester, Mass., asking that negotiations be opened looking to the improvement in the means of communication between them and the people now in Lithuania and the Lithuanian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, telegrams from several citizens of Boston, Mass., protesting against the proposed tax to be levied on theater tickets under the pending revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

SUNDAY, January 19, 1919.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, Jan. 14, 1919.)

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

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR GALLINGER.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I offer the following resolutions and move their adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 417) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate expresses its profound sorrow in the death of the Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate, in pursuance of an order heretofore made, assemble 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. HOLLIS. Mr. President, my late distinguished colleague, the Hon. JACOB HAROLD GALLINGER, was the leader of his party in the Senate and the veteran of this body by two full years in point of continuous service. He entered the Senate March 4, 1891, serving without a break to the day of his death, August 17, 1918, a period of 27 years.

Senator GALLINGER began his political career in the New Hampshire Legislature in 1872, serving there for several terms, and later three terms in the State senate, where he was twice president. He was a Member of the National Congress for two terms before he entered the United States Senate. For many years he was chairman of the Republican State committee in New Hampshire.

The duties of these various offices he discharged with industry, intelligence, and dignity. He leaned toward the formal in his conduct of public business, but he was delightfully informal, genial, and kindly in his own home and among his friends. He was ever ready to perform favors for friend or foe. He was of an optimistic temperament, wholesome, sane, uniformly cheerful and courteous. It is delightful to one who has been his persistent political adversary from his home ward to the forum of the Senate to be able to accord to him, without reservation, so much of praise.

His character and his attitude toward public questions were conventional and consistent. One who had followed his course for a few years could foretell with certainty how he would vote on any matter of importance. He was sure not to be "the first by whom the new is tried," and he was always among "the last to lay the old aside."

Senator GALLINGER was a natural conservative. Hard work and persistent effort had lifted him from lowly circumstances to a position of power and influence among his fellows. The game of life was played in his generation according to his tastes and inclinations. He believed that any man of average intelligence could get on in the world if he would be sober, industrious, and thrifty. He did not believe that the country nor the Government owed any man more than this opportunity.

I think Senator GALLINGER was frankly puzzled at the era of change and reform in which he spent his declining years. I used to see him in the Senate gazing at some colleague whom he believed to be honest, wondering how any intelligent man could utter such foolishness.

More than once he has said to me in substance: "I suppose you young chaps consider me very old-fashioned. Perhaps I am. But things look to me now as they have all my life. I believe I am right, and I shall stick it out if I have to stand alone."

His long and elevated allegiance to prohibition and woman suffrage testify to his courage and independence. I sincerely believe that the inevitable adoption of Federal amendments on these subjects was hastened several years by his advocacy and support. In these two respects he departed from conventionalism and conservatism and became progressive and radical. I think he delighted in thus straying occasionally from the beaten conservative path and plucking a few nosegays from Bohemian fields. Most of his political associates were opposed to prohibition, and nearly all of them abhorred woman suffrage, particularly in the early days. But he never faltered.

The name of my late colleague has been familiar to me from boyhood. All my life he has been a leading citizen of my native city. I remember hearing my father speak of him in 1876, when I was only 7, and my father and Dr. GALLINGER, as he was then known, were members of the New Hampshire constitutional convention. His children were my playmates and schoolmates, and his daughter sat beside me during our first year in the Concord High School.

Dr. GALLINGER enjoyed a good practice as a physician in the best circles of Concord before he entered Congress, in the days when a physician was not a specialist, but an all-around general practitioner, family adviser, and friend. My townsmen referred to him to the last as "Doctor" GALLINGER, feeling in some way that that appellation was less formal than that of "Senator."

He was always prominent in advancing the cause of our city and our State. In the old days there were perennial contests in the State legislature and before the courts between the Concord Railroad and the Boston & Maine Railroad, which was then called a "foreigner." Dr. GALLINGER and my father always worked together for the interests of the Concord road against the foreign invader. And it was characteristic of Senator GALLINGER that he continued those early friendships and affiliations throughout his life. He had a great gift in the way of staunchness and loyalty to his friends.

Senator GALLINGER was a tireless worker and had little patience with those who were lazy or inattentive. For 20 years I tested his skill in political campaigns, and I never knew it to fail. No detail was overlooked. He kept track of every absent voter and found time to take a friendly interest in promising young men of both parties just approaching their majority. The Democratic Party won no important victories in New Hampshire until he retired as chairman of the Republican State Committee in 1908.

My relations with my colleague were always cordial in private life. In the Senate we usually voted against each other, but we never clashed in debate after the tariff contest of 1913. We found many opportunities to reciprocate favors, and we never hesitated to confer on matters in which our constituents were interested.

I can testify with authority to the universal esteem in which my late colleague was held by Senators on this side of the Chamber. I leave it to those who were associated with him long years in the Senate to speak of his services here. I have tried merely to outline his many fine qualities as observed by a political antagonist of a younger generation who knew him as a good neighbor, a kind parent, a devoted husband, and an exemplary citizen.

New Hampshire mourns his loss.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, "the man who was one of us has put on the garment of Eternity and become radiant and triumphant; the present is all at once the past; Hope is suddenly cut away and only the backward vistas of Memory remain, shone over by a light that proceeds not from this earthly sun."

"This is a transition out of visible Time into invisible Eternity."

And the questions which arise as we mourn for the friend who has gone and strive to do him honor are two: What did he do in the life that was granted him among the generation and in the times where his lot was cast; and the greater question, How did he live his life? What a man was is ever more important than what he did. Without misgiving we can ask and answer both questions in the case of Senator GALLINGER. A long life closing with all that should accompany old age, "honor, love, obedience, troops of friends." A life beginning with the earnest pursuit and crowding activities of a noble profession and then passing to many years of devoted public service lasting longer than the lifetime of a generation of men.

For more than 27 years he has served his State and his country in the Senate of the United States. A great trust this and finely executed. No more faithful public servant ever sat in the great body of which he was so long an honored member. His diligence and industry never flagged. He passed daily from the committee room, where most of the hard work—never