

Serbs, Slovenes, and Croats to the jurisdiction of Italy; and petition addressed to the Sixty-sixth Congress, relating to the controversy between Italy and the Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also petitions protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest against the repeal of the daylight-saving law, and a petition urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of St. Brendan Society, composed of citizens of Boston, Mass., for rejection of any league of nations which does not recognize the republic of Ireland, as well as the self-determined government of other oppressed nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UPSHAW: Petition of numerous citizens of Atlanta, Ga., against the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition signed by Ellis Mills et al., citizens of Pottstown, Pa., protesting against the luxury-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of sundry citizens of Asheville, N. C., asking repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 19, 1919.

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

Almighty God, the God of nations, we come before Thee with our national problems. We thank Thee that we can stand upon the traditions of our people and follow the light that shines along the pathway inspired by Thy truth, followed by men of vision in our day. Grant us, we pray Thee, a due appreciation of the ever-increasing responsibility that is upon us as a Nation, a responsibility proportionate to the blessings that we enjoy, the power that has been committed to us, the wisdom that Thou hast given to us, and the splendid opportunities to which Thou dost call us. Guide us by Thy counsel into the large service for all mankind. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. JONES of Washington and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

### ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION (S. DOC. NO. 34)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$2,000 required by the War Department for "Incidental expenses, Tank Corps Schools," for the fiscal year 1920, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

### SALE OF CONDEMNED PROPERTY (S. DOC. NO. 33).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication dated May 19, 1919, from the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate, transmitting, in compliance with law, a statement showing the proceeds from the sales of condemned property of the United States in his charge, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. H. Overhue, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3854) for the repeal of the daylight-saving law, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, further insists upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21 to the bill, agrees to the further conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GOOD, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Seattle. It recites that the reso-

lution was introduced by former United States Senator Piles, seconded by Gov. Louis Hart and Mayor Ole Hanson. The resolution relates to the reported outrages against the Jews in Poland. I ask that it may be read to the Senate.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., June 18, 1919.

HON. WESLEY L. JONES,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

At a public mass meeting held in Metropolitan Theater to-night the following resolution, introduced by former United States Senator Samuel Piles and seconded by Gov. Louis Hart and Mayor Ole Hanson, was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas we citizens of the State of Washington in mass meeting assembled in the Metropolitan Theater at the city of Seattle on this 18th day of June, 1919, are satisfied that organized massacres have been directed against Jewish communities in eastern Europe, especially in Poland; and

"Whereas the atrocities committed have been so frequent and cruel that the Congress of the United States has been moved to pass resolutions deploring the acts of violence and cruelties inflicted upon men, women, and children because of their race or religion; and

"Whereas the Right Hon. Cecil Harmsworth, British undersecretary of state, after submitting statistical data with respect to the lives lost and property plundered, intimates that if the Polish-Jewish situation is to be ameliorated concerted action of all the Allies and associate powers is necessary; and

"Whereas Poland was admitted into full membership of the family of nations by the allied and associated powers as a free and independent State upon condition that her responsible Government would protect the rights of all races and religions within her borders; and

"Whereas 746,000 men of the Jewish faith willingly offered their lives in the allied and associated armies that the principles of democracy might be perpetuated, the oppressed nations made free, and to make certain that all would thereafter be protected in their civil and religious liberty; and

"Whereas we, as a free people, are imbued with the old-fashioned idea that those who fought that all might be free are entitled to live and worship according to their dictates of their own unfettered conscience, irrespective of race or creed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this people that Congress, in order to safeguard the interests of civilization and further the cause of humanity in the present assault upon both, should take such action as to it may seem proper to prevent a recurrence of the cruel and wicked outrages that have recently been committed against the Jewish people, and that in the meantime the Department of State be requested to bring to the attention of the Government of Poland our abhorrence of the atrocious wrongs which have so far been inflicted upon, and which even now threaten, those who are unable to defend themselves against the cruel and monstrous outrages that have so profoundly shocked the conscience of civilized people everywhere.

"Resolved further, That copies of these resolutions be telegraphed to the Department of State and to our Representatives in both branches of Congress."

NATHAN ECKSTEIN, Chairman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I present a memorial on Federal paved highways addressed to the President and the Congress of the United States by Leon F. Moss, of Los Angeles, Calif. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a resolution adopted by the City Council of Fort Myers, Fla., favoring the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Illinois, remonstrating against the repeal or any modification of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KING. I have received a large number of letters, statements, and telegrams in opposition to the continuation of the Federal Employment Bureau or Service. One letter, which is a type of many I am receiving, and which has come from the Utah Associated Industries, is before me. I ask that it be read and referred to the appropriate committee having that matter in charge.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UTAH ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES,  
Salt Lake City, Utah, May 26, 1919.

Re Federal Employment Bureau.  
HON. WILLIAM H. KING,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KING: You will remember that some weeks ago we communicated with you relative to the attitude of the Utah Associated Industries on the continuation of the Federal Employment Bureau. At that time we had occasion to urge that the appropriations solicited by the heads of the Federal Employment Bureau be not allowed; that the best interests of the country can be conserved by the abolition of the Federal Employment Bureau; that the bureau, being created as a war-time emergency, has fulfilled its mission, and that its continuation would be a burden upon the taxpayers, and that the problems which they have outlined can and are being successfully dealt with by the individual communities and States.

We respectfully ask, therefore, that you review the situation carefully, and trust that you will share our views that the appropriation asked for be not allowed.

Thanking you for an expression of your attitude in the matter, we remain,

Very truly,

A. C. REES,  
General Secretary.

Mr. KING. I have been advised since the letter just offered was sent to the desk to be read that there is a bill pending before the Committee on Education and Labor for the appropriation of \$4,000,000 for the perpetuation of this employment service. I move, therefore, that the letter be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented petitions of Local Union No. 558, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Sheffield, Ala., setting forth their grievances with the War Department regarding working conditions, etc., at Nitrate Plant No. 2, Muscle Shoals, Ala., which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. KNOX presented a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 2, 1919.

Whereas the Government of the United States has heretofore provided pensions for veterans who served in the Civil and other wars when such veterans had reached certain ages; and

Whereas no similar provision has been made for veterans of the Spanish-American War: Therefore be it

*Resolved (if the senate concur).* That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania does hereby respectfully petition Congress of the United States to adopt legislation providing for the pensioning of all veterans of the Spanish-American War when said veterans reach a certain age.

*Resolved.* That the Secretary of the Commonwealth forward a copy of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania.

THOMAS H. GARVIN,

Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The foregoing resolution concurred in by the senate June 3, 1919.

W. P. GALLAGHER,

Chief Clerk of the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE  
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
Harrisburg, June 9, 1919.

PENNSYLVANIA, 88:

I, Cyrus E. Woods, secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, having the custody of the great seal of Pennsylvania, do hereby certify that the foregoing and annexed is a full, true, and correct copy of concurrent resolution No. 18-B, passed by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, petitioning the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation providing for the pensioning of all veterans of the Spanish-American War when said veterans have reached a certain age, as the same remains on file and appears of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed the day and year above written.

[SEAL.]

CYRUS E. WOODS,

Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. KNOX presented memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of the Kiwanis Club, of Chester, McKees Rocks, and Williamsport, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Marsteller, Brick Church, Apollo, Barnesboro, Leechburg, and Ford City, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. McLEAN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Torrington, Bridgeport, Yalesville, Mount Carmel, Rockville, Abington, South Manchester, and Portland, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions of the Rotary Club of Wichita; the Ministerial Association of Wichita; the Chamber of Commerce of Salina; the Industrial Council of Topeka; the Community Labor Board for the First Employment District for Kansas, of Topeka; of the Central Labor Union, of Hutchinson; and of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae of Topeka, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the continuance of the United States Employment Service, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 52, S. N. P. D., of Mineral, Kans., and a petition of Local Lodge No. 9, S. N. P. J., of Yale, Kans., praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with

peace deliberations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE presented a memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Greenville, Me., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NEWARK BAY BRIDGE.

Mr. EDGE. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 1378) to authorize the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey to construct a bridge across the navigable waters of the Newark Bay, in the State of New Jersey, and I submit a report (No. 20) thereon. I call the attention of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] to the bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 7, to strike out the words "together with the necessary" before the words "approaches thereto" and insert the word "and"; in line 12, after the word "provisions," to strike out the words "of section 2," and after the word "act," in the same line, to strike out the words "of Congress," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That authority be, and is hereby, granted to the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge, and approaches thereto, across the Newark Bay, in the State of New Jersey, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between the city of Elizabeth, in the county of Union, and the city of Bayonne, in the county of Hudson, in said State, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOSSES TO CONTRACTORS.

Mr. KIRBY. I report back favorably from the Committee on Commerce Senate resolution 83, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 83) submitted by Mr. MCKELLAR on the 17th instant, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, requested to have an examination made and report to the Senate at the earliest practicable moment as to the amount and cause of loss, if any, to the contractors on the following contracts:

In lower St. Francis levee district and first and second Government districts:

Miles 41/0-48/4.	Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 83/30-87/14.	Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 93/15-96/8.	Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 130/0-140/29.	Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 168/20-169/30.	Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 171/32-173/0.	Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 173/0-175/0.	Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 175/0-177/0.	Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 177/0-179/0.	Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 179/0-180/0.	Bids received August 24, 1917.

In lower Yazoo levee district and third Government district:

Stations 1513-1575. Bid received November 10, 1917.

Stations 1200-1513. Bid received September 4, 1917.

The Secretary of War is also requested to report as to stage of completion of said contracts, the delay on each, if any, the cause of delay, and what estimate of what the work contemplated in said contracts would cost as of the day of the report.

Mr. KIRBY. This resolution asks only for information as to the present status of these contracts and the amount of losses, if any, sustained by the contractors, and also as to whether the work is being delayed. I ask that the resolution be adopted.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 2117) for the relief of Seemann & Co.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 2118) to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Park, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 2119) to restore Col. Robert H. Peck, of the Regular Army, to the place in the lineal list he would have occupied had he not been separated from the service; and

A bill (S. 2120) for the relief of certain officers in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:  
A bill (S. 2121) for the promotion of educational extension through the United States Bureau of Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:  
A bill (S. 2122) for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Fort Payne, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMOOT:  
A bill (S. 2123) granting a pension to Charles W. Bechtel (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:  
A bill (S. 2124) donating a captured cannon or fieldpiece and cannon balls to the city of Benwood, Marshall County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:  
A bill (S. 2125) granting an increase of pension to John A. C. Hazel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCE:  
A bill (S. 2126) for the relief of certain employees of the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:  
A bill (S. 2127) granting a pension to Thomas Thompson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENT TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SWANSON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$200,000 to enable the Secretary of Labor to continue the Investigation and Inspection Service, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL POLICY.

Mr. SPENCER. I submit the following resolution and ask that it be read and lie over under the rule.

The resolution (S. Res. 86) was read, as follows:  
*Resolved*, That the Senate approaches the consideration of the league of nations with entire sympathy and in the earnest desire to cooperate as fully as it may in thus establishing and preserving the peace of the world.

That in the interest of a frank and full understanding with the other nations of the world, and particularly with the signatory nations to the covenant itself, candor and friendship alike require that the danger of future misunderstanding should, as far as possible, be eliminated, and to that end the following declaration should be clearly and definitely made:

First. That the Monroe doctrine is an essential national policy of the United States, and that the necessity and extent of its application and enforcement are matters to be determined alone by the United States with the occasion for interpretation may from time to time arise and without interference, direct or indirect, on the part of any other nation.

Second. That internal questions entirely domestic in character, such as immigration and tariff, notwithstanding certain international results that may from time to time naturally be connected therewith, are matters to be determined entirely by the country in which they arise and are under no circumstances questions for settlement under the provisions of the league of nations.

Third. That inasmuch as the United States is governed by a written Constitution, the provisions of which are supreme and controlling in this Republic over every act, legislative, executive, or judicial, and by such Constitution it is expressly provided that the power either to declare war or to continue war for more than two years is vested exclusively in the Congress of the United States. It is apparent that the United States can not bind itself in advance to either make war in the future or to send its Army or Navy into other lands for purposes of control, which is an act of war, without the express authorization of Congress at the time; and therefore whether the United States, as the necessity for such action in the future may arise, shall by any military or naval force cooperate in maintaining any of the provisions of the league of nations is a matter which the Congress, under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, is and must be entirely free to determine by what in its judgment is at the time consistent with the honor and interest and duty of the American people.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over under the rule.

CLAIMS AGAINST MEXICO.

Mr. KING. I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration. Let me state before it is read, if I may, that this resolution was offered at the last session, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably by them, and unanimously passed by the Senate. It was introduced at the beginning of this session and referred to the committee. Inadvertently it was denominated a joint resolution instead of a Senate resolution. I am offering this as a Senate resolution, and in view of the fact that it relates to the same matter which has been considered by the committee, asking for certain information concerning conditions in Mexico, I apprehend there will be no objection to its passage. I have spoken to the chairman of the committee and various other members of the committee, and all are in accord with the terms of the resolution, or rather are not opposed to its consideration.

Mr. CURTIS. Let it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.  
The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 87), as follows:

Whereas claims aggregating millions of dollars in compensation for damages to property and for personal outrages and destruction of life suffered by American citizens in the Republic of Mexico have been filed with the Department of State for presentation to the Government of Mexico; and

Whereas some years have already intervened between the commission of such damages and outrages and no progress is apparently being made toward the liquidation, settlement, and payment of such claims: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate whether or not said claims have been presented to the Government of Mexico, and what steps and measures are being taken to prosecute such claims and to liquidate and settle the same, and if said claims have not been presented, then to report to the Senate what steps and measures are contemplated to be taken with respect thereto and when the department will proceed with the same; also to report to the Senate the number of citizens of the United States who have been killed in Mexico since Porfirio Diaz retired from the Presidency of Mexico, together with the number of nationals of other countries who have been killed in Mexico as far as the Secretary of State is advised; also to report to the Senate the amount of claims filed with the Secretary for damages suffered by citizens of the United States in Mexico, and any information which the Secretary has as to the confiscation of property of citizens of the United States and as to the damage suffered by the citizens of the United States in Mexico.

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

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CURTIS. I am advised that on account of official business the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] will be unable to serve upon the conference committee on the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes. I therefore ask that he be relieved from serving as one of the conferees, and that the Vice President appoint a Senator to take his place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made, and the Vice President announces the appointment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN].

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that, with the permission of the Senate, I shall address the Senate on the league of nations on Tuesday next after the routine morning business.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—DAYLIGHT-SAVING LAW.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to announce that if I had been present yesterday when the vote was taken on the motion of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to repeal the daylight-saving law I should have voted "nay."

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 3854. An act to repeal the daylight-saving law was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.

Mr. KENYON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 18) providing for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment.

The motion was agreed to.  
Mr. KING. 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	Harris	McKellar	Smith, Ga.
Ball	Harrison	McLean	Smoot
Beckham	Henderson	McNary	Spencer
Calder	Hitchcock	Moses	Sterling
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	New	Sutherland
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newberry	Swanson
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Thomas
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Trammell
Dial	Kellogg	Overman	Underwood
Dillingham	Kendrick	Page	Wadsworth
Edge	Kenyon	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	Keyes	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	King	Poindexter	Warren
Fernald	Kirby	Robinson	Watson
Fletcher	Knox	Sheppard	Williams
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Sherman	
Gronna	Lenroot	Simmons	
Hale	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. MCKELLAR. The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY], and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] are detained on public business.

Mr. KING. The Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the Senator from

Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] are necessarily detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT Sixty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

#### NATIONAL PEACE POLICY.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, so far as possible I shall refrain from any discussion of the proposed league of nations or of the pending peace treaty. A resolution such as this justifies, if, indeed, it does not require, some incursion into the domain which it covers. I have steadfastly avoided any discussion of the treaty, and particularly of its league of nations feature, until it shall be laid before the Senate, thus giving us the official text, together with such information as in all probability will accompany its transmission. It is true that on one or two occasions I have elsewhere expressed myself with regard to some features of the original proposed covenant of the league of nations, but not until the President had himself twice spoken at length regarding it.

The resolution offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], of course, refers to the peace treaty, and is based upon it. I challenge the constitutional power of the Senate to entertain it, and protest the expediency of doing so at this time. I believe, after as careful a consideration as I have been able to give to the subject, that it is not only improper for the Senate either to adopt or to reject it; that it is not only unwise at this time to go on record regarding it, but that, as a part of the treaty-making power, we have no power to advise the peace congress either of our views concerning its work or as to what the treaty should contain.

When this resolution was introduced, I think every one, both in and out of this Chamber, regarded it as a direct challenge to the inclusion of the proposed league within the boundaries of the peace treaty; that its primary purpose was to notify the delegates composing the peace convention that no treaty embracing the scheme of a league of nations could receive the sanction of a constitutional majority here; and that in consequence no such treaty should be sent here for our consideration. That view was confirmed by an interview shortly afterwards published in the Washington and other newspapers of the country purporting to give the sentiments of the author of the resolution to the public. The Washington Star of June 13 published this interview from which I quote:

Whether the resolution passes or not, it will put the Senate on record in the matter of the league of nations. I can hardly believe, in view of the growing sentiment in the country against the league, but that there will be enough Senators to defeat its passage.

This interview has not been denied; no one has so far asserted that it is incorrect. I am justified, therefore, in assuming that it was published by the authority of the Senator from Pennsylvania, and conveyed to the public his construction of the purpose of the resolution. It was, therefore, Mr. President, with some surprise that I listened to the opening sentences of the Senator's speech day before yesterday when he said:

The resolution before us does not call for a vote for or against the league of nations; it does not call for even an expression of an opinion either for or against the league. On these points this resolution is wholly colorless.

I am unable to reconcile that statement with the quotation just made from the interview of the previous week. It indicates either that the Senator has changed his mind and that the purpose to be subserved by this resolution has been altered accordingly or that resentments have been voiced in the country that make it expedient to abandon the object for which he prepared it. If this is a "colorless" resolution, either as to this or any other point, certainly the time of the Senate should not now be wasted in its consideration. If it has become a "colorless" resolution since it was introduced and reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, then it should be withdrawn from the calendar, because I am unable to perceive what office it can perform if a vote taken upon it can in no wise "call for even an expression of an opinion either for or against the proposed league of nations."

Before discussing the resolution, let me dispose of another opening statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania. He said:

Somewhat experienced in the ills and embarrassments suffered by the Executive branch from opposition (for partisan purposes) to legitimate national activities, I fully sympathize with the position that in foreign affairs we should present a firm and united front. If, therefore, opposition or support of the league becomes a party issue in this country, it will not be upon my initiative nor with my partisan support. But if Senators on the other side continue as a party to oppose all efforts to secure full consideration of this great matter, if they do not cease to listen to and to obey the mere fiat of a partisan Executive, if they remain firm in their stand against the constitutional right of the Senate fully and fairly to consider this question upon its merits, and if they persist in their denial of the sovereign right of the people to deliberate upon and reach a determination concerning it, if

this, sir, is to be the party attitude of Senators who oppose, then I say here and now, in all soberness, I shall be the last to shrink from the issue which they so force. And I will say further, if to stand for the rights of the Senate as a coequal part of the treaty-making power is a manifestation of partisanship, then I am a partisan; if to demand that the people of the United States shall have a right to make up their own minds as to whether or not we shall put ourselves under the domination of the balance of the world; if to regard our free institutions as the greatest instrumentalities of government which the world now possesses, and therefore worthy of preservation over all others which exist in the world; if to love my own country and our own people with my whole heart and soul above and beyond all other countries and peoples of the world—if these things are manifestations of partisanship, then, thank God, I am a partisan. Senators of the opposition, you may make this a partisan issue if you choose, but if you do you must pay to the American people and to their posterity throughout all time the penalty which they will exact.

I construe this, Mr. President, as no other than a shrewd attempt by a very able Senator to shift the burden of an obvious partisanship to the opposition and, by assuming a nonpartisan, lofty attitude of patriotism, to declare to the world that it is the Democracy alone which would drag into the mire of partisan politics the mightiest question ever presented for the consideration of the American Congress. I fully agree that this should not be a partisan question. I have protested in my feeble way against any such manifestation wherever I have encountered it. I believe that upon a subject like this the man who votes for or against this treaty for merely partisan considerations has no conception of the duties and obligations placed upon his shoulders by his oath of office.

But if this great subject has assumed or is assuming a partisan character, then I contend that the Republican opponents of the treaty, not entirely, but nearly so, must assume the blame and the burden. One distinguished opponent of the treaty, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], has from the beginning insisted that it was the duty of his party to make the league a party issue, and that his party should array itself against the treaty. The chairman of the national committee does not accept this counsel, but insists—and, I think, most wisely—that an international problem affecting not only our own but the peoples of the world should be divorced, as far as possible, from all partisan considerations and determined upon its merits as a mighty national and international issue.

But, Mr. President, almost immediately after the return of Mr. Wilson from Paris, and upon the eve of the adjournment of the last Congress, a certain number of Senators, more than one-third of the membership of this body, placed their signatures to what is popularly known as a "round robin" protest against the proposed league and inserted it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, thus giving an official manifestation of their attitude upon the general subject of the treaty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And it was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the leader of the Republican Party.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes; and I think his name, like that of Abou Ben Adhem, "led all the rest."

Mr. President, if that round robin was presented to a single Democratic Senator before its introduction, I am not aware of it. I am not aware that it was presented to anybody. There must have been some reason for it, and I am not uncharitable when I assert it to have been a partisan one. That justifies me in resenting the attempt of the Senator from Pennsylvania to shift the burden and threaten us with dire consequences should we so far forget our duty as Senators and as Americans as to make this a party question.

The Republicans have control of this body now. They recently organized the Senate, and among other things thoroughly reorganized the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is an open secret that none but opponents of the league were eligible to membership upon that committee in this Congress. I am referring now to the new Members. If that is not true, I hope some Senator upon the other side will rise right now and correct the statement, for I have heard it on several occasions, and I have never heard it denied; and if that is not an evidence of partisanship with regard to a great national question, what is it?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. And it can also be observed that when they organized that great committee they were not content unless they had a majority of three on it.

Mr. SMOOT. The same as they had before.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado permit a brief interference with his argument?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask if he will wait, say, three minutes by the clock for any Republican Senator to dare deny that the Foreign Relations Committee was stacked, and stacked against the President of the United States, by the will and power of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the leader of the Republican Party?

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I have no hesitation in denying that, both as a Republican Senator and as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, which was stacked against the President of the United States, if at all, only in the sense that he is a Democrat and I am a Republican.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ah, now, Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. That is the issue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will excuse me a moment further, it was not only stacked as a deck of cards might have been against the President because he was President and because he was a Democrat, as the Senator confesses, but it was stacked against him because he was the leader of the movement in favor of a covenant of peace for the world.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi may be much more familiar with Republicanism and the trend of Republican thought than I; but it can not be possible that even he thinks that under the new organization of the Senate, with a Republican majority, we should continue a Democratic majority on any committee.

Mr. THOMAS. No; that is not the proposition at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I never said that. I am a partisan.

Mr. MOSES. So am I, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would not continue a Republican organization under Democratic rule; but I say that you have stacked an international committee, which is not a partisan committee, against the hope of the world for peace and against the covenant of the league of nations, as well as against a Democratic President.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. You say you did it merely against a Democratic President. That far I go with you if he were a Republican President and I were in the majority.

Mr. MOSES. Oh, no; I can not permit the Senator from Mississippi to misquote me to that extent, Mr. President. I say that the majority of the committee was made up of Republicans, and in that sense only was it stacked against the President, he being a Democrat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the majority of the committee was not only made up of Republicans, but it was made up of Republicans who came out openly and declared that they were against the league of nations and they were against the treaty of peace; and there is but one Republican left upon the committee in favor of the league of nations, and the only reason he was left there was because you dared not remove him. I refer to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER].

Mr. MOSES. The Senator from Mississippi shows an unwonted knowledge of Republican affairs, Mr. President; but inasmuch as the injunction of secrecy upon the proceedings of the executive session of the Committee on Foreign Relations the other day has been removed, it may suffice to call to his attention the fact that upon every record vote there taken the Democratic members of the committee lined up solidly on one side, and whatever division took place in the committee at all took place on the Republican side, where two Republican Senators occasionally voted with the Democrats.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, that also is true, accidentally. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] voted with the Democrats upon every proposition involving the league of nations.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, was the stacking—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon. If he will wait just a little while, then perhaps I will yield to him.

Mr. THOMAS. I think I have the floor, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado has the floor, and he ought to take charge of it.

Mr. THOMAS. I will soon yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You left just one Republican member on that committee in favor of the league of nations and the hope of the civilized world for peace, and the only reason you left one was that you dared not take him off. Of course, he voted for it and with us whenever the question of the league of nations was involved. There was another member of the committee—there were, in fact, two—who said that unless section 5 of the Knox resolution were stricken out he might vote with us. We voted to keep section 5 in so as to make them vote against you. Politics; yes. You voted to take section 5 out to let them vote with you. Politics; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, the Senator may not camouflage things. He knows as well as I do, and as a man of honor he will not deny, that the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania is not merely the motion of the criminal lawyer with a client about to hang for a continuance, but that it is a motion to defeat the covenant of peace and the league of nations, and that is all that

is behind it, and that any man who says that you are merely pleading for further time to think, when if you had any capacity to think at all you would have thought long ago, is simply untruthful and insincere and dishonest.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. You are trying to defeat the league of nations. That is what you are trying to do, and you know it as well as I do; and when I say "you" I do not mean you personally. I do not intend to be personal toward anybody. I mean this whole infernal gang.

Mr. THOMAS and Mr. McCORMICK addressed the Chair.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for one moment?

Mr. THOMAS. I will.

Mr. MOSES. Of course I know that the Senator from Mississippi, who sits with me on the Committee on Foreign Relations, does not intend to apply to me personally the epithets which he has just used. So far as concerns the motives which actuated the Senator from Pennsylvania in making his motion in the Committee on Foreign Relations, he fully stated them before the committee, and they are on record in the minutes of the meetings of that committee. My experience with the Senator from Pennsylvania as his colleague here on this floor and as his subordinate when he was at the head of the State Department leads me to believe that he is intellectually and personally honest, and that whatever statement of motive he may have made here, in the committee room, or elsewhere is absolutely sincere and without any reservation whatever.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Illinois for a moment.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, as I came in the charge was being made that the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee was stacked with Republicans.

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; I made no such charge. It had a right to have a majority of Republicans. I said it was stacked against the covenant of peace and the league of nations.

Mr. McCORMICK. If you please, Mr. President, the charge was made that it was stacked with Republicans against the covenant of peace. It might be replied that the commission in Paris was stacked with Democrats, excluding all Republicans, ready to bow to the will of the chief American representative over there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not think that is worth replying to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I trust I have said nothing, and I certainly intend to say nothing, that will reflect in the slightest degree upon my distinguished friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, for whose opinion and for the integrity of whose conscience and intellect I entertain the very highest regard. I am merely contrasting conditions with announcements and protesting against what seems to me to be an effort to shift the burden of partisanship, doubtless for partisan purposes, upon this side of the Chamber. When the Senator says that he has no partisan motive in introducing this resolution, I am bound to accept that statement, but I must nevertheless insist that the action of his colleagues upon a subject like this speaks louder than protestations upon the floor and indicates a partisanship which I regret to see manifested toward any international question.

I want to be entirely fair upon this proposition. The chairman of the Democratic national committee has himself insisted that it should be made a party issue. I deplore that attitude, whether it appears among our own or the ranks of the opposition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon; he is doing an injustice to the chairman of the Democratic national committee.

Mr. THOMAS. It may be that I am.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He merely said that if the Republican Party chose to make it a partisan question he would welcome the issue.

Mr. THOMAS. I based my statement upon the accounts which I saw in the public press, and I am very glad to learn that they were overdrawn.

We can not, of course, wholly abandon partisanship if we would, even in the consideration of international questions. I can not, and I am charitable enough to believe that others opposed to me can not, do so; but I believe that we can subordinate them, when the occasion requires, to the tremendous problems which we occasionally encounter which bring us in contact with other nations and which are fraught with consequences reaching beyond our shores and far beyond the future of the present generation.

Mr. President, these preliminaries having been removed, let me come to the resolution itself, which challenges the treaty-making power of the Executive by asserting the coequality of the Senate. I refer, of course, to the language of the preamble. I regret that it found the calendar just when the peace congress had prepared and delivered the revised draft of the treaty to the German representatives. I have no doubt they regard it as providential and that it may serve to stimulate their opposition to it. If it were expedient, the resolution should have been offered long ago. If the answer be that the "round robin" was presented long ago, I reply that the "round robin" should have been sufficient and needed no supplement in the shape of this or any other resolution.

The asserted coequality of the treaty-making power of the Senate has no warrant in the Constitution. It is opposed to the overwhelming current of national procedure and the enlightened opinion of the past hundred and twenty years. It has been asserted, but never successfully. It has been assailed, and always with success, and the renewal of it at this time and from a party which is founded upon the principles and the doctrines of Alexander Hamilton, justifies me in also characterizing that as partisan in design and embarrassing, and intended to be embarrassing, to the Executive in operation. The fact that it bears the name of an eminent lawyer and statesman, whose sponsorship of it endows it with its chief claim to serious and exhaustive consideration, makes it all the more remarkable.

It was preceded by the adoption what I may term the Irish resolution, which received the unanimous vote of the Senate with one exception. This can have no other effect—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nor intent.

Mr. THOMAS. Than to embarrass the deliberations of our delegation in the peace congress. Since I have referred to that resolution, Mr. President, let me say that it is in direct conflict with the principles embodied in the Knox resolution. I do not know whether the Senator from Pennsylvania voted for the Irish resolution or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He did.

Mr. THOMAS. The principal feature of the preamble of the Knox resolution is that since war was declared for certain purposes by our country, the peace congress, now that we have won the victory, should devote itself to the accomplishment of those purposes and those alone, leaving other questions to be decided hereafter and after more full deliberation.

We certainly did not enter this war with the object of securing the independence of the Irish Sinn Fein. The people of the United States have always sympathized with the wrongs of Ireland. As the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] said some days ago, I have about as many friends among the Irish people as anyone in this Chamber. I wish them as well as any man can. But if I had been here when the resolution was considered my vote would have been recorded with that of the Senator from Mississippi.

Now, the Senator from Pennsylvania indirectly gave us the reason for the Irish resolution when he said that the Irish were "the political dynamite of the Anglo-Saxon race," wherefore both sides of this Chamber, anxious either for the dynamite or to prevent its explosion, for political purposes only, by their action have intruded the resolution into the councils of the peace conference, knowing that it had no place there; that it would disturb the proceedings without accomplishing anything whatever. Not a Senator voting for it would as a member of the congress ever move to proceed to its consideration.

Mr. President, the influences in Ireland responsible for the resolution do not represent the Ireland of Parnell, of Redmond, of Michael Davitt, and of T. P. O'Connor, Irish nationalists all, but an element which exhibited but little devotion to the great principles of democracy when fighting for its life in the great crisis of the World War. They were consorting with the enemy, giving him aid and comfort for the undoing of the British Empire.

We did not enter this war to establish the right of a faction to demand autonomy from a peace congress as the essential of a lasting peace or otherwise, whatever the merits of their contention. In entertaining the resolution we intruded ourselves into the domestic affairs of one of our Allies, inspired only by the promptings of partisan selfishness.

Mr. President, Korea has been knocking at the doors of Congress for some time. She hungers for some resolution of similar import. She has been appealing to the American people for many months from the oppressions of Japan. They implore us to recognize their cause and secure them a hearing before and justice from her rulers. Has anyone introduced a Korean resolution here; and if so, would any Senator on either side vote for it? Korea has no votes in America.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator pardon me just a moment for an interruption, the Senator, contrary to his usual custom, being rather stupid? There are no Korean-Americans, hyphenated Americans from Korea, with votes to reelect Senators and Representatives. The reason is perfectly clear.

Mr. THOMAS. No; and no hyphenated Chinese, either. There is a Chinese question, a very serious one, and one with which I very greatly sympathize, but she knocks at these doors in vain. I imagine that if in the House of Commons some enthusiast introduced a resolution at the behest of the people of Porto Rico or, if you please, of the colored people of the South—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mississippi especially.

Mr. THOMAS. Mississippi especially, as the Senator says, asking the peace congress to give them a hearing, with a view to establishing their independence, the author of the Irish resolution, a most eloquent and distinguished statesman, would be the first and the loudest in his denunciation of the insult, and would rail at the temerity of the British House of Commons interfering with our affairs.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And still worse if the British House of Lords did it.

Mr. THOMAS. I think it comes with ill grace from Senators who are unanimous in their support of that resolution within the short space of a week to father another declaring that the American commissioners to the world's peace congress should confine themselves to securing peace only by the safeguarding of the objects for which we waged this war. The inconsistency is so glaring that its statement is all that is needed to expose it.

Now, let me turn to the second preamble of the resolution:

Whereas the Senate of the United States, being a coequal part of the treaty-making power of this Government and therefore coequally responsible for any treaty which is concluded and ratified, is deeply concerned.

And so forth.

Mr. President, in what does this alleged coequality consist? The treaty-making power of the Senate must be found in the Constitution. There it is provided that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties." If that establishes coequality, then the preamble of this resolution can not be assailed. If that recital does not establish coequality, the assertion of it must fall.

Mr. Webster defines "coequal" as being "on an equality in rank, on a par in age or in extent;" and the Century Dictionary defines the word as meaning "equal with another person or thing, or with one another, having equal rank, dignity, intellectual ability, etc., of corresponding character or quality."

If the Senate is coequal with the President, why has it not long ago selected delegates either from its own members or elsewhere and sent them to Paris? It may advise the President if it sees fit, but it is an established fact, which can not be questioned, that the President may accept or reject that advice as he may think best for the country. It is with him entirely a matter of discretion. Our real function does not begin until the treaty reaches us after it is negotiated. The President's functions are then suspended while the Senate has the treaty under consideration. They are resumed after the Senate shall have ratified it. To assert that this means coequality is to assert that because the President has the veto power over legislation he also is endowed coequally with the legislative authority, which is ours by organic law.

Mr. President, it would be monstrous if a body composed of 96 men, upon such a slender foundation as this, can assert, much less assume, to exercise such extraordinary authority. If this coequality exists, why has not the Senator from Pennsylvania been active long ago? Why did he not assert it at the time the President appointed his commissioners and insist that this body, being endowed with the same right and authority, should not only be consulted in the appointment of our commissioners but appoint commissioners of its own?

Mr. President, never in the history of this Nation until this resolution was introduced has the coequality of the Senate with the Executive been claimed as to a tremendous power, purely administrative. So far as I have been able to ascertain from the records of the Congress, this is the first recorded instance, and no alleged executive encroachment upon legislative authority even by Theodore Roosevelt himself can compare with this asserted encroachment upon the power of the Executive.

I have heard much since I have been a member of this body of the usurpation of legislative authority by the President. It is a song that has been sung in every Congress since Washington was inaugurated, but it comes with ill grace from those who so complain to themselves assert an executive authority which must, if it be established, take its precedent from the Knox resolution.

Before I refer to the precedents let me speak of another peculiarity of the resolution. I say peculiarity, perhaps I should designate it as another unique feature. I refer to the third clause of the resolution, "that the Senate advises, in accordance with its constitutional right and duty," and so forth.

Under the Constitution such advice as the Senate may offer must be tendered to the Executive. If the President needs counsel or if the Senate thinks it wise to give him counsel it has a perfect right to do so. But this resolution does not pretend to advise the President. It advises the assembled delegates of the civilized world. Of course, if we are coequal in power with the President we may have that authority, but whoever before assumed that under this clause of the Constitution the Senate of the United States has the right and that it was its duty to tender its counsel to a world peace conference, to the delegates of other nations duly assembled, to all the people of the world, and to the President of the United States, only if he be a delegate himself?

To adopt this resolution, therefore, would be to establish a precedent which would justify the Senate, pursuant to its coequal executive authority, to take part, of its own volition as a part of its duty, in the exercise of constitutional functions in the councils of every nation where the United States might be interested or involved.

Mr. President, I assert without fear of successful contradiction, first, that the Executive of the United States possesses the sole treaty-negotiating power; that the Senate's power to advise and consent is and must be confined to action upon and consideration of treaties hitherto negotiated and submitted by him to the Senate for ratification or rejection. It then, and not until then, has the power to ratify, to amend, or to reject. If it ratifies, the President, as the depository of the treaty-making power, may himself reject the treaty and refuse to deliver it. As a corollary, if these positions are not correct, it must be the duty of the Senate to cooperate in the negotiation of all treaties made by the Government, or be faithless to its duty and unmindful of its obligations. That is preposterous.

Mr. President, this controversy in some phase is as old as the Government itself. In the *Federalist*, Mr. Hamilton gives his views on the subject. They are perfectly sound, and never have been successfully confuted. Afterwards, in 1793, when Great Britain and France were at war with each other, President Washington issued a neutrality proclamation which prompted Hamilton to elaborate the subject. Public sentiment in this country was then overwhelmingly sympathetic with France. It was during the period of our first treaty with France, which some, with much plausibility, contended to be so ample as to require us to act as an ally.

The French minister to this country, with an impudence that has never been imitated, assumed to go over the heads of the President and the Cabinet, and appeal to the people for aid for his Government against what he called the "common enemy." At that time Mr. Hamilton, feeling the need of clarifying the political atmosphere, published a series of letters, defining the extent of the Executive power of the President of the United States under the Constitution. Among other things he said:

The legislative department is not the organ of intercourse between the United States and foreign nations. It is charged neither with making nor interpreting treaties.

Mr. Hamilton then takes up that clause of the Constitution which declares the Executive power to be vested in the President of the United States of America, and discusses it logically and exhaustively. Among his other conclusions, I find this:

It deserves to be remarked that, as the participation of the Senate in the making of treaties, and the power of the legislature to declare war, are exceptions out of the general "Executive power" vested in the President, they are to be construed strictly, and ought to be extended no further than is essential to their execution.

These letters created a profound impression, so much so that Mr. Jefferson, as a politician, became anxious for the consequences. He was himself a poor controversialist with the pen. Therefore he appealed to Madison, and wrote him as follows regarding Hamilton:

Nobody answers him, and his doctrines will therefore be taken for confessed. For God's sake, my dear sir, take up your pen, select the most striking heresies, and cut him to pieces in face of the public. There is nobody else can and will enter the lists against him.

Mr. Madison responded, I think, reluctantly, and, under the signature of Helvidius, he discussed the proposition at length. He was unrivaled as a dialectician, and made the best possible case under the circumstances. His argument became the basis for every subsequent contention against the authority of the President and of the right of the Senate to share with him the power to make treaties. So far as one can learn from contemporaneous history, the argument was with Mr. Hamilton, and public opinion accepted his views and acted upon them.

Some time afterwards—I think in 1825—the then President, Mr. John Quincy Adams, nominated commissioners to what was known as the Panama Congress, which was called by certain South American Republics, Mexico and Nicaragua, I think, being the leading nations in the movement, whose purpose, among other things, was to effect treaties of alliance with the United States, at which time the subject was again involved.

In that connection let me say that that discussion, occurring in 1826, was within three years after the announcement of the Monroe doctrine by the President, which, by the way, was a purely Executive policy. The Monroe doctrine was then assailed in the House of Representatives and in the Senate with a bitterness and a virulence finding its parallel only in the attacks by some gentlemen upon the proposed league of nations.

By way of digression, let me refer to just two specimens of the oratory which at that time ornamented the columns of Gales and Seaton's Register of Debates. I will take, first, Senator Macon, who said:

What, said Mr. M., had been the constant practice in our own Government? Had it not been a constant increase of Executive power?—

How natural that sounds—

There was hardly a session of Congress passed but what some power, some patronage was gained by the Executive. We had a very recent and memorable example before us. President Monroe had said that the United States "owed it to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety," and that "we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny by an European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. In the war between these new governments and Spain we declared our neutrality at the time of their recognition, and to this we have adhered, and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur which, in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change on the part of the United States indispensable to their security." It was hardly noticed at the time—

That is the Monroe doctrine—

and now what had it become? He should like to see the letter addressed to the Mexican Government. Now, they were told that this was a pledge, and the United States were to take the front of the battle. If every department of this Government—the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the President—did not watch the power which the Constitution had given them, but let it be taken from them by piecemeal, who could tell where it would end?

Now let us turn to the other House. I now read an extract from a speech of Mr. Floyd, of Virginia, who said:

We are told by the gentleman from Maryland that a pledge was given by Mr. Monroe, then President, to these southern Republics, that we would defend and protect them from the assaults of European armies, or words to this effect; and that since that period this pledge has been renewed by letters from this Government to others, and particularly by our minister to Mexico. Sir, when that message was delivered to this House I then rose in my place and protested against that declaration of the President, as assuming an unwarrantable power, violating the spirit of the Constitution, assuming grounds and an attitude in regard to European powers calculated to involve us in a strife which there existed, and in which we had no interest, and indirectly leading to war, which Congress alone had the right to declare. We are now called upon to redeem the pledge given by Mr. Monroe, the parallel of Ferdinand; not only so, but the further pledge given by Mr. Adams, and that, too, by the correspondence of our envoy with the Republic of Mexico. Here, then, the President has assumed to give support to these nations, even at the hazard of war, without consulting Congress or the representatives of the people. The President has told us that we should not be "palsied by the will of our constituents." This bold claim to unlimited power, if acted upon, extinguishes at one blow the liberty of the Nation. A claim so broad dare not be hinted at by the King of Great Britain; Alexander, Emperor of all the Russias, alone possesses such power.

The daring of this pledge, so contrary to the cautious indecision and irresolution of the former President, caused me to inquire how the circumstances happened, when a Member of Congress, high in the confidence of the President, informed me that the British Government sought a conversation with Mr. Rush, our then envoy and minister plenipotentiary at the Court of St. James, and proposed to him that they should unite upon the subject of South American affairs, and so shape their correspondence as to show to Europe the probable course these Governments would take in the cause of Spanish America. Mr. Rush, who is doubtless as able a negotiator as the Secretary of the Treasury—for the mistake he has made in his report does not exceed five or six millions of dollars this year; but, as it is his first attempt, there is reason to hope he may mend—refused to accede to the propositions unless the British would agree to enter into a treaty recognizing the independence of South America; this did not suit the views of England at that time. This was forwarded to the President, and was then lying on his table, when he issued that bulletin, pledging this Nation to a course which is daily becoming dangerous to the peace of the country from without and dangerous to the Constitution from within.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. Just a moment. I do not wish it to be inferred from what I have said that I am at all committed to the league of nations. I am simply emphasizing the fact that all great forward movements which have become embedded in the policy of this country have been assailed by logic, by abuse, by aspersion of motives, and by gloomy predictions of ultimate

consequences, only to be crystallized into the framework of the Nation's progress.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a moment.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I have no desire to interrupt the trend of the Senator's argument. I simply wish to ascertain whether the Senator from Colorado read with approval the sentiments which he has just quoted, or whether he adopts the judgment of Mr. Floyd and Mr. Macon with reference to the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, certainly not. I introduced it really as a digression from my remarks to show contemporaneous opinion and criticism of a policy which had been initiated a year or two before by the then President, but which at that time had not crystallized itself into our institutions.

Mr. FALL. I asked the question because the Senator, of course, is perfectly frank and sincere, and I am so familiar with the history with reference to this matter as to know that the statement of Mr. Floyd that no attention was paid to the Monroe doctrine when it was announced—

Mr. THOMAS. This was three years afterwards.

Mr. FALL. Yes; but he makes the statement that there was no attention paid to it, and I know that history would not bear out any such assertion.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, it would not.

Mr. FALL. No.

Mr. THOMAS. But I presume—he seems to have been a gentleman of very strong convictions and prejudices—that he probably meant that relatively it had not excited the attention that would have followed if it had been understood as the supporters of the administration at that time were construing it.

A motion, I think, was offered in the House during the consideration of these appointments which sought to force the President's hand with regard to his foreign policy, and Mr. Webster's comment upon it was very short but conclusive:

He would recapitulate only his objections to this amendment. It was unprecedented, nothing of the kind having been attempted before. It was, in his opinion, unconstitutional, as it was taking the proper responsibility from the Executive and exercising, ourselves, a power which, from its nature, belongs to the Executive, and not to us. It was prescribing, by the House, the instructions for a minister abroad. It was nugatory, as it attached conditions which might be complied with or might not. And, lastly, if gentlemen thought it important to express the sense of the House on these subjects, or any of them, the regular and customary way was by resolution. At present it seemed to him that we must make the appropriation without conditions or refuse it. The President had laid the case before us. If our opinion of the character of the meeting, or its objects, led us to withhold the appropriation, we had the power to do so. If we had not so much confidence in the Executive, as to render us willing to trust to the constitutional exercise of the Executive power, we have power to refuse the money. It is a direct question of aye or no. If the ministers to be sent to Panama may not be trusted to act like other ministers, under the instructions of the Executive, they ought not to go at all.

The next occasion, Mr. President, for the consideration of this asserted congressional authority arose under the Henry Winter Davis resolution of 1864, which, of course, was aimed at the French then in Mexico. Mr. Davis, one of the great leaders of the House of Representatives during that stormy period, feeling the need of some assertion of the Monroe doctrine as appropriate to the French attempt to subjugate Mexico, introduced this resolution as chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the Congress of the United States are unwilling, by silence, to leave the nations of the world under the impression that they are indifferent spectators of the deplorable events now transpiring in the Republic of Mexico; and they therefore think fit to declare that it does not accord with the policy of the United States to acknowledge a monarchical government, erected on the ruins of any republican government in America, under the auspices of any European power.

That resolution passed unanimously.

Mr. Seward, then Secretary of State, in explaining it to Minister Dayton at Paris, wrote:

"It truly interprets the uniform sentiment of the people of the United States in reference to Mexico," yet it is "another and distinct question whether the United States would think it necessary or proper to express themselves in the form adopted by the House of Representatives at this time. This is a practical and purely executive question, and the decision of it constitutionally belongs not to the House of Representatives, nor even to Congress, but to the President of the United States. \* \* \* While the President receives the declaration of the House of Representatives with the profound respect to which it is entitled, as an exposition of its sentiments upon a grave and important subject, he directs that you inform the Government of France that he does not at present contemplate any departure from the policy which this Government has hitherto pursued in regard to the war which exists between France and Mexico. It is hardly necessary to say that the proceeding of the House of Representatives was adopted upon suggestions arising within itself, and not upon any communication of the executive department; and that the French Government would be seasonably apprised of any change of policy upon this subject which the President might at any future time think it proper to adopt."

This dispatch was communicated by the President to the House, and on June 27 of the same year Mr. Davis made an elaborate report thereon from his committee, and concluded with this resolution:

*Resolved*, That Congress has a constitutional right to an authoritative voice in declaring and prescribing the foreign policy of the United States, as well in the recognition of new powers as in other matters; and it is the constitutional duty of the President to respect that policy, not less in diplomatic negotiations than in the use of the national forces when authorized by law; and the propriety of any declaration of foreign policy by Congress is sufficiently proved by the vote which pronounces it; and such proposition while pending and undetermined is not a fit topic of diplomatic explanation with any foreign power.

The resolution came up for debate, and this was Mr. Blaine's conclusive comment upon it:

To adopt this principle is to start out with a new theory in the administration of our foreign affairs, and I think the House has justified its sense of self-respect and its just appreciation of the spheres of the coordinate departments of Government by promptly laying the resolution on the table.

It is true, Mr. President, that these were House proceedings, as was the next, to which I will call attention; but the House, as well as the Senate, during the first 50 years or longer of our national existence, was quite as insistent upon the assertion of legislative prerogatives in the administration and conduct of foreign affairs as was the Senate.

Historically, therefore, the action of the House on the occasions when the subject was considered is quite as important in determining the soundness of this resolution as the action of the Senate.

In 1876 the Republic of Pretoria, afterwards known as the Transvaal Republic, sent to Congress congratulations upon the first centennial of our national independence. Mr. Swann, of Maryland, reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations a resolution expressing the high appreciation of Congress of the congratulations. On January 26 President Grant vetoed the resolution upon these grounds:

Sympathizing, as I do, in the spirit of courtesy and friendly recognition which has prompted the passage of these resolutions, I can not escape the conviction that their adoption has inadvertently involved the exercise of a power which infringes upon the constitutional rights of the Executive. \* \* \* The Constitution of the United States, following the established usage of nations, has indicated the President as the agent to represent the national sovereignty in its intercourse with foreign powers and to receive all official communications from them \* \* \* making him, in the language of one of the most eminent writers on constitutional law, "the constitutional organ of communication with foreign States." If Congress can direct the correspondence of the Secretary of State with foreign governments, a case very different from that now under consideration might arise when that officer might be directed to present to the same foreign government entirely different and antagonistic views or statements.

That ended the incident, which seems to have put the general subject at rest until the rejection by the Colombian Senate of the Panama Canal treaty in 1903. That is an incident with which we are all more or less familiar. It occurred at a comparatively recent date in our history. The Senate of Colombia is modeled largely after our own and has the same treaty-making power. It saw fit to exercise that power negatively, which resulted in the rejection of the treaty, followed by a so-called insurrection in Panama, which Mr. Roosevelt recognized in just 1 day, 17 hours, and 41 minutes after the junta's proclamation of independence; his reasons, among others, being that Colombia having sought the treaty and the Senate, from improper motives, having rejected it, Panama had a right to rebel; and having rebelled and declared her independence, he assumed and exercised the right, which the American people seemed subsequently to have approved, of immediately recognizing the new republic born of this insurrection and making a treaty with it. Colombia was thus punished by us because her senate had the temerity to defeat our President's treaty.

When the Colombian treaty comes to us for consideration I shall have something to say in detail upon that subject. I am interested now, however, only in the attitude of the distinguished leader of the Republican Party in this body and his associates with regard to resolutions, somewhat analogous to the present, which were offered, one by the Senator's colleague, the late George F. Hoar, and the manner in which the subject was then considered and disposed of by them.

On the 17th of December, 1903, Mr. Hoar offered a resolution regarding this subject which I will not burden the Senate with reading, but which I will ask to have inserted in the RECORD. It is found at page 316, volume 38, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

*Resolved*, That the President be requested, if not, in his judgment, incompatible with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate such facts as may be in his possession or in that of any of the executive departments as will show whether at the time of the ratification of the treaty with the Republic of Panama, lately communicated to the Senate, Panama had successfully established its independence, had

lawfully adopted a constitution, and had given authority to the persons with whom said treaty purports to have been made to negotiate and ratify the same.

Also the population of said Republic of Panama at that time, its capacity for self-government, and the race and character of the persons composing it.

Also whether the officials negotiating or ratifying the treaty on the part of Panama had any personal or private interest in or relation to the construction of a canal across the Isthmus of Panama.

Also whether the constitution of the Republic of Colombia authorized the secession of Panama therefrom, and whether Colombia was prevented by the action of the United States or by any officer or force under the jurisdiction of the same from attempting to assert its authority or to prevent such secession, and what instructions, if any, had been given by the Government of the United States to such officers, whether civil, military, or naval, and, if any action had been taken by such officers without special authority, what action was so taken, and whether such action has been approved or disapproved by the Government of the United States.

Also at what time information of any revolution or resistance to the Government of Colombia in Panama was received by the Government of the United States or any department thereof, and whether any information was received of any expected or intended revolution before it occurred, and the date of such information.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator supported this resolution with his usual exhaustive eloquence, and was thereupon severely criticized by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Foraker, who, speaking of it, said:

It ought to have been made in executive session, if it was to be made at all, not alone because it involved an attack upon the administration but because it involved an attack upon our country as well. There is a treaty now before the Senate with respect to this identical matter, a treaty concerning a great transaction, of which the whole world is witness. All the nations have our action under consideration. It does seem to me that it would have been the part of both patriotism and wisdom, certainly the part of conservatism, for the Senator from Massachusetts to have waited until that treaty, involving all these transactions which he has discussed, could be considered in the committee where it is pending, and then be considered here in executive session of the Senate, where international relations and international questions can be considered without offense to anyone—

Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. President—

Mr. FORAKER. Wait a minute—and where, Mr. President, all the information called for by this resolution could have been secured just as well as here in the open Senate.

Therefore it is, I say, I criticize that speech because of the fact that any purpose the Senator could have had in mind to subserve, so far as giving information and the benefit of his views to his brother Senators is concerned, could have been subserved better behind the doors in executive session than in the open Senate, where the words spoken will be taken up and spread broadcast before the world as words of criticism coming from the Senate of the United States upon the President of the United States in this great matter. I doubt not the President has acted from sentiments and motives of the highest and the loftiest patriotism and the purest intention to subserve American good.

On the 12th of January following Senator Bacon introduced a resolution relating to the same subject. It will be found in volume 38, page 614, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask leave to introduce that without reading.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate,* That the President be respectfully informed that the Senate favor and advise the negotiation, with a view to its ratification, of a treaty with the Republic of Colombia, to the end that there may be peacefully and satisfactorily determined and adjusted all differences between the United States and the Republic of Colombia growing out of the recent revolution in Panama and the consequent secession of Panama from Colombia, and the alleged aid and assistance by the land and naval power of the United States in the successful accomplishment of said revolution and secession through the alleged forcible prevention by said land or naval forces of the assertion and maintenance by Colombia of her sovereignty and authority in Panama, and that full and complete compensation may be made by the United States to the Republic of Colombia for the loss of her sovereignty and property rights in Panama so far as the same may be shown to be due to any act of the United States through the land or naval forces of the same.

*Resolved further,* That the President be respectfully informed that if it should prove to be impracticable for the United States and the Republic of Colombia to agree through a convention upon the question of the said alleged responsibility on the part of the United States, or upon the question of the amount of compensation to be made when such responsibility shall be established, the Senate in that case favor and advise the negotiation, with a view to its ratification, of a treaty with the Republic of Colombia submitting to the permanent court of arbitration at The Hague, or to some other tribunal to be agreed upon, for impartial arbitration and peaceful determination, all questions between the United States and the Republic of Colombia growing out of the matters herein recited.

Mr. THOMAS. This resolution incurred the opposition of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who then said:

Mr. President, if I rightly apprehend that resolution, it is, in the first place, in the nature of advice to the President to enter upon a negotiation with Colombia. As to the right of the Senate to give such advice to the President I have no doubt; but this resolution, as I understand it, goes further, and instructs the President as to the course of that negotiation. But, Mr. President, my objection to this resolution is much deeper than that. Negotiations, as is well known, are pending between Gen. Reyes and the Secretary of State. They are in communication. What the conditions of their negotiations are we do not know.

Mr. DANIEL. May I ask the Senator whether he is informed as to whether or not those negotiations are ended?

Mr. LODGE. Not to my knowledge. All I can say is that I am not aware that they are ended.

I think for us to come into the Senate with a resolution distinctly in the interest of Colombia would be a most harmful thing. I do not want even to discuss such a resolution. I do not think it ought to be discussed.

I think the Senator was right; and he there stated concisely the fundamental objection to the consideration in open session of the Bacon resolution.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] day before yesterday, referred distinctly to Senator Bacon as an authority supporting his contention, and to the argument which he made in 1906 in support of the Senate prerogative. At least, he recommended the Senator's argument to this side of the Chamber. He must have done so, because it was the only instance in recent time in which a Senator deliberately contended for the constitutional power of the Senate to participate in the negotiation as well as in the making of treaties.

I knew Senator Bacon well. I had the most extreme affection for him. He was a great man. He had his faults. He had the most exalted notion of senatorial authority and dignity. He nearly always referred to himself as an ambassador from the State of Georgia. His insistence upon precedent was sometimes as inconvenient as it was absurd; and he generally succeeded in having his senatorial dignity respected by all with whom he came in contact. Very naturally he was the advocate of everything enhancing the dignity and authority not only of the Senate but of each of its members. What wonder that he should be the surviving champion of such a claim? But he fought in vain. Every position taken, every attitude assumed by President Roosevelt of an Executive character as the outgrowth of the Colombian incident received the unbroken support of the majority in this body, with the single exception of the then senior Senator from the State of Massachusetts, and this side was frequently taunted for its unsuccessful efforts to make a political issue out of the Panama incident.

Mr. Roosevelt's contempt for the Senate was well known. His contempt for every other obstacle to the exercise of such authority as he saw fit at the time to assume is a matter of history; but no one here said him nay. He was supported by the Senate majority enthusiastically, almost unanimously, constantly, and consistently, in his assumption, sometimes proper, frequently extraordinary, of executive authority.

I might weary the Senate by reading one or two extracts from Mr. Roosevelt's writings regarding his conception of Executive power and his own view of senatorial interference, but I will reserve that for another occasion.

Mr. Bacon's argument, to which the Senator from Pennsylvania approvingly referred, was made in 1906, in reply or attempted reply, to the most thorough and exhaustive discussion of the subject that has ever taken place upon this floor. I refer to the speech of Senator Spooner, a synopsis of which can be found in the book entitled "The President's Control of Foreign Relations," by Prof. Corwin, of Princeton University, published in 1917.

His argument has never been answered, and it never can be answered until all our conceptions of the nature of Executive authority and the extent to which it is conferred by the Constitution upon the President of the United States have been profoundly changed. It was inspired by a Rooseveltian episode. The President, as we all remember, had taken occasion about that time, or just previously thereto, to appoint commissioners to the Algeiras conference, the outgrowth of one of the aggressions of Germany upon the coast of North Africa, and designed to involve France in warfare. Senator Bacon denied the power of the President on his own initiative to take part in the conference and also contended that the commissioners named by him should have been submitted to the Senate for their approval or rejection. Senator Spooner rendered a distinct service to that Congress and to his country when he devoted his genius, industry, and abilities to an exhaustive study and exposition of the subject. I will read merely some of his conclusions. After expressing great respect for those who differed with him—and I commend Mr. Spooner to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] as a Roland for his Democratic Oliver—he said:

The Senate has nothing whatever to do with the negotiation of treaties or the conduct of our foreign intercourse and relations, save the exercise of the one constitutional function of advice and consent which the Constitution requires as a precedent condition to the making of a treaty. Except as to the participation in the treaty-making power, the Senate under the Constitution has obviously neither responsibilities nor power.

It is now asserted that we are coequal in this power with the President of the United States.

From the foundation of the Government it has been conceded in practice and in theory that the Constitution vests the power of negotiation and the various phases—and they are multifarious—of the conduct of our foreign relations exclusively in the President. And, Mr. President,

he does not exercise that constitutional power, nor can he be made to do it under the tutelage or guardianship of the Senate or of the House, or of the Senate and House combined.

I read again:

He may issue to the agent chosen by him—and neither Congress nor the Senate has any concern as to whom he chooses—such instructions as seem to him wise. He may vary them from day to day. That is his concern. The Senate has no right to demand that he shall unfold to the world or to it, even in executive session, his instructions or the prospect or progress of the negotiations. I said "right." I use that word advisedly in order to illustrate what all men who have studied the subject are willing to concede—that under the Constitution the absolute power of negotiation is in the President and the means of negotiation subject wholly to his will and his judgment.

Mr. Hamilton said that the treaty-making power, being executive, constitutional exceptions to it must be construed strictly. This is but an elaboration of his proposition.

I continue reading:

When he shall have negotiated and sent his proposed treaty to the Senate, the jurisdiction of this body attaches and its power begins.

If it then begins, it certainly was nonexistent until then.

It may advise and consent, or it may refuse. And in the exercise of this function it is as independent of the Executive as he is independent of it in the matter of negotiation.

The Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Tillman, here asked for an explanation of the powers and prerogatives of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, to which Mr. Spooner answered very clearly, and then he was interrupted by Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, who said:

I merely wish to remind him of a fact with which he no doubt is very familiar, that in the administration of Mr. Madison the Senate deputed a committee to see him in regard to the appointment of a minister to Sweden, I think, and he replied that he could recognize no committee of the Senate, that his relations were exclusively with the Senate. I have no doubt the Senator intended to recall that, but as he stated the exact relations as he understood them, it seemed to bear on that point.

On another page Senator Spooner said:

We ratified the arbitration treaty unanimously, I believe. The President, in the exercise of the power which no one can dispute, pocketed it. The President may negotiate and sign a proposed treaty and not send it to the Senate. In such case what would be thought of a resolution asking him to inform the Senate whether he had negotiated such a proposed treaty, and why he had not sent it to the Senate? Having sent a treaty to the Senate, he may withdraw it the next day.

We, as the Senate, a part of the treaty-making power, have no more right under the Constitution to invade the prerogative of the President to deal with our foreign relations, to conduct them, to negotiate treaties, and that is not all—the conduct of our foreign relations is not limited to the negotiation of treaties—we have no more right under the Constitution to invade that prerogative than he has to invade the prerogative of legislation.

Mr. President, that was, in my judgment, a sound proposition then; it is a sound proposition now.

Senator Bacon promptly replied. In the course of his discussion he was interrupted by Mr. Beveridge with these questions:

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Suppose the Constitution had been silent upon the question of the treaty-making power, where would that power have lodged? Or I will put the question in this way: Suppose the Constitution had said nothing about making treaties, would not the complete power of making treaties have been in the President, under section 1 of Article II, which lodges the executive power in the President?

Mr. BACON. I think not. I do not understand the word "executive" to mean anything of the kind.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does not the Senator think that in the natural division of the powers of the Government into legislative, executive, and judicial the treaty-making power has always been considered an executive function, and therefore if the Constitution had been silent upon the subject of treaties it would have been completely under the President's control, under that provision of the Constitution which confides in the President the executive power, and that that section concerning treaties is merely a limitation upon that universal power?

Mr. BACON. Oh, no. The Senator has gone to his favorite doctrine as to extraconstitutional power, which I will not stop to discuss with him to-day. The two continents, separated by the Atlantic Ocean, are not wider apart than the Senator and I upon the subject of the exercise of powers not found in the Constitution.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will ask this question: If the Constitution had said nothing about the treaty-making power, where would the treaty-making power have been lodged?

Mr. BACON. I have received that question from the Senator several times. I have said that I did not agree with him that it would be with the Executive.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Where would it be?

Mr. BACON. I think undoubtedly in the legislative branch of the Government, for reasons which I will give.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is the whole question.

The Senator was thus driven to the necessity of insisting that in the absence of any constitutional mention of executive power it would be lodged in the legislature. He gave some plausible reasons afterwards for it, but to my mind the proposition is simply unthinkable, especially in view of that very specific clause of the Constitution which vests the executive power in the President and those other specific clauses which enumerate such legislative powers as we possess. The Supreme Court of the United States in the celebrated case of *Kansas v. Colorado* emphasized that distinction in its discussion of the general powers granted to the judicial department under the Constitution.

When Mr. Spooner ended his discussion the then junior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. LODGE, at once took the floor and enthusiastically announced his approval of the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin. Mr. Spooner's position was forecast by Secretary Fish in a letter to Minister Motley on the 15th day of May, 1869, in which he said:

According to the practice of this Government the Senate is not ordinarily consulted in the initiatory state of a negotiation, but its consent and advice are only invoked after the treaty is concluded under the direction of the President and submitted to its consideration.

He there repeated almost word for word the language of Henry Clay in 1824, in speaking in this body on a Senate amendment offered to the African slave-trade treaty with the British Government. Mr. Butler, who has written a work on treaty-making power, is in absolute accord with that view.

Now, Mr. President, except those citations which were submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] in his exhaustive speech upon this treaty the other day, I believe I have given to the Senate a concise, if not an intelligible account of every congressional occasion where legislative assertion of executive authority has been made or challenged.

I unhesitatingly declare that while here and there vigorous assertions have been made to sustain the duality of the treaty-making power, and made always until now upon this side of the Chamber, the consensus of opinion and of judgment, to say nothing of the strength of argument, has been with those who have maintained the exclusive control of the President of the United States over foreign affairs. But to-day, the leader of the Republican Party, Mr. LODGE, my distinguished friend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], and their associates, find it necessary to appeal to Democratic judgment, to Madisonian and Baconian doctrine in support of this resolution, which of course, means that they now repudiate the great lights of statesmanship with which their own party and its predecessors have been illumined since the adoption of the Federal Constitution.

The Senator from Massachusetts protests that he believes and stands by every utterance of his own upon the subject, but his practical application of them is unfortunate.

His recent performances can not be made to square with his oft-repeated convictions. His equilibrium may continue, but it is the equilibrium of the gyroscope. He keeps his feet by rapid rotation, for he can not otherwise declare that his doctrines of the past are still sound and at the same time square his political course by another compass. I mean no disrespect to the distinguished Senator when I measure his leadership by the crustacean which looks forward while crawling backward, an apt illustration of his attitude toward the President since the Paris congress was organized and his assertion of senatorial prerogative as embodied in this resolution, whose recitals he has indorsed in public interviews and which, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, he heartily supported.

I have endeavored to show that we have not the constitutional authority for the passage of this resolution, and that, assuming that I am wrong, it is inexpedient at this time to do so. Indeed, I am rather of the opinion that this is the present attitude of its author. I had expected that the resolution would be called up on motion, especially after its summary report from the Committee on Foreign Relations and its entrance upon the calendar, but thus far no movement has been made in that direction. The Senator has preferred to discuss it pending the consideration of a distinct item of unfinished business.

I come now to a consideration, very briefly, of some of the other recitals of the resolution. One of them is that—

The treaty as drawn contains principles, guarantees, and undertakings obliterative of legitimate race and national aspirations, oppressive of weak nations and peoples—

And so forth.

The Senator from Pennsylvania day before yesterday clarified any obscurity in that recital by the statement that it had reference to that part of the treaty constituting the proposed league of nations. Apart from the accuracy or inaccuracy, from the truth or error of the recital, I want to emphasize the fact that "no weak nation or people" is complaining of that part of the treaty. The Senator called attention to the fact that there were troubles in the Balkans over boundaries; that there were troubles in the newly constituted nations of a similar character; that there were also racial troubles, and appeal was being made by them all to the congress at Paris for settlement. That is true; but those problems are involved in other portions of the treaty, and with which the league of nations has little if anything to do. But, assume that it has everything to do therewith, it is undisputed that all the small nations are in favor of the league. Why, then, should we complain of it in their behalf, especially when, in the judgment of some of us, there is enough to criticize affecting our own affairs?

The appeal, therefore, to the small nations in this resolution as it has now been clarified is an appeal which the situation deprives of all foundation, and, in my judgment, it has no place in the resolution.

It is also declared that—

the people of the United States have had neither time to examine and consider nor opportunity to express regarding it—

This treaty—

a matured and deliberate judgment.

If the people of the United States have not had time to consider and opportunity to mature and pass judgment upon the articles of the proposed covenant for a league of nations, then it is useless, in my judgment, to extend it further. The question of a league of nations, the problems involved in the conception of such a system, have been actively before the American people ever since Germany declared war upon France. Almost immediately thereafter the League for Peace was organized in this country. It was an active league. It had its subsidiaries in every State—I had almost said in every city and at crossroads in the United States. It has supplied them from time to time with an abundance of literature. The opponents of the league have been equally industrious. From the day of the surrender to the present hour the air has been replete with discussions and controversies in advocacy of or in opposition to the league of nations. The printing press has been busy. The mail of Senators has long been crowded to overflow with petitions for and remonstrances against it. If there is a man or woman between the two oceans who has not reflected upon it, who has not discussed it, who has not reached some conclusion upon it, then it argues for his or her ignorance and for the impossibility of their ever understanding or reaching any intelligent conclusion concerning it.

The Senator complains, and perhaps justly, of the waste of time by the peace congress because of their consideration of so many subjects which are foreign to the main proposition, which is peace with the Central Empires. If that be true, then, fortiori, is it true that more time has been given the American people for a full consideration and discussion of this part of the treaty.

If a request had been made for time for the consideration of the treaty, I could understand it. We have only very recently received incomplete copies of the remainder of the treaty. I have given it such attention as I can, and I have succeeded so far in reading it once, and I understand it as little as before. Consequently, I must read it again and again before getting anything like a fair comprehension of it. It is an enormous document, and I concede that ample time should be given and taken not only by the public but by the Members of this body if we may arrive at a full and complete understanding of the vast and far-reaching import of its multitudinous paragraphs.

Mr. President, since this resolution was introduced it has been sadly mutilated. In my judgment, the best part of it has been excluded. I understand that was done to placate the objections of a single member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. If I had to vote for it, I confess the rejected portion would appeal to me far more urgently than any other or all other portions of the resolution. It was prepared with much care and designed to cover every important feature then in contemplation as a basis for the presentation of the resolution in the hope of its ultimate passage:

5. That, finally, it shall be the declared policy of our Government, in order to meet fully and fairly our obligations to ourselves and to the world, that the freedom and peace of Europe being again threatened by any power or combination of powers, the United States will regard such a situation with grave concern as a menace to its own peace and freedom, will consult with other powers affected with a view to devising means for the removal of such menace, and will, the necessity arising in the future, carry out the same complete accord and cooperation with our chief cobelligerents for the defense of civilization.

Consistently with my assurance at the outset, I shall not comment upon the merits of that section, but with regard to its expediency, if this resolution is to be passed at all, that or some substitute for it should be embodied in it. Anybody can protest or object. Few, however, perceive the necessity of accompanying protest or objection with a substitute. If we are to effect or accomplish any purpose whatever with such a resolution, I think it should be through a statement of some definite policy regarding our future world relations. Nobody wants to see another war. All are a unit, whatever the individual opinion of the treaty or any part of it may be, in an earnest hope that some means of avoiding a recurrence of these terrible conflicts may be devised. Hence this resolution, or any resolution which fails to suggest something immediate and essential to the end that wars shall be ended in fact as well as in theory, is incomplete.

I confess, Mr. President, that this eliminated fifth section emphasizes my objection to the whole resolution, because it is a perfect illustration of the declaration of an executive policy by a legislative body. It is a perfect example of the consequences which must inevitably ensue if the new claim of co-equality with the President in the control of foreign affairs shall take root in our institutions and become a part of the prerogatives of the Senate of the United States.

I do not think the resolution should have been introduced. I trust it will not come to a vote, and I hope, if it does, for the reasons I have given, that it will be overwhelmingly rejected.

During the delivery of Mr. THOMAS'S speech, Mr. SHERMAN. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. To-morrow, Mr. President, after the conclusion of the morning business, I shall submit some observations on the influence of the Vatican in the proposed league of nations, which will occupy about 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to the Senator that notice has been given for to-morrow morning by another Senator?

Mr. SHERMAN. I did not know that. I will follow that Senator, then, not knowing who he is, for about 30 minutes.

After the conclusion of Mr. THOMAS'S speech,

#### CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. KING. 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:

Ball	Harrison	McCumber	Sherman
Caldor	Henderson	McKellar	Shields
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	McNary	Simmons
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Dial	Kellogg	New	Spencer
Dillingham	Kendrick	Newberry	Stanley
Edge	Kenyon	Nugent	Sutherland
Elkins	Keyes	Page	Swanson
Fletcher	King	Phelan	Thomas
France	Kirby	Phipps	Trammell
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Poindexter	Underwood
Gronna	La Follette	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Harding	Lenroot	Reed	Watson
Harris	McCormick	Sheppard	Wolcott

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce the absence on official business of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

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

#### VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 18) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, it has been some days since this bill was before the Senate, and I ask the Secretary to state the amendment now pending. I think the committee amendments were not completed.

The SECRETARY. The first committee amendment, on page 1, line 4, was agreed to. The next committee amendment, beginning on line 5, was not agreed to. That amendment is in line 5, after the word "otherwise," to insert "and who are without sufficient means to provide for their own rehabilitation."

Mr. KENYON. May I ask as to the other committee amendments? I should like to know the status of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All other committee amendments have been agreed to, the Chair is informed.

The SECRETARY. An amendment was added by consent of the committee at the top of page 5, where the language "in 1919 or" was stricken out, and the following words were inserted: "between the date of the passage of this act and December 31." That amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Are there any other amendments which have not been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are not any, the Chair is informed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether the amendment on page 1, line 5, was agreed to? I was called out of the Senate a few days ago, and I did not understand what action had been taken upon the various committee amendments.

Mr. KENYON. The amendment on line 5, inserting the words "and who are without sufficient means to provide for their own rehabilitation," was not agreed to.

Mr. KING. Was it disagreed to?

Mr. KENYON. The amendment on page 1, line 4, striking out the word "occupation" and inserting the word "industry,"

was agreed to. The amendment in line 5, as I understand, is the amendment now before the Senate.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not this bill contemplates the education, training, and rehabilitation of all individuals, young or old, within the States of the Union who have some physical ailment or who have met with some accident or misfortune, so that their ability to perform labor or to discharge their usual work and labor may be impaired.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I explained this bill at some great length a week or so ago and covered that question, as I understood it, at that time. I do not want to take a great deal more time in any extended explanation of the bill, but I am perfectly willing to answer such questions as may be asked, if I may be able to answer them. I see the Senator from Georgia is about to rise.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No, Mr. President; when the Senator from Iowa shall have concluded what he has to say I have a few general remarks which I desire to make about the bill.

Mr. KENYON. Then I think I will give way to the Senator from Georgia, as I have already discussed the bill for an hour and a half. I will, however, proceed to answer the question of the junior Senator from Utah, which involves a somewhat extended statement.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for vocational rehabilitation for men injured in occupations and otherwise. That covers practically all cases of men and women workers, whether in the factory or on the farm, who may be to such an extent injured that the injury amounts to a disability, so that they can not engage in the line of occupation which they had previously been following. I want to be perfectly fair and say that, in my judgment, it goes even further. If one had an occupational disease which amounted to a disability—and that is easy to conceive of, for there may be cases of consumptives, as that trouble, as the Senator knows, is growing—so that there would have to be a new line of vocation for the man in order to earn to his living, it would cover such cases.

Bear in mind, however, please, that this is only a stimulation to the States. Just what is to be done is covered by the States. The rules and regulations that the different boards of the 48 States now operating under the Smith-Hughes Act or the vocational educational act, what plans they devise for this work must be approved by the Federal board before there can be any Federal aid. Their plans can be broad; they can cover the course of study; they can cover the training of the teachers; they can cover the kind of work that these men shall be taught to perform. The only thing for the Federal board is to indorse the rules and regulations of the State boards before the Federal money shall be applied. Have I answered the Senator's question?

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to another question?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The word "vocation," of course, includes every line of employment. It would include all professional engagements. A lawyer, a doctor, an engineer, of course, would be embraced within the word "vocation."

Mr. KENYON. Strictly, technically, and dictionary speaking, that is true; but this is not intended to cover professional education; it is vocational education.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will excuse me, then there must be a further limitation placed upon the language of the bill, for the word "vocation" includes profession, calling, labor. A lawyer has a vocation under the meaning of the term, as much so as a farmer or a carpenter. The same is also true of the doctor, the dentist, the civil engineer, the mining engineer, the painter, or the artist. They would all come within the word "vocation."

Mr. KENYON. I think that is technically true; but the Senator must rely somewhat upon the common sense of the boards of the States and the Federal board having the matter in charge. There are cases of soldiers who have been so wounded that they can not go on with their former work. There are a few cases where they are taking such soldiers and making lawyers out of them. Their college course may have been interrupted, their law course may have been interrupted, or their studies as doctors may have been interrupted; but there are only a very few of those cases. If the State board and the Federal board in the case of a man who may be mutilated in industry find that he exhibits capacities which, in their judgment, show that he might do better as a lawyer or as a doctor or as a dentist than in some other line of work, it is true that the States could cover that case in their rules and regulations, and the Federal money would go, to some extent, to help in

that purpose; and I do not really see any reason why it should not do so.

Mr. KING. And, Mr. President, if the Senator will indulge me, as I read the bill it is not limited to those who have already a vocation, profession, or calling, but it would extend to children who are immature in years, not having determined what their course in life should be, and, indeed, fit only for the grade schools. It would permit the utilization of funds for the education of young men and women for vocations, for professions, and for life work if they were disabled; and under the amendment which has been tendered, if it should be accepted, if they were without sufficient means to provide for their own vocational training. So, after all, under this bill, as I read between the four corners of it, the Federal Government could go into the States and aid in educating the boys and girls and in training them for some profession or calling or vocation in life. Certainly that ought not to be the purpose of the bill, as I understand the meaning of the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Utah must give some credit to State boards for some sense. We have to rely on human beings to do human work. No part of the Federal money is available unless the Federal board indorses the State plan. They would not have to indorse a plan which would permit vocational training to a child unless they desired to do so. So the Senator gets back, in the last analysis, to the action of the State. His complaint seems to be that we are destroying the power of the State. We are not doing that. The States make the regulations. If they are foolish regulations, the Federal board does not have to approve them or to give them one cent of money.

I merely want to say one word more. This bill is indorsed in its general purposes by the National Association of Manufacturers, through a representative whom they have sent before the committee, and it is also indorsed by the American Federation of Labor. It is strange, I think, that a bill is indorsed by these two great agencies in this country, and it is a matter of congratulation that such is the fact.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the Senator will suffer an interruption, I desire to ask him what the outside figure will be which will be required to care for the present industrial accidents; what is the estimate of those? Has the committee any information in regard to the matter?

Mr. KENYON. Only by estimating. That would be a very hard question to answer. There are over 200,000 men functionally crippled as the result of accidents in industry in the country, most of them on the scrap heap, and many of them beggars, mendicants. There is an average of 22,500 deaths a year of men who are hurt in industry; there are about 15,000 cases of men who are seriously injured in industry every year. The Senator from New Jersey can figure perhaps as well as I can what the expense of tuition, training, and subsistence would be. It would amount to a very large sum, of course.

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me to make a suggestion to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], I desire to say that this bill covers not only industrial accidents but all manner of diseases, all organic troubles, all disabilities, whether congenital or no matter the causes from which those diseases or misfortunes or infirmities arose. The bill calls for the same vocational rehabilitation with respect to people who are disabled through illness as those who may meet with accidents in their industrial vocations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think, Mr. President, that some instruction in such cases might be wise, and it might be a good public policy, but this is all a question of policy. As I understand, the vocational training bill providing assistance to the States for vocational training in the public schools, the appropriations are automatically increasing year by year until the figures of approximately \$8,000,000 are reached. I asked the question of the chairman of the committee to ascertain whether we would have to face very greatly increased appropriations in the future.

Mr. KENYON. May I say to the Senator that I had intended to offer an amendment limiting the period of this appropriation to five years. If this plan shall not be a success in five years it never will be; five years will determine whether or not it can be successfully carried on; and, if it is successfully carried on, there will be no trouble about the funds. Under the bill there will be appropriated \$500,000 the first year, \$750,000 the second year, and \$1,000,000 after that.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As I have heretofore said, it is all a question of policy as to whether the Federal Government

should appropriate money for this purpose or whether the question of compensation for those injured in industry should be left to the States. I am very doubtful about that. When we are using every effort in this Congress to limit our appropriations and are practically taking an account of stock to see how we are situated in regard to necessary expenditures for the reorganization of our Army and our Navy, and when separate appropriations, a million dollars here and a million dollars there are demanded, for many objects—many of them worthy, no doubt—I think the Congress ought to hesitate. I do not believe that this question will suffer if we postpone it for a year or two. The Vocational Board already have imposed upon them great burdens in the supervision of vocational education under the act of Congress; they are administering now over \$3,000,000 and distributing it to the States; and yet they are reaching out seeking wider responsibility, wider and broader authority, and more money from the Congress. The question rests with the Congress whether it is our duty at this time to adopt the paternalistic policy of appropriating money to aid those who are injured in industry. I think that the cause is a very worthy one; but, in the condition in which we find the Public Treasury at this time, we ought to postpone this proposal for a year or two.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to give the Senate a little history of this bill. I introduced the bill at the last session of Congress, and it was substantially tendered as an amendment to the bill providing for the vocational rehabilitation of injured soldiers. I opposed such action at that time, and urged its friends not to press it. I did so because the study of the problem of special training for the injured and the partly disabled had not progressed very far in the United States, and I did not believe it practicable to undertake concurrently at that time special training for injured soldiers and special training for those disabled in other ways. I felt that the first charge upon the Nation should be the injured soldiers; that this responsibility was greater than for those generally disabled; and that we could not go too far in furnishing to the disabled soldier at complete national expense opportunity for any kind of preparation for the battle of life which money could give and which his remaining physical strength and mental capacity could utilize.

At that time I had appeals from all over the United States to add to the bill for the rehabilitation of the soldiers legislation looking toward national aid and stimulation for the rehabilitation of all partly disabled persons. I have here in my hand [exhibiting] a portion of the communications and resolutions received from practically every State in the Union, from the real students of human health and from the students of vocational training.

It was a new subject. We had gone on with our educational system since the early history of our Government without giving any special thought or study to the problem as to what might be done for those partly disabled physically. During the years of the past and until the present war no Government of which I know had studied the problem of retraining for work the disabled soldier and saving him from the mortification of penury. It is not simply the question of his ability to take care of himself or taking care of him but the privilege of taking care of himself that is even more important.

There had been in Belgium for a number of years a little school where special study had been given to the rehabilitation of the injured. With the first onslaught of the Germans the school was broken up. The leader reached France and there started a school for the rehabilitation of injured soldiers. Then England and other nations took up the work, and it was found that by special study of the individual case and by special study of the fields of occupation it was practicable to do much to prepare for particular lines of occupation those partly disabled. Within the past four years the consciousness has come to the world that the injured and physically unfortunate may be made the object of special study, and that as a result of special study along various occupational lines fields of employment may be opened and preparation for particular occupations given to those who otherwise might be almost beggars.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator know that education is a matter of evolutionary development and that we are employing now in our schools within the States methods of teaching that are very much in advance of those that existed but a few years ago? In the University of Wisconsin, inspired in part by the splendid work of the distinguished Senator from that State [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who was governor and served his State with

ability for years, the University of Wisconsin has become not a beggar at the hands of the Federal Government, but has become a shining light upon the pathway of educational development and social and economic progress. That State did not come with cap in hand, bow before the Federal Government, and ask for bounties and aid; it set the pace, and other States, following it, engaged in happy rivalry, and they have made progress—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will answer the Senator's question.

Mr. KING. Let me complete the sentence.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Very well.

Mr. KING. That State and other States years ago made provision for the blind and for the deaf, and have developed wonderful schools to care for those who are unfortunate; so that, little by little, indeed—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I beg the Senator not to do more than ask me a question and let me answer him.

Mr. KING. I apologize to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will not consume a great deal of time, and I believe I can use it better if I do not have the able speech of the Senator from Utah injected into the midst of mine.

Mr. KING. I apologize to my distinguished friend. I am sure that he will make a far better speech than I, but I wish him to remember the fact that civilization and education are flowers of slow growth; they do not, as Minerva did, spring all at once from the brow of Jove; we have to grow.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I agree with the Senator that education is a matter of evolution; I agree with him also that the University of Wisconsin has done wonderful work; I agree with him that we have made progress all over the United States in practically every State in developing schools for the blind and the deaf; but even the great University of Wisconsin did not broadly take up the subject of vocational work for the injured generally, and the University of Wisconsin, through its great leaders, as appears from the papers I have before me, are asking for this contribution in order that a study may be made of the Nation-wide problem by the Nation itself.

Now, let me go on, and let the Senator understand what I mean by the bill. I speak for myself alone. Something over a year and a half ago—about two years ago—when we realized that our own boys would come home to us legless, armless, and injured in many other ways so that their former lines of occupation could not be followed, under the leadership and by the aid of the Red Cross, we sent a commission to Canada to study what they were doing toward the vocational rehabilitation of men injured while in the army; that is to say, toward the study, first, of what lines of occupation might be followed by men partially disabled physically, and then how schools could be opened where the injured could be fitted for various lines of occupation. We had quite elaborate hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor and reported a bill to the Senate providing for the vocational training of our injured soldiers, the work to be done entirely at national expense. It was then from all over the United States that appeals came to me as chairman of the committee to add a provision for the training of all those injured in industry.

The Manufacturers' Association of the United States came forward with an appeal; the railroad organizations came forward with an appeal; those who were connected with industry and knew of the many accidents that happened to their employees came urging the National Government to appropriate money for the study of this question and to help stimulate in the States intelligent attention to the rehabilitation of the injured in any line.

Not only that; all over the country labor organizations, those who did the work, coming from the men who received the injuries, passed resolutions appealing for an amendment to our soldiers' bill adding all injured in industry. I will not stop to read these resolutions to you, but I think I can say that they are from every State, not in the same language, not manufactured by machinery, but coming from the hearts and brains of humans who are really human.

It was hard for me to resist their appeal at that time, but I believed it unwise to undertake then more than the rehabilitation of the soldiers. We had not a sufficient number of men and women engaged in vocational training who had studied this subject, who had specialized on vocational occupations for the injured. Why, indeed, our Vocational Educational Board, as soon as the subject first arose, gladly accepted the offer of the Red Cross, and sent a dozen of its best men and women into Canada, who stayed there two or three months, to see what progress—what evolution, in the language of the Senator from Utah—had been made there toward helping to fit the physically disqualified for profitable occupation.

After conferring with the board and its director, we agreed that it would be best to defer the general work until the board

had had a year or two of developing instructors, studying the problem, and handling the soldiers. This bill I promised to introduce at the time I declined to press it as a part of the vocational rehabilitation of the soldiers. I promised these various agencies then that just as soon as we were well under way with our work for the soldiers, as soon as the Federal Board for Vocational Education believed it was ready and the country was ready to move forward intelligently with a reasonable number of prepared experts toward the training of all injured in industries and otherwise, I would present the bill, and I presented it as a separate measure.

Now let me give you what I contemplate may be accomplished by this measure.

I do not object to the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa that we limit this appropriation to five years. It is not my idea that this money is to be a constant appropriation. I think eventually it will be the work of the States alone. I think eventually it should be the work of the States alone. I think eventually it will go into our general vocational educational work, and that the appropriation under our general vocational bill will be ample for the permanent stimulus which the National Government will give to vocational education; and I shall vote for the amendment to limit the appropriation of the million dollars to five years. I am willing to tell the States in advance: "We are only going to help you with information and broad study. We are only going to help you with this start, which you must duplicate to get a dollar of it. You must put up as much as you get from the National Government." The average will be about \$25,000, I think, to a State. The State will have to put up an equal sum.

Now, of course, \$50,000 from a State will not carry the education of these cripples and these helpless persons. What it will do will be this: It will provide for a line of special study of classes of injured, and carry the result of that special study into the industrial and educational systems of the States. That is my view of it, and that is the view of the Federal board; but it is a subject that has been completely neglected, it is a subject which we had never thought about seriously, and the world had never thought much about until this war, and had never realized the possibilities that may come from the special study and the evolution in training that can grow out of that special study.

What I hope is this: As our soldiers who have been injured pass away from the special training they are receiving, as they finish their special training—which I think will take place, as to most of them, practically all, in two years' time—I think we should stimulate the States to join the Nation in utilizing the forces that we have developed for the special training of the soldiers, and have them take up the training of the injured and crippled generally; and I think this bill now will come right in behind the training of the soldiers and will be an inspiration to the States and a help to the States to take up the work that has been begun, to take up the experts who have been trained and continue that work for all. Now, of course, it would not carry the expense as we do in the case of injured soldiers. It is simply to carry into our schools, into our systems, into our vocational training quickly that which had not been considered prior to the last few years, but that which has recently been found of so much value.

I sat at all the hearings before this committee, where experts came to us from Canada, from the Red Cross, and from across the ocean, telling how injured men have been taught to do something that I would have thought it utterly impossible for them to do. Five years ago if anybody had suggested this to me I would have thought it was idealistic and impossible, but it has been done. The necessities of the situation brought it about.

I want to say that the hearings of the experts about what was accomplished to help the maimed and the halt and the blind, and the chance to serve in that way, touched me perhaps more—the certainty of good and the certainty of no harm—than anything that has happened before in my service in the Senate. We see something that we hope is good, but careful thought suggests the possibility of harm and danger alongside of it; but here is all good. If but one out of ten could be put on his feet, if but one out of ten could be taken from the field of charity into the privilege of independence and self-support, oh, what a blessed thing it is to help that one! The pathos and the beauty with which those engaged in the work told the story of accomplishment would have touched a heart of stone—the joy that had been brought into the lives of those who served from the joy they had brought into the lives of those who were served. It was almost a benediction to have the privilege of listening to them.

Now, Mr. President, what is this bill? It does not propose to have the National Government take charge of this work. It proposes that the National Government, through the Federal

Board for Vocational Education, which has general charge of our continuing appropriation, which in 1924 will amount to about \$9,000,000 a year, shall, with the aid of the States, first have a fund to continue for itself this study that it has begun for the soldiers, and give that information to the States and to the schools of the States. It provides that in addition to that a small sum of money—about \$25,000 average, I think it is—shall go to each State which will undertake the special study and the special handling of the rehabilitation of the unfortunate. That is all; and our hope is to catch them at this moment, when they see their boys who have come home from abroad being helped by special training, to catch their imaginations. This is the hour to do it—to catch their imaginations and their hearts and put them into this work. If we catch them, and they take it up, and they go on with it for three or four years, nothing can stop it. It will not need any more national money. It will become a part then, through evolution, of what they do in the schools. They will have to be shown what has really been accomplished.

I say again to the Senator from Utah that when I came to the Senate I would have voted against any such scheme, because I would not have thought there was anything in it; but I know now that there is something in it, and I want to help to give the unfortunate of my country a chance to derive the benefit. I do not expect this fund to do the work, except by stimulating the State schools and carrying to them the information as to how it can be done. I expect it to be the process of producing in our school systems throughout the United States an evolution that will bring a closer study of all the unfortunates—the physically unfortunate—a closer study in the schools and in the States of their special cases and what should be done for them.

The blind and the deaf suggested to the States that one special work, and they went at it. Just as surely as they start this work and continue it for the five years there will no longer be any necessity for national contribution to it. The Federal board, with the experts that it has gathered around it, with the information that it has gathered, with the possibilities that it will open up to the mind and the imagination and the observation of the educators of the country and the people of the country, will give such an onward movement to this line of work that it will almost carry itself thereafter.

This is my conception of the bill. I am giving you the view as it was brought to me by experts from the Red Cross, by experts from Europe, by experts from Canada, by students of education who have become interested in it and approve it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as a member of the committee which reported this bill, I feel it appropriate that I should give some reasons for my support of it.

I do not think I have witnessed more pitiful scenes in my life than those I have observed from time to time in the homes of people where the breadwinner of the family had met with an industrial accident. I have seen repeatedly men in industrial life who have lost an arm or a leg go home to their families, and then their wife or young children forced away from home and school and obliged to go to work in the factories to earn the necessary money to support their crippled husband or father. Why should the man or woman whose only offense was that he had met with an accident in industrial life be obliged to become a dependent and bring burdens to those who naturally look to him for support? I consider it a reflection upon our foresight that we have not long ago met this industrial problem and found a solution for it. It is the Government's work to solve it.

What is there about our Government that attracts the oppressed and the weak of the whole world to it? It is that our Government does more to promote the happiness and the well-being of the human family than any other Government. There can be no such happiness unless a Government is trying to remove misery, poverty, and suffering; and there is great, unnecessary suffering and poverty now endured by altogether too many through industrial accidents.

Mr. President, so I give my hearty support to this bill, because, in my opinion, it will supply something that the Government owes the unfortunate. Without hesitancy we pass health laws, we provide education for our young people, and we promote opportunities for employment. There is not a Senator on this floor who would vote against the enactment of a good-health law. There is not a Senator on this floor who would vote against the passage of an ordinary educational bill; but the man or woman who is unfortunate enough to have been injured in industrial life we discard, and deny him or her the most humane of all forms of assistance from the Government—another chance to learn an honorable occupation.

It is as proper and necessary a function of Government to take the boys and the girls and the men and women who have met through no fault of theirs with accidents in industrial life

and been impaired in their usefulness and provide them with the education to rehabilitate them, as it is a proper function of the Government to take the child and train and educate him—for what? To be able to earn a livelihood, to be able to prepare himself to take advantage of the industrial opportunities of life, and to prevent his becoming a public charge or a burden for years upon others who must thereafter deny themselves opportunities and comforts that otherwise they would and should enjoy.

So this bill seeks to provide a means of rehabilitating those who now, because they have met with industrial accidents, are obliged to live upon the toil and labor and sacrifices of others.

It is pitiful to think that not until a few years ago did we appreciate the necessity of a workman's compensation law; and that has only gone part way in solving this problem. That has simply removed a part of the financial burden for a time. Here is a long step forward; the Government, through this measure, reaches out its hands to these unfortunates and says, "Here is a chance for you. We will give you a vocational education. We will provide a new opportunity for you to earn a livelihood. We will help you free yourself from becoming a pauper. We will free you from bringing misery and suffering to your family and those dependent upon you."

Mr. President, it seems to me it is a splendid step forward for our National Government to say to the States, "The time has come to do something for this unfortunate class." We owe it to them. We owe it to them because it is our bounden duty to remove misery and suffering and poverty as far as the Government can do it, and especially when it comes without fault through mere chance or accident.

The States have not made much headway with this question, though some of the States have attempted to pass laws on the subject. My own State has given much study to this problem, and our public-spirited citizens have been giving a very great deal of time and attention to it; but for some reason or other there has not yet been devised a satisfactory solution. The National Government now asks the States to interest themselves in this problem, to turn their attention to it, to appreciate that here is an evil and injury that the Government should take notice of and seek to adopt some steps to remove.

Mr. President, for these reasons it seems to me to be a function of Government, a basic one, a fundamental one, as important as the health, as important as the education of the young, the education and the training and the refitting for useful occupation of those who are injured in industry. I, therefore, heartily give my support to this measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I indorse absolutely the eloquent and forceful statements of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. He has put the case splendidly. As a member of this committee, I, too, am very greatly in favor of the bill.

I think the matter can be best stated to the Senate by pointing out, if I may, exactly what a vote on this bill means. If Senators vote for the bill, they vote to aid the maimed and injured who are without sufficient means to provide for their own rehabilitation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No, Mr. President; that amendment has not been put into the bill, and I do not think it ought to be.

Mr. McKELLAR. I differ with the Senator entirely. The amendment has been put in the bill by the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I shall oppose adding that, because, if the Senator will pardon me just a moment—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. This money will not go simply to an individual. It will go in training teachers and in special study, and all will get the benefit of it, whether they are paupers, whether they have something, whether they were injured without fault, or whether they are the waifs on the street. It will help teach how to rehabilitate the injured. Only twenty-odd thousand dollars goes to each State, I want to say to the Senator, under this provision, and it will be used in public schools. It will be used in public institutions; and you can not afford to say that because a man's father has something he can not go to a public school or a public institution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the bill as reported out of the committee has the language that I have read. It applies to those maimed or injured persons who are without sufficient means to provide for their own rehabilitation. I think that limitation should be in this bill. If it is an experiment, as the Senator from Georgia says, we ought to experiment with those of our citizenship who are unable to rehabilitate themselves. Those who are financially able to rehabilitate themselves need no aid from the Government. If the appropriation is small in the beginning, as he says, it is all the greater reason

why we should take care of these maimed and wounded and injured who are unable to rehabilitate themselves, and I hope that this amendment of the committee will be agreed to. It should be agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will excuse me just a moment, then I will yield. I had to digress by reason of the interruption of the Senator from Georgia.

I want to say again that I hope no Senator will vote against this bill, and if he does vote against it, I want him to understand what he is voting against. When he votes against this bill he votes against the young men and women who have been injured in industry who are unable to have themselves rehabilitated so that they can earn a livelihood in this great country of ours. It is a direct issue. Are you going to vote for and stand by this helpless class of our citizenship or are you going to vote against this and leave to their own utter helplessness this helpless class of our citizenship? The question is directly up to you in this bill.

Now is the time of all times to put it into operation. Why? We have just established a Federal Vocational Board of training and rehabilitation for maimed and wounded soldiers. This is put under the direction of that board. It is easy enough, with one organization, to do the whole work. There never was a better opportunity. These gentlemen constituting that board are well fitted for the work. They have it in hand. It will just mean an additional class of persons to whom the act applies. Practically no additional overhead charges. Now is the time, and it will do almost as much good if carried out as it will to the maimed and wounded soldiers themselves. I think that the bill we passed last year for the rehabilitation of wounded and maimed soldiers was one of the greatest bills that was ever passed by this body, and this is only second to it; and it ought to be added to it, and added to it without delay and without debate. The wounded soldiers come first, but surely this stricken, helpless, suffering class comes next. We have done our duty by our wounded soldiers in this matter. Now let us do our full duty by this deserving and helpless class.

The Senator from New Jersey says that he is opposed to it now because it is his and our desire to economize. I am always in favor of economy. We ought to economize, but I ask the Senate not to economize at the expense of the helpless, the maimed, the wounded, and injured people of our country. Do not let us economize at the expense of the helpless. Let us cut off some of the appropriations that go to those who can help themselves in this country, but do not let us start to economize at such a place. The Lord knows we can find better cases in which to economize than in this case. It is a false economy not to build up and make self-supporting and happier these deserving cripples.

Both the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] have expressed themselves as being in favor of an amendment to limit this work to five years. I hope such an amendment will not be adopted. It ought not to be adopted. It ought to be the permanent policy of the Government to aid in the rehabilitation of these injured and unfortunate persons.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I am as much in favor of this being made permanent as is the Senator from Tennessee, but there are objections made particularly by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to appropriating a sum that is to run on year after year without end. It was my thought—and I think it was the same with the Senator from Georgia—that this work will show within five years what can be accomplished. There will be no trouble if it is a success as a policy in procuring appropriations from Congress. Five years will demonstrate if it is not to be a success, and then the matter can be dropped. It is because of that feeling against permanent annual appropriations that we felt inclined to make the limitation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to have heard this statement from the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], because I know how he feels on these questions generally. I know he is a forward-looking man, a progressive statesman, and I am glad to hear him say he is still of the view that it ought to be permanent.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield in just a moment. It ought to be permanent. It is going to be permanent. If we pass this bill, we might as well make up our minds that the people are never going to permit this splendid work to be stopped, and we might as well make up our minds to another matter: It is not started now except in some States, and there in a very meager way, and what this bill is going to do is to start this

splendid work in every State in our Union, and they are going to keep it up when the Federal Congress keeps it up. It is going to be like many other of such policies that we have established in this country, a mutual policy between the States and the Federal Government, and while I think in a sense it is immaterial whether we limit it to five years or not, because succeeding Congresses will certainly keep it in force, yet I am not in favor and I shall vote against the amendment putting a limitation of time on it, because I do not believe there ought to be any limitation on it. I think it ought to be a permanent policy of this Government, and we might as well adopt it now.

I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to say to the Senator that my willingness to limit the appropriation to five years was in no sense due to any thought that the work would ever stop, but this bill will for the next five years furnish special stimulation and special instruction and special advice. From that time on we will be appropriating \$9,000,000 to vocational education, and the rehabilitation of the injured or defective will become a part of our vocational educational system in every State that nothing could stop. That was my view of it. If at the end of five years we shall find that it needs special stimulation, of course I would vote for further special appropriation, but I feel so convinced of its wisdom and so convinced of its value that I have little doubt that this special line of study and special line of instruction will become a thorough and complete part of the vocational training of the entire country.

Mr. MCKELLAR. So certain am I that it is going to become a part of our vocational training in this country that I have no doubt whatever about it. I will say I think it is immaterial, but I believe the friends of the measure ought to stand together to make it permanent. I know the Senator from Georgia feels about it exactly as I do; I have heard him express his views on the subject. I know he is one of the strongest friends of vocational education. This is his bill, and I hope he will change his mind and vote with us to make his work permanent. It is a humane undertaking in which we are about to embark, and we ought to fix it right in the beginning and stand by it. We ought to enlarge it instead of curtailing it in any way. There are going to be maimed and wounded and injured young men and women in industry as long as time shall last. They are not for this year or for next year or for five years, but they will be coming on every year. It is a duty the National Government as well as the State governments should perform, notwithstanding the objection of my distinguished friend from Utah [Mr. KING]. I do not know whether he has objected yet or not, but I know that he will, though I hope he will not. I hope there will be no vote against this measure. There ought not to be a vote against the State governments functioning and the National Government functioning in harmony under a law to aid the helpless, injured, and wounded in industry or otherwise. We who are not physically disabled should never let an opportunity pass to restore, to build up, to give larger activity, to give better means of mental and physical occupation to those of our fellow beings who have been so unfortunate as to in part lose their limbs or physical senses. This bill, in my judgment, is the true way to be the just friends of the blind, the deaf, the halt, and the maimed. No nobler or truer function of government can be imagined than of building up this unfortunate class of our citizenship.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, this is one of the most difficult bills to criticize that could be brought into this Chamber, because it is directed to the charitable impulses that prevail in every right-minded person's heart. I apprehend that the bill has not yet been interpreted in this body to cover many of the beneficiaries who would not appeal to that charitable impulse if it were understood now what relief is to be extended to the latter kind.

Let me make the suggestion that in order to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and who are without sufficient means, and so forth, if it is for those who have been injured in the military or naval service of the United States, why not say so? If it is to cover the persons injured in the industrial army in peace, why not say so? Why not limit it, in other words, to the military and industrial part of the population?

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I think it is the purpose of the advocates of the bill and those who have drafted it that it shall not apply to the military or naval forces of the United States or to those who have been injured while serving in the naval or military forces of the United States. The bill which was passed during the last session covers the rehabilitation of wounded soldiers and sailors, but it is, as I interpret it, and as I understand the at-

titude of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], to be devoted exclusively to those who are injured in industrial occupations or who are ill or who by reason of any cause whatever suffer any physical or mental disability or deterioration which precludes them from earning a livelihood.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask the Senator from Iowa if the interpretation of the Senator from Utah is correct?

Mr. KENYON. As the Senator from Illinois is aware, we passed a bill about a year ago taking care of the soldiers and sailors. The other day we passed another bill still further taking care of them. They are absolutely precluded from this act. The act does not say so in terms, but that is thoroughly understood. It applies to men injured in occupation and otherwise.

Mr. SHERMAN. Why then No. 3?

Mr. KENYON. What is No. 3?

Mr. SHERMAN. This is No. 3. You have already enumerated two, one passed a year or so ago and one passed a week or so ago.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] has explained that when the bill was brought forward a year ago it was considered rather an urgent matter for soldiers and sailors, and while we were importuned also to put in men injured in industry, we thought that that should be left out, to be taken care of in a further bill. No. 2 was the bill passed a few days ago, which I introduced simply to take care of soldiers and sailors who could not secure the vocational rehabilitation because of a certain ruling of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, which excluded those men, so that the first two are really only one for soldiers and sailors. This bill is for those injured in industries and otherwise.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It was really a correction of what we did not expect the interpretation of the department to be.

Mr. KENYON. It was to take care of an erroneous ruling by the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

Mr. SHERMAN. If this is to take care of the industrially injured, why not limit it so in the bill?

Mr. KENYON. That is a fair question. It is a fair dispute, and it was the subject of dispute before the committee. Shall the bill take care of men merely in industries? And when I say "take care of" I use it merely in the form of a stimulation of the State, because it is not taking care of anything. If so, that does not take care of a man hurt upon a farm. We thought the term "occupation" should be used instead of "industry," as that takes in men on farms and men in factories.

If the Senator will follow me, that was No. 2. No. 3: Shall we go further than that and provide for taking care of men and women no matter how they are injured? That is going a long ways, there is no doubt about it, and there was some opposition to that in the committee, but we finally decided to put it in. It would bring up a fight, we supposed, on the floor.

Let me give the Senator an illustration. I used an illustration the other day, and I will use another one to-day. Here is a bum on the street run over by an automobile—an arm cut off or a leg cut off. He is under this bill. If the State has provided for that kind of a case, this money can go to that use; and I appeal to the Senator why should it not be so used?

If you can take a bum who is a liability upon society and by some kind of training make a good citizen out of him or put him in a place to do work instead of throwing him on the scrap heap for charity or for the poorhouse, have you not really done not only a humane thing but a sound economic thing for the country besides? That is the argument. I admit that there are two sides to it, that it covers a wide range, and possibly we do not want to go that far. Possibly it is too humane, possibly it is too idealistic, possibly we have not reached the point yet where we can see economic value in that thing. That is what we intend to do in this bill. I do not want to deceive the Senator at all; and if that goes too far the Senator can move to strike out the words "or otherwise" and thus raise the point.

Mr. SHERMAN. If it were to further take care of those disabled in military life, so far as this branch of the argument is involved, I do not apprehend there would be any dispute about it. I am willing to go further and apply it to those injured in industrial life and let it extend to those who are injured in agriculture or in any legitimate occupation, limiting it to those who are injured or disabled in a given lawful pursuit. If this is merely cumulative, intended to be supplemental, in other words, to former legislation, some a year or so ago and some a week or so ago, on this branch of it I would have no objection to such a measure.

But we are to go further in this bill, and, upon the merits of the bill as very frankly avowed by the Senator from Iowa

with his usual candor in the discussion of public measures, we are to take up all of the social rubbish—if I may be allowed the expression—all the adult failures, the industrially and vocationally and temperamentally and physically and mentally unfit and regard them as the wards of the States or of the Government, and try the experiment of making over an adult failure. Let that experiment rest on the State. The Government ought not enter upon that undertaking.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator pardon me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PITTMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Let me throw out this suggestion to the Senator from Illinois. Suppose the State, stimulated under this leadership, had in one of its cities a school to teach the blind how to operate typewriters. Here is a young fellow hurt on a railroad. That is an industry. Here is another one hurt out on a farm who is blind. There are two. Here is another boy who accidentally blew his eyes out with a little powder, not in an industry at all. Would you not allow him to go into that school and learn how to work too?

What I want to impress upon the Senator is that we do not give anything to them. We are not proposing to take them like we do the soldiers and bear their expenses and pay for their board and pay for their clothes. We hope to open up special schools that can teach the injured how to do something. We first started at the industries and stopped there. That was our idea. Then we thought we had to add the farms, and we added them. Then we got to thinking about some in neither. If the chance for training was there, would you exclude them? That was what was in our minds, and in perfect candor I am telling the Senator, because I think it will appeal to him just like it did to us.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Illinois, before he replies to the Senator from Georgia, permit me to propound one question to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Georgia say that the language to which he has just called attention would limit the aid to mere instruction? As I read the language, it would mean that we would have to care for them. I am making no comment upon the wisdom or lack of wisdom, the justice or injustice, of doing so, but these are the words:

That in order to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and who are without sufficient means to provide for their own rehabilitation and their return to civil employment, there is hereby appropriated—

And so forth.

Do not those words, when properly interpreted, imply a duty upon the part of those who accept this appropriation to rehabilitate them and fit them to return to private employment, and in so doing, if the individual is unable to provide food and clothing for himself, manifestly the duty would rest upon the Government and upon the State, through the instrumentality provided, to support him?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think so. I think the amount given, when proportioned to the number to be reached, makes it utterly impossible that that should take place.

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Illinois will excuse me. Of course, it makes it impossible to do that; I concede that; but that would merely call for additional appropriations because of the futility of the bill.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that the only purpose, as I understand it, for which this money will be used will be for providing a course of instruction and the placing in employment of disabled persons. If there is any question about it, I have prepared an amendment to introduce to one of the sections covering that feature.

Mr. KING. Let me say to the Senator from Iowa, if I may still crave the indulgence of my friend from Illinois, if the Federal Government under the limitations of the Constitution, keeping in view our dual form of Government and the duties and obligations resting upon the States, may go into the States and take the individual and educate him, either industrially or intellectually, then I can not see any reason why the Federal Government may not support him while he is being educated. If there is obligation to educate him industrially and intellectually, there is a corresponding obligation upon the Federal Government to feed him and clothe him during that period, particularly if poverty prevents him from clothing and feeding himself. You can not in principle draw the line of cleavage between the mere function of educating and feeding and cloth-

ing while being educated, because to educate the individual he would have to be fed and clothed during the process of education.

Mr. KENYON. If the Senator from Illinois will pardon me, I would not draw the line personally at all on that. I would not object to seeing the Federal Government take care of him while he was getting this training. But this bill does not go that far, and consequently the Senator can not have legitimately the objection which he raises. This does not go into the States and take charge of the education. It does not go into the States and tell the States what they have to do. It simply says, if you submit plans to the Federal board which are satisfactory to the Federal board, you will have your proportion of this money as set forth in the bill. If you do not want to do that you need not participate in the bill or have anything to do with it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, this is like a number of other bills that are pending here. They all land at the same destination finally. It is like the educational bill, which provides for the distribution among the States of a considerable sum of money from the Federal Treasury. It all gets finally to the same place, as far as this particular feature of it is involved. They are no more nor less than bribes, open and direct, to the State authorities.

The States themselves have certain reserved powers. Every Senator is quite familiar with the limitations on those powers, what have been granted away and what of them still remain. Many assaults have been made by Congress, at more or less complaisant sessions, upon those powers. The courts have been full of them. The law libraries are full of cases where Congress has undertaken to destroy these powers by invasive legislation, and the courts have protected these reserved powers. That is another branch of this investigation, and just at the present time I do not care to pursue it further, except to note the fact that destruction or invasion has not been successful because of the guardianship and the watchful care of the judicial department of the Federal Government.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator used an expression just a moment ago that is quite interesting to me, and it reminded me of a similar statement made by former Senator Morgan, the great Democratic Senator from Alabama, whose doctrine at one time was believed in by Democrats, and whom Democrats were proud to follow at one time, but apparently his doctrine is forgotten now, and Democrats as well as Republicans follow false gods with respect to the powers of the Federal Government. Will the Senator permit me to read just a sentence or two?

Mr. SHERMAN. I shall be glad to have the Senator read it.

Mr. KING. Senator Morgan was speaking of a bill, with which the Senator is familiar, which was introduced in 1886 into the Senate of the United States by Senator Blair, of New Hampshire, for the purpose of appropriating \$77,000,000 to the States for educational purposes. There were limitations there, and he said it would be a bad thing to fasten a permanent policy upon the Government such as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has pleaded so eloquently for. In commenting upon the Blair bill and the bribes of the Federal Government, by making contributions to the States and the States thereby relinquishing a part of their sovereignty and a part of their duty, he used this expression:

This bill assails that class. It assails them not merely with a taxing power, but it takes from their own pockets their own gold as a bribe and holds it before their eyes and asks them to submit to taxation in order that they may receive the sham reward. That is done too often in this country. It is done in many systems of laws against which I always object, for I do not see why it is that we should take money out of one pocket of a laboring man and transfer it to the other diminished by the amount that shall stick to the hands of the middleman as it goes through and flatter him that we are promoting his welfare. This is a bill to create offices. It is a bill to elaborate the machinery of Government. It is a bill to take away from the people of this country the right to make their voluntary contribution for the education of their own children, and to put that sacred duty into the hands of Congress.

I might say in passing, if the Senator from Illinois will pardon me, that this bill takes \$200,000 out of the limited appropriation for one year, as I understand it, for salaries for this Vocational Board that already has a multitude of employees who are receiving all the way up to \$10,000 apiece, so that more than one-tenth of this appropriation is to be paid as compensation to men who are already drawing salaries from the Government of the United States. We tax the people of Illinois and the people of Iowa and the people of Georgia, and after a part only of it gets into the Treasury, because the overhead expenses are enormous, a portion of it filters back to those States again, filtering through the hands of a multitude of officials who take 5 or 10 or 15 or 20 per cent of it. So when the people of Georgia or Illinois come to get back the original dollar that they paid

in taxes, they will get perhaps 70 or 75 cents on the dollar. That is a little better than bankruptcy, however.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the 40 per cent of this appropriation of \$500,000 for the first year, 1919, is all that is to be taken in a pay roll, I am amazed at the moderation of the department having it in charge. I have never known anything to be so reasonable. Usually it is about 60 per cent in these enterprises. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is sound in his criticism, although it is not as bad as it might be or as bad as it will be later on. Those things always grow in due proportion. The Senator has touched an elemental weakness in the whole scheme.

These sums of money therefore are used to invade these reserved powers of the States when Congress or the department has failed to break down those powers by direct assault. It is proposed that every State legislature, and in the interim when there is no State legislature the governor, as provided in one of the sections, will accept the provisions of this bill in order to obtain the distributive share of the sum provided.

Take the limitation mentioned by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], that if the person is an adult and is injured, no reason exists why he ought not to be taken and trained so that he may be able to earn a livelihood. Go that far, if there be merit in it, but if the person is of the kind already subject to the poor laws of the State or has no visible means of support and has had no occupation previous to the time of being disabled, this bill advances beyond that limitation and places a premium upon all the idle social misfits and failures of human society. It is to that part of the bill that I direct my criticism. Take the extreme limit of a part of the population and carry it as far as the Senator from Georgia has suggested. If they are without means and have been of previous industrial life that has not put them in the vagrant class, in the class supported by the poor laws or the habitually criminal, let them have the relief under the bill; but there ought to be a limitation in all human decency so that we do not by this bill place a premium upon the vagrant, the criminal, and the worthless.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. How does the Senator reach the conclusion that it places a premium upon those persons? A man can not have this training unless he is disabled. Surely a man is not going to have his hand or his leg cut off in order to get the training? Where is the premium that is placed upon it?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly I will explain that. A man has, we will say, reached the age of 40 years—to follow out the Senator's illustration given awhile ago—and he is run over by some plutocrat's automobile on the streets of Des Moines, Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. There are no plutocrats in Iowa; confine it to the senatorial automobiles in Washington.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understand that no Senator ever admits that there is a plutocrat in his own State. Nevertheless their habitat is in every State in the Union. I do not know in all of the States such as belong to that classification, but in many of the States, where I know it is claimed with great vigor that they do not exist, they are nevertheless to be found. I can find them in Iowa. For many years I lived in the Mississippi River district running from above Burlington down to and below Keokuk and down to the Missouri State line. I apprehend that in the river towns, beginning with Dubuque and running down through Burlington, even in towns that are not regarded as the metropolis of the Hawkeye State, if I were to go into the interior, where the soil is richer, where more cattle and hogs are found, and where the forms of wealth are very largely noncorporate in character, belonging to the farmer, whose possessions and person are sacred both against legislation and against the declamations of statesmen, I could find plutocrats in the far interior between Council Bluffs and Burlington. I have known some of them. In fact some of them emigrated in an early day from Illinois and settled in that country when land was comparatively cheap, bought many thousand acres, and by the unearned increment, referred to by Henry George, in time they became most obnoxious plutocrats.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KENYON. One of them, who I am sure has not become obnoxious, emigrated from those same prairies of Iowa to Illinois, and became its governor, and is now its governor.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes. We approve of plutocrats in our State; we elect some of that alleged variety governor; we are not afraid of them; we encourage their settling within our borders, for thereby we are enabled to raise taxes, and if the Senator from Iowa will look at the income-tax returns, both cor-

porate and individual, in the State of their immigration he will find that the reason why we pay many fold more taxes than does Iowa is because we encourage gentlemen of ability to settle within our limits and to remain there. Invidious legislation does not drive them from the borders of our State, nor do we, by public opinion, seek to proscribe them. Therefore when I speak of a man being run over by the automobile of a plutocrat, Mr. President, thereby rendering him, as the Senator says, eligible under this bill to vocational instruction, he wants to know why it ought not at that period be given to him, because that is the only time he has ever been qualified by being disabled to receive such instruction.

I am talking about the man 40 or 50 years of age, not of the juvenile; about the one who has reached that period of life where both habits and mind are settled, where he is fixed in his methods of daily life, whatever they may be, whether they are of a reprehensible or of a commendable kind. In that event, under this bill it makes no difference what kind of a life he is living, he is taken, in part by appropriation under a measure of this kind, and given instruction. If before that time he was an industrious man, if he was not a vagrant, if he was not supported in whole or in part by public charity, if he was not a criminal, I am willing to go on this branch of the controversy that far in the bill, following the lead of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], but for that type of rapidly increasing number in this country I am not willing to say to them that if they suffer misfortune after being of that previous life the Government will thereby take them and make them its wards, educate them, and attempt to make something out of a broken wreck that was merely a sound physical wreck before. I am not willing to go that far, and that is where legitimate criticism of this bill begins.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. If the State of Illinois, for instance, adopted the policy of taking care of that kind of men and giving them vocational training and subsistence during the time, would the Senator object to any portion of the funds of the Federal Government under this act going to the State of Illinois?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KENYON. That would be entirely a matter for the State. If the State did not provide for taking care of that kind of men, then nothing would go to the State; it would be entirely up to the State.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; I should object to that.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for just a moment?

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] will pardon me, this bill goes further than that. While it is true it does not compel the Federal Government to make the appropriations unless it desires to do so, nevertheless the Federal Government may withhold the appropriations unless the plans adopted by the State meet the approval of the Federal board. Therefore this board may dictate the plans, for the State may be so desirous of getting the appropriation that it will yield to the suggestions of the Federal board. So in the end, as we all know, the plans will emanate from the Federal board, and the Federal board will be the omnipotent power that will devise the plans, superintend their execution, and control all of the activities of the State, as well, of course, as of the Federal agency.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, it is a very severe indictment of the State boards that they can be controlled by the Federal boards. I am too jealous of State rights, as advocated by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], to believe that any such thing can be brought about.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then, Mr. President, unless the State yields absolutely to the Federal authority, it will receive no money under this bill. If the State goes so far, let it do so; it is its own affair. But the Government ought not encourage it.

Allow me to give you a brief experience on those subjects. These projects are very numerous now, but they are as old as they are numerous in mere precedents. Of late years they have come along very, very rapidly. All such schemes that have been invented in the last 8 or 10 years are legion in number, but some 15 years ago in a certain State I knew of a geological and mineral survey being made by the State. It had appropriated for this purpose an adequate sum of money; the surveys were in progress by a competent corps of engineers, by geologists, by those skilled in that line of work, both on the

surface and below the surface of the earth. While they were conducting their work, from Washington came some one from the geological department connected with the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the United States. He happened to interview the Senator now having the floor, who was occupying a somewhat humble position at that time, but of some authority in the expenditure of money. He said that the Government would be glad to join; that it had a certain amount of money that could be expended for the joint purpose of obtaining a more extensive geological survey of the State than the State was itself likely to give.

I made some inquiry about it. He stated the sum of money, the number of employees he had, and that they would join with those of the State. Everything appeared to be agreeable. I thought probably it would be an arrangement that would be practicable. At the last moment, however, he submitted a requirement that all of the money of the State and its pay rolls should become absolutely subservient to the rules made in Washington in the department. It could not be a partnership affair at all. It must be exclusive; and so we separated. We did not need money that bad. We can yet levy and collect our own taxes adequate for such purposes.

The result was that some States yielded and got the contribution from the Treasury here, but other States did not. My own State did not yield. We therefore received no part of it. We conducted our survey to a conclusion, published it in a volume that I believe to be as valuable as the tomes that go out of the department here, for the coal miners, those engaged in the fluorspar mines, and of zinc and lead and every description in that country from the Ohio River to the Wisconsin lead regions, have been using that volume as an authority. We received none of the Government money because we would not surrender the power of the State; and not only that, but give our money and pay rolls into the custody of somebody in Washington. That was a local affair, and we conducted it to a conclusion as such affair wholly within the power of the State, as it was.

When these rules are to be made here by the Federal board, they will be imposed upon every State authority, and unless a State authority yields to the rules framed in Washington by this board, not one dollar will go to any State. The yielding State that is willing to surrender its own integrity and independence will be bribed by a golden flood of which they themselves pay a part. It is an old method of breaking down the proper power of the State.

Let me say to some of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber, you will go on in this way year after year until by custom, by what in effect I will call governmental bribery, by taking taxes that you yourselves in part pay, by breaking down the morale of your own State officers, by drugging the public conscience of your own State, by crossing the boundary until at last the line of demarcation will be obliterated, until finally the Government, acting through Congress and through departmental officers, will be framing your own election laws, and that, too, by some subtle form of bribery will be taken from you, or you will be clubbed, and that power, now one that is peculiarly local to every one of the 48 States of the Union, will be "more honored in the breach than the observance." That is for you to say. We shall take care of ourselves under any kind of a law. It is a question of whether or not you can. When that day comes you will be crying for help, and help, when it reaches that stage of public morale in your State officers and the limitations of the reserved powers of the State, will be very difficult to get.

There is always, Mr. President, a certain number of the population who are failures. It is an unpleasant thing to be compelled to refer to that part of any community. The Senator has asked whether we take care of them in our State. We do. There are two groups. We take care of certain unfortunate, the blind, both the juvenile and the adult; we take care of the feeble-minded, and of those who are mutilated or disabled. In every large State of the Union where there is any industrial life that is done. The phrase employed in this bill is "persons disabled." A person is disabled who mentally does not have sufficient vigor of understanding to learn any occupation by which he can make a living. This bill would invade the schools for the feeble-minded in every State in the Union. It would say to the management, the board of charities, or whatever authority in the State takes care of them, "If you will administer your schools for the feeble-minded under rules framed in Washington we will give you out of the Public Treasury a certain sum of money. If you do not let us take over and administer that power of the State, you can not have a dollar."

When it came to spending the money that is the way all of these sums of which I have had any practical knowledge have been administered in years past. I am not ready to have the schools for the feeble-minded in my State, the schools for the vocational training of those injured in industry, and the schools for those who are blind, either by accident or by disease or from birth, either the juvenile or the adult, turned over to some wise man in Washington who thinks he knows more about how to administer them in States of from six to twelve million population, running from the Atlantic seaboard through Pennsylvania out to Illinois, than we do ourselves. Still that is what this bill does.

The administration of such matters is one of the reserved rights of the States. If a soldier has been injured in the late war he can be taken care of under existing law, supplemented by this bill, if it be so limited. Let it be limited then to the soldier who has been injured and I will make no criticism of that; in fact, I will join with other Senators as cordially as anyone for such vocational rehabilitation. It ought to be done.

I will go further, to restate now the limit: I will help, through contributions from the Public Treasury, the vocational rehabilitation of the industrial army, because a large part of the industrially disabled are engaged in occupations producing merchandise or commodities which eventually go into interstate trade and become a part of the interstate commerce of the country. I will go even further than that and say that any person of previous good life, of industrious habits, who has not been supported by the poor laws, who is not an habitual vagrant and not a criminal, may be included in this bill; but I do object to throwing the benefits of such an act as this around the vagrant, the criminal, the worthless, and the vagabond who never did anything until he had his leg cut off. In that event, as the Senator says, he is to be taken in hand by the Government and trained to become a useful citizen. I simply say, Mr. President, it can not be done. Such a proposal takes no heed of the changeless conditions of human life. After a man has reached the period when he has hardened down into what he is in this world, do you think you can make over the broken instrument, the failure of life? Some Senators may suppose that can be done, but I am not quite that optimistic. Let such failures go to the poorhouse. That is a harsh phrase; I am not saying to the "almshouse"; I am saying the "poorhouse" in the good old way. These are with others enumerated the second group.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. If such a man goes to the poorhouse, who supports him—the State, does it not?

Mr. SHERMAN. The State.

Mr. KENYON. If, instead of going to the poorhouse, you can train that man so that he can support himself, do you not perform a good economic service for the State? Is not that worth while?

Mr. SHERMAN. That is the Senator's statement. The kind of individual to whom I refer is the one who, either by the providence of God or the misfortune of the man himself—I do not know what it is and I will not undertake to fix the responsibility—is beyond all human help.

Mr. KENYON. There is no man beyond help; there is no man so low that he can not be helped; there is no man so low that there is not a spark of manhood in him somewhere, and if you get hold of it you can make a man of him. Otherwise you decry all the religion in which we believe.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from Iowa has a good theory, but it is utterly inapplicable in practice. I wish he were right; I know he is not. I have lived in a jurisdiction of from six to six and one-half millions of people, containing the second largest city on the Western Hemisphere, and I have dealt with those who came and went out again on the tide of a great population.

Mr. KENYON. They may never have had a chance to do anything else. Give them a chance and see what they will do.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have heard from the reformers on the lecture platform that some men never had a chance; but I say, Mr. President, there is not anybody in this Republic of ours with the average wits which the Almighty gave him and of ordinary physical health who did not have a chance.

Such an average person who had no chance does not exist. I have heard from infancy the statement made by the Senator from Iowa, but I repeat that in this country of ours the person of average physical health, of average understanding, whether he had a dollar in the world to begin with or not, who has reached maturity, is an adult and is a failure, has nobody under the blue vault of heaven to complain about but himself.

That is where we vitally differ—upon one of the elemental things of human life—and that is where this bill is basically wrong. It takes no account of that immutable boundary that the Creator has fixed between the failure and the success. I am not ready to put a premium, therefore, on the failures of life. When the Senator asks me how I am able to make such an inference from the provisions of this bill, I reply that that is how I draw that inference, and I think it is fairly a legitimate result of this bill as it is written, beginning with section 1 and running through all of its operative provisions. Let me read—

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. Why does not the Senator make a test on that question? It is a fair question for a test, and it could be easily made by moving to strike out the words "or otherwise," in lines 4 and 5. The Senate could vote on that question. That is a fair matter of dispute. I do not agree with the Senator, but there will be other Senators who will agree with him, and if those words go out—

Mr. SHERMAN. The objection I have just voiced I would not urge further if the words "or otherwise" are stricken out, so that the bill will apply only to those disabled in industry.

Mr. KENYON. I say the Senator can make the test by moving to strike out the words "or otherwise."

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, Mr. President, I anticipate what the result would be. There is a wave of maudlin sentiment washing over this country which will not subside until we have been impaired in our incomes and our charitable sensibilities have been shocked by the worthless element of humanity that abuses those sensibilities. There probably can be no recovery without that experience.

I trust that some one will make the motion referred to. I very seldom offer a bill in this body, and have very seldom done so in any legislative body in which I have ever served. When I retire from the Senate I will have rounded out 26 years of public service, 22 years of which have been in legislative bodies, and in that time I never introduced a bill which matured into a statute, and I have seldom offered amendments, although I have framed new sections; but in that time I am glad to say that I have killed more bills than were ever passed. I believe the man who does that in a legislative body performs the greatest service he can render to his constituents and to the general public, especially in this age of dissolution, of fraud, of maudlin sentiment, of extravagance, of State bribery, of the deadening of every sensibility, of destroying the elements that go to make a self-supporting, self-respecting man. Now is the best time in the world, Mr. President, to take the bills that come in here and dissect and defeat them. The price of print paper has been outrageously increased, as I suggested here the other day, by the immense printing bills of the departments, enhanced very largely by the bills incurred by the Government Printing Office because of matter coming from Congress.

The pending bill would be less objectionable if the words "or otherwise" were stricken out, so that persons disabled in industry and those injured in military life alone would be cared for. As it is now framed it will cover, I repeat, every criminal, every vagrant, every loafing failure inside of our borders—and there is no limitation as to aliens or citizens—and make him a ward of the Government, because this is only a beginning.

It is true there are only a half million dollars appropriated for the first year, but the following year \$750,000 are appropriated, and the year following that \$1,000,000, and in the two remaining years I assume that the appropriation will be no less. I have seldom known of appropriations growing any less in this body. The usual rule is for them to increase, and I regard this merely as an entering wedge. It will eventually "go the whole hog," because, if once a beginning is had there never is an end.

I have heretofore made remarks here on pay rolls. When a pay roll is once created, the 12 labors of Hercules, as described in mythology, are no comparison with the task of destroying them. They survive with all the vitality that belongs to a law of nature. So the limit of five years, announced here by the Senator from Iowa, will be very easily removed. The five years having provided for these sums of money, aggregating something like five and one-half to six million dollars, will by that time have built around it such a permanent pay roll that it will have become impossible to destroy it, however it lacks in merit.

I wish to read certain extracts from Mr. E. W. Howe, a constituent of the senior Senator from Kansas. It is from Howe's Magazine. It is filled with hard-headed sense:

The greatest fallacy of all time is that the poor man need do nothing to help himself; that the reformers will take care of him by means of resolutions and conventions. The poor man, in popular literature, has

never been to blame for anything, particularly for his poverty; the rich man has robbed him, and there is nothing to do but make the rich man give it back.

I lately wrote that: "I had never known anyone in a public utterance to tell the truth about the poor, which is that they are not imposed on."

I meant no more than that there is not now, and has never been, a general disposition to impose on the poor; that there are no laws in the United States discriminating against them. I did not mean, of course, that individuals in all classes are not imposed upon by other individuals every day and hour, but in this one is as bad as another.

So I stand by the statement, though it has shocked many. I was lately talking to a lawyer of some local note, and made the statement that there are no laws in this country discriminating against the poor, whereas there are many discriminating against the well-to-do. He denied it at first, whereupon I asked him to look over his books. He did this with a rather surprising result. In a week he brought me a typewritten list of 73 such laws, and said he had not completed his search.

The facts are, of course, that laws specially favoring the poor bristle in the statutes of every State, in the national laws, and in the ordinances of every city and town. I do not object to this, and only mention it as further evidence that there is no disposition either in law or custom to impose on the poor; on the contrary that they are the objects of our concern and benevolence. The Bible is notoriously prejudiced in their favor, and this has continued in almost every book to this day.

I know the poor from the inside, having long been one of them, but never have I known of a law oppressing me because of poverty; on the contrary, I have always observed that the laws rather gave me the best of it. I have not encountered in a long life a generally accepted social custom intended to impose on the poor; on the contrary, custom has always begged me to acquire an education and offered me abundant and honorable opportunities to improve my financial condition.

A Washington professor fears I am "an employee of predeceous wealth." I am not; nor am I an employee of predeceous poverty. My case is that as an observer of events I prefer to be reasonably honest.

That is a good phrase, "reasonably honest." Some of us seem to have an excessive dose of it now.

I am tired of those extravagantly good people who praise themselves and abuse their enemies to a point beyond truth and fairness, as mischievous a form of lying as can be indulged in.

When I speak of the poor I do not mean the old or the sick; I mean the shiftless, of which we have a tremendous number in this country. I shall never have the same respect for the shiftless man that I have for his brother who is reasonably industrious and frugal, and who frequently becomes useful, not only to his family but to his community. No one can persuade me that the men who earn \$10 a day are not as honorable as those who earn \$4, and I believe the \$10 a day men are a little more capable than their \$4 brethren. And if the \$10 a day men are promoted, which is happening to them constantly, I do not believe them less worthy than they were when working for less.

Nor do I think there is any useful thing accomplished by our American plan of forever exalting the poor and crying down the well to do. I do not believe it is any easier for a poor man to get into heaven than it is for a well-to-do man.

Finally, I believe (and the professors may make the most of it) that a thousand well-to-do men will average a little better in usefulness, integrity, and industry than a thousand average poor men.

I believe this because in our fat country extreme poverty indicates an individual below the average, unless it is accompanied by old age or misfortune.

They are taken care of under other laws—old-age pensions, compensation laws, health insurance, and the like.

The most useful men the world has ever known have been well-to-do, with very few exceptions. Let any man perform a useful service for the world, and the world will pay him for it, as it should.

I believe—and every man of ordinary honesty and intelligence believes—that a man who behaves, saves, and works hard is entitled to progress in his finances with age, and provide for his days of inactivity. If he does not succeed in this in some measure, the world blames him, and he blames himself, as much as I do.

When we properly train children, our ambition for them is that they may become not only polite and worthy men and women but successful in life; one result is as much in our minds as the other. You never in your life knew a father or a mother who warned their children to avoid becoming well-to-do. If we have a son who is spoken well of by his employer, and is promoted because of good habits, how proud we are of him! How the neighbors praise him. He is pursuing precisely the course expected of a good boy. Yet this is precisely the course which, if persisted in, will result in his becoming well-to-do, and possibly rich. How apparent, then, is that meanness which declares that such a man, when he has become elderly and properly rounded out his life, is a thief.—E. W. Howe's Monthly.

Ah, let me say to the Senator from Iowa, when he places this bill before the Senate without the limitation, he is placing a premium upon the vagrant, the worthless, and the failures of the community. It is to that part of it that I object.

I know, Mr. President, that it is generally supposed, as indicated by Mr. Howe in his philosophy, that the person who does accumulate anything ought to be penalized. When you get done penalizing the thrifty and the industrious, there will be nothing left to pay old-age pensions to all the accumulated failures of this world. When you get through taxing the people that have something to support the failures, the vagrant, the disabled tramp that is run over by some plutocrat's automobile; when you get through taxing the ones that have something to tax to support the failures, criminal, vagrant, and otherwise, who have nothing to tax, then you will have no community save that of the Bolshevik. That is the philosophy—and I say it with all due respect—that is the philosophy, just about 2 per cent of it,

in this bill, that is applied about 100 per cent in Petrograd and vicinity by Lenin and Trotsky. We have 2 per cent in this bill as compared with 100 per cent in that delectable place governed by Lenin.

I propose to appeal to some of the successes of life, and have the Senators in this body, who wish for their constituency and their support the failures of life, depend upon those failures to put them through and keep them in the Senate. It is time to draw that line. I do not want the vote of any vagrant in the world, unless he voluntarily gives it to me. I do not want a criminal vote. I do not want to be elected by the failures and criminals.

If I can not represent the part of the Caucasian race that amounts to something in the world—that if they get a leg cut off can still get along with the other leg that is left, or with an eye put out can go through life one-eyed and still make a living—if I can not be the representative of that kind of people, I do not want to be the representative of the man that can not make a living or live at all unless the Government takes him and holds him up and feeds and clothes and shelters him and gives him an opportunity that he says he has never had before. If the philosophy of this bill is sound, it is a misfortune if a failure lives to be 50 years old before he loses a leg. He ought to have it cut off in infancy, and then the Government would salvage him early. It would save him from wasting 30 or 40 years riding on a brake beam or chasing a job that is always a few days ahead of him.

I have heard enough of that, and it is time to call a halt. I do not know how much such sound sense will be found on this subject, but I intend to take the measure of it. I intend to draw the line between maudlin sympathy, perverted, misdirected charity, and those who are entitled to the great, charitable impulses of organized government.

If this be limited by striking out all of the type I have indicated, then that criticism can be withdrawn and I would not urge it further. As it is, though, this bill with that feature remaining in it is a misdirected measure of charity. It is in that respect an effort of scintillating decay. It marks the decadence of social institutions. There is no real progress in such a measure. This is called a humanitarian measure. The most suspicious characters in the Western States are some of the professional humanitarians. I find when I search the private conduct of such a professional humanitarian that he is always exploiting somebody else's pocketbook but he never gives anything himself, not even his own services, unless he is paid a very liberal salary to relieve the poor at somebody else's expense.

The Senator from Georgia says that it was never thought of before; that we have discovered one of the great humanitarian impulses of our generation. Why, it was practiced in ancient Egypt, the gateway of civilization. The races that preceded the Aztecs in Mexico and Central America, with the altars and ruins of their forgotten temples, exercised as humane a charity as we are exercising in any of our institutions to-day. The indications show it. We think we have discovered everything. We are in the kindergarten, not only of charity but of government and in the perpetuity of what we expect to preserve. There is not very much that is original in either. We borrowed our laws from England. We borrowed our Constitution from the Netherlands, from the States General. We took our great elementary act of habeas corpus from an act of Parliament in 1679. We have borrowed our charities from the laws of England. We are behind England 15 years in legislation on compensation laws, on old-age insurance, on all forms of industrial relief for the sick, the aged, and the disabled. We are trotting along, probably going as fast as public sentiment wishes to go; but the last two or three years has been a peculiarly prolific time to take everything, call it by the name of a war charity, and throw the cloak over it, so that every vagrant that falls out of a box car, every rider of the brake beam, every bronzed, blistered, odoriferous knight of the tomato can, every perambulating mendicant haunting the back door is to be regarded as the misfortune of society, a petted sacrifice to economic environment. He is not to blame for anything—never! He is a victim of social injustice.

Notwithstanding he may have reached the age of 40 or 50 years, wearing a pair of shoes rescued from the ash can, and living upon the free lunch that comes out of the alley, and quarreling with the neighborhood dogs for his nutrition, notwithstanding that he has not had a bath since he was born, that he has constitutional scruples against it, that he would go to Russia, where baths are forbidden for common people, if he only had a railroad ticket, or could swim far enough to get over the Atlantic, that he is that kind of a man—now, not-

withstanding all that, he is to be taken at 40 or 50 years of age—

One more unfortunate  
Weary of breath,  
Rashly importunate,  
About to go to his death—

if I might paraphrase Tom Hood—because society will not do something for him. He is to be taken, why? Because he has been an ignoble failure all his life. He has been either criminal or semicriminal. He has not improved his chances, or has been a chronic idler. He is exalted into an industrial hero because he fell out of the box car and had his leg cut off. He is to be taken up by human society, exalted into a student of some industrious art, converted into the beneficiary of human society, converted into some kind of an industrial agent, where a one-legged man or a man with no arms can make a living, when he could not or did not do it when he had both arms or legs.

Why, we have that now, Mr. President, in most of the States, the large States, where they have any considerable population of that kind. If a Senator were disabled, and had not saved anything out of his salary because of the high cost of living in Washington during the last few years, and came to my State, they would take care of him and give him an occupation in a public institution, but we do not want any help from the Government. The feeble-minded are educated; they are taken care of from infancy until they are matured, and then we have provision for caring for them later on. The blind are cared for, both the juvenile and the adult. The blind are trained in childhood in the Braille system of writing and reading. The typewriter invented for their benefit is at their command. They learn the raised alphabet. When they reach adult years, they are taught occupations without cost. That is given by the State. They are allowed to fit themselves for any occupation—basket weaving, piano tuning, typewriting, the preparation of books for the blind, music. Over 100 occupations are taught the totally and stone blind in these institutions.

We do not want any help from the Government. If there is a State that is too weak to support itself, if any one of the 48 States has become industrially dependent, if it wishes to become a mendicant, begging at the threshold of the Federal Government for alms, let it disgrace itself and lose its own self-respect by making the application, if this permissive legislation is granted. But any State that has any self-respect left, that exercises its reserved powers, ought to have too much pride of its own citizenship to apply for or receive from the Treasury what is its own duty to support, what every State does that is worthy of its local sovereignty.

There is a feature here that I am quite loath to advert to, but I conceive it to be my duty to do it. We have had an employment agency, a United States Employment Service, for some time. There are \$272,000 appropriated in the deficiency bill, which is yet in conference, or was a few hours ago, paying for a deficiency for the United States Employment Service. In due time there will be fourteen or fifteen million dollars coming in here to be appropriated to perpetuate that service. I might just as well announce now that I am opposed to it. First, where any unemployment exists in any considerable degree the States take care of that by free employment agencies of their own. Next, for every person who is not willing to receive gratuitous service there are honest and well-conducted private employment agencies to which we have access, and to which many self-respecting, self-supporting people go and pay a reasonable charge for the service and receive it.

I know what will be the natural result, and I can foretell it, without being possessed of either the gift of tongues or prophets.

Look at the various things that may be done, all of them, running up to some six in number, saying what shall be done by this board, found on page 5 of the bill:

It shall be the duty of said board (1) to examine plans submitted by the State boards and approve the same if believed to be feasible and found to be in conformity with the provisions and purposes of this act.

In other words, if the bill passes as it is now, they take in everybody, the deserving and the undeserving.

Still reading on page 5:

(2) To ascertain annually whether the several States are using or are prepared to use the money received by them in accordance with the provisions of this act; (3) to certify on or before the 1st day of January of each year to the Secretary of the Treasury each State which has accepted the provisions of this act and complied therewith, together with the amount which each State is entitled to receive under the provisions of this act; (4) to deduct from the next succeeding allotment to any State whenever any portion of the fund annually allotted has not been expended for the purpose provided for in this act a sum equal to such unexpended portion; (5) to withhold the allotment of moneys to any State whenever it shall be determined that moneys allotted are not being expended for the purposes and conditions of this act; (6) to require the replacement by withholding sub-

sequent allotments of any portion of the moneys received by the custodian of any State under this act that by any action or contingency is diminished or lost.

It then provides that an appeal may be taken from any State to Congress in the event there is a difference of opinion about whether the State is rightfully deprived of any payment or installment.

With this, coupled with other provisions of the bill, it puts it in the hands of the board to lay down the details under which this money is to be paid. The great part of it is industrial life—occupations of some kind.

What has been the result in the United States Employment Service? The United States Employment Service has mingled itself with every undertaking it ought not to put its hand upon, all the way from underwriting Mr. Mooney for a new trial down to insisting that no man be given an occupation unless he joins a union, even when he came out of the Army. He would not have this beneficial service of the Government unless he belonged to a union. That I will bring out here in due time. I only inferentially refer to it to show the abuses that have been practiced by Government officials and the use of money for that perverted purpose. There ought to be no discrimination between a union and a nonunion man, between the equally deserving in any occupation, whether they be of military or civil life, giving preference to the military life in the first instance.

In these same undertakings, Mr. President, it will be Government officials. They deal with finding places for the unemployed. I asked the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] if under the present administration, to say nothing about the future, whether it be of one political party or another, the persons enforcing this law and finding vocational rehabilitation for the persons concerned will not be members of some labor union in the first instance?

Mr. KENYON. Not at all. There are a representative of labor on the vocational board now, a representative of agriculture, a representative of manufactures, and some members of the Cabinet. That question does not enter into it at all.

Mr. SHERMAN. The representatives not of the union are in the minority.

Mr. KENYON. There is one representative of labor on the vocational board, Mr. Holder.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not question that the Senator believes that, but the first time I have a gold brick to sell and he is in Iowa, I will hunt him up.

Mr. KENYON. I will send it over to Illinois where they buy them much more frequently than we do.

Mr. SHERMAN. I know better than the Senator about that.

Mr. KENYON. There are representatives of the manufactures on the board and a representative of agriculture. Why does the Senator say the board is composed of representatives of union labor?

Mr. SHERMAN. Because in everything having to do with employment they have controlled and now control. That is why I say it.

Mr. KENYON. This is an educational board.

Mr. SHERMAN. Oh, well, educational.

Mr. KENYON. A vocational educational board.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; educational.

Mr. KENYON. That is evidently what the Senator is talking about. The bill before the Senate is not in the nature of an employment bill. If he is talking about an employment bill, that is not before us.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is concealed with the euphonious phrase "vocational rehabilitation"; but every time a man is vocationally rehabilitated he has to have something to employ his rehabilitated talent; otherwise it is a failure, and that naturally will become a part of the system. I know the Senator too well, with his mental acumen and his great legal experience and his knowledge of men, and I think his charitable impulses and the kindness of his heart have run away with his usual good judgment.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the Senator pays me a compliment which I do not deserve. I should be very glad to have been the author of this bill, but I was not. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] was the author of the bill. So while I enjoy the delightful references of the Senator, in order to be fair he should take the Senator from Georgia into the sphere of his compliments also.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will transfer them to the Senator from Georgia and return to the Senator from Iowa by saying that I did not merely apply it to the authorship of the bill, all of which is deserved. I was applying it to the somewhat optimistic idea that I feared the Senator from Iowa had, that there would be no labor-union discrimination in the application of the bill. I think he is overly hopeful.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator know who is the director who has been selected by the Vocational Board to have charge of vocational training under the bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; I know who it is at present.

Mr. KENYON. Dr. Prosser.

Mr. SHERMAN. I know who at the present time are administering it.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator would not claim that Dr. Prosser was influenced in a wrongful way by any labor union or anything else? He is one of the strongest men in the country.

Mr. SHERMAN. He will not administer this; he will delegate it to somebody else.

Mr. KENYON. He is very deeply interested in it and will undoubtedly be the moving factor in the whole problem.

Mr. SHERMAN. Oh, yes; I understand the moving factors in all these great uplifts. I have witnessed their operation for many years. We have one in Paris now, and the difficulty is that the right hand knoweth not what the left hand is doing here at home.

Mr. KENYON. That has not anything to do with this bill. I am not willing to get into that controversy about this bill. The gentleman at Paris will not have anything to do with this bill. The Senator has a little disease about Paris.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is quite justified. Certainly, the Executive Department is running without the absent one at Paris. He will likely have something to do with continuing the gentleman of high character referred to by the Senator from Iowa, if he remains, and he was either directly or indirectly responsible for his selection.

Admitting that the gentleman named is of high character and ability, which I concede, if he administers it there might be no possibility of abuses of this kind. Still he can not attend to everything. He must delegate that power to somebody else, and insensibly in the gradations of that delegated power it will go from one to another, and finally in its application it will be in the hands of another Densmore. That is where this will go finally, and these vocationally rehabilitated gentlemen will be handled by the same kind of agency as the United States Employment Service. That is where practically it will land.

Mr. KENYON. I do not know why the Senator says that. The board is now constructed, all the machinery is in operation for the educational side of the vocational training. That same board is to carry it on. Dr. Prosser is the director, and I suppose he will continue as the director. Can the Senator think of a better man to do the work?

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no criticism of him.

Mr. KENYON. Then why bring Mr. Densmore in? He has nothing to do with it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Because he will get a Densmore before he finishes up. My prediction is just as good as that of the Senator from Iowa on that proposition.

Mr. KENYON. No; it is not, because I am bringing the situation that exists and the organization that exists ready to go on with this work, while the Senator is simply engaging in idiosyncratic terms about it. I was trying to use some of the Senator's language, but I am not very good at it.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is entirely satisfactory in the application. There are no dreams in this administration. They are all horrible realities of the morning after. There is not a theory that has not turned out to be a neurotic delirium. When I make a prediction when information is given by legislation of this character of what will happen, I base it upon what has already happened, not upon the high character of somebody at the head of a bureau or department who can not possibly attend to all the details of it himself, but must delegate it out where inevitably it will fall into the same lamentable condition of other departments and bureaus that are now existing and in operation.

Therefore, Mr. President, leaving the objection I have been urging at present, upon the ground that we ought to have some reasonable limit, that is my basic objection to the bill. There should be some reasonable limit for the deserving and worthy part of the population and unless that limitation is placed in the bill it ought not to pass.

There is no use saying that it does not place a premium upon the incapable, the worthless, and the criminal. It is said they are to be relieved. Well, they are, but I believe in putting their relief upon the right basis. Put it where from time immemorial and by the solemn experience of mankind it belongs. If a person is a criminal, or semi-criminal, let him take the consequences of it. If he is a vagrant, let him bear that burden. If he is a failure let him take the result of his failure unless it proves to be a misfortune before he reaches adult years. If he is an adult failure and then becomes disabled, if he is disabled in industry, give him a chance; but if

he is a disabled vagrant I do not believe in taking money out of the Treasury. Even if the State has gone so far in its sympathies as to do so, the Treasury of the United States should not contribute. These are the limits. There ought to be some encouragement for a man to be industrious, to do something in the world.

We are drifting to a point where the only hero in the industrial world is the worthless willful failure. The only object of criticism is the man who succeeds. He is the one who is pointed out to be discriminated and legislated against. We have become hero worshippers of the vagrants and the failures, and that is the type idealized in this bill.

I thought, Mr. President, it was my duty to object and to take the time necessary to state my objections, and I have done so. I wish here solemnly to say not only to the Senators in this Chamber but to the general public outside that we are traveling the gait and in the direction that will ultimately make failures out of the successful American people. It is 2 per cent Bolshevism now in this bill, and like every other blood poison that gets into a healthy anatomy it can spread with the greatest rapidity until the whole system is affected.

There is no substitute, Mr. President, for industry, for thrift, for taking care of yourself, for the God-fearing and self-respecting man and woman. We have lost sight of that type, of the old New England type that came over with the Puritans, of the old Virginian ancestor who came to the banks of the James River in an early day, the genuine American with the English blood who settled in that country and in Massachusetts. They laid the foundation of American character. It is the fashion now to decry it, and I have heard it in the pulpit. Shame eternally upon the doctor of divinity who teaches such creeds to his congregation. I have heard ministers of the Gospel say that the old New England idea of thrift was a hateful idea, because it made a man stingy and mean; it killed the generosity of the human heart. I have heard them criticize the white blood of the Southern States by saying that their chivalry was a humbug, that their ideas of honor and keeping faith belonged to a generation of fox-hunting squires and owners of race horses.

Anything to belittle the thrift that belongs to the character on which this Republic was built. It is that character to which I refer and I am defending it in my remarks on this bill.

This bill is based on an attack upon that character, upon the best system of private individual life I believe the Caucasian race ever saw, whether it be in the Southern States, in New England, or in the far West. I believe it is the highest type of the white blood ever known. I believe it has built up the solid substructure on which this Republic has been founded. It is upon the individual responsibility that belongs to the man and the woman. In this age we are dissolving that responsibility, legislating it away. I believe it would be a good thing, Mr. President, if there was a little more of Billy Sunday orthodoxy preached in this country, a little more individual responsibility, that we catch hades when we deserve it. That is his creed. But we are legislating, and on the lecture platform and in the raveled out magazines of a sensational character with the professors of economy from learned universities introducing a new system of economy that idealizes and makes heroes of the failures of the earth, it has done away entirely with the character of the American self-respecting, thrifty man and woman who laid the foundation of empire in years past. They are the ones who are to-day the objects of execration and ridicule.

Oh, it is a good deal better now to keep going as long as you have a dollar. I have a young friend who came to the depot one time with me. He wanted to call a cab for me, but I said, "No; I will take a street car." I had a couple of grips. He said, "You do not want to carry those to the street car?" I said, "Yes; I do." He said, "Let me carry one." I let him have it. He did not have muscle enough to carry it. He was a runt. He was a fair-sized fellow and had a cigarette in his mouth and he lived upon fine victuals every day. He fared sumptuously and his raiment was like that of the days of Solomon, but he could not lift the gripsack up on the step of the car. As he went in and sat down he said, "I hate to carry a gripsack into a car. It is bad form. It makes me blush to carry baggage. We ought to have had it in a cab or had somebody carry our baggage. This is a pretty good-sized city and they notice it." I said, "Yes; and they ought to notice that you have not yet paid for that \$60 overcoat you bought two years ago and are wearing to-night, that you have not paid for and likely never will." I said, "Get red in the face over that, my boy." I will never get his vote, but I do not want it. If I can not be elected by somebody other than the deadbeats of the world I never want to hold another office. And still you are putting a premium on deadbeats and vagrants and criminals and loafers of the human race here by the 2

per cent that ought to be cut out of this bill before it even has a chance of going to roll call in this body.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. I am talking about the five-year limitation.

Mr. KENYON. I thought the Senator was through.

Mr. SHERMAN. I reserve the right to talk upon other amendments and upon the bill.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I think it is quite apparent that we can not reach a vote on this measure to-night. I therefore move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and at (5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 20, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, June 19, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

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

O Thou who hast ever ministered abundantly unto Thy children and who holdest in the hollow of Thy hand the destiny of men and of nations, continue, we beseech Thee, Thy ministrations unto us as a people, that we may continue to grow in all that makes a nation great and glorious.

Make us great in peace as we have been great and magnanimous in war, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done, in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

### MASSACRES IN POLAND.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted at a public mass meeting held in Metropolitan Theater, in the city of Seattle, on the 16th day of June, 1919, protesting against the organized massacres that have been directed against the Jewish communities in eastern Europe, especially in Poland.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that he be allowed to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the resolutions referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to direct the attention of the gentleman to the fact that a few days ago a similar request was made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE], which was objected to. I am frank to say I think it was properly objected to.

Mr. MILLER. These were resolutions adopted at a mass meeting and were presented by a former United States Senator and were seconded by the governor of the State and the mayor of the city.

Mr. GARRETT. The resolutions referred to by the gentleman from Virginia were adopted at a mass meeting held in the city of Richmond, but I do not know who the participants were. I think the resolutions should be introduced in the regular way and go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

### THE MEXICAN SITUATION.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] may proceed for five minutes on the Mexican situation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] may address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I want to beg the pardon of this House for encroaching upon your time at this moment, realizing that I am a new Member and that new Members, like my father used to say about his children, "should be seen and not heard."

But, gentlemen, I am being importuned every day by my people of El Paso and along the border to secure protection of Americans living in my city and in my district and Americans residing in Mexico.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULD] on Tuesday, I believe—I was not present in the Chamber at that time, but was taking up a matter with the Secretary of State relative to the telegrams I had received as to conditions then prevailing and asking for protection for Americans in Mexico and in my city—the gentleman from New York, I understand, criticized the Secretary of War for sending troops across the river into Juarez for the purpose of protecting the Carranzistas stationed in that city. I want to say to the gentleman from New York that after the

Columbus said there was an agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Mexico—you may term it a gentleman's agreement if you please; it was not a part of the treaty—there was an agreement entered into at that time when the lives of citizens of one country were in peril that country had a right to send troops across the river into the other country to protect those citizens.

The gentleman may not know of that agreement, but I am reliably informed that it is in existence. In pursuance of that agreement we sent troops across the river, not to protect the Carranzistas but for the purpose of protecting the Americans against the bullets of both factions that might come across the river. [Applause.] If the gentleman has any doubt about that I will read an article from the daily paper—the Morning Times—a reputable newspaper of large circulation in my home city of El Paso concerning that matter.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I decline to yield, for I have only five minutes, and I do not want to take up the time of the House.

Mr. KAHN. Just a question.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Very well.

Mr. KAHN. How about the statement of Gen. Aguilla, the son-in-law of President Carranza, protesting against our sending troops into Mexico if there is such an agreement as the gentleman refers to?

Mr. HUDSPETH. There is an agreement, and the gentleman can satisfy himself by calling up the Secretary of State. I want to state, if the gentleman has read the newspaper reports as I did, he would know that Gen. Aguilla made the statement on his own initiative. I think it was never ratified by that bewhiskered gentleman who claims to be President of Mexico.

Mr. KNUTSON. What was the object of throwing shrapnel shells into the race track at Juarez?

Mr. HUDSPETH. To protect American lives in El Paso, where I have lived a good portion of my life. That was the object. Does the gentleman sanction that? [Applause.]

Mr. EMERSON. I do not care whether we have an agreement or not. I uphold the position taken by Secretary of War Baker in going across the line and defending American lives and American property. [Applause.]

Mr. HUDSPETH. I uphold him, and I believe every other red-blooded American upholds him in sending troops across the river to protect American lives. I want to say, gentlemen, if you had seen what I have seen, if you had stood on the streets of my city and seen Americans shot down by Mexican bullets when they were pursuing their lawful business and their daily vocations, you would say that the Secretary of War was right in sending troops across the river to protect American lives in that city. [Applause.] I have no criticism to make of the Secretary of War. I am glad he has done his duty in protecting American lives. [Applause.] For eight years the town of Juarez, having a population of 20,000, across the river from the city of El Paso, has been in the hands of first one band and then another of Mexican revolutionists. We go to bed in El Paso with Juarez under one government and awake in the morning to find it under another, and in almost every instance the taking of Juarez has been accompanied by loss of life in my home city of El Paso. As I have stated before, good citizens, going about their daily business upon our principal streets, are the victims of Mexican bullets. We have stood this for eight long years. I ask you, gentlemen, as Americans, as Representatives of a red-blooded, self-reliant, self-respecting people, how long must we continue to suffer? The gentleman from New York calls it an unwarranted invasion, without authority of law and Congress, and now proposes an investigation by Congress of the Secretary of War for the recent sending of troops into Mexico. Let me say to my friend from New York, in all kindness, but with all the vigor of my 6 feet of manhood, if the Secretary of War has decided that it is his duty as a representative of this Government to protect the lives of Americans who have a right to live along the border and pursue their businesses both on this side and in Mexico, my God, sir, do not hamper him in any way or retard him in the discharge of his duty.

Ah, you say, let Uncle Sam keep out, we have had enough war, Carranza will protect Americans. Let me say to you, my friends, I am neither a jingo nor an agitator, but I am a Texan and an American first, and an American pursuing a lawful business is entitled to protection from this Government wherever he may happen to be on this great globe, and so far as Carranza protecting him, let me say to you, that, in my candid judgment, that bewhiskered gentleman who has the title of President of Mexico has neither the desire nor the ability, if he had the inclination, to protect Americans in Mexico. He is too busily engaged, or was, sending felicitations to Kaiser Bill on the anniversary of his birth, and wishing him many happy returns, to give much thought to Amer-

icans or their welfare or security. I understand his latest spasm is to demand an apology from our Government for last Sunday night's little episode. What for, I ask you? When he could not or would not protect Americans in El Paso, and bullets were falling like hail on our streets and snuffing out the lives of our citizens, some of them in their homes under their beds being wounded, Uncle Sam sent his khaki-clad boys in and stopped it, and probably, incidentally, relieved Carranza from a terrible thrashing at the hands of Villa; and for this he demands an apology. Well, I want to say this: I am just a west Texas Congressman, but if I were in charge of affairs international of this Government, that flowing crop of whiskers would grow to the ground and sweep out his tracks before Uncle Sam doffed his hat and apologized to that spineless cactus of Mexico.

Sad as it makes my heart to recall it, I witnessed—and 80,000 people in the great city of El Paso were plunged into mourning, our homes darkened, and the shadow of death passed over our streets—one instance of Carranza protecting and safeguarding Americans in Mexico. No! He utterly failed, through criminal negligence, to protect Americans in Mexico, after his chief lieutenant, Obregon, had stood in a banquet hall in El Paso, tendered by the business men of my city, and stated it was then time for Americans to return to Mexico, and they were invited to do so and would be given every protection by the then Carranza government; that Mexico asked them to resume their business and would aid them in every way. Eighteen of our best citizens accepted that invitation and left for their mines in southwestern Chihuahua. They were foully murdered by Mexicans at Santa Ysabel, 40 miles west of Chihuahua, whether by Villa men or other bandits I do not know, and two days after their departure their bodies were brought back to El Paso, cold in death, mutilated in the most fiendish manner. That is one of the many instances of his failure to protect Americans. I say, Mr. Speaker, the clock has struck the hour, and it has been striking that same hour for eight long years, when this Government should say to both Carranza and Villa, "You must keep your unholy hands off of our citizens, and if another American life is sacrificed at your hands I will put my armies into your country and visit upon you the wrath of a long-suffering and outraged people." I tell you, gentlemen, it will not necessitate a war if we act on all occasions with the promptness of last Sunday night. Ah, you say our troops went in only to protect Carranza solely.

Whether that be true or not, if they stop the shooting of my people in El Paso I indorse the action; but I do not believe it to be true, for I have in my possession a telegram from Hon. Charles Davis, the splendid mayor of El Paso, commending Gen. Cabell and Gen. Erwin, which I here insert:

EL PASO, TEX., June 17, 1919.

Hon. C. B. HUDSPETH,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

No intention to criticize local military commanders for their entry into Juarez, as we believe firing into our city has been effectively stopped. We commend Gen. Erwin, as he acted on information sufficient to himself, although we believe Carranzistas equally guilty as Villistas for casualties in our city. Can't something be done to protect lives and property of citizens in interior of Mexico? Can't all factions in Mexico be put on notice that no one will be allowed to fight within 5 miles of our border anywhere or our troops will stop same?

CHARLES DAVIS, Mayor.

Also a telegram from the military committee of the El Paso Chamber of Commerce strongly commending these two efficient officers for their prompt handling of the situation, and I also wish to insert this telegram:

EL PASO, TEX., June 18, 1919.

Hon. C. B. HUDSPETH,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We, the military affairs committee of the El Paso Chamber of Commerce, unqualifiedly commend Maj. Gen. Cabell, commander of the Southern Department, and Brig. Gen. Erwin, commander of the El Paso district, for their prompt action in taking the necessary measures to stop the firing across the American border, and thereby preventing further loss in El Paso during the fighting in Juarez on June 14 and 15, 1919.

MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
EL PASO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

I also wish to insert an article which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Times, and which meets with my approval and coincides exactly with my views:

While England has flying machines patrolling the air above and near Berlin, the United States has flying machines patrolling the borders of Mexico.

Mexicans want to know why the United States sent troops onto Mexican soil after shots across the border had killed six Americans. Americans wonder not why the troops were sent in but why they were called out. If it is desirable to keep an American army of occupation on German soil because Germany may do something more to Europeans, why not have an army of occupation in Mexico, where the genial but excited Villista brigands are actually shooting across and killing Americans now?

I hold in my hand a copy of the San Antonio Express, of San Antonio, Tex., stating unequivocally that the War Department

ordered the troops in to protect American lives, and that only, and not to take sides with either Carranza or Villa. Villa is a bandit, full of venom and prejudice, and this act in protecting El Paso on the part of our Government will in all probability enrage him and imperil the lives of American citizens in his wake. I urge upon our Government the great importance of keeping him under the strictest and closest surveillance at all times, even to the extent of sending a well-organized troop to follow on his trail and swoop down upon him with the vengeance of an outraged country if he attempts to harm a single hair on the head of an American.

To further strengthen the statements heretofore made, according to the information I had received from what I considered an authentic source, that our troops entered Mexico for the sole purpose only of protecting American lives and American lives only, I herewith submit a letter from the War Department as a part of my remarks, and which was in response to a protest I made upon receipt of a telegram from Mayor Davis, of El Paso, against the withdrawal of our troops:

Hon. C. B. HUDSPETH,

*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIR: I beg leave to acknowledge the receipt of a telegram from the mayor of El Paso concerning the entry of United States troops into Mexico and referred by you to the Secretary of War. In reply, permit me to say that the entry of these troops was in accord with general instructions for the purpose of protecting the lives and property of American citizens. The decision was made upon conclusive evidence that the followers of Villa were firing into the city of El Paso and after several citizens and United States soldiers had been wounded by these shots. No question of sides was involved. The troops quickly accomplished their mission by scattering and dispersing Villa's band and were promptly withdrawn to United States territory. The department is in receipt of a telegram from the Chamber of Commerce, El Paso, expressing satisfaction and gratification for the prompt protection thus afforded residents of that city.

Very truly, yours,

HENRY JERVEY,

*Major General, United States Army.*

*Assistant Chief of Staff, Director of Operations.*

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUDSPETH. May I have five minutes more, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. I am compelled to object. We must proceed with the appropriation bills.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I would like just two minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I want to say to you gentlemen that I know Mexican revolutionists. If you have never seen the average Mexican revolutionary army, you ought to travel miles to see it. You will see breechclouts, bows and arrows, men with sandals on their feet, and every character of gun, from an old flintlock to a modern Mauser. People talk about Carranza starving those revolutionists into submission. Let me say to you that the average Mexican revolutionist can live for 30 days on a tortilla a day, and when the tortilla is gone he smokes a cigarette stump, tightens up his belt, and is good for 30 days longer. Yet they talk about starving him out! [Laughter.] I want to say to you gentlemen that I indorse the Secretary of War in sending our troops into Juarez. I indorse that splendid American, Gen. Cabell, in San Antonio, who responded so promptly to the call of my city and ordered the troops to cross. I indorse Gen. Erwin, the commander at El Paso, for promptly sending troops across the river and protecting the lives of Americans. Was Villa in command? Yes. I know Villa as well as I know any member of the Texas delegation. There he was on his white horse, leading his charge at that time. And I say to you that this report, which I have not the time to read, shows that the American troops went across the border by orders of the Secretary of War, under the same kind of orders that sent Pershing into Mexico to pursue Villa after the Columbus raid. I want to say to you that the life of every American in Mexico is in peril at this time. You have friends there. Possibly every man in this House has friends in Mexico, pursuing their business, opening their mines, engaged in useful work, and I say to you that I believe the only mistake made was in withdrawing the troops before the last moment of danger was passed. [Applause.] We ought to keep them there. I feel I have attempted to perform my duty and lay this matter before you as calmly as my nature will permit. Sir, I would not give the life of one good American for the entire Republic of Mexico. I love my country—every part of it. I love that flag over the Speaker's desk; it stands for the protection of Americans, their lives and property, all over the combined world. [Applause on both sides.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. No; I can not yield. I have not the time. The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the daylight-saving repeal which passed the House yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the repeal of the daylight-saving law. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman has permission under the general leave granted yesterday.

Mr. ESCH. There was a general order yesterday giving leave to print for five days.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. There are two matters of unfinished business. One is the deficiency appropriation bill, on which the previous question was ordered on Tuesday and upon which a point of order is pending. Then there is also the wire-control bill, on which the previous question was ordered yesterday. The Chair thinks the deficiency bill has precedence, as it is the one on which the previous question was first ordered; so unless anyone asks unanimous consent for a substitution, the Chair lays before the House the conference report on the deficiency bill. There is a point of order pending. The conference report itself was agreed to, and there is pending a Senate amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to acquire and complete immediately the hospital at Broadview, Cook County, Ill., authorized and appropriated for by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," approved March 3, 1919 (Public Act No. 326, 65th Cong.).

The last paragraph of section 6 of the "Act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," approved March 3, 1919, is hereby amended to read as follows: The sum of \$1,500,000 is hereby authorized to be held as an emergency fund for the purchase of land and the erection thereon of buildings or for the purchase of land and buildings, and the remodeling thereof, suitable for hospital and sanatoria purposes, which the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to select and locate for the uses of the United States Public Health Service, if in his judgment the emergency requires it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] moved to concur in this amendment with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Good moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21 and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the said amendment insert the following:

"The Secretary of the Treasury, until further authorized by law, shall take no further action under the authority granted in sections 6 and 7 and such portions of sections 8, 9, and 10 that relate to the acquisition of land and hospitals and the expenditures of funds authorized in sections 6 and 7 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines,' approved March 3, 1919': *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to Congress within the next 30 days the contracts or obligations entered into and the sums expended under the authority granted in said act, together with his recommendations as to what action, if any, should be taken in the matter of acquiring any of the hospitals authorized to be acquired by said act."

The SPEAKER. Does any gentleman wish to make any new suggestions to the Chair on the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I understood that debate closed on the matter on Tuesday night last.

The SPEAKER. That is a matter in the discretion of the Chair, and if anyone has anything new to present to the Chair the Chair will hear him. If not, the Chair is ready to rule.

The point of order made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] is not germane to the Senate amendment. The rule on germaneness is very simple—

No motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

While the rule seems simple, of course the difficulty always lies in deciding what is strictly the subject under consideration. In this instance the original bill gave the Secretary of the Treasury power to establish hospitals in several different places, and also other powers in respect to hospitals. The Senate amendment compelled him to build one of these hospitals, where before he simply was given authority to build it. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] moves an amendment to the Senate amendment to repeal the whole law which gave the Secretary the discretion to build these hospitals. It seems very clear to the Chair that if the only clause in the Senate amendment was to compel building the Chicago hospital, then an amendment which repealed the whole law giving the Secretary authority to build all these hospitals would not be in order. Indeed, it would be questionable, under the precedents, whether

an amendment which forbade the Secretary to build the Chicago hospital alone would be in order. That, at least, would be open to debate, for although that in one sense is "the subject under consideration," yet it has been held, for instance, that a bill authorizing the Court of Claims to adjudicate a claim can not be amended to provide for payment of that same claim. The subject under consideration was not simply the claim, but the action to be taken concerning the claim. And so it might be argued that to forbid the Secretary of the Treasury to build one hospital is not germane to an amendment which compelled him to build it. But the question here is broader than that. The question here is, When an amendment orders the Secretary to build the hospital, is it germane to repeal the whole law under which the Secretary previously had power to build that hospital and others? The Chair thinks it clearly would not be germane if that was the only subject in the Senate amendment.

But in the Senate amendment there is another proposition which applies to a different part of the law to be amended. There is a clause in the original law setting aside a special fund of \$1,500,000 to purchase land and buildings. That clause is amended by the Senate amendment to authorize the Secretary not only to purchase buildings but also to erect buildings. That, of course, is a minor paragraph in the original law and this is a rather insignificant amendment. Yet it is argued, and argued plausibly and forcibly, that when more than one clause or section of a law is amended that fact brings the whole law before the House, and an amendment would then be in order to repeal the law. There is one notable precedent for that, but the Chair thinks it is clearly distinguished from this. In the case to which the Chair refers the amendments were numerous and went to the heart of the bill, and changed the bill in a vital way. In that case it was held that a motion to repeal the whole law was in order, but it seems to the Chair that in the case before us the two sections referred to by the Senate amendment are easily segregated from the rest of the law, and that they do not affect the whole law, and that a motion to repeal the whole law is not fairly germane to an amendment which simply changes those two paragraphs. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, in order that the record may be kept straight, I want to call the Speaker's attention to the fact that the amendment I have offered does not repeal the whole law.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct in that.

Mr. GOOD. The law provides for turning over these buildings and it provides for a great many things.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think it is orderly procedure that the matter should be further argued, but the Chair is glad to have any correction of statement made. The gentleman's correction is quite proper and the Chair thanks him for calling attention to it. The Chair did not state the facts accurately. He stated what in his mind was the general result rather than the exact reading of the amendment. The amendment offered by the gentleman does not, of course, repeal the law, but it does absolutely take away from the Secretary of the Treasury authority to complete these buildings, and, therefore, while it does not repeal the law, it makes nugatory for a time the provisions of the law and is equally within the line of reasoning of the Chair.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 21 and agree to the conference asked.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VAILE. The Speaker having ruled out of order the motion of the gentleman from Iowa, would it now be in order to move to recede and concur with an amendment that is germane?

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered, and no further amendments would be in order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to further insist upon the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendment No. 21 and agree to the conference asked.

The motion was agreed to.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. Good, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union—

The SPEAKER. There is another matter of unfinished business before the House, and that is the wire-control bill, on which the previous question was ordered. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina demands a separate vote on the amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "existing," insert the words "telegraph rates and."

The SPEAKER. Before putting this question the Chair will ask if a separate vote is demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment in the nature of a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. That will come later.

Mr. MOON. I know; but I wanted to ask if it is in order now to ask unanimous consent that this motion be considered as pending under the rules for action later.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that a motion which he states is in the nature of a motion to recommit may be pending now and considered later. The gentleman will have the right later to make that motion. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question comes on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT], which the Clerk has just reported.

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

On a division (demanded by Mr. MERRITT) there were— yeas 42, yeas 152.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Moon moves that this bill S. 120 be recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment at the close of section 1 of the said bill, as follows:

"Provided further, That no reduction of wages of telephone or telegraph employees now in effect shall be made so long as the orders of the Postmaster General fixing present rates are effective."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order upon the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. That this motion to recommit contains matter which is not germane to the subject matter either of the section or of the bill, and it would not be in order in the House directly to amend the bill in this respect and therefore it is not in order to recommit the bill for the purpose of amending it in a manner which is not germane to the provisions of the bill. Now, I direct the attention of the Chair to the fact that if we were legislating to continue Government control over these utilities this matter might perhaps be considered germane, but, if the Speaker will note, the act which was approved July 16, 1918, and which contained the authority for the control of these facilities, is repealed. It is an outright repeal. We are repealing this authority of law under which the telegraphs and telephones were taken over and controlled by the Government. We are making a provision as to certain existing rates which were fixed during the period of control, but there is nothing in this law which refers in any way to the wages of the people who will now become employees of private corporations, and I submit that it is not germane to include a proviso touching a matter which is not contemplated in the bill, particularly when we repeal the very law under which we might have legislated perhaps upon that subject, and I think that even that proposition is doubtful.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I had not supposed the Chair would want to hear from the gentleman from Tennessee on a proposition like this. This bill, Mr. Speaker, is a bill which provides for the turning of the telegraph and telephone companies of the United States back to their owners. Now, it carries provisions for the rates that are now existing under the orders of the Postmaster General. It provides the means by which those rates may be changed by the utilities commissions

of the States. It provides the method by which the companies may, with the consent of the controlling bodies, either reduce or control their rates, under the same orders of the Postmaster General, who fixed those rates and fixed the wages of the employees. It seems to me that it is a very simple question, that the whole question of wire control, rates, and wages is involved, that the means is provided to determine what the rates, pending the control, shall be and how they may be changed. It also must necessarily involve the power to say whether the funds the companies are accumulating under the bill shall be used for the benefit of the companies exclusively or increased by a reduction of the wages of the employees and protection afforded employers. Now, there was no question made upon this yesterday. The motion to recommit is changed a little from the amendment that was voted on yesterday by the committee. It will be observed that the motion now provides that so long as the orders of the Postmaster General are effective as to rates that the wages of the laboring people performing this service shall not be reduced. Now, of course, I understand the Republicans do not want to vote on this question; of course, I know they do not want to put themselves on record—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. MOON. I am making this statement in order to get to the point of order a little closer. I know gentlemen do not want to vote on this.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. MOON. Let me ask the Chair if I desire to express my view of the question how else shall I do it?

The SPEAKER. It can be done in debate, but not in connection with the point of order.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, if it is so thoroughly determined in this House that nothing shall be said in the interest of these employees, I do not desire to discuss the question further.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the point of order is very clear. The law as amended says the existing law—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized. Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is a strange thing that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] sat here yesterday with all the rest and let them vote on this identical proposition and never opened their heads about it.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to the gentleman that I "opened my head" about it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You did not get ruled out.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to have the point of order debated. The Chair does not think that anything outside of that is proper.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was debating the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will permit me to state, I will say that I was not present when the amendment was offered yesterday. If I had been, I should have made the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thought the gentleman was always present.

This proposition is simply part and parcel of the bill proper. The bill proper undertakes to give back to the companies that own these wires the wires themselves. But they have six months in which to do this thing unless the municipalities and other instrumentalities intervene. Now, if we are going to mulct these people that send telegrams according to the old rates, the pretext for which was that they needed them in order to pay these operators more wages, it seems to me it follows inevitably as a matter of common sense that these wages be kept up. It is a fair proposition, and this is the only way to get a record vote on it.

Mr. ALMON. It seems that while the wires were in control of the Government the Postmaster General fixed the rates and payment of employees. Now, this bill expressly provides that the rates fixed by the Postmaster General shall remain in force for six months. And this provision simply provides that the rate of wages fixed by the Postmaster General shall also continue.

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

Mr. ALMON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. This bill as it stands now only provides that telephone rates shall remain in effect, not the telegraph rates. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The SPEAKER. Of course, the Chair, in ruling, has nothing to do with the question raised by the gentleman that this

amendment would be reasonable and proper. The Chair has no right to consider the merits of the amendment. The only question before the Chair is whether it is germane. This bill simply provides that the telephone rates as established in the existing law shall continue, to which the gentleman from Tennessee makes the motion that no reduction of wages shall be allowed. The bill does not refer at all anywhere to the question of wages, and therefore that question is obviously not germane to the bill, and it is clear that the Chair must sustain the point of order.

Mr. MOON. We do not think so, and I appeal from the judgment of the Chair.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee appeals from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Is it not really germane? This is going back to the question, however—

The SPEAKER. It is too late to argue the question. The gentleman from Tennessee has appealed from the decision of the Chair. The question is on laying the appeal on the table.

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

Mr. MOON. I demand the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee demand the yeas and nays?

Mr. MOON. Yes, sir; of course I do.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of laying the appeal upon the table will, as their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed will answer "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 189, nays 161, answered "present" 2, not voting 78, as follows:

YEAS—189.

Ackerman	Fairfield	Layton	Rose
Anderson	Focht	Lehbach	Rowe
Andrews, Md.	Fordney	Longworth	Sanders, Ind.
Andrews, Nebr.	Frear	Lufkin	Sanders, N. Y.
Bacharach	Freeman	Lubring	Schall
Barbour	French	McArthur	Sells
Begg	Fuller, Ill.	McCulloch	Shreve
Benham	Garland	McFadden	Siegel
Bland, Ind.	Glynn	McKenzie	Sinnott
Blanton	Good	McKinley	Slemp
Boies	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Idaho
Bowers	Gould	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Smith, Ill.
Britten	Green, Iowa	MacCrate	Smith, Mich.
Brooks, Ill.	Greene, Mass.	MacGregor	Steenerson
Brooks, Pa.	Greene, Vt.	Madden	Stephens, Ohio
Browne	Hadley	Magee	Stiness
Browning	Hamilton	Merritt	Strong, Kans.
Burdick	Hardy, Colo.	Michener	Strong, Pa.
Burroughs	Haskell	Miller	Summers, Wash.
Butler	Haugen	Monahan, Wis.	Sweet
Campbell, Kans.	Hawley	Mondell	Taylor, Tenn.
Cannon	Hays	Moore, Ohio	Temple
Chindblom	Hernandez	Moore, Pa.	Thompson, Ohio
Christopherson	Hersey	Moore, Ind.	Timberlake
Classon	Hickey	Morgan	Tincher
Cole	Hicks	Mott	Tinkham
Cooper	Hill	Mudd	Towner
Costello	Hoch	Nelson, Wis.	Treadway
Cramton	Houghton	Newton, Minn.	Vaile
Crowther	Hull, Iowa	Newton, Mo.	Vare
Currie, Mich.	Hutchinson	Nolan	Vestal
Curry, Calif.	Ireland	Ogden	Voigt
Dallinger	Jefferis	Osborne	Walsh
Darrow	Johnson, S. Dak.	Peters	Walters
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Wash.	Porter	Wason
Denison	Juil	Radcliffe	Watson, Pa.
Dickinson, Iowa	Kearns	Ramsey	Webster
Dowell	Kelley, Mich.	Ramseyer	White, Kans.
Dunbar	Kendall	Randall, Wis.	White, Me.
Dunn	Kennedy, Iowa	Reavis	Williams
Echols	Kiess	Reber	Winslow
Edmonds	Kinkaid	Reed, N. Y.	Wood, Ind.
Elliott	Klecza	Reed, W. Va.	Woodyard
Ellsworth	Knutson	Rhodes	Yates
Elston	Kraus	Ricketts	Young, N. Dak.
Esch	Kreider	Riddick	
Evans, Nebr.	Lampert	Robson, Ky.	
	Langley	Rodenberg	

NAYS—161.

Alexander	Box	Carter	Doremus
Almon	Brand	Casey	Doughton
Ashbrook	Brlggs	Clark, Fla.	Drane
Aswell	Brinson	Clark, Mo.	Dupré
Ayres	Brumbaugh	Cleary	Emerson
Babka	Buchanan	Coady	Evans, Mont.
Bankhead	Byrnes, S. C.	Collier	Ferris
Barkley	Byrns, Tenn.	Connally	Fields
Bee	Caldwell	Crisp	Fisher
Bell	Campbell, Pa.	Cullen	Fitzgerald
Benson	Candler	Davey	Flood
Black	Cantrill	Davis, Tenn.	Gallivan
Bland, Mo.	Caraway	Dent	Gandy
Bland, Va.	Carew	Dickinson, Mo.	Ganly
Booher	Carss	Dominick	Garnier

Garrett	Larsen	Nichols, Mich.	Stegall
Godwin, N. C.	Lazaro	O'Connell	Stedman
Goodwin, Ark.	Lea, Calif.	O'Connor	Stevenson
Griffin	Leshner	Oldfield	Summers, Tex.
Hardy, Tex.	Lever	Overstreet	Taylor, Ark.
Hastings	Linthicum	Park	Taylor, Colo.
Hayden	Loneragan	Parrish	Thomas
Hersman	McAndrews	Pell	Thompson, Okla.
Holland	McDuffie	Phelan	Upshaw
Howard	McGlennon	Pou	Venable
Huddleston	McKeown	Quin	Vinson
Hudspeth	McKiniry	Rainey, J. W.	Watkins
Hull, Tenn.	McLane	Raker	Weaver
Humphreys	Maher	Randall, Calif.	Webb
Igoe	Mapes	Rayburn	Welling
Jacoway	Martin	Riordan	Welty
James	Mays	Robinson, N. C.	Wheeler
Johnson, Ky.	Mead	Romjue	Wilson, La.
Johnson, Miss.	Minahan, N. J.	Rouse	Wingo
Johnson, N. Y.	Montague	Sabath	Woods, Va.
Jones, Tex.	Moon	Sanders, La.	Wright
Kelly, Pa.	Mooney	Scott	Yong, Tex.
Kincheloe	Moore, Va.	Sims	Zihlman
Kitchin	Neely	Sisson	
Lanham	Nelson, Mo.	Smith, N. Y.	
Lankford	Nicholls, S. C.	Smithwick	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.  
Small Whaley

NOT VOTING—78.

Anthony	Goodall	Major	Saunders, Va.
Baer	Graham, Pa.	Mann	Scully
Blackmon	Graham, Ill.	Mansfield	Sears
Burke	Griest	Mason	Sherwood
Copley	Hamill	Morin	Sinclair
Crago	Harrison	Murphy	Snell
Dempsey	Heflin	Oliver	Snyder
Dewalt	Hulings	Olney	Steele
Donovan	Husted	Padgett	Stephens, Miss.
Dooling	Jones, Pa.	Paige	Sullivan
Dyer	Kahn	Parker	Tillman
Eagan	Kennedy, R. I.	Platt	Tilson
Eagle	Kettner	Purnell	Volstead
Evans, Nev.	King	Ragsdale	Ward
Fess	LaGuardia	Rainey, H. T.	Watson, Va.
Foster	Lee, Ga.	Rogers	Wilson, Ill.
Fuller, Mass.	Little	Rowan	Wilson, Pa.
Gallagher	Luce	Rubey	Wise
Gard	McClintic	Rucker	
Goldfogle	McPherson	Sanford	

So the motion to lay the appeal on the table was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

- Mr. PURNELL with Mr. McCLINTIC.
- Mr. McPHERSON with Mr. LEE of Georgia.
- Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. GALLAGHER.
- Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. STEELE.
- Mr. GRIEST with Mr. WISE.
- Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.
- Mr. DYER with Mr. WHALEY.
- Mr. SANFORD with Mr. HARRISON.
- Mr. ROGERS with Mr. SMALL.
- Mr. HULINGS with Mr. WATSON of Virginia.
- Mr. SNYDER with Mr. TILLMAN.
- Mr. FESS with Mr. SHERWOOD.
- Mr. KAHN with Mr. PADGETT.
- Mr. MASON with Mr. HEFLIN.
- Mr. BAER with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.
- Mr. COPLEY with Mr. SULLIVAN.
- Mr. CRAGO with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.
- Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. SEARS.
- Mr. FOSTER with Mr. SCULLY.
- Mr. GOODALL with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.
- Mr. HUSTED with Mr. RUCKER.
- Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania with Mr. RUBEY.
- Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. ROWAN.
- Mr. KING with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.
- Mr. LA GUARDIA with Mr. RAGSDALE.
- Mr. LITTLE with Mr. OLIVER.
- Mr. MORIN with Mr. MANSFIELD.
- Mr. PAIGE with Mr. MAJOR.
- Mr. MURPHY with Mr. KETTNER.
- Mr. PARKER with Mr. GARD.
- Mr. PLATT with Mr. EAGLE.
- Mr. SNELL with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.
- Mr. TILSON with Mr. EAGAN.
- Mr. VOLSTEAD with Mr. DOOLING.
- Mr. WARD with Mr. DONOVAN.
- Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. DEWALT.

Ending June 20:

- Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. OLNEY.
- Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name was called?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I just came in. I did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not qualified.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.  
The question was taken, and the bill was passed.  
On motion of Mr. ESCH, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. GOOD. Pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ascertain if we can agree as to time for general debate.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have some requests for time. Will the gentleman agree to an hour to a side?

Mr. GOOD. I have some requests on this side. All I desire to do personally is to explain the bill. I think we can get through with an hour on this side. I would not want to consent to longer time than an hour to a side.

I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the general debate be limited to two hours, one half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and the remaining half to be controlled by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to two hours, one to be controlled by himself and one by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman be able to allow me five minutes?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman just this moment approaches me about time. I have a number of other requests, and I can not promise for certain that I can yield to the gentleman five minutes out of the hour.

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Chair to notify me when I have consumed 35 minutes of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to acknowledge that because of the very limited time that the subcommittee had to consider this bill, where the estimates were very large and the items involved were numerous, we could not consider all of the items in the sense of having hearings reopened upon them. A similar bill passed at the last session of Congress, but failed of final enactment. The committee there-

fore, except in the case of some few items, did not go into the matter of hearings on the bill generally. It did hold quite extensive hearings upon the estimates for the Emergency Fleet Corporation and some other matters where estimates had been sent to Congress since the adjournment of the Sixty-fifth Congress. But as a general rule, outside of these exceptions we accepted the hearings and judgment of the former committee. In a general way this bill carries quite a reduction over the bill that was passed at the previous session of Congress. Some of the items, however, are largely increased. There are some new items in the bill, made necessary by the enactment of statutes that were approved after the former bill had passed; for example, the act of March 3, which turned over to the Public Health Service all of the war-risk patients, made it necessary for us to appropriate a large sum of money to take care of these soldiers and sailors. There are several such items in the bill made necessary at the time, whereas the appropriation was not apparently needed when the bill was under consideration before.

This bill carries \$483,914,850.95. The former bill carried a total of \$851,171,859.25. This bill carries \$367,257,008.30 less than the amount carried in the bill that failed in the last Congress. It carries \$477,099,310.30 less than the total estimates considered.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. So that this bill, taken in connection with the Army and the Navy bills, represents a saving of about one billion?

Mr. GOOD. Something in that neighborhood; that is, as the bills passed the House.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The principal reduction in this bill is found in the appropriation for the emergency fleet. There were a few minor reductions. There are but a few items to which I want to call the especial attention of the committee at this time. This bill provides for an appropriation of \$200,000 to take over the functions of the War Trade Board. The War Trade Board has a balance of something like \$275,000. By an Executive order the functions of the War Trade Board have been transferred to the State Department. It is necessary, therefore, to provide some force for the closing up of its business. While it was estimated that it would require more than \$200,000, it was the judgment of the committee that that amount would be all that would be required to do the work necessary to wind up the affairs of this organization.

The employees in the office of the Alien Property Custodian, about 440 in number, I believe, are complaining, and complaining bitterly—and it seems to us justly so—because they were discriminated against in regard to the bonus of \$240 per year that is paid to all Government clerks except those in a few bureaus. One bureau, that of the War Risk, was given a bonus of \$120 a year, and it seemed to the committee that we should make no discrimination between the employees in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance who came in after 1916 and those in the Alien Property Custodian's office. Therefore we carry a provision which is a gratuity, giving them the same bonus that the employees in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance now receive, or will receive next year, of \$120 per year.

Mr. ALMON. May I ask if that is to be retroactive?

Mr. GOOD. That is not to be retroactive. In this bill we are only dealing with matters pertaining to the next fiscal year and do not go back to the appropriation for last year.

The next item of importance in the bill is that of the emergency shipping fund. It is a big item in the bill. There was an estimate originally before the committee when we had this matter under consideration of \$704,471,855 for this purpose. It was stated before the committee that there are still available authorizations to the extent of \$220,000,000; that is to say, that all of the contracts for constructing ships authorized have been let, except contracts to the extent of \$220,000,000 for ships. If Congress took no action regarding this limit of authorization, the Emergency Fleet Corporation could go ahead now and let contracts for additional ships aggregating \$220,000,000. The committee went into the matter very thoroughly as to the extent to which the Emergency Fleet Corporation should be permitted to engage in the building of new ships. It was the opinion of the committee as a general principle that we should not permit new contracts to be let at all; but if we followed that principle without variation we found that a great deal of material and supplies that had been purchased for the building of ships would have to be salvaged at a very low price. We found also that our fleet would be an unbalanced fleet. We had a large number

of steel ships of one type. In the opinion of experts they are too slow, and in order to make the fleet a balanced and workable fleet it is necessary to let some contracts—not many in comparison with the total, but some new contracts—in order, first, to utilize the material that is one of the large items of cost, material that has already been purchased and is owned by the Government and is on hand, and that would largely be wasted. Secondly, that in order to permit some of the contractors who have contracts for building these slow ships to sell the ships and relieve the Government of the responsibility for the payment of them, so that the Government will not lose a dollar in the disposition of these slow ships. Some contractors have said they were willing to take their chances, that if they were given new contracts for larger and faster ships that could be manufactured in part from the material already on hand they would take over the slow ships they have under contract themselves, that the Government is now bound to pay for, so that we would thereby get better ships, larger ships, and faster ships in return for the undesirable ships.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Hurley, the chairman of the Shipping Board, in certain notices that he has sent out to Members of Congress and others, indicated that in order to complete the shipbuilding program he would need about \$600,000,000. I do not see any specific sum of \$600,000,000 carried in the bill. The first item is for reducing the authorization of \$2,884,000,000 heretofore established by \$120,000,000. Does Mr. Hurley get \$600,000,000 out of that appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. Out of which appropriation?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Out of that item.

Mr. GOOD. I was just going to explain that and to show how the items are made up. When my explanation is made I think the gentleman will be satisfied. I can not explain it all in one sentence.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman if he is going on.

Mr. GOOD. I was just going to explain that. If I can have the attention of Members while I give the explanation I think a good many of the anticipated questions will be answered in the explanation. I was going to say that there remain, therefore, \$220,000,000 of authorizations. We are canceling \$120,000,000 of the authorizations, so that Mr. Hurley can go forward and let contracts for these larger and faster ships to the extent of \$100,000,000 worth of ships.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The total appropriation heretofore authorized is reduced by this bill \$120,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. What page is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Page 45. I desire to know about that, and I do not think what the gentleman has said yet has fully explained it.

Mr. GOOD. Of course it has not, and as I said before I can not give the gentleman all the information in one sentence. I am just coming to the details of the matter now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will let me say this, I will try not to interrupt him again. I want to know whether Mr. Hurley and the Shipping Board get \$600,000,000 in this bill to complete shipping contracts already made.

Mr. GOOD. I will answer the gentleman, and when he gets the figures he will see how Mr. Hurley gets it and how much he gets.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. All right.

Mr. GOOD. Of the \$704,000,000 Mr. Ackerson stated that if we cut off \$220,000,000 of authorizations and prevented them from building any ships not now under contract, we could take from his estimate of \$704,000,000 the sum of \$150,000,000; but we did not do that. We only cut off \$120,000,000 of the authorization, and in doing that we did take, according to Mr. Ackerson's statement, \$80,000,000 from the estimates. The estimates were based on the entire program, and this item, by the way, is tied up very closely with the following item; that is, the using of the proceeds from the sale of ships to pay for the construction of ships. The committee felt the Shipping Board should pursue the policy of disposing of some of these slow ships, and that policy should be inaugurated at once. It was agreed by everybody connected with the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation that our fleet would be a lopsided fleet. We had too many boats of one kind. They were standard ships of a given type that had to be built very quickly, and it is the purpose of the Shipping Board to sell ships of an undesirable type. It was the opinion of the committee that while the United States is the only one of many builders of ships that can make spot delivery we ought to sell the undesirable ships, or ships of an undesirable type, so far as the fleet is concerned, when there was a market for them, and not

hold them until other shipbuilders in the United States and elsewhere could build ships and offer them for sale on the market and compete with our ships. It was the opinion of the officers of this organization that they could easily sell the ships and use \$150,000,000 that they would receive in payment for ships we are building and will build.

Now, in regard to what I have said about the undesirable ships, I do not want it understood that they are not desirable except so far as their type is concerned. Even the type is all right, but we have too many of one type. It is this undesirable type of ship that it is proposed to sell. They are too small, mostly all of one size, and they are too slow. Men who came before the committee were of the opinion that no one could operate a fleet of that kind of vessels unless they had some ships of larger tonnage and faster ships.

So it is desirable to sell these ships. So we have taken first from the estimate \$80,000,000 on the abandonment of authorization. We have taken \$75,000,000 which they say they can get from the sale of the ships and use it for the building of ships. Mr. Rosseter said \$130,000,000 could be obtained in this way. In the cancellation of authorization and the using of the money we will get from the sale of ships we account for a reduction of \$155,000,000. We want to feel, first, that the organization should sell the ships, the undesirable ones, and, secondly, use the money for the payment of new ships that have been estimated for without asking the Congress to appropriate more money, and when they will have the money in the treasury of the Emergency Fleet Corporation to pay for the building of the ships. Of course, the letting of contracts for new construction will not, and certainly should not, be undertaken until the selling of ships already constructed justifies it.

The original act provided that the \$50,000,000 that was appropriated for capital stock of the United States Shipping Board could be used for building ships. That is now being used, in a way, for building ships, but it will be consumed during the year, and it was admitted that by that amount they would have paid for the building of the ships and would not need additional appropriations for the same purpose, and so we allow them to use just what they are using, except it will no longer be a revolving fund. The \$50,000,000 was not taken into consideration when they made the estimates.

We found on examination that they had a balance of the fund for building houses at the shipyards. They had an unexpended and unobligated balance, after the building of the houses, amounting to \$6,514,230. They also had unobligated and unexpended a balance of \$9,874,691 for transportation at shipyards. They had extended car lines, had extended railway lines, bought new equipment for railroads, loaned the money for this purpose to street car companies, but when the armistice was signed that program was stopped. With the stopping of the program they found an unexpended and unobligated balance of almost \$10,000,000. So the committee felt that that fund was available for building ships. It has already been appropriated and should be expended, and thereby obviate the necessity to that extent of additional appropriations.

Then we found in the appropriation of \$55,000,000 for foreign ships there was a net balance unobligated of \$4,176,250, and we applied that in a similar way.

Then there was a fund of \$150,000,000, which was appropriated for the purchase of ships that had been already constructed. We found they had only used about \$31,000,000 of that appropriation, and that balance of \$118,000,000 was available for the acquisition of ships, and we said to the board that that fund was available, and they acknowledged it, for the acquisition of ships. To that extent we have refused to give additional appropriation.

Then there was an unexpended and unobligated balance of \$25,111,370 for building more plants. It is not intended to build any more plants, but rather it is intended to sell what plants we have built. And while we have not taken into consideration here anything for salvage, Mr. Hurley, when he made the estimates, estimated that there would be some salvage—I think about \$18,000,000—and reduced his estimate from \$734,000,000 to \$704,000,000 because of such sale.

But there is now an unobligated and unexpended balance of \$25,111,000 that could be used now for the payment of contracts for building the ships and for the payment of wages and material for building ships at the yards.

There was also from the operation of ships a considerable sum. The statement before the committee was to the effect that last year, not counting eleven millions that is due the Shipping Board from the Belgian Relief Commission, and not counting about two millions due from the Navy, not counting about forty-five millions due from the War Department for the transportation of the Army, they still have a profit of \$12,000,000.

We are launching new ships and launching them fast, and the Emergency Fleet Corporation has a great fleet upon the high seas. The income is enormous, and it was admitted by those in charge of the operation, as well as by Mr. Hurley, that we could very reasonably take \$5,000,000 a month, or \$60,000,000 during the year, that would be received in the operation of the fleet to go toward the cost of building the ships. In this connection it must be remembered that the Emergency Fleet Corporation has a working capital of \$65,000,000; so its working capital will not be impaired unless the estimates are found to be not well founded.

And what we have done here is, as I understand it, with the acquiescence and consent of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation. We have found that they can use of appropriations already made, plus advanced receipts from the sale of ships, and also \$60,000,000, which they will receive from operations, \$428,000,000, and when we subtract that from \$704,000,000 we get the amount carried in the bill.

I now yield, if I have not made myself clear, first, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has partly explained what I desire to get at, but so far as the public knows, and the public apparently never gets the details which the gentleman has just put into his speech, Mr. Hurley wanted \$600,000,000 more in order to complete the shipbuilding program.

Mr. GOOD. He wanted \$704,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We were informed through the various messages received from Mr. Hurley that about \$600,000,000 was wanted. If it was \$704,000,000, then it was so much more. On page 45, under the head of Emergency Shipping Fund, it is provided that the authorization of \$2,884,000,000, heretofore used for the construction of ships, is reduced by the sum of \$120,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I assume that the committee is saving \$120,000,000 of the \$2,884,000,000 by this paragraph.

Mr. GOOD. No. The \$120,000,000 is only a reduction in the authorization and except in a general way did not affect the reduction in the appropriation. We have made a reduction in the estimates, and that is tied up with the sale of ships. The two are tied together. We have saved there. Deduct \$155,000,000 for these two considerations—sale of ships and reduction in authorization.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has referred to certain sums that were found by the committee not to have been expended.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As, for instance, in housing, and \$50,000,000 of the incorporation, and so forth. Were those sums which were so discovered and are now counted included in the \$2,884,000,000, or were they separate sums?

Mr. GOOD. I do not quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I say frankly to the gentleman that I do not find any appropriations in this bill for the Shipping Board, except \$276,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. That is all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the utilization of \$150,000,000 already appropriated.

Mr. GOOD. But they have a right under the law to use these funds.

Mr. HICKS. Is it not a question between authorization and appropriation? That makes the difference.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understand that thoroughly. I want to find out if any of the \$2,884,000,000 is still available over and above the \$150,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Almost all of the moneys appropriated have been expended. We have the ships for that, and we have let contracts for all the ships authorized, except to the extent of \$220,000,000, and now we cancel authorizations to the extent of \$120,000,000, leaving available for the Shipping Board to let new contracts to the extent of \$100,000,000 more for ships.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Originally we authorized \$50,000,000 for incorporation.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is that included in this total of \$2,884,000,000, or is that a separate item, because the gentleman has referred to that as something that can now be utilized?

Mr. GOOD. I would have to look that up, but it would not make any difference with regard to that, for the authorization is one thing and the appropriation quite another. We have not appropriated the full amount authorized.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of this tremendous lump sum, as it is presented here, \$2,884,000,000 previously authorized, we are about to save \$120,000,000, if I understand the language in this bill.

Mr. GOOD. We cut off of the authorization that amount.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to know whether there is discretion left in the board to expend any more money or whether there is any left.

Mr. GOOD. Of course they have not enough money to spend, to pay for these ships, or we would not appropriate anything. They need \$276,000,000 for next year. After using \$150,000,000, as I have explained, that was tied up in the proposed sale of ships and the reduction in authorization, and after using the unexpended balance which I referred to, we still need for the next year \$276,000,000. Now, if we do not sell these ships, they will need more money; that is all there is to it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman state in round numbers how much extra Mr. Hurley and the Shipping Board have to expend now in order to complete the ships on the ways or to fulfill contracts, in addition to the \$2,884,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. Again the gentleman is confusing the authorization with the appropriation. The appropriation up to this time totals about \$1,938,000,000. They get direct appropriation by this bill of \$276,000,000.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman is mistaken. They get \$120,000,000 less than the whole total authorization.

Mr. GOOD. No; I am not mistaken. They are going to use, as they have a right to use, from operation \$60,000,000, and they are going to use, as they have a right to use, \$50,000,000 of capital stock, and these other unexpended balances to which I have referred.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. You are bringing in all of those available funds that have not been used and are applying them to the purposes of the Shipping Board?

Mr. GOOD. Absolutely—\$428,000,000, less \$155,000,000 from sale of ships; so Mr. Hurley has to use this year \$704,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the only new money this Congress is appropriating for the Shipping Board, apart from what has already been authorized, is \$276,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. That is all the new money.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And that, put with the funds to which the gentleman has referred, which are now being made available, and such from the sale of ships, and such other income as the board will receive from various sources, will be the fund upon which the Shipping Board will operate next year?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. As I understand, the total authorizations are \$2,844,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. We have been gradually appropriating from time to time up to that authorization, but we have not reached it within \$704,000,000. Is that right?

Mr. GOOD. The \$704,000,000 estimated does not bring the total appropriated up to the amount of authorization. I am not sure how much we will have to appropriate next year, but we will have to appropriate more money.

Mr. ELSTON. Has there ever been any authorization to build ships in excess of this \$2,884,000,000? There is no other authorization, is there?

Mr. GOOD. No; not to build ships. There are some authorizations to acquire ships already built, to requisition ships, to buy some ships from Japan and China, but for building ships the amount the gentleman cites is the total authorization.

Mr. ELSTON. That is true. Now, then, in the past we have authorized up to \$2,884,000,000, but we have never appropriated up to that amount because we have never built the ships. Now, we are in the course of building ships—

Mr. GOOD. That is not the reason, but we never appropriate money except as the money is needed to pay for the ships as they are built, and there will have to be some appropriations made next year to complete the program.

Mr. ELSTON. I understand, but we are building under that total authorization ships which will have to be paid for. We are now \$600,000,000 short of paying for them. Now, this bill appropriates \$276,000,000 of that \$600,000,000, and you find the rest out of the unexpended appropriations which were appropriated for other purposes which now you gather in, which, added to the \$276,000,000, makes up the \$600,000,000. Is not that true?

Mr. GOOD. That is not all.

Mr. ELSTON. That is the story.

Mr. GOOD. No; it is not the story, because you are getting \$60,000,000 from operations; you are going to get something from the sale of ships, a considerable amount.

Mr. ELSTON. I understand, but, as I say, the amount is gathered in from other sources and covered into this particular purpose.

Mr. NOLAN. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. NOLAN. Can the gentleman give the committee some idea of the prices we are receiving for these ships and the cost of ships, to see whether we are on the right or wrong side of the ledger?

Mr. BRITTEN. Before answering that question, I would like to ask something about the appropriation in the bill before the gentleman goes into the selling price.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was informed at Hog Island the other day while there that the board had sold several ships recently at \$210 a ton.

Mr. NOLAN. I wanted to get it from the chairman of the committee and find out if the committee got any idea from the Shipping Board.

Mr. GOOD. Steel ships were sold for \$222 per ton, according to my recollection. Some have been sold for less, but not much less. Of course, the wooden ship is a different story.

Mr. NOLAN. In other words, the ships they figure do not fit in with the new program; they are getting rid of them at better prices than they will get in the future for them; is that the idea?

Mr. GOOD. Well, if conditions should become normal or anything like normal—of course, it will not soon, if ever, become normal, if by the term normal we take the prices of ships that obtained before the war—but it is understood that these ships will after a few years, after the different countries commence to purchase ships, that the prices will go down, perhaps, as low as \$170 or \$160—maybe \$150—a ton. That is the reason why the committee felt it was desirable to sell the ships of the type described. We have sold several and will sell more and use the money received in the construction of ships.

Mr. NOLAN. Does the gentleman get the information from the Shipping Board as to the price of new ships based on the price of the substitute type of ships?

Mr. GOOD. I can not tell the gentleman that. They can not tell, of course, because it depends upon the labor situation, the price of material, and so forth; but we have carried in the bill a proviso that no contract shall be let on the cost-plus or cost-plus-fee basis. They must be let in accordance with the regular requirements.

Mr. NOLAN. I thought the committee might have some information as to bids on the substitute type of ships.

Mr. GOOD. They have taken no bids recently, and could not state the price at which these ships could be built. My recollection is that the cost of the ships ranges from about \$200 to \$220 per ton.

Mr. NOLAN. But they have received offers on the substitute type of ships of \$165 a ton?

Mr. GOOD. Well, that may be; I can not answer the gentleman, however.

Mr. SCOTT and Mr. BRITTEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 35 minutes.

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, who has been on his feet.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am very much interested in this well-balanced fleet the gentleman is speaking about, but I am a little confused by the gentleman's reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

Mr. GOOD. I am yielding for a question, but I am not yielding for any explanation.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am putting the question now. The gentleman said that \$276,000,000 appropriated by this bill is new money, which, added to certain other unexpended sums, will make a total of \$428,000,000. Is that the net amount the Shipping Board may expend this year for new ships, or is it some amount less than the \$704,000,000 as estimated by the Shipping Board?

I am greatly interested in seeing this bill carry enough money so as to enable the Shipping Board to bring into successful conclusion its desires for a well-balanced fleet of cargo and passenger carriers.

I believe this can be accomplished only by an appropriation at the present time of approximately \$675,000,000, which I believe is the amount requested by Edward N. Hurley, chairman of the Shipping Board, in a letter to you dated June 4, 1919, when he presented a statement showing cost of administration, cost of shipyard development, and so forth.

I am anxious to satisfy myself that the total amount carried or permitted under this bill will not in any way embarrass the Shipping Board, in which, under Chairman Hurley, I believe the complete confidence of Congress will be justified.

Mr. GOOD. The estimate of the Shipping Board is that they can expend under no circumstances more than \$704,000,000 this year. The authorization has nothing to do with the amount carried in this bill, except they do not exceed the authorization, and there will then have to be additional appropriations during the next year, but to what extent we are not able to ascertain at this time. Mr. Hurley will get \$704,000,000 from the sources I have stated, unless he falls down on the sale of ships or on his operating income. If the expectations are not met in this regard, then to that extent the appropriation carried will be too little.

Mr. BRITTEN. At that point, will not the further appropriation be in amount approximately the difference between the \$428,000,000 carried in this bill and something less than \$704,000,000 estimated by the Shipping Board?

Mr. GOOD. If we let all the contracts, approximately so.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman says the value of the ships as determined by the selling price, from \$210 to \$222, gives a virtual profit to the United States?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; I do not think there is any profit at all. I did not mean to say that, if I said it. The statement was that they were sold practically without loss. But I think some ships, many of them, will be disposed of at a loss.

Mr. SCOTT. Was that statement that they were sold without loss based on the total amount of tonnage supposed to be produced—on the dead-weight tonnage?

Mr. GOOD. I suppose the statement was based on the actual cost of the ships sold. I think in some of the yards it is costing more to build these ships than the cost in other yards. I am satisfied of that.

Mr. SCOTT. Did your committee ascertain from the Shipping Board the total number of ships that are classified in their present dead-weight tonnage which are not now available for transportation purposes?

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will look in the hearings, at page 572, he will find the total cost, the total price, and, where ships are sold, the amount paid.

Mr. SCOTT. I am entirely familiar with the table, but I have not found any place where the Shipping Board have indicated the total amount of dead-weight tonnage which is carried on their books as tonnage, but which is not now and never has been available for shipping purposes.

Mr. GOOD. I do not know as to that.

Mr. SCOTT. That is the point I want to find out.

Mr. GOOD. I am sorry I can not inform the gentleman. There is the total of the tonnage sold, the cost of the ship, and the amount paid for the ship. I think the gentleman will find in the tables—I can not state just what it amounted to—the total dead-weight tonnage of all the ships delivered, of all the ships in the wet basin, and the total dead-weight tonnage of all the ships on the ways. That is all in the record.

Now, there was another item of \$11,000,000 that was carried in the prior bill to give the Shipping Board the right to instruct the seamen employed by it. It seemed to us that that was not a business proposition, that that item was a part of the operating cost of the fleet. Men and concerns who are in the shipping business train their men in training vessels or in carrying cargoes, and the cost of training is an element in the cost of operation. And after we discussed the matter with the Shipping Board, Mr. Hurley said: "We will withdraw the estimate of \$11,000,000 for that purpose." That, I think, tells in a broad way the story with regard to the shipping provision that is carried in the bill.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question for information?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. Was the entire authorization of \$2,884,000,000 for construction of ships made before the signing of the armistice?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; Congress has not authorized the acquisition of any ship since that. All the contracts were made before the signing of the armistice. There have been no contracts made since.

Mr. ALMON. All this authorization was made prior to the signing of the armistice?

Mr. GOOD. Before the armistice was signed. My recollection is that the entire authorization was availed of and contracts let, but since that time there have been a good many cancellations; that wherever they found that by canceling a contract the loss would be less than the anticipated loss would be if they completed the vessel, the contract was canceled and damages paid.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if he has finished with the shipping question.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to ask the gentleman, then, in view of this great saving, why it was found inadvisable to appropriate to the city of Baltimore the \$177,000 for that quarantine station which they took over two years ago?

Mr. GOOD. I have not reached the quarantine station, but I will say to the gentleman—

Mr. LINTHICUM. I wanted to know; that is all.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that we were called here on the 19th day of May with nearly all the appropriation bills to consider, and when we took up this bill we unanimously concluded we could not go into the rehearings. It was simply a question of judgment of the former committee, and we accepted their judgment in regard to those matters. And there may be and are many, many meritorious projects that were considered by the former committee that this committee did not consider, because it could not take the time to consider them. We felt it was more important to put this bill through and let it become a law before the 1st day of July than it was at this time to go into an investigation that would take two months to make, and if we took up the quarantine station we would have had to take up at least a hundred other matters that some other Members felt it was just as important to have an appropriation for as the gentleman from Maryland thinks it is important to have an appropriation for his quarantine station.

Mr. LINTHICUM. We felt that having taken over this hospital and having run it for the last two years that, according to the amount the appraisers set, it ought to be paid. We certainly would like to be paid so that we can build a hospital that will be advantageous to the Government as well.

Mr. GOOD. There are some few items that I want to call attention to, and I want to do it now, so that the House may understand some of the things in this bill that they might not otherwise have their attention called to. There has been a question before the House for some time in regard to the Employment Service. There have been those who wanted the Employment Service continued. There have been those who wanted the Employment Service discontinued entirely. The committee has considered both sides of that proposition in a general way, and we carry in this bill not a program for the present Employment Service but we do carry in the bill a provision creating in the Department of Labor a Bureau of Employment that will act as a clearing house in connection with the information sent by States and the political subdivisions thereof. And we have estimated very carefully as to what it will cost to carry on that kind of a service.

There are those who say that absolutely no good has come out of that service. That is not the opinion of the committee or any member of the committee, and I think I am speaking within the limit when I say that. There are on the committee some who think that the sum of at least \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 ought to be appropriated, and that we ought to send out agents all over the country and have agencies in every State and large city for this service. But it was the judgment of the committee that if we could preserve all that was good in the Employment Service by having here in Washington only a bureau that could act as a clearing house, and that would not send its agents and employees to the various States and various municipalities, good results would flow from such action. And so you will find in the bill a provision carrying \$200,000, which will be expended in the District of Columbia alone for that service. We do not carry anything for a field service, nor do we create such a service.

Then, too, we found that it was necessary to very largely increase the appropriations in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Before the gentleman leaves that Employment Bureau I would like to understand what the situation is. An appropriation of something like \$270,000 was made, was it not, to carry on the work of that bureau until the 1st of July?

Mr. GOOD. That is true.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And this appropriation that you suggest now is all that will be available for the entire next fiscal year?

Mr. GOOD. The appropriation made in the deficiency bill carried the Employment Service on a different basis. Practically all of that, or a large part of it, was expended in the field. It was expended for the rental of quarters in various States and cities, and it was expended for the employment of persons scattered throughout the country. This does not contemplate the expenditure of a penny for that purpose. That work in the field will have to be done by States or counties or cities, if it is done at all.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And the sum you name, \$200,000, is the entire amount appropriated by Congress for that object for the next fiscal year?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; that is the entire amount; and I will say to the gentleman that we arrive at this in this way: The estimate for \$4,000,000 included \$3,600,000 for field service and \$400,000 for departmental work in the city of Washington, including \$60,000 for traveling expenses; and in giving the \$200,000, if we erred at all, it was on the side of liberality, because I do not see how it can expend, under the rate of pay specified in the bill, any more than the amount carried.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I know something of what that field work was, and I think the gentleman's last statement—that he was liberal in appropriating \$200,000—is literally true.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to gentlemen of the House that this item is offered not as a matter authorized by law, but we included it because we thought it would enable the department to carry out a program that would permit it to preserve all that was good in the Employment Service and eliminate a great deal of that which was bad in the former administration of that service, and the result would aid the unemployed in securing work. We desire to eliminate the loss caused by unemployment.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. NOLAN. Has the gentleman given any consideration to soldier-placement work, which is now conducted in the Employment Service?

Mr. GOOD. The committee did not take into consideration the employment of any particular class of people, but all the unemployed. We looked at the matter in a broad way, and, of course, the matter of discharged soldiers and sailors will, as the gentleman knows, increase the number of the unemployed, because in some places, of course, the soldier will be given his old position and the person occupying that position will be thrown upon the public for a new place.

Mr. NOLAN. Does not the gentleman know that at the various Army posts throughout the country the United States Employment Service has had different sets of officials who take these men before they are discharged and direct them to the Employment Service, that finds positions for them after they are discharged?

Mr. GOOD. Of course, the gentleman knows that the Army at the present time, in addition to this Employment Service, is maintaining at Army posts and points of demobilization an employment service distinct from the Employment Service that is carried on by the Department of Labor.

Mr. NOLAN. My information, which I think is accurate, is that it is just the opposite. They have detailed officers to take care of this work in conjunction with the Employment Service of the Department of Labor. The soldier does not necessarily get employment at the place where he is demobilized, but he is placed by the Employment Service after he leaves the Army post or point of demobilization.

Mr. GOOD. They can make available all the information which the Army officers send to the bureau here.

Mr. NOLAN. How is this service to be kept in existence?

Mr. GOOD. The part to be performed by the Government will be kept in existence by the appropriation.

Mr. NOLAN. I am talking about the United States Employment Service, which finds positions for the soldiers after they leave the military service.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman this: That if the War Department does not maintain at these posts officers to furnish that information this bill does not carry anything to maintain them there.

Mr. NOLAN. That is what I wanted to bring out, that this bill does not make any provision for the Employment Service in the placement of soldiers throughout the country.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; it does. It provides \$200,000 for a bureau in Washington to find places for every person seeking employment, whether he is a soldier or sailor or civilian.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. In connection with the inquiry of the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN], I am quite sure that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations does not want to leave the impression on the minds of the members of this committee that this matter was not referred to in the subcommittee. He will probably recall that I stated that 400,000 soldiers had been placed through the United States Employment Service.

Mr. GOOD. I understand that.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not a fact that the chambers of commerce and other civic institutions throughout the country are lending their best efforts to find employment for the returning soldiers?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes; in conjunction with the United States Employment Service. They work with the United States Employment Service.

Mr. GOOD. It was the opinion of the committee, at least the majority of the committee, that the States or subdivisions of States would respond, where there was a shortage of labor or a surplus of labor, in furnishing this information, and the State that is not big enough to meet that situation and collect this information without our sending political agents of the Government from the seat of Government here into that State—the State that will not do that is not entitled to much consideration.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Then there are 45 such States in this Union.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. In the State of Illinois there is an employment service, paid for by a State appropriation, and the Chairman now presiding over the Committee of the Whole [Mr. MADDEN] will correct me if I am incorrect when I say that it is liberal and ample, and I am under the impression that in many of the States the same condition exists.

Mr. GOOD. I think that is true. And if the service is worth anything to the citizens of a State, that State will collect its information and report it to Washington. If they will not do that, they are not entitled to much consideration.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will this bill, if it passes the House in this form, result in the closing of these Federal employment agencies throughout the United States that are now existing?

Mr. GOOD. The bill itself, so far as the Federal appropriation is concerned, would have that effect, and, irrespective of the amount carried in this bill, a great many of them have already been closed and are being closed every day, because there were not enough funds appropriated in the former bill, and some of the States and municipalities did not see fit to make appropriations or raise money for that purpose.

Mr. BARBOUR. Did the committee take into consideration the fact that in a great many cities throughout the United States the expenses of these Federal employment agencies were being carried on by public subscription, in the hope that the committee would provide for them in this bill?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; the committee took that into consideration, but the committee took into consideration also the fact that the State in which a workingman lives owes some obligation to that person. The National Government can not do everything for him. If the State refuses to do anything we think it is unreasonable to come in here and ask an appropriation from the Federal Treasury of money that is raised entirely by taxation and by loans to do the things that the States say are not necessary to be done in their own communities. We leave that to the States to do, and I think properly so.

Now, we have increased the amount by \$7,000,000 for family allowances. The former bill carried \$33,000,000. The amount appropriated is \$40,000,000. The demands upon this fund will gradually decrease, but the amount carried in the former bill was not sufficient.

The amount carried in this bill for compensation fund is \$24,000,000. The amount carried in the former bill was only \$20,000,000. At the present rate the expenditure is not quite \$2,000,000 a month, but the rate of increase is enormous, and as these boys are discharged and their status is fixed under the law it will continue to increase. We can not tell just what this amount will be, but the amount carried in the bill of \$24,000,000 will not be enough. It was evident that the former did not carry enough to supply the service for much longer than the 1st of December, and I am frank to say that this amount was arrived at with a realization that it would be necessary later in the year, when we know more about the matter and the requirements of the service, to bring in an additional amount in some deficiency bill, because these sums are arrived at in the administration of the law, and we will pay whatever is necessary to pay, and when the appropriation falls short it will, of course, be supplemented.

Now, there is an item of \$200,000 carried in the bill that was not carried in the former bill, with regard to the Lincoln Memorial. The plans for the Lincoln Memorial contemplate the building of a reflecting pool that will be about 160 feet wide, as I now recall, and something over 2,000 feet long. That pool

is shown in all of the graphic illustrations with regard to the Lincoln Memorial. It is a part of the general landscaping of the part of the park where this memorial is located. It is a question whether we should take this matter up now; but those of you who have been down to the memorial realize that we must secure from some place a large amount of surplus earth to fill in around the memorial itself. By building this pool now we can use that surplus earth for filling in around the memorial, and if it is not built now it will be necessary to buy this earth and haul it from a distance, and then if this plan is carried out, which is the plan that has been adopted from the beginning, it will be necessary to move the earth a long distance. We are carrying in this bill, therefore, an amount sufficient to make this excavation and start this work, so that the memorial may be in some fit condition, so far as the grounds are concerned, when the memorial is dedicated in the fall.

There is also a provision in the bill reducing the amount of the appropriation for the Alaskan Railroad by \$1,964,351. That reduction was brought about in this way: The former bill carried the remainder of the authorization. This bill carries the remainder of the authorization, but before we considered this bill and subsequent to the adjournment of the Sixty-fifth Congress, Congress had also by a deficiency appropriation appropriated \$1,964,000, and it was necessary to reduce the appropriation carried in the former bill by that amount.

There was a large estimate brought in for the detection and prosecution of crime. Last year the Attorney General had \$2,000,000. He estimated \$1,500,000 originally, but later brought in an estimate of \$500,000 more. This bill carries for the purpose \$1,400,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee was recognized.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that his time be extended 25 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I will not object, the gentleman does not mean to use 25 minutes immediately following the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GOOD. No; not right away; I had agreed to yield that amount of time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa has gone very thoroughly into the various items and details of the bill, and it is not my purpose to undertake to discuss the bill in general. I may say that so far as the bill is concerned, and the appropriations contained in it, practically all of them have my approval, except in a few instances. I am not going to take the time of the committee in general debate to discuss these particular items in the bill to which I do not give assent, but I shall expect if the occasion arises later on under the five-minute rule to discuss them.

As explained by the gentleman from Iowa, this bill makes a considerable reduction over the bill that was passed by the House in February and which failed in the Senate. The reduction amounts to about \$367,272,401.50. It should be stated that that reduction is brought about by the very great reduction made in the estimates of the Shipping Board, a reduction amounting to something like three hundred and eighty odd million dollars.

As a matter of fact, if the Shipping Board appropriation is not considered this bill really carries an increase of something like \$20,000,000 over the bill passed in February by the House and which failed in the Senate. For instance, as the report shows, the amount by which sums in the previous bill have been increased for various activities amount to \$13,973,000.

This bill carries appropriations for new items amounting to \$6,054,203.50. The total increase over the last bill, excluding the items for the Shipping Board, is \$20,027,203.

In so far as the cut in the appropriations for the Shipping Board is concerned, I think it only fair for those who had charge of the former bill to say that that decrease has been made possible by the change of conditions since the 1st of February when the hearings on the sundry civil bill were conducted and when the first bill was framed. It appears that since that time the Shipping Board has entered upon a program of selling a great many ships. It is the purpose, as the gentleman from Iowa stated, of the Shipping Board to sell all of the wooden vessels and a number of the cargo steel vessels.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. I rose to inquire whether the gentleman knows of any provision of the law that authorizes the Shipping Board to sell steel vessels without advertising.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know that they are selling them without advertisement.

Mr. CALDWELL. In the press they say they will not give out the terms under which they are selling them until after so many days. I did not know that there was any law passed by Congress that would permit their selling steel vessels without advertising them, so that everybody could bid on them. Has there been any public advertising; and if not, why do they discriminate?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I know the statement was made by Commander Ackerman, representing the Emergency Fleet Corporation, that a full and complete notice is given in the newspapers, and in order to protect the Emergency Fleet Corporation from the charge that full publicity was not given the corporation has in its files certain newspaper clippings showing that full publicity is given with reference to all sales made by the Shipping Board.

As I was saying, since the former bill was framed the Shipping Board has not only entered upon a selling program but has proceeded with the operation of ships, and it now develops, as the gentleman from Iowa states, that the net proceeds of the operation of the ships will amount to a considerable sum.

There is no reason under the law, as construed by the Shipping Board, why the net proceeds from that operation, in so far as they can be, and the proceeds of the sales of ships should not go into the general fund of the Emergency Fleet Corporation for the construction of ships.

In addition to the change of conditions which made it possible to make this reduction—

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. I would like to know whether, when they are selling these vessels, they are permitted to sell them to other nations and let them become vessels under another flag?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are selling ships both to foreign and domestic purchasers. I may say that it was stated by representatives of the Emergency Fleet Corporation that it is the purpose to sell the more desirable ships, the larger ships, and those of greater speed to domestic concerns with the understanding and agreement on the part of such purchasers that the ships shall sail under the American flag. It is only the type of vessels that are considered not so desirable that are being sold abroad.

Mr. CALDWELL. In other words, the wooden ships?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Well, nobody cares anything about them.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Are these ships being sold at less than cost?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Wooden ships are being sold probably at less than cost.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The Shipping Board is going on and building more ships and accepting more ships—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that they are selling these wooden vessels which are undesirable, of course, for many reasons, and they propose to build such ships as are built in the future of a better and more desirable and up-to-date type. In other words, steel vessels of larger capacity and of greater speed.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman remembers the almost scandal that arose out of the disposition of vessels that had been taken over during the Spanish War, which were disposed of shortly after the war for ridiculously low prices, at least a great deal less than they had cost. The gentleman, I presume, is taking steps in this bill to insure that that kind of a situation will not again be presented to this country.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think there is any need for apprehension that the commission and those in charge of the Emergency Fleet Corporation will not fully protect the interests of the Government.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Is it left purely to their discretion?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I may say to the gentleman that these wooden vessels, as the gentleman knows, are of an undesirable type. They can not possibly compete with steel vessels. They are not built for overseas trade. They were built simply for coastwise trade, in order to release steel vessels that were being used in coastwise trade for overseas trade. Those ships ultimately must be sold, because, as I say, they can not be used in competition with larger and speedier vessels. Manifestly it is to the interest of the United States Government to sell them now, when there is such a great demand for ships, and when the Government is in a position to say that it can make spot delivery and can secure better prices now than if it waits a year or two, when it possibly could not sell them at all.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Is it in the discretion of the Shipping Board to sell them for whatever it chooses?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does the gentleman think that discretion ought to be reposed in them?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not see how Congress, sitting here without any knowledge of the shipping industry, and without knowledge of conditions that confront the Shipping Board, could undertake to legislate with reference to the sale of these ships, in so far as the price is concerned. We must trust somebody.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does not the gentleman think that we can safeguard it by providing for publicity and competition?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is publicity.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Is there any law which requires it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Frankly, I can not say to the gentleman that there is a law which requires it, except the general law which requires publicity when sales of Government property are made; but as a matter of fact publicity is being given to these sales, according to the hearings.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That is the point I want to get at. Does not the gentleman think we should have some ample provision of law safeguarding the sale of these ships? Otherwise, the Shipping Board might simply turn them over to somebody for a nominal price, and while I do not question the business judgment or patriotism of the members of the board, it seems to me to be a very objectionable public policy to leave that kind of thing wholly to the discretion of an officer without safeguards or provisions of law.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I may say that there is a general provision of law which does require publicity in the sale of Government property.

Mr. CALDWELL. But if the gentleman will yield, this Emergency Fleet Corporation is a corporation that is performing governmental functions. It holds title to these ships, and the only way they have any right to sell them at all is upon the theory that they are a corporation, a legal entity, and can do it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is the point I made here. There is no law, as I understand it, that specifically authorizes any branch of the Government to sell any Government property unless a board sits upon it and fixes an upset price and they advertise it, and everything is given full publicity. As I understand it, the sales of these ships have been taken over by, you may say, the board of directors of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and they have to a certain extent made private sales.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They have made sales to private concerns.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes; and they have made sales in which the terms of the sale have not been what they advertised, so that other bidders would know about it, if we are to believe the Associated Press reports concerning it. I was confused about that, and that is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I may say to the gentleman that the Emergency Fleet Corporation has taken pains to let the whole world know that they have ships for sale. Every effort has been made to let all possible purchasers, both in this country and in foreign countries, become acquainted with the fact that these ships are for sale. I do not think there is any question, so far as these gentlemen are concerned, that they have given the widest possible publicity to it, but I do not know whether it would be possible to put these ships up at public sale and sell them to the highest bidder, because, as I say, conditions are changing every day.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. EDMONDS. I would like to state that the Emergency Fleet Corporation has full authority to purchase, sell, charter just the same as a private concern has. That authority was given to them by Congress.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Do I understand that means without control, that they have absolute discretion to buy and sell at will?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. They are a corporation, created by the vote of the gentleman and the vote of every other Member of this House, and in which the Government owns the entire stock of \$50,000,000. They are acting as a corporation, the Government being the sole stockholder, and therefore they have, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS] suggests, full authority to sell, to operate, to do anything that a private corporation may do.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does not the gentleman think there should be something to safeguard the publicity and competition in those sales?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think, I will say to the gentleman, that in a matter of this sort, where conditions are changing every day and where in a month from now you may not be able to secure as favorable price for your ships as tomorrow, and where frequently action is necessary to be taken quickly, that we must of necessity put some confidence and some faith in those who are at the head of this Emergency Fleet Corporation, just as the gentleman, if he owned stock in a private corporation, would put trust and confidence in those who were elected to manage and control the corporation in which he was a stockholder.

Mr. WELLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do.

Mr. WELLING. Can the gentleman say what percentage of losses the Government has sustained in the disposal of these wooden ships?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand that a good price is being paid to-day, but it is anticipated there will ultimately be some loss necessarily in the sale of these ships, because it is not expected that prices will be so good in the future as they have been in the past.

Now, to proceed further with what I was speaking of when I was interrupted—that is, the causes which have resulted in a reduction of these estimates—I referred to the fact that the Shipping Board has now a selling program, and that has enabled the committee, with the concurrence of the Shipping Board, to anticipate the receipts, at least in part, that are expected from the sale of ships during the next fiscal year. In addition to that, I referred to the fact that they are now making money out of their operations, and it is anticipated there will be a considerable sum which can be used from those operations in the construction of ships.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRIGGS. To what extent does the department intend now to sell its steel ships? What percentage of the steel ships does it expect to sell?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not say to the gentleman, and I do not know that the Shipping Board could answer that question. I do not think it is the purpose of the Shipping Board to sell any of the desirable ships, the more desirable types of ships, at this time or until Congress shall determine what is to be done, but they are selling a number of steel ships in order to round out their fleet.

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman will permit, that depends largely upon the condition of affairs in Europe as to when it would be wise to dispose of those ships.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, I do not think the Shipping Board has any idea of selling all their steel ships by any means, regardless of conditions in Europe, but it is impossible for the department now to state how many of those ships they will sell or intend to sell. It depends on conditions, as the gentleman from Mississippi has stated.

Mr. BRIGGS. I desire to ask whether the Shipping Board have any program now for the sale of steel ships or the disposition of steel ships. I understood Chairman Hurley has advocated a certain plan for the disposition of ships, and is this action that is now being pursued of selling steel ships without inviting competitive bids or other methods to be pursued in line with Chairman Hurley's plan of disposing of all the steel ships or is it only applied to a certain percentage of those which are regarded as undesirable ships at this time?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My understanding is from the statements in the hearings that he does not contemplate at this time selling any ships except those that the Shipping Board regard as undesirable with a view of rounding out their fleet.

Now, gentlemen, if I may proceed, because I have only a few more minutes, in addition to the saving made possible on account of the two facts to which I have referred, as the gentleman from Iowa stated, it was stated to the committee that something like \$45,000,000 could be utilized in the construction of ships, and which is made up of an unexpended balance of the housing appropriation, transportation appropriation, and a certain number of items which I need not mention; in addition to that it developed that at the present time the Emergency Fleet Corporation has claims against the War Department of \$45,000,000, \$2,000,000 against the Navy Department, \$18,000,000 against the Belgian Relief Commission, more than \$2,000,000 against foreign Governments, nearly half a million dollars claim against the Food Administration, all of which when collected may be utilized in the construction of ships. Then, as the gentleman from Iowa stated, there is \$118,000,000 now in the Treasury as an unexpended balance of the appropriation which was made some time ago for the purchase of foreign

ships, money which has not been used and which will not be used. Then the gentleman from Iowa has referred to the fact that some \$80,000,000 would be available on account of the abandonment of the program of ship construction. Personally, I know nothing about that; there is nothing in the hearings so far as I can find to justify that statement; nothing was said in the committee on the part of Mr. Harley and Commander Ackerman as to that, and I was of the opinion that this sum was taken into consideration when they presented their estimates; however, on the assurance of the gentleman from Iowa, who has conferred with them, that they agree to that, why, I have given my own personal assent to it. Then the gentleman from Iowa referred to \$11,000,000 which is eliminated from the appropriations carried in the former sundry civil bill for the training of recruits.

He stated the Shipping Board now thought this sum could properly be carried under operations and should be paid for out of operations. I repeat, while this bill does carry a very great reduction of more than three hundred and sixty odd million dollars, as a matter of fact the reduction was made possible on account of the change of conditions since the 1st of February, when the former bill was prepared and sent to the House. In other respects the bill has actually been increased more than twenty millions for the next year, which does not bear out the assertion that the Republicans are practicing a greater economy than the Democrats.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. In some of the sales that are now being made of ships by the Shipping Board are the estimates of the return from those sales based upon the return to be made in the fiscal year ending in 1920, or are they inclusive of the whole purchase price to be received from those ships? In other words, are not the terms of the sales of the ships that are now being made predicated upon a five-year period, a certain amount of the sale price being paid down—25 per cent—and the balance distributed in four years?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true. And the committee has not taken into consideration the full amount of the purchase price that is expected to be obtained in the sale of ships. But it has only taken into consideration for the next fiscal year a portion of the purchase price that the ship commissioner expects to receive during that fiscal year. In other words, it was stated that probably \$125,000,000 or \$150,000,000 of ships could be sold. The committee has only taken into consideration the sum of \$75,000,000 for that purpose. Now, that may cut too deep. I am not prepared to say it will not. It appeared to the ship commissioners and the others who came before the committee that it would be taking too much from them. But if it does, I will say to the gentleman that they, of course, can come and get a deficiency later on.

Now, I want to proceed, if the gentleman will permit me, to another feature.

Mr. BRIGGS. All right.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, gentlemen, this bill carries an addition of \$500,000 to the appropriation which was carried in the former sundry civil bill for the detection of crime. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] has already referred to the fact that the Attorney General appeared before the committee and requested \$2,000,000 or an excess of \$500,000 over and above the estimate that was submitted in the last Congress. The committee on the former sundry civil bill cut the estimate of \$1,500,000 to \$900,000. This bill carries \$1,400,000. This increase was made in order to enable the Attorney General to hunt down and prosecute to the limit the anarchists over the country. I am sure every member of the committee was anxious to give the Attorney General every dollar he wanted for this particular purpose. So far as I am concerned, I would have been willing to have appropriated the whole amount for him if needed to crush out these terrorists and put them where they belong.

The whole machinery of the law should be set in motion to stamp this out and put an end to their practices. We have an Attorney General who is not going to hesitate to apply the full force of the law to them, and if he needs more money I am sure Congress will give it to him.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman explain the \$200,000 in reference to the Lincoln Memorial pool down there?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will recall that the original appropriation for the Lincoln Memorial carried \$2,000,000. Later on the Congress appropriated \$500,000, making a total of \$2,500,000. That was for the Lincoln Memorial proper—the building. Now, this bill carries \$200,000 for a reflecting pool which is to be constructed in front of the building, and is a part of the landscape. It has, as I understand,

no connection with the Lincoln Memorial proper, except that it is in front of it and will enhance its beauty and attractiveness.

Mr. GALLIVAN. A part of the grounds?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. A part of Potomac Park, a part of the scheme of the Superintendent of Public Grounds and of the Fine Arts Commission, and these other commissions which are interested in beautifying the grounds and buildings of Washington.

Mr. GARNER. This proposed \$200,000 is not authorized, then, by the law that authorized the construction of the Lincoln Memorial?

Mr. GALLIVAN. No.

Mr. GARNER. And therefore is not authorized by law at present, and is subject to a point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know whether it is subject to a point of order or not.

Mr. GARNER. Under what provision of law would you make this appropriation, then?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know.

Mr. GARNER. I judge somebody else will have to find out, then.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think it will be subject to a point of order, unless it can be held in order under the general scheme of park improvement in Washington.

Mr. GARNER. Under that scheme you could build a pool or a monument or anything else, and I do not believe that general scheme is broad enough to carry this.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise, extend, and correct my remarks in the Record.

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

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in nine long, weary, waltzing years that a Republican Committee on Appropriations has had the privilege of bringing before the Congress of the United States a sundry civil appropriation bill, a bill which carries almost a half billion of dollars. There is a reason for the Republicans being in the position of having charge now of the Committee on Appropriations. I want to congratulate the new chairman of that committee on his exceptional work, and also his Republican associates on their work in preparing these supply bills in such speedy fashion, in working until midnight, in working all day on Sundays; and I want especially to mention the names of those assistants to that committee, who have worked until 6 o'clock in the morning for the last three days preparing this bill. First of all, I want to mention the exceptional clerk of our committee, Mr. Marcellus C. Shield, and then his assistants, Mr. W. A. Ryan, Mr. J. F. Scanlon, and Mr. A. K. Barta. They have worked just as faithfully and just as loyally with our Republican Committee on Appropriations as they worked with the Democratic committee, by which they were trained. No committee in any Congress ever had more faithful and efficient assistants.

Now, Mr. Chairman, both of my colleagues on the subcommittee on the sundry civil bill have referred to one item in this bill, namely, the appropriation granted to the Attorney General, which is something over \$1,400,000, for the detection of crime due to unrest in the country.

They have laid special emphasis upon it, and they have said to the House that they would gladly vote every dollar asked for—even twice this sum—when the Department of Justice will be able to show the committee that the condition of social unrest in the country is such that the department should have that amount of money. I want the committee specially to fasten its attention upon that item, and in addressing the House at this time my purpose is to draw to the attention of Congress and of the country the danger that is now upon us, a danger which will probably mean that the Attorney General will have to come back and ask for more money for this fund.

We can not close our eyes to the fact that there is a scething undercurrent of unrest prevailing among all the toilers throughout the country, which is fast developing into expressions and demonstrations of the most radical form. Yes; it has broken out in many places in the most violent form of anarchy, a defiance of the law by an attempt on the part of desperate men to seek vengeance for their so-called wrongs. Conditions, gentlemen, seem to have reached a point where sane and sensible men are saying, "Whither are we drifting?"

The law-abiding, God-fearing people of our country are trying to analyze the causes that are responsible for the recent out-

break of lawlessness and the general feeling of unrest and discontent that now prevails, which makes an appropriation of \$1,500,000 necessary in this bill for the detection of criminals.

It seems to me, gentlemen—and I want the attention of every man in the committee—that we do not have to look far for one of the main causes of the present-day conditions in this country. The men who are most directly responsible are those misguided officials in the city of Washington, clothed with authority during the period of the war which has turned their heads. While the President has been in Europe some of these officials seem to have gone mad in their lust for power, and they have blindly blundered in the administration of their departments in such a manner as to aggravate the feeling of unrest which has been referred to by my two colleagues. In my judgment, it would be a great relief—yes, a Godsend—to the people of this country if the President will hurry home and clean house in his official family. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If he will do this, I believe it will do more than any other thing to check radicalism and anarchy and make appropriations of this kind unnecessary.

During the period of the war the press censorship, denial of freedom of speech, and other inexcusable blunders by autocratic officials aroused a spirit of resentment among the people. One of the greatest blunderers of the administration, and I believe one of the worst autocrats that this country has ever had in official life, and the one man mainly responsible for the present condition of social unrest, for which we are providing in this bill, is the present Postmaster General. [Applause.]

Starting out with the administration at its beginning, he had every opportunity to add luster to the Democratic Party and to make a name for himself that would go down in history as a gem. How well he has succeeded in his work as a public official is a matter of record of which any man ought to be ashamed. I can best sum up in a brief way the official record of Mr. Burleson in the words of a writer in the *New Republic* headed, "The tie that binds."

Suppose Mr. Burleson, either on his own initiative or Mr. Wilson's, were actually to leave the Cabinet. Would the country gain as mightily as we have been told? Have Mr. Burleson's critics, through their agitation, thought their agitation through to the end? Do they see the consequences?

Consider for a moment who it is that wants Mr. Burleson to go. The business men, because he has destroyed the efficiency of the Postal Service. The trade-unionists, because he has fought the interests of organized labor. The owners of telegraph lines, because he has shut them out from their own companies. The users of telegraph lines, because he has raised the rates on messages. The operators of telegraph lines, because he has raised the rates without raising their wages. The publishers of great periodicals, because he has backed the zone law. The mail sorters and mail collectors, because he has backed a nonliving wage. The Republicans, because he is a political messenger in the lobbies of Congress. The Democrats, because he is a drag on the party's chances in 1920.

[Laughter on the Republican side.]

You can not dodge the conclusion. To-day, when empires are splitting apart, when vast territories are torn into angry clans, when brother greets brother with a machine gun, what force is it that keeps these 48 States of ours together, a cohesive whole, a single union, now and forever, one and inseparable? What force prompts capitalist to grasp the hand of laborer, Republican to take common counsel with Socialist? What bond unites trade-unionist and banker? What common brief keeps I. W. W. from leaping for the throat of broker? The country rises, rises unanimously, rises, and like the Germans in 1914, cries, "We have one bond and one alone—getting rid of Burleson!"

Let the agitators take heed. Let them, while there is yet time, beware. Lest, like Samson, they pull down upon our heads the mighty temple of our progenitors.

It is the unanimous sentiment of the people of the entire country that Postmaster General Burleson is the biggest and most complete failure as a public official that the country has ever produced.

The chief cause responsible for the failure of Mr. Burleson is "love of power." This weakness is attended by "fear" and out of fear "cruelty" and "brutality" have inevitably developed. By his acts he forced strikes among the employees of telephone and telegraph companies which caused a violent disturbance in business and great financial loss. The strike of the New England telephone operators was only a part of the universal strike of public sentiment which now exists against the Burlesonization of important national interests. A strike maker and a strike breeder is a dangerous sort of man to be in command of such vital enterprises just now. He knew that the women operators in Boston had grievances that would bear scrutiny. He was aware that they would strike. He knew it was his duty to see that no stoppage of business occurred. He was informed that the grievances had not been considered, but with the bullheadedness so characteristic of him he did nothing whatever either to help the girls to a hearing or see that the business people did not suffer a loss. At no time was he willing to meet the workers in a kindly spirit, and at no time did he

suggest any way by which a decent adjustment of their troubles could be had. If he had been bent on forcing a strike, he could not have acted a better part in bringing it about. Although the telephones, like the telegraphs, were under the control of the Post Office Department, that branch of the public service was as helpless at the crisis of the trouble as it was weak and inefficient at its beginning. Having done nothing to avert the strike and having left its settlement to private agencies, it is hard to understand how he can reconcile his practice with his Government-ownership theory. Mr. Burleson knew that a vexatious and costly strike was imminent in New England, but he evidently did not care. It came and went in the most approved style of corporations and labor organizations acting solely under the influence of arrogance and greed.

When the telephone employees could not get redress or even proper consideration of the grievances and were forced to strike, Mr. Burleson claimed that "the strike was due to a misunderstanding."

Later, when he forced a strike among the telegraph employees he "got out from under" by turning the management back to the private owners. He has by his actions destroyed all hope of Government ownership of public utilities, notwithstanding his public declarations in favor of it.

The worst thing about Burleson's malpractice in office is that, seizing hold of the very nerves of America, he has wrenched them asunder. There is not a home or a business house that has not felt, in a small measure or great, the wrongs done by the Postmaster General to the mail, the telephone, and the telegraph services. The whole country has suffered from the deterioration of the administration of the domestic postal service under his management, and the defects of the overseas Army mail service have been scarcely less than scandalous. His capacity for mischief has accomplished even more than might have seemed possible to anyone else. As a trouble maker and breeder of discontent among employees of the Post Office Department and by his arbitrary and unwise methods of dealing with these employees, he created a widespread revolt that has driven the members of three out of four branches of the Postal Service into the arms of the American Federation of Labor for refuge and self-protection. The Postal Service is filled with embittered, baffled, underpaid, and overworked men. It would have been in disastrous conflict with State laws and labor unions and an enlightened public opinion long ago were it not sheltered by the unapproachable authority of the Federal Government. The best of Mr. Burleson's critics has very properly called him a "sweatshopper." The Postmaster General has clashed with labor unions. He has made his service hated by thousands of those who serve in it, because the Postal Department has been administered since he went into office under a rule of tyranny and an economic creed so harsh as to bring disintegration as a natural consequence. Yet Mr. Burleson remains the swaggering reactionary, safe in the Cabinet, a living, breathing denial and contradiction of all that is generous and wise and farsighted in President Wilson's policies.

His attitude toward the employees of the Postal Service was thoroughly out of harmony with the policy of the Government during the war. At the time when the President, under advice of leaders of labor and employers, announced a program of collective bargaining, Postmaster General Burleson was disciplining postal employees who dared to ask for this same right. Some of his postmasters were tyrannizing over these employees, shifting their positions at will, and the men were without redress. He has mistreated and maltreated post-office employees, exploiting them worse than any private profiteer, opposing any increases in their wages, and, czarlike, frowning upon their American rights to organize. No shortsighted corporation slave driver of the old type would have possibly displayed less sympathy and more ineptitude than has Mr. Burleson in his dealings with the employees of the Postal Service. When he first took hold he found it a peaceful and loyal branch of the Government, and he has converted it into one which is personally rebellious and hostile to him.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard it said time after time that Mr. Burleson received his appointment because of his great political acumen. If he is such a political wonder, let him get out of the Cabinet, take hold of the affairs of my dear old, dying Democratic Party, and try if he can restore it to life. At any rate, the public, whose postal facilities have been destroyed, and the Government employees, who are subject to his autocratic will, are entitled to a new and a fair deal.

Oblivion yearns for Mr. Burleson as it yearns for no other man in public life anywhere. He is inexplicable. The people of the United States whose interest is still concentrated on the towering issues of war, are as yet unaware of the bizarre ruin that he is making of what was once the most efficient and the

most popular branch of the Federal service. He is the greatest misfit in public office that this country has ever known, and his continuance in public service is a standing menace to the future success of the Democratic Party, to which I still pledge my allegiance. [Applause.]

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, on pages 26 to 30 in this bill before us for discussion are found items of appropriation for the War Risk Insurance Bureau. This prompts me to take a few moments of the House to present in a simple, businesslike manner a matter which I believe is of general interest to all the Members of Congress. It is a matter which relates itself to the war-risk insurance act, relative to payment of insurance to dependents of men who have died in the service in the line of duty between the time of induction and entrainment by their local draft boards and the examination by the Army surgeon or physician at the camp of mobilization. In my judgment, this act needs amending, so as to permit the War Risk Insurance Bureau to be just and fair in the treatment of thousands of dependents who have lost either their husband, father, or son in the service of their country between the time of induction and entrainment by their local boards and their final examination by the Army camp physician or surgeon and their assignment to their Army organizations at the mobilization camps.

The facts are that a great many of our soldiers died on the train on the way to the camp of mobilization from accident or sickness, others were placed in camps infested with the terrible scourge of Spanish influenza, and thousands of these men died in the course of a few days or weeks. To all intents and purposes a man inducted and entrained by the local draft board becomes thereby a member of the Naval and Military Establishments of the Government and is subject to the orders of the military and naval regulations, so much so that if he attempted to desert or in any way violate any of the military and naval regulations he would be subject to court-martial. In this belief a great many of the dependents of soldiers who died between the time of induction by the local boards and the final acceptance at mobilization camps have applied to the Government for the payment of their claims, believing that they are entitled to the benefits under the war-risk insurance act.

These claims and contentions on the part of the dependents have brought about necessary rulings and interpretations of the act by the War Risk Insurance Bureau. One of these rulings is that no insurance could be justly paid to dependents of men who died between induction and entrainment and before they were reexamined by the Army physicians or surgeons at the concentration camp and assigned to their organizations in the Army service. This condition and this ruling have worked untold hardship and injury to thousands of cases all over the country, and it is my understanding that the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, as well as the Treasury Department, is very much in sympathy with the just contention made by a great many of these dependents that the Government should pay the insurance in full because the Government took these men from their homes under the selective-draft act in sound body and mind, and in the line of duty, under military regulations, exposed them to accident and contagious diseases, which resulted in their death before they could possibly be reexamined and accepted at the camp of mobilization.

I wish to place before you a concrete case which has come under my own observation and which is typical of thousands of other cases throughout the entire country. I have had this case under consideration for the last six months, and have consulted the War Risk Insurance Bureau with a view of having it properly adjusted. This private was attached to recruit depot, Company No. 6, Camp Shelby, Miss. He was examined and inducted into the service by the local board at Grantsburg, Wis., and entrained for Camp Shelby, Miss., on October 21, 1918. He arrived at Camp Shelby October 24, 1918, and remained in the Army camp under the direction of the military officers from October 24 to October 28, when he was stricken with Spanish influenza and taken to the Army hospital and died November 4, 1918. On November 2, 1918, he took out insurance in the amount of \$10,000, payable to his father under insurance certificate No. 4296229. At the time this insurance was applied for—on November 2, 1918—there were confined in this Army hospital nearly 1,200 recruits suffering from Spanish influenza, all of whom had not as yet been reexamined or accepted into the active military service. We all know the great prevalence of this disease, not only in the Army camps but all over the country, and while the Bureau of War Risk Insurance had up to that time refused to accept any applications for insurance from men who had not been reexamined by the Army camp physicians or surgeons and accepted into the active military service, realizing the critical condition of these men, permission was received

from The Adjutant General of the Army to accept applications for insurance from these men while they were confined in the hospital, and under this special dispensation of the regular ruling the soldier I speak of applied for insurance while he was in the hospital November 2, 1918, and insurance certificate No. 4296229, referred to above, was issued by the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

The father of the deceased soldier presented his claim for insurance, as he believed he was fully justified in doing, since his son was in good health when he left home for entrainment and mobilization, and that his death was due entirely to the Spanish influenza with which he came in contact when he arrived at the camp.

On March 13 the Chief of the Compensation and Claims Division of the War Risk Insurance Bureau advised the father that the bureau was unable to consider the claim for insurance of his son, owing to the fact that he was never at any time, while at the camp, put through the usual physical examination or accepted by the camp doctor for military service, but in that letter acknowledged all the facts which I have set forth in the beginning of my statement relative to induction and entrainment by the local board and the arriving at camp October 24, and that he was taken to the hospital suffering from influenza, but stating, further, that because he had not been reexamined and accepted into the service of the United States Army the bureau could not consider his application for insurance as being valid and, therefore, could not make payment under the policy. The father sent me this letter, and I again took the matter up personally with the Director of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, and in his letter to me under date of April 11 he states that under the rulings of the bureau the application for insurance was invalid for two reasons—first, because the soldier had never been physically reexamined and accepted into the military service of the United States; and, second, because even if he had been physically examined and accepted into the service of the United States, his application for insurance was made upon his deathbed and was, therefore, invalid for the reason that it was deathbed insurance. Now, the second reason for refusing the claim has been overruled by a special order of the Director of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, dated June 9, 1919, which deals directly with the validity of applications for insurance made by soldiers in a dying condition, the director's order being as follows:

In determining the validity of applications for war-risk insurance and claims based thereon, the fact that the applicants were in a dying condition at the time the applications were made shall be disregarded. Applications for war-risk insurance that have been rejected on the ground that the applicants were mortally ill at the time of making such applications shall be reconsidered and insurance granted thereon if such applications are otherwise valid under the war-risk insurance act. The Compensation and Claims Division of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance shall immediately reexamine all claims for insurance that have been disallowed on the ground that the applications therefor were made while the applicants were in a dying condition, and if such applications are otherwise valid, shall make awards thereon pursuant to the provisions of the war-risk insurance act. The beneficiaries or other persons concerned in such cases shall be notified that the case will be reopened and adjudicated in accordance with the provisions of this order.

This order by the War Risk Insurance Bureau is, in my judgment perfectly sound and correct and helps to deal justly with the insurance claims upon this bureau, and makes it possible for the United States of America to do the right and square thing by its citizenship. The Bureau of War Risk Insurance, I think, is equally anxious to do the just and square thing by thousands of claimants under the ruling given in the director's letter to me of June 4, when he states:

I regret to inform you that the general counsel of the bureau has decided that the bureau has no authority, under the provisions of the war-risk insurance act, to grant insurance to a drafted man until he has been physically examined and finally accepted for military service by Army surgeons at camp or other point of concentration. The bureau can not bind the Government beyond its authority. The bureau must, therefore, deny that insurance was granted on the life of the above-named deceased soldier.

We must protect equally the sacred rights and interests of our Government and the sacred rights and interests of our soldiers and their dependents. I am aware that the approximately 32,000 local draft boards in the United States sent during the war to the various camps for final assignment to their Army organizations about 300,000 men who were rejected by the Army camp physicians and surgeons. Thousands of these cases were tubercular; some had glass eyes; some had clubfeet and numberless other ailments and diseases. It is therefore perfectly evident that the Government could not establish the precedent of paying insurance to these absolutely unworthy cases, even though they were inducted and entrained by their local boards. The payment of these 300,000 unworthy claims would mean a draft on the Treasury and the taxpayers of the United States amounting to the enormous sum of \$1,200,000,000, counting an average insur-

ance of \$4,000 to each claim. Now, what I am anxious to show is that the War Risk Insurance Bureau is correct in its contentions, as we must protect the Government from these 300,000 unscrupulous claims, which, in fact, are not claims at all upon the Government. And no one desires more than I do to protect the Government and our taxpayers from any unjust claims and drain upon the Treasury. Indeed, I am very much in sympathy with every movement that to-day looks toward the reduction of our taxes and the retrenchment of expenses, and it is a very happy sign indeed that our Army, Navy, and sundry civil bills have been reduced by approximately \$1,500,000,000 in their proposed appropriations by their respective committees.

We must eliminate every bureau and department that has sprung into being under war conditions that is no longer necessary in peace times. We must apply the pruning knife most diligently and persistently. We must install the budget system. We must eliminate extravagance and waste wherever found in all the departments of the Government; but in our anxiety to reduce taxes and prevent extravagance we must never forget to do justice to needy dependents of honest men who died in the service of their country.

We must so amend the war-risk insurance act that we will protect the Government from unscrupulous claims and at the same time pay insurance to dependents of honest and brave soldiers who were in sound body and mind when they left their homes and were inducted by their local draft boards and who, by no fault of their own, died in transit, in the line of duty, by accident, or from contagious diseases before they could be reexamined and accepted into the active military service at the camp of mobilization.

I have therefore prepared and introduced a bill, No. 5907, to amend the war-risk insurance act so that it will be possible for the Government to protect itself against fraud and unscrupulous claimants and at the same time deal justly by thousands of dependents who have been deprived of their father, husband, or son. From the home camps as well as from the battle fields of France and Flanders comes to-day a spirit born of devotion, sacrifice, and service that demands a justice and a righteousness defined in the great Rooseveltian phrase of "a square deal to all." I plead for simple justice to the dependent wife, mother, father, or child of the soldier who has made the supreme sacrifice in the line of duty in order that Christianity, liberty, and civilization might be vouchsafed to us and to all mankind. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not know what the real grievance of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] is against the Postmaster General, but from the fury and intemperance of his criticism it is certainly of a personal nature. The Postmaster General does not deserve from his bitterest Republican enemy such an unwarranted criticism. Of course, I can not in the short time left discuss his whole record. I can only briefly refer to it. If there has been one Cabinet officer in the history of our Government who has made an honest effort for economy in Government expenditures, it has been the Postmaster General. Those of us who believe in economical government and indorse officials who make an effort for economy should hold up the hands of General Burleson and not condemn him for his honest and courageous efforts to give the people a businesslike administration, and my Republican friends who are now out on a campaign of economy ought not to have applauded so vigorously the statement made by my friend from Massachusetts. This applause, however, was partisan Republican applause because a Democratic official is attacked by a Democrat on this floor. The gentleman from Massachusetts was prompted by some personal grievance and you Republicans are prompted by partisan feeling and prejudice.

I do not know what particular action on the part of the Postmaster General has caused this assault. I do not know whether the Postmaster General's action on the abolition of the pneumatic tubes in the city of Boston had anything to do with it or not, nor do I know what stockholders were affected, but I do know that this House by a large majority sustained the Postmaster General in that position. I do know that it was a nonpartisan proposition, a purely business proposition, and I do know that many Republicans voted with the Postmaster General, along with the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Moon, who led the fight and abolished the pneumatic-tube service. Perhaps the stockholders in this pneumatic-tube corporation would be glad to see our Postmaster General discredited because their profits were stopped. This assault is certainly a personal one and not prompted by any desire to serve the public.

Another thing: I know that the questions that General Burleson has to deal with now and has had to deal with in the

past are most difficult to solve without incurring the ill will of those whose salaries are affected, and if you Republicans shall come into power you are going to find that you will have to deal with them, and unless you yield to these demands you will find that your officials are going to be subjected to the same character of abuse. When you do not yield to the demands made on the Treasury by these members of the Post Office Department that belong to the various organizations and affiliate with certain labor organizations, you are going to find that you will be singled out as an object of criticism and abuse.

Postmaster General Burleson, from the beginning of his administration down to this good hour, has courageously met that issue and has endeavored to do what you Republicans say you want to do, economize in the expenditure of public money.

It is true that when you stand between a man and the Public Treasury you always gain his enmity and his ill will. Many of us love Postmaster General Burleson for some of the enemies that he has made. I know that the rural letter carriers, all of whom, as a rule, are a fine lot of fellows, because of their insistent demand for increased pay became angry with the Postmaster General and do not like him because he for a time opposed them. Notwithstanding the fact that Congress did increase their pay and has increased their pay radically, yet they have not forgiven him because he did for a time object and prevent radical increases in that service. And in all the departments of the service the Postmaster General has made every effort to economize in the public expense, and forsooth he is abused.

Now, if an officer of the Government grows unpopular when he tries to economize in public expenditure, and you Republicans fail to hold up his hands, you gentlemen will never be able to carry out reforms which you pretend you will carry out now if you applaud a man who criticizes officials who have been economical. [Applause.]

The issue is squarely drawn, and if you take your stand with the idea that you will condemn everything a Democrat does because he is a Democrat and praise everything that a Republican does because he is a Republican you will look in vain for efficient and economical officers in either party. We should try a man fairly and on his record irrespective of his party.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended five minutes in order that I may yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield that time to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, there have been but few beings on the face of the earth that were perfect. I believe they do speak of Enoch as being a perfect man, and God took him. They speak of Elijah as a good man, and he was taken up in a chariot of fire. Christ was the greatest being ever on earth, and He was crucified. I do not suppose you will find any Cabinet officer that will be spirited away like Enoch, and you will not find any one of them to go up in a chariot of fire like Elijah, and none of them want to be crucified like the Master was. None of us are perfect, no not one.

But take the record of the Postmaster General as a whole, and no man will say that there has been on his part any other motive than to give to the people of the United States the best Postal Service he could with his department economically and honestly administered. There has been no charge of any sort of fraud or peculation against the Postmaster General. The only charge made against him is a charge of a nebulous character, and the expression of certain opinions that people entertain in reference to his efforts at economy, and a combined effort on the part of certain people to discredit his standing throughout the United States.

I do not know whether this assault upon him will succeed or not, but I sincerely trust that the President, before he shall take any action in this matter, will look carefully into the record, and if he does, in my judgment he will not find anything that would justify his removal from office, as is now asked for from some quarters, but will find ample and full warrant for saying, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." Gen. Burleson when he was a Member of this House was respected and honored by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

In addition to that, his reputation in this House for honesty and integrity was second to none. That he is a man of strong mind and determined purpose no man who served with him in this House will deny. That he is a man who, having formed his conclusions and arrived at a firm decision, is not

easily shaken, is to his credit, not to his discredit. [Applause.] A man who is not willing to stand up and courageously fight for what he believes to be right does not deserve a seat in this body or a position of honor or trust in the Government.

What has there been in his whole record to justify all of the assaults that are being made upon him, except the fact that he has endeavored to prevent certain influences outside and inside of the Post Office Department making a raid upon the Treasury of the United States? He has been successful in preventing these raids. This is Postmaster General Burleson's chief sin in the eyes of those who would fatten at Government expense and feed out of the Government crib.

Mr. Chairman, if I have any complaint to make against him myself, it would be that he has not been quite as partisan as I would like him to have been in the matter of post offices—not only that, but I am one of those fellows who believe that to the victor belong the spoils. I agree literally with Andrew Jackson that it is utterly impossible for an Executive to successfully conduct a Democratic administration or a Republican administration, as the case may be, unless he has on guard as officials, as his captains and lieutenants, men who are in sympathy with him; and when the people speak at the ballot box they ought to have their sovereign will carried out. Wherever there is discretion to be exercised upon the part of those administering an office, if I had my way about it I would turn all out who did not believe in public affairs as the platform directed. [Applause.]

From what sources comes all of the criticism? First, from the pneumatic-tube service, which Congress abolished and Burleson helped to abolish; second, from the great magazines of the country, who object to the law passed by Congress which deprives them of a part of the \$96,000,000 which the Government had been losing on hauling in the mails their magazines—they are bitter; third, certain labor organizations, who object to Postmaster General Burleson because he will not let them run the Post Office Department and fix their salaries and raid the Treasury. Every man in America should indorse General Burleson if he believes in good business administration. You Republicans should not applaud this assault, because he has been doing all in his power to run his department economically, and this now seems to be your chief political asset against this administration. If you are honest in your professions, you should applaud him. No; you assault the War and Navy expenditures and say they were extravagant. Now, be consistent and help hold up Burleson's hands, who has practiced real, judicious, honest, and business economy.

Postmaster General Burleson has on all occasions been absolutely fair to all. He has retained in his department officials down there that you gentlemen know to be just as soundly Republican as you yourselves are. Postmaster General Burleson has always, in my judgment, endeavored to do the right thing, as God has given him the power to see the right, courageously, for the good of the American people and the good of the Post Office Department. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that general debate upon this bill be limited to 15 minutes, which is already allotted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 15 minutes, already allotted. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, that agreement can not be made in committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves the right to object.

Mr. GOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request and yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE].

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish, without discussion, to make a statement of certain facts that it seems to me are very interesting in connection with the treaty which is under negotiation.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, June 16, page 1173, is found a communication from the Acting Secretary of State, which reads as follows:

In the absence of the President and the Secretary of State, and by the President's direction, the undersigned, Acting Secretary of State, presents his compliments to the honorable the Secretary of the Senate, and in response to Senate resolution of June 6 advises that the President states that he would, of course, be very glad to communicate to the Senate the full text of the treaty if that text were complete, which is not the case. The Acting Secretary of State advises, further, that the President states that the treaty is now in process of negotiation; that many points of great moment are under consideration; that the text will, of course, not be complete until it is finally ready for signa-

ture; and he (the President) feels that it would not be in the public interest to communicate officially to the Senate a text which is provisional and not definite, and he finds no precedent for such a procedure.

It is true that only in exceptional instances has the President of the United States communicated officially to the Senate the text of a treaty which was only provisional and not definite, yet in view of the many instances in which this procedure has been followed it may be considered possible that the Acting Secretary of State has misunderstood the President and has erred in attributing to him the statement that he (the President) finds no precedent for such procedure.

The following is a partial list of such precedents:

On June 10, 1846, President Polk submitted to the Senate the proposed but incomplete treaty between the United States and Great Britain concerning the Oregon boundary. By formal vote, two-thirds concurring, the Senate advised the conclusion of the treaty, and thereafter it was signed on June 15 and again submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to the ratification. The vote on ratification was taken on June 18 and the President ratified it on June 19 in accordance with the advice and consent thus given. (Executive Journal VII, 84, 89, 90, 95.)

On December 17, 1861, President Lincoln sent to the Senate for its advice a preliminary draft of a treaty which had been presented to the Government of Mexico and which dealt with the payment of certain claims urged by European powers against that country. (Executive Journal XII, 24.)

On February 10, 1868, President Johnson sent to the Senate for its advice the draft of an unsigned and incomplete treaty with the Dominican Republic concerning the transfer of the Peninsula and Bay of Samana to the United States. (Executive Journal XVI, 163.)

On June 18, 1874, President Grant submitted a draft of a proposed agreement with Great Britain for commercial reciprocity with Canada, and after long deliberation the Senate declared on February 3, 1875, that it would be inexpedient to negotiate such a treaty. (Executive Journal XIX, 355, 502.)

Many precedents exist not only for the submission of a provisional text to the Senate, but also there are many precedents for consultation with the Senate during the negotiation of the treaty, and even before negotiations have begun with regard to the terms that are to be included in it.

President Washington on many occasions followed this course. By special messages of August 4, 1790, August 11, 1790, January 18, 1792, and March 23, 1792, President Washington asked the advice of the Senate as to treaties which were in contemplation between the United States and certain Indian tribes. (Executive Journal I, 55, 60, 98, 116.)

In a message to the Senate of February 9, 1790, President Washington mentioned the difference between the United States and Great Britain as to the Northeastern Boundary and said that he considered it advisable to postpone any negotiations on the subject until he had received the advice of the Senate as to the propositions to be offered on the part of the United States. (Executive Journal I, 36, 37.)

On May 8, 1792, President Washington inquired of the Senate whether it would approve a treaty with Algiers for the payment of ransom and peace money if such a treaty should be concluded.

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

Mr. TEMPLE. I am sorry, but I can not, as my time is limited.

This action of the President was in accordance with a written communication from Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State, dated April 1, 1792, in which he told the President that it was advisable, whenever possible, to consult the Senate before the opening of negotiations since its subsequent approbation was necessary to validate a treaty. (Executive Journal I, 122, 123. Jefferson Papers, Series 4, vol. 2, 18.)

All these cases are cited and references given in a few pages of "Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement," by Samuel B. Crandall, one of the best known works on that subject. The fact that these precedents are so easily found lends probability to the supposition that the Acting Secretary of State has misunderstood the President's statement.

I wish to call attention also to one other matter that is of interest in this connection.

The statement has been made repeatedly that the text of the treaty made public by order of the Senate on Monday, June 9, shows that there is no important difference between the full text of the treaty and the summary given out some weeks ago.

It may be that a comparison of the summary with that portion of the treaty which had not previously been published in full shows no serious discrepancies. Doubtless many persons thought it entirely unnecessary to compare the newly disclosed

text of the league covenant with the previously published full text of that document, and have therefore not observed one very remarkable and important change.

Article 4 of the revised covenant, adopted April 28, corresponds with article 3 of the original draft first published February 14, and contains the following provision:

The council shall consist of representatives of the United States of America, of the British Empire, of France, of Italy, and of Japan, together with representatives of four other members of the league.

The corresponding provision of the document made public by order of the Senate shows a very important change, of which no previous announcement has been made. It is found in article 4, and is as follows:

The council shall consist of representatives of the principal allied and associated powers, together with representatives of four other members of the league. (RECORD, June 9, p. 804.)

I have not found anywhere in the treaty a definition of the phrase "the principal allied and associated powers," though that phrase is used again in article 440 (RECORD, p. 857), which provides that the whole treaty—including, of course, the league of nations section—shall come into force when ratified by Germany and three of the principal allied and associated powers.

Originally there were to be nine members of the council; now the number is not determined. Formerly, five great powers, named in the treaty, and four smaller ones; now, perhaps, three great powers, not named, and four smaller ones. There may, perhaps, be more than five powers claiming permanent membership on the council; for if the phrase is not defined, who knows how many nations may claim to be of the "principal allied and associated powers"? [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

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

Mr. GOOD. How much more time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has six minutes remaining.

Mr. GOOD. I yield five and a half minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RICKETTS].

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE], so that I may ask him a question in regard to these treaties?

Mr. GOOD. I have already allotted all of the time that I have.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RICKETTS] is recognized for five and a half minutes.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, since this Congress convened in special session I have not taken up any of the time of the House in discussing legislation, for the reason that I fully appreciated the fact that important legislation was pending, in the form of appropriation bills, which should be considered and passed by the House at the earliest possible date in order that the various departments of this Government might continue to function during the next fiscal year commencing July 1 of this year and ending on June 30, 1920. This legislation failed of passage during the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, and it is all important to the country that the various and numerous appropriation bills now pending before the House should be passed by Congress before the 1st day of July of this year.

I have therefore been content to listen attentively to the discussion of these various appropriation matters and have confined my thought to a strict analysis of the arguments presented, both as to the merits and demerits of each and every bill, in order that I might determine the scope of these appropriations and be able to vote for such amendment as would be safe and sane along economic lines and in the interest of the taxpayers of the country.

No Congress in the history of this Nation has had greater responsibilities devolving upon it or has been confronted by greater or more perplexing problems touching the welfare of the country than confronts the Sixty-sixth Congress. We are the Representatives of the people, and the people are expecting us and depending upon us to enact such legislation of a reconstructive nature as will stabilize the business of the country and at the same time reduce the great burden of taxation which rests so heavily upon the shoulders of the taxpayers of the Nation.

#### ECONOMY.

I have no doubt that the majority party of this House holds that majority by reason of the fact that the people of this Nation in the last election were not altogether satisfied, in many instances, with the disbursement of the funds arising from taxation, both in a direct and indirect way, during the prosecution of the war, and in order to avoid a continuation of such prac-

tice or policy, and to prevent the expenditure of fabulous sums of money which, in many instances, were sheer waste of the people's funds and the very climax of extravagance, elected a Republican Congress and gave to the Republican side of this House a safe and certain working majority. Hence, the responsibility of reducing taxation, curtailing appropriations, and of restraining or preventing lavish expenditure and waste of the people's money rests upon the Republicans in this House.

It is true that in all the legislation that has been passed during this session we have pursued a policy of economy. The record shows that in the various appropriation bills which have been passed many millions of dollars have been saved. The House has been slashing and cutting appropriation bills right and left, and to an extent even greater than expected. The estimates of the heads of departments have already been reduced more than a billion and a quarter dollars—\$1,350,000,000—and all of the appropriation bills have not as yet been passed. Possibly the largest saving thus far effected has been upon the following bills:

The Army bill, from which \$450,000,000 was cut by the House committee; and another \$150,000,000 was taken from this bill when the House, by a large vote, reduced the personnel of the Army from 509,000 to 300,000 men.

The Navy bill, already reduced \$300,000,000 from Secretary Daniel's estimate, with probably further reduction to come.

The railroad bill reduced \$450,000,000, in which the Senate committee has concurred.

The object of these reductions in estimated appropriations is, of course, to reduce taxation in the various tax bills, which means a great saving to the taxpayers of the country. It has a further purpose, and that is to serve notice on the various department heads to curtail their estimates in the future and to abandon contemplated large enterprises.

It is quite clear to me, and I think to the House as well, that many items in these appropriation bills heretofore passed could have been eliminated if the various committees which reported out these bills and the House had the time to have given each item of expenditure that degree of consideration and that scrupulous investigation that it deserves. However, the failure of the Sixty-fifth Congress to pass these appropriation bills in its last session cast upon this House the responsibility of enacting this legislation hurriedly. We are compelled to be expeditious, for, if we should fail to pass the appropriations by the 1st of July of this year, then the various departments of Government would be without funds and would cease to function.

The House, in one month has made \$75,000,000 a day available for expenditure by the several Government departments. Here is how it has been apportioned:

Railroad appropriation	\$750,000,000
War Department	718,000,000
Navy Department	601,000,000
Agriculture Department	32,150,000
General deficiencies	21,350,000
Indian Bureau	15,800,000
District of Columbia	14,150,000
Urgent deficiency	45,000,000

Making a total of 2,197,450,000

This amount trims departmental estimates approximately \$1,350,000,000. Only one more appropriation bill remains to be enacted, and that is the sundry civil bill, expected to carry about \$600,000,000, which bill is being drafted by the House Appropriations Committee and is scheduled to be reported out at an early date.

#### RECORD PRUNING.

Never in history has the House sliced appropriation bills as the present one has done. Since the Senate is showing no disposition to make more than minor changes in the House draft of appropriation measures, it is plain that the policy of the majority of Congress is to establish a record for economy.

This special session of Congress has been a great blessing to the taxpayers and the country, for, if the appropriation bills that have been passed by the House during this session had been passed at the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, the taxpayers of the country would have been required to have raised on appropriation bills already passed the additional enormous sum of \$1,350,000,000.

The following provision in the bill on military affairs, "That no part of any of the appropriations made therein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate," means an additional saving to the taxpayers of the country of a sum of money ranging from \$75,000,000 to \$100,000,000. A point of order was made against this provision and sustained, but fortunately the Rules Committee brought in a rule making

this provision in order, and it was passed by a large vote in the House upon the theory that it would result in a great saving of money at a time when money is so badly needed by this Government in liquidating its outstanding obligations. This provision is not clearly understood by many people who are interested in various projects, but it is the purpose of the majority of this House to carry out every legal contract that has been made by the War Department, or any other department of Government, where there is either a legal or moral obligation to carry out the same. This provision was intended to check expenditures for the present until an investigation should be made, so as to determine what projects should be continued in the interest of the people of the Nation.

The great World War is practically over and the people of this Nation are delighted to know that it is terminated. The soldier boys are returning to their respective homes and the strain of war is rapidly subsiding. What the people want now is peace, prosperity, and happiness. They are tired of war. They can see no good reason why the Military Establishment of this Nation should not be greatly reduced, so as to conform to a peace basis. We have no need now of a large standing Army or a large Navy, and many of the various organizations engaged in war activities through which large sums of the people's money is expended can now be abandoned, and should be abandoned, and every unnecessary experimental expenditure of money in any form of war activity should cease and terminate.

The soldier boys in France and other allied countries who have borne the burden of the war and brought about a state of peace should receive their discharges and be returned to their homes at once. It is not clear to me why they have not long since been returned. They enlisted for the period of the war, and the war has been practically over since the signing of the armistice on November 11, 1918. More than six months have elapsed and yet thousands of them are still held on foreign soil. Why are these soldier boys still held on foreign soil? Why not return them at once? Not next month or next year, but immediately.

#### HIGH COST OF LIVING.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to another question that to me seems to be paramount at this time in the interest of the citizenship of this Nation, and that is the question of the high cost of living.

Ninety per cent of our population of 110,000,000 consists of people in ordinary financial circumstances. A very large majority of them are dependent upon their labor for the support and maintenance of themselves and their families. The money they earn by honest toil lacks value in purchasing power. It is not a dollar worth 100 cents, but, in truth and in fact, in purchasing power is only worth about 40 cents. These laboring men of the country are straining every nerve to meet their honest obligations and to subsist and maintain and support their families. Every article of foodstuffs consumed in the homes of the United States by the occupants thereof is costing more money than ever before in the history of the country. Why is this? Is it because of a lack or scarcity of the various food products? No; not so. We have an abundance of food stored in the warehouses of the United States that is not being put on the market. In addition to this the War Department and the United States Government has in its possession more than \$60,000,000 worth of products that the people need and should have. Many thousands of laboring men and miners in my State, in the Hocking Valley and in southeastern Ohio, and elsewhere, are to-day without the necessities of life because of the fact that they have been thrown out of employment and have not been able to earn a dollar this year. Many of these people are hungry, and it seems to me to be the duty of Congress to relieve this situation by proper legislation. We should take such action, in a legislative way, as will restore the dollar to its par value, and that can be done by releasing the food products now in store in the great warehouses of the United States and by releasing from the War Department and other departments of Government the more than \$60,000,000 worth of foodstuffs now withheld from the people.

In a recent hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives it was learned that an approximate surplus of canned meats held by the War Department, as shown by a report of the Director of Sales of the Quartermaster's Department, amounts to a total of 141,000,000 pounds of bacon, beef, corned beef, and corned-beef hash. Why not release these products at once and place them on the market?

The laboring men of the country were loyal, patriotic, and true during the Great War struggle. They unreluctantly contributed of their means to the various war activities. They willingly purchased bonds in the five great war loans, aggre-

gating eighteen and one-half billions of dollars. They subscribed liberally for these bonds. In many instances they mortgaged their earnings far ahead in order to help the United States. They contributed heavily to the various war charities and worked arduously in these various war drives.

Suddenly the great coal boom, due to the demand for coal at home and abroad in the factories of the different nations, subsided and they were left without employment, with their money invested in securities of the Government. Who was more patriotic, more generous, and more charitable than the American laboring man?

The American farmer likewise discharged nobly his duty to his country under the great stress of the World War. He has also been required, and is still required, to pay the highest price for fertilizer, machinery, seed, and all kinds of agricultural implements and equipment. He also was liberal in subscribing for bonds in the five Liberty loans floated by the Government.

Upon these two classes of citizens of the United States depended very largely the success of our armies in the struggle for the protection of American rights. And yet the laboring men of the country are still required to pay the highest price ever known for each and every article that is necessary in order to maintain and support himself and family, and the farmer is likewise required to pay war-time prices for all the equipment that he needs in the successful prosecution of his business.

Something must be done to relieve this situation. Prices have continued to soar since 1912. In the year 1916 it was maintained upon the floor of this House that the high cost of living was due to monopoly, and that the Sherman antitrust law was a failure, that it should be amended, and subsequently this House and the Congress of the United States passed what is known as the Clayton Act, which was supposed to be a very much more severe law relative to the prosecution of trusts and monopolies. But, notwithstanding the existence of the Sherman law and the Clayton law, many of the articles, food products, and commodities used in the homes of the United States have been controlled by the trusts and monopolies of the country.

The people of this Nation can not expect a great reduction in prices relative to the purchase of food products and other articles consumed by the people of the United States until the cause shall have been removed. It is no use to close our eyes to the cold truth. You may advance this theory or that theory, but, after all, when your various theories are analyzed, they are found to rest upon one proposition, and that is the proposition of monopoly—the stamping out of competition. I am not opposed to the combination of capital for commercial and industrial development, and the development of our resources, but I am opposed to any organization that seeks to control and force the American laboring man and the American people generally to pay a fixed price for any article they may need. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate upon the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill, be now closed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that general debate upon the sundry civil appropriation bill be now closed. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman allow me to have five minutes?

Mr. GOOD. We are going to give liberal time under the five-minute rule.

Mr. BLANTON. The only trouble with that is that under the five-minute rule one is limited absolutely to the subject under consideration.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that sometime during the debate under the five-minute rule I will ask that he have five minutes in which to discuss matters out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I will make the same request of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GOOD. I think I can comply with that.

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

Mr. GOOD. 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. 6176.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and 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 bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To enable the Department of State to perform the duties transferred by order of the President from the War Trade Board to the Department of State, the sum of \$200,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$3,500,000 for the War Trade Board for the fiscal year 1919, is reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee about this transfer. Was this one of the transfers made under the so-called Overman Act?

Mr. GOOD. I suppose this transfer was made by the President under the provisions of the Overman Act; at least the President has by Executive order made the transfer, but whether it is made under that act or not I do not know whether the proclamation states. I find it was made under that act, and call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on the 12th of May the President issued an order reading as follows:

PARIS, FRANCE, May 12, 1919.

I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, under the authority conferred by an act authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government, approved May 20, 1918, do hereby order and direct that whenever, in his judgment, it becomes expedient the chairman or the vice chairman of the War Trade Board, at his discretion, shall relinquish and transfer to the Department of State by decrees all or any integral part of the personnel, duties, powers, and functions of the War Trade Board and its records and public property in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in the United States.

WOODROW WILSON.

Mr. WALSH. Well, that apparently is an attempt to consolidate or transfer one department under the Overman Act, although I doubt if the Overman Act authorized the transfer of the executive department to Paris to issue orders under its provision. But I should like to ask now what functions of the War Trade Board the Department of State are to perform under this transfer of \$200,000, and is there a provision in the bill covering back into the Treasury any unexpended balance over and above the \$200,000 so transferred?

Mr. GOOD. Answering the last question first, I will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts there is about \$270,000 of unexpended and unobligated balances, and there will be covered back into the Treasury about \$70,000. As to the functions that are transferred, the vice chairman of the War Trade Board appeared before the committee and pointed out some very important functions that are to be performed by the State Department. For example, the War Trade Board is now issuing licenses to certain countries to bring exports into the United States. They have the power to place an embargo upon the exportation of anything into the United States. So far as Germany is concerned, or Austria-Hungary, they could bring their exports now into the United States without an embargo. They are exercising that authority with regard to certain countries and certain classes of things, especially dyestuffs.

Mr. WALSH. I know, but the War Trade Board expires by limitation at a certain period after the war.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Now, under this transfer of duty under the Overman Act is it contemplated they are going to perform those duties and functions of the War Trade Board during peace times?

Mr. GOOD. Not after the period of the expiration of the power or authority of the War Trade Board under the act.

Mr. WALSH. If this is made available for the entire fiscal year 1920, would it be made available for any period longer than it would have been available under the authority given to the War Trade Board?

Mr. GOOD. The control powers of the War Trade Board expire automatically, under Title VII of the espionage act and

section 11 of the trading with the enemy act, as soon as peace is declared. The appropriation to the State Department will not extend this control and no such extension is intended. The money will be used to liquidate the affairs of the board.

Mr. WALSH. But the Executive order, or proclamation, or whatever created the War Trade Board, I think you will find, curtailed its activities to the period of the war and a certain length of time thereafter. Now, apparently under this transfer the Secretary of State can go on and continue this embargo after peace is declared if there is any of this money available.

Mr. GOOD. Well, none of this money will be available very long. My recollection is that they are running on the basis now of about \$80,000 a month.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Eighty-five thousand.

Mr. GOOD. Eighty-five thousand, the gentleman from Tennessee informs me. So the gentleman from Massachusetts can see that the functions can not be performed very long.

Mr. WALSH. That is very true, but with respect—

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

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. In reference to the gentleman's last statement, is it contemplated that the entire personnel of the War Trade Board is also to be shifted over there and become a part of the diplomatic branch of the executive branch?

Mr. GOOD. No; they have reduced their personnel, and are reducing it right along. It is their purpose to go out of existence very soon, and this is simply an easy method of bringing about the closing of the entire affairs of the War Trade Board.

Mr. WALSH. And does the gentleman know whether this includes that part of the War Trade Board that was at Paris upon expert work in connection with the making of the treaty?

Mr. GOOD. I can not answer the gentleman as to that.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that he may proceed out of order for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, the matter I desire to discuss is the motion to recommit that was offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] this morning, and which was held not to be in order on the wire-control bill, which ruling was appealed from, and the appeal tabled by the House. On the face of it the motion to recommit made by the gentleman from Tennessee would seem to be in the interest of the employees of the telephone companies of this country, inasmuch as it provided there should be no reduction in wages while the present rates set by the Postmaster General were in effect. The fact of the matter is that during all the time that the wires of this country were under the control of the Postmaster General that official absolutely refused to allow the telephone companies of this country to recognize the principle of collective bargaining and refused to permit the telephone companies to negotiate wage agreements with their employees, so much so that the telephone employees of the country threatened to strike and had set last Monday morning as the day for a nation-wide strike, that would involve the electrical workers and the telephone operators from coast to coast. On the eve of that strike the Postmaster General saw fit to put into effect an order giving the telephone companies the right to negotiate with their employees collectively. Now, the motion to recommit, that was offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon], on its face would seem to have been in the interest of the employees. The employees are not fearful of any reduction in wages to-day. What they were after and what they intended to strike for was the right to negotiate with their employers for increases in wages. And if the motion to recommit that was offered by the gentleman from Tennessee this morning had been held in order and adopted, it would have given the incentive to the telephone companies of this country, after the wires were returned to private control, to say, "We can not give consideration to an increase in wages, for the simple reason that these wages were based upon rates fixed by the Postmaster General, and until such time as we can secure increases in rates from the public-utility commissions of this country or the other rate-fixing agencies we can not possibly give any consideration to the question of an increase in wages."

So I say to a lot of men on this side of the House and on the other who were doubtful about the effect of that, that if the

motion to recommit made by the gentleman from Tennessee had been passed, instead of it being beneficial to the employees of the telephone companies of this country it would have been detrimental to their efforts to secure increases in wages that were refused them during the time that the wires were under Government control, due to the fact that the Postmaster General of these United States refused to carry out and put into effect the principle the President of the United States enunciated in reference to collective bargaining.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NOLAN. In a moment.

In other words, the President, in all departments of the Government, and the Government itself, conceded the right of the employees to have a hearing through their organizations and associations. He recommended that to private employers in this country. That was the policy of the War Labor Board; that was the policy of the War Industries Board. He further recommended the principle in his recent message to Congress.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NOLAN. In one moment.

Mr. MOON. You will not have any time left then.

Mr. NOLAN. I will have some time left.

But the Postmaster General refused to recognize the principle of collective bargaining. He even termed the idea a silly one. These men were on the eve of a strike last Saturday, hundreds of thousands of them all over this country, and it would have crippled the telephone service of the country. This strike was as much to uphold the principle of collective bargaining and the right to organize as it was for an increase in pay. These people meant business, and they forced Mr. Burleson to change his tune, and this motion to recommit looks like one that could readily come from the department to help the companies. If you had written into the bill this morning the provision offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, the wire companies of this country would have used it as an instrument to refuse to raise salaries and wages until such time as they got further increases in rates, and, God knows, they have high enough rates now.

Mr. MOON. Now, the gentleman knows that there is nothing in that sort of logic, but it is simply a pretext to justify the vote against that proposition. That amendment provided simply that so long as the rates of the Postmaster General were in force they should not reduce the wages of employees. It leaves no implication anywhere that after the wires had gone back to the owners under the determination of the Utilities Commission wages could not be increased.

Mr. NOLAN. That is not in answer to my statement.

Mr. MOON. You do not touch that question.

Mr. NOLAN. The employees are willing and I am willing that the employees shall protect themselves. They thought they could protect themselves last Saturday; the Postmaster General thought so; that was why he quit and conceded their right to meet their employers and discuss wages and conditions.

Mr. MOON. Yes; but while you are protecting the corporations you might protect the employees a little.

Mr. NOLAN. If, according to the gentleman's line of reasoning, when you look to the interest of the employees you protect the corporation, then the gentleman's statement might be considered to be in the line of logic.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last three words.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the privilege of collective bargaining, to be sound and all right, should be exercised only when the parties who are to be benefited thereby are willing to the transaction and want the bargaining done in that way. But how about the kind of a case that I called to the attention of the House last Saturday, in the nature of an editorial from the San Antonio Daily Express, the large daily newspaper published in the Alamo city of Texas? In that paper the editor calls attention to the fact that the foreman of his electrical department was ordered by the walking delegate to walk out and strike, and the foreman himself came to the editor and said, "I do not want to strike; I am satisfied with my position; I am satisfied with my hours of service; I am satisfied with the good pay that you give me; I am satisfied with the one day off per week; I am satisfied with everything connected with my service, and I do not want to strike." And yet that man is forced by the order that comes to leave his position and walk out in idleness, his family suffering the consequences.

Let me read to my good friend from California [Mr. NOLAN] a notice that was published in one of our Washington papers—the

Washington Post, if you please—last Saturday morning, on our Flag Day, but Mr. Gompers's protest day, as follows, under "special notices":

All members of the Bricklayers' Union, No. 1, D. C., are ordered—

Not requested, not invited, but "ordered," if you please—to meet at Union Station, June 14, 1919, at 1.30 o'clock sharp.

Now listen—

Failing to appear, they shall be fined according to article 24, section 10.—M. A. Wolfe, recording secretary.

That is the result of collective bargaining, if you please, where men whose consciences tell them that they are not in sympathy with a protest against the fundamental law of the land, when they are not in sympathy with a protest against something that vitally concerns their homes, families, and consciences; in other words, when they do not believe in light wines and beer, when they do not believe in saloons, and yet they are ordered to appear and protest against prohibition when they believe in and favor prohibition; and they are ordered to join a protest, if you please, which says to the country, "No beer, no work."

I want to tell you what ought to follow and what will surely and inevitably follow that slogan of "No beer, no work": "Jails and penitentiaries!" That ought to be the corollary to that kind of a slogan in this country. For when men refuse to work, they are forced to obtain a living without working, and only one result follows this method—crime, jails, penitentiary. Collective bargaining may be all right if the parties who seek it want it and will not resort to force in obtaining their demands. But if the parties do not want it, you ought to let them alone and let them go about their business in their own way, and let them earn an honest living by the sweat of their brows if they want to, when they are perfectly satisfied with their condition in life and their situation and their hours of service and their treatment by their employer, as was the case with the good foreman of the electrical division of the San Antonio Express, who was ordered to walk out and let his family suffer, except for the little pittance that his organization gives him every day that he is not at work; ordered to do that at a time when his conscience rebels. I say to the gentleman from California that there is going to be a proper adjustment some day. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hoosick Falls, N. Y., post office: For completion, \$41,150.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HICKS. I do so for the purpose of asking for some information from the chairman of this committee in regard to these post offices that are being completed and carried forward to completion. I assume from the way this is worded, not having asked for any increase in the appropriation above that authorized by law, that these contracts must be fixed contracts and not based upon the rising cost of material and labor, because they are evidently contracts made in some cases several years ago, were they not?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; some of them were.

Mr. HICKS. Then some of these contractors must be in a very serious financial condition in regard to the contracts.

Mr. GOOD. Some of them are going through bankruptcy now. In some of these cases we carry items for rent of temporary quarters, which under the contract would have to be paid by the contractor, because he did not complete the building within the time specified. But the contractor has failed, and the post office is occupying rented property, and the Government is liable for the rent of it, and while we have a claim against the contractor for the amount of the rent, we can not recover it. All of these items are within the limit of cost fixed by law. In some cases the limit of cost was increased. In some cases Congress increased the limit of cost to make provision for the very things that the gentleman is complaining of.

Mr. HICKS. In those cases where the contractor has fallen down and gone into bankruptcy, what has the Government done to finish those buildings? Has it relet the contracts, or is it holding the bondsmen while work is suspended? What does the gentleman know about those cases?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know about those cases. I will say to the gentleman that practically all of these post offices, except four or five, were carried in the former bill and went through without objection, and we did not examine into them.

Mr. HICKS. I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Is this committee making any appropriations except those authorized by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds?

Mr. BUTLER. They can not do it.

Mr. GOOD. There is nothing carried in this bill at all for post offices in excess of the limit of cost that has been fixed by Congress.

Mr. DOWELL. What is being done with the building programs where the authorizations are not sufficient to complete the buildings?

Mr. GOOD. They will have to await action by Congress on a report from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. DOWELL. This takes no action on cases of that kind?

Mr. GOOD. We can not appropriate \$500,000, for instance, for a public building where the limit of cost is \$300,000. Where the department can not get a bid within the limit of cost it has not let the contract and we are not appropriating the money.

Mr. COOPER. I move to strike out the last two words. I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for not to exceed 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for not to exceed 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, on last Saturday, June 14, on the day which has been set aside in honor of our national emblem, there was a demonstration held on the steps and at the east front of the Capitol Building of our Nation. This public meeting was fostered for a threefold purpose. First, to protest against national prohibition of the liquor traffic; second, to ask for the repeal of the war-time prohibition law which becomes effective July 1, 1919; third, to urge that permission be granted in our country for the manufacture and sale of wines and beers containing a certain per cent of alcohol.

For weeks before the demonstration took place it was very widely advertised in the newspapers as a protest against prohibition by organized labor and the laboring classes of our country, and it had the support of some of the labor leaders, including Mr. Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor. Now, I want to be frank and I will say that there are thousands of union laboring men in our country who are opposed to prohibition of the liquor traffic, but a large number of these men have been directly or indirectly engaged in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of intoxicating liquor. But I challenge the statement that was made by Mr. Gompers and other speakers at the meeting on the Capitol steps, June 14, that they spoke the sentiments of 3,000,000 members of organized labor in our country. [Applause.] I want Mr. Gompers and the other speakers at this meeting to know that they do not speak for organized labor as a whole on this question, and that there are hundreds of thousands of union labor men that are not ready to adopt the whisky bottle and the beer keg as their emblem. [Applause.]

There are many industrial sections of our country where the workmen have voted for and helped adopt prohibition. Have you Members of Congress who live in the prohibition States been called upon by the laboring classes from your districts to repeal the prohibition laws? The last State which went dry by a direct vote of the people is the great industrial State of Ohio, the fourth industrial State of the Union. Last fall thousands of union men and skilled workers there went to the polls and registered their protest against the liquor traffic. I call your attention to the great manufacturing district which I have the honor to represent in Congress. This district has the second largest iron and steel industry in the world, and the majority for prohibition in this district when the vote was counted last fall on the question of State-wide prohibition was over 10,000. This is not an agricultural center. It is a manufacturing district which has about 100,000 workmen in its industries. Youngstown, my home city, has 50,000 men working in the steel plants and factories. We have a large foreign population, and of those in this class who voted about 99 per cent voted wet. All of the professional and business men in this city are not dry, yet under these conditions the workmen of this great industrial city went to the polls and played a great part in registering a dry majority for State-wide prohibition of over 1,200. Yet Mr. Gompers and other labor leaders come here and on the Capitol steps of this Nation attack prohibition and say that in doing so they are speaking for the working classes of the country.

At this point I insert an editorial from the Youngstown Telegram of June 12, 1919, as follows:

LABOR AND PROHIBITION.

For several months advocates of the dying liquor traffic have been laboring to range the workmen of the country behind a movement to upset prohibition before the final knell of the liquor business is sounded. The movement has not been in the slightest degree successful. Even in

New York—the last stronghold of the wets—the “No beer, no work” campaign soon frayed out because men who work for a living did not care to be classed with the riffraff that made up the bulk of the movement.

Another drive is now under way to make it appear that labor is opposed to prohibition. The movement is rather insidious because the real motive—the complete restoration of the liquor traffic—is hidden. Ostensibly all that is asked is the removal until January 16, 1920, of the ban against the sale of light wines and beer. It is a weak camouflage since nobody is greatly concerned about the half-way postponement of prohibition for a mere six months. Even the most ardent wet admits that if the country is going dry it might as well go dry next month as next January.

Back of the movement for so-called workmen's protest parades is the campaign for permanent repeal of nation-wide prohibition. If Congress can be impressed by parades in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Washington and thereby persuaded to repeal the war-time prohibition act in so far as beer and light wines are concerned, the first round will be won in the antiprohibition fight. It is that sentimental victory alone that is sought. It is a movement in keeping with the announced determination of the liquor men to submit four antiprohibition proposals in Ohio this fall—and more than four if they can scrape up additional ones—in the hope that one or more may win in the confusion and thereby permit a loud cry to go up that sentiment is changing.

Congressmen are not likely to succumb to this propaganda. Taking the sentiment of their individual districts alone into consideration, they know the verdict is against repeal. Far away parades are not one-half as convincing as votes that have been registered at home.

The movement to throw onto union labor the burden of reviving the liquor traffic is sponsored by Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Gompers is an admirable man in many respects and is entitled to the thanks of the country for his good work during the war. It is only regrettable that he is abusing the position he holds and the trust reposed in him by leading the movement to make it appear that labor is solidly wet, whereas labor never was unitedly in favor of the liquor traffic, and certainly there has been less reason than ever in recent years to make it appear wet. Ohio is one of the great industrial States of the Union—the fourth, and perhaps even the third, in rank—and Ohio decisively voted dry last year.

Facts are always more satisfactory than intangible claims, and we do not need to go away from home to get these. Youngstown is the center of one of the great manufacturing districts of the country. It is wholly an industrial city and the Mahoning Valley is wholly an industrial region. Industrial plant employees are overwhelmingly in the majority here, even when ranged against all other workers combined. Professional men, business men, and other men not in the mills did not vote solidly dry last November. There were antiprohibitionists among them, and yet Youngstown gave a dry majority of more than 1,000, while Mahoning County voted dry by upward of 4,000. Canton, Akron, Ashtabula, and other industrial centers of northeastern Ohio rolled up prohibition majorities as well. The great majority of industrial plant employees must have voted dry. Whence comes this demand from labor for liquor is not easy to see.

Youngstown, too, met the situation created by wet obstructionists in the State legislature, who blocked a prohibition enforcement bill by passing a drastic city ordinance against illegal liquor selling. It received a unanimous vote in city council, which does not leave much doubt of sentiment here. Instead of the 40 or 50 “drunks” a day arrested under the old “model” license law, arrests for this cause are now two or three a week. The pawnbrokers and loafers who deemed it their right to live off workers have disappeared. Efficiency has been greatly increased and the workman who was “a good fellow if it wasn't for the booze” is not heard from any more. The only complaint made here is that the “chain gang” from the city jail that was depended upon for park improvements has gone out of business for lack of recruits.

There seems to be no need of demonstrations when we already have had ballots. In almost all the States ratification of nation-wide prohibition was an issue last fall, and legislatures committed to ratification were elected in all but three States. And the movement for beer and light wines is new in its inception, and yet it has already been given a test at the ballot box. Michigan weighed it against prohibition and indorsed prohibition far more emphatically than it accepted it.

Mr. Chairman, in the industrial centers where prohibition has been tried and tested the labor leaders and the men themselves speak in glowing terms regarding the benefits of prohibition upon the working classes. In no State in the Union where prohibition has been tried have they voted to return to the saloon. On the contrary, wherever they have voted a second time on the question the prohibition majority has been increased.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I will yield when I have finished my statement.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I simply want to correct one statement of the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, in the last hours of its miserable existence the liquor traffic, aided by the German-American Alliance—brewers who, according to the report just filed by the Senate Judiciary Committee, aided our enemies during the war—I say in the last hours of its miserable existence the liquor traffic, aided by the German brewers, are trying to hide behind the broad backs of the American workmen, taking advantage of the political unrest which comes at the end of the great war. The traffic threatens to ally itself with anarchy and Bolshevism unless it is able to secure some concessions from the Government and society. The liquor interests declare that if the workmen do not get their beer they will not work, and they are agitating along that line. I have here a button, many of which were worn Saturday—“No beer, no work!” This is an insult to the decent American workman, who is loyal to his country and loves his family and home. [Applause.]

And no less a person than Mr. Gompers tells us that there are a certain class of people in this country—he says they are mostly foreigners—who will not obey the organic law of this land, and if we attempt to enforce the prohibition laws they will resort to anarchy and Bolshevism. It ill becomes Mr. Gompers to make such a public statement as this, for I do not hesitate to say that when Mr. Gompers makes a statement of that nature in public it will have a tendency to encourage that very thing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. COOPER. If I have time after I finish this, I will be glad to yield.

Is this great Government of ours going to set aside the law and a constitutional amendment which has been adopted by 45 out of the 48 States of the Union because a foreign element and the German brewers threaten us with anarchy? No; the American people will not listen to such a threat; but, on the other hand, I want to answer this statement that has been made by Mr. Gompers and the German brewers by saying that from this hour on America is going to be for American institutions and American principles, not for anarchy and Bolshevism.

Just a word relative to some of the speeches that were made on the Capitol steps last Saturday. I listened to John J. Kearney, who is a member of the State Senate from Massachusetts. He confined most of his remarks to an attack upon Members of Congress by referring to them as being spineless misrepresentatives of the people. In answer to him I ask to have printed in the Record at this point a report submitted by Lemuel H. Murlin, president of Boston University; John M. Barker, professor of Boston University; John L. Bates, former governor of Massachusetts; George W. Coleman, president of the Open Forum National Council; Henry I. Harriman, former president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce.

#### THE VERDICT.

April-May, 1919.

The committee to secure testimony from the most reliable and representative sources as to the success or failure of prohibition were: Chairman, Lemuel H. Murlin, president of Boston University; secretary, John M. Barker, professor in Boston University; John L. Bates, former governor of Massachusetts; George W. Coleman, president Open Forum National Council; Henry I. Harriman, former president Boston Chamber of Commerce.

Prohibition States May 1, 1919..... 32  
Deduct States where prohibition has not been in effect over 4 months, Florida, Montana, Ohio, Wyoming..... 4

EXCERPTS FROM REPLIES (APRIL-MAY, 1919) OF THE GOVERNORS OF THESE 28 STATES.

1. Alabama—Gov. Thomas E. Kilby (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1915):

"Prohibition is an unqualified success in Alabama. Drunkenness is reduced to a minimum, crime reduced 50 per cent, and there is a large increase in bank deposits. The new city jail at Birmingham has been empty over a year, and many county jails are without prisoners. The business sentiment of Alabama strongly indorses present prohibition conditions, regardless of former attitude on the subject."

2. Arizona—Gov. Thomas E. Campbell (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1915):

"Prohibition has resulted in a marked decrease in commitments to penal institutions and the hospitals for the insane. The number of destitute families has greatly decreased. The best possible indorsement is that the voters, after a two years' trial, overwhelmingly adopted a more stringent prohibition bill."

3. Arkansas—Gov. Charles H. Brough (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):

"Conditions are greatly improved since State-wide prohibition went into effect. Crimes have materially decreased, though there is considerable bootlegging. Gen. Leonard Wood stated to me that the principal reason Little Rock secured the Camp Pike cantonment was because of prohibition."

4. Colorado—Gov. Oliver H. Shoup (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):

"Colorado has shown a marked advance in many lines. It is safe to say that the State never will revert to the old policy of licensing the liquor traffic."

5. Georgia—Gov. Hugh M. Dorsey (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1908):

"I think prohibition has gone a long way toward helping our people, and especially the negroes and poorer classes. I am very much in favor of prohibition."

6. Idaho—Gov. D. W. Davis (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):

"There is no question of the benefit of prohibition. Countless thousands of our citizens have been benefited directly or indirectly by the elimination of the liquor traffic. We have some cases of illicit selling, but these can not even begin to dim the shining light of the new era."

7. Indiana—Gov. James P. Goodrich (prohibition since Apr. 2, 1918):

"I inclose a clipping from this morning's Star showing the great decrease in the number in our jails which prohibition has brought."

8. Iowa—Gov. William L. Harding (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):

"Gov. Harding was ill when your letter reached here, and has not sufficiently recovered to give any attention to his correspondence."

9. Kansas—Gov. Henry J. Allen (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1881):

"Prohibition has contributed much to our material welfare. Money that was formerly spent in support of the liquor traffic has now gone into better food and those things which mean better social conditions; but great as has been the material advance, it is upon the moral side that Kansas has gained most. Crime has decreased, jails in many counties have been entirely empty for a long period, and pauperism has decreased. The sentiment in Kansas is to-day practically unanimous in its support."

10. Maine—Gov. Carl E. Milliken, by C. E. Owen (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1851):

"At Gov. Milliken's request I am replying to your letter. In the past enforcement was lax, nullification of the law became a system, so that conditions in some sections differed little from conditions under license; but recently prohibition has been enforced throughout the State, and even in the judgment of business men there has been a new demonstration of the value of prohibition."

11. Michigan—Gov. Albert E. Sleeper (prohibition since May 1, 1918):

"Our prohibitory law has already effected results of considerable importance. Arrests for drunkenness all over the State have been cut down to about one-quarter. Business men report that bills are paid more promptly, and the effect of prohibition on general business has been good."

12. Mississippi—Gov. Theo. G. Bilbo (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1909):

"Prohibition has brought a very marked decrease in crime and a marked increase in material prosperity. Our people are delighted with the results."

13. Nebraska—Gov. Samuel R. McKelvie (prohibition since May 1, 1917):

"There is no doubt that if prohibition were to be resubmitted to the people, they would give it a much larger affirmative vote than it received when it was first adopted."

14. Nevada—Gov. Emmett D. Boyle (prohibition since Dec. 16, 1918):

"Business men are pleased with the results. The law is generally enforced without much difficulty, and the closing of saloons has brought noticeably beneficial results."

15. New Hampshire—Gov. John H. Bartlett (prohibition since May 1, 1918):

"Conditions have been so much better under prohibition than under license that many former believers in license are now outspoken for prohibition. We confidently expect even better results after July 1. The comparative arrests for drunkenness in our eight largest cities which were formerly license are: May, 1917, to March, 1918, under license, 6,987; May, 1918, to March, 1919, under prohibition, 1,547."

16. New Mexico—Gov. O. A. Larrazolo (prohibition since Oct. 1, 1918):

"I believe that every decent American is in favor of the closing of the saloon; but when we go further than the teachings of Christ and say that a man shall not take a drink we are adopting a law which is and always will be a failure."

17. North Carolina—Gov. Thomas W. Bickett (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1909):

"The prohibition question is no longer a debatable one in North Carolina. There were many men of character who opposed it. All these have now become convinced of its wisdom and its efficiency."

18. North Dakota—Gov. Lynn J. Frazier (prohibition since Nov. 2, 1889):

"Crime has been greatly decreased. We have had prohibition since 1889, and with the enactment of bone-dry legislation the benefits of prohibition are even more in evidence."

19. Oklahoma—Gov. J. B. A. Robertson (prohibition since Nov. 16, 1907):

"Crime has been greatly lessened, business conditions greatly improved, while the good effects upon the morals of the citizens can not be overestimated. Oklahoma is strong for prohibition."

20. Oregon—Gov. Ben W. Olcott (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):

"Our experience under a bone-dry statute has been all for the betterment of the general public welfare. Industries have prospered. Business conditions are acknowledged to be of the best. Old brewery buildings are housing other industries. A material decrease is shown in the number of men in prison. It is my firm belief that to-day the great majority of the people of Oregon are in favor of prohibition."

21. South Carolina—Gov. R. A. Cooper (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):

"Crime is unquestionably less. If we should have a vote on the question to-day, the majority for prohibition would be larger than when it was first voted. Prohibition has the effect of saving money to those who would drink, and general efficiency, as well as individual efficiency, is enhanced."

22. South Dakota—Gov. Peter Norbeck (prohibition since July 1, 1917):

"Prohibition has brought splendid results. Business has gone forward, bank deposits have increased, all to an unusual degree, and countless homes have been made happier."

23. Tennessee—Gov. A. H. Roberts (prohibition since July 1, 1909):

"As a result of our experience, the prohibition sentiment in this State is overwhelming."

24. Texas—Gov. W. P. Hobby (prohibition since June 26, 1918):

"In our eight largest cities prohibition has reduced the arrests for drunkenness from 14,128 in 1917-18 to 3,337 in the corresponding period 1918-19. I voted against State-wide prohibition, but after seeing its actual operations as shown by the effect upon crime and upon government in Texas, I am convinced of its practical value."

25. Utah—Gov. S. Bamberger, by the attorney general (prohibition since Aug. 1, 1917):

"Our penitentiary population has decreased. The people are happier. More money is being spent for legitimate purposes. Bills are being paid better. More home property is being purchased by the working people, and if the matter were submitted on a referendum to-day I feel Utah would come as near being unanimous in favor of prohibition as it is possible for a State to come."

26. Virginia—Gov. W. Davis, by commissioner of prohibition (prohibition since Nov. 1, 1916):

"Business interests which were the most insistent opponents of prohibition have been the chief beneficiaries of the change, in improved efficiency of labor, the reduction of accidents, and the great increase in the volume of business. It is gratifying to note the gracefulness with which they now admit that their fears have proved utterly groundless. The general benefit of prohibition upon the business interests, criminal record, peace, and prosperity of the State is without parallel."

27. Washington—Gov. Ernest Lister (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):

"There has been a marked improvement in conditions. Even in the larger cities, such as Seattle, Spokane, and Tacoma, the sentiment for prohibition is much stronger to-day than ever before."

28. West Virginia—Gov. John J. Cornwell (prohibition since July 1, 1914):

"No man of intelligence, regardless of what was his position on prohibition, will to-day deny that the benefits arising from the suppression of the liquor traffic have been many. Crime has been reduced, bank deposits have increased enormously, and all collateral benefits have followed."

SUMMARY.

- 26 governors give a verdict for prohibition.
- 1 governor gives a verdict against prohibition.
- 1 has not replied.

28

May 1, 1919. The 10 largest cities where prohibition has been in effect over four months are:

	Population, 1918.
1. Detroit, Mich.....	850,000
2. Washington, D. C.....	400,000
3. Seattle, Wash.....	356,445
4. Indianapolis, Ind.....	315,000
5. Portland, Oreg.....	310,000
6. Denver, Colo.....	268,000
7. San Antonio, Tex.....	225,000
8. Atlanta, Ga.....	220,000
9. Birmingham, Ala.....	212,000
10. Omaha, Nebr.....	200,000

EXCERPTS FROM REPLIES (APRIL-MAY, 1919) OF THE MAYORS AND CHIEFS OF POLICE OF THESE 10 CITIES.

1. Detroit—Mayor James Couzens (prohibition since May 1, 1918):  
 "Prohibition has brought a decrease not alone in drunkenness but in larceny, disorderly conduct, assault and battery, nonsupport, vagrancy, etc.—a decrease in all punishable misdemeanors of 26,140 over the previous year. Admissions to the poorhouse have decreased from 2,214 to 800. Deaths from alcoholism have decreased from 92 to 17. Savings deposits have increased over \$25,000,000."

Detroit—First Deputy Commissioner of Police William P. Rutledge:  
 "Drunkenness has decreased by one-half and general conditions have greatly improved. I recently read 100 letters from manufacturers saying they would not go back to wet under any circumstances, the general physical and mental condition of their men was so much better. The Detroit Board of Commerce states: 'Detroit's experience has proved beyond a possibility of doubt that prohibition is a most valuable contribution to industrial efficiency, higher productivity, and conservation of man power.'"

2. Washington—Has no mayor (prohibition since Nov. 1, 1917).  
 Washington—Superintendent of Police Pullman:  
 "Prohibition has brought good results. Although the law here was imperfect up to March 1, when liquor could be brought in for personal use, drunkenness has been reduced to a minimum and crimes growing out of drunkenness, such as assault, disorderly conduct, etc., have been greatly reduced."

3. Seattle—Acting Mayor W. D. Lane (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):  
 "Prohibition is a success here from every standpoint. Every effort to restore the saloon has been overwhelmingly defeated. The Seattle Times and many business men who opposed prohibition are now convinced by its practical operation. Business has improved and crime and drunkenness have decreased remarkably. Prohibition is one big reason for Seattle's leadership in shipbuilding."

Seattle—Chief of Police J. F. Warren:  
 "All intoxicated persons are now arrested, while formerly many were sent home, so there has not been a decrease in the arrests for drunkenness. Business conditions, however, are very much improved, and the business sentiment is overwhelmingly in favor of prohibition."

4. Indianapolis—Mayor Charles W. Jewett (prohibition since Apr. 2, 1918):  
 "Our county workhouse has been abolished, crime reduced, and social conditions improved. Prohibition is a success in Indianapolis."  
 Indianapolis—Chief of Police George V. Coffin:  
 "Prohibition has had a salutary effect on such charges as assault and battery, drunkenness, etc."

5. Portland—Mayor George L. Baker (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):  
 "When Oregon adopted prohibition the improvement everywhere was so marked that a year later a law was passed making the State bone dry. There was the usual cry of ruining the State, but it did not materialize. Portland's bank clearance, population, building permits, and other business transactions increased. Absolute prohibition has been such a success that there is no longer any talk of opposing it."

Portland—Chief of Police N. F. Johnson:  
 "Prohibition has been a success. Hundreds of representative citizens who voted against it are now ardent supporters. Buildings formerly occupied by saloons were rented with very little delay. A few months preceding the adoption of prohibition I handled some 1,600 cases of destitution, and in practically every case the head of the family owed a saloon bill. Ten months after the adoption of prohibition I checked 75 corner grocery stores in the district where most of this destitution was, and without a single exception collections from 50 per cent to 75 per cent better were reported. The year preceding prohibition our average daily arrests for drunkenness were 23; the year following the average per day was 2½."

6. Denver—Mayor W. F. R. Mills, by his secretary (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):  
 "There is no question but that prohibition has been of great benefit. Money heretofore spent for liquor is now spent for family purposes, and the home life has been immeasurably benefited. Many homes are really homes now that never were before. The family is fed and clothed and sunshine has dispelled gloom. A very large proportion of the business men who opposed prohibition are now in favor of it."  
 Denver—Chief of Police. No reply.

7. San Antonio—Mayor Sam C. Bell (prohibition since June 21, 1918):  
 "These statistics for similar periods tell our story:

	Before.	After.
Vagrancy.....	2,945	1,832
Drunkenness.....	3,070	1,214

San Antonio—Chief of Police F. H. Lancaster:  
 "Crime has decreased, but bootlegging has increased. Prohibition does not prohibit in San Antonio. The only solution of prohibition is stopping the manufacture of intoxicating drinks."

8. Atlanta—Mayor James L. Key (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1908):  
 "Prohibition has proved a success in Atlanta in every way. Crime, drunkenness, and vice have decreased. The general efficiency of the body of citizens has increased. General business conditions have improved. The law meets with the approval of the community and is accepted as well as other measures."

Atlanta—Chief of Police James L. Beavers:  
 "Drunkenness has decreased more than 50 per cent. Prohibition has been very successful here and it will be more so when we get the nationwide prohibition law July 1."

9. Birmingham—N. A. Barrett, president of city commission (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1915):  
 "Prohibition has been a monumental success in Birmingham. Our main city prison with a capacity of 400 has been converted into a parental school. Our growth under prohibition has been extraordinary."

Birmingham—Chief of Police T. J. Shirley:  
 "Our arrests for drunkenness in 1918 were 670 compared with 2,453 when we had the saloons. Since January 15, 1919, we have had bone-dry prohibition and a still further gain has been made. We have abandoned our new jail, which has been turned over to the juvenile court."

10. Omaha—Mayor Edward P. Smith (prohibition since May 1, 1917):  
 "Prohibition has much greater strength in Omaha now than when adopted. Arrests for drunkenness and attendant offenses are less than one-third of what they were. Business was never more prosperous."

Omaha—Chief of Police M. Everstein:  
 "Crime has decreased more than 40 per cent, drunkenness more than 50 per cent, and this would be even greater if times were normal. Business is excellent."

SUMMARY.

- 17 mayors and chiefs of police give a verdict for prohibition.
- 1 chief of police gives a verdict against prohibition.
- 1 has not replied.

19

10 SUNDRY REPLIES (APRIL-MAY, 1919).

1. Ann Arbor, Mich.—E. M. Wurster, mayor (prohibition since May 1, 1918):  
 "Prohibition has done wonders for the individual toper and wonders for the whole community. All business runs much smoother than formerly and the jails are practically empty. Many of those who were the greatest objectors to prohibition are now its staunchest supporters."

2. Colorado—Victor E. Keyes, attorney general (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):  
 "Prohibition has brought most satisfactory results. While we have lost license fees, it has been demonstrated that even from the standpoint of dollars and cents it has been beneficial. Crime has been greatly reduced and the benefits resulting to the State have been very great."

3. Dallas, Tex.—J. W. Ryan, chief of police (prohibition since June 26, 1918):  
 "Comparing three months before prohibition with a corresponding three months after, I find 1,108 arrests for drunkenness and disorder against 109 now. This gives a fair and impartial estimate of the effect of prohibition. Another offense, wife beating, which was very common during the saloon era, averaging 5 to 6 per day, has now become 'extinct.'"

4. Kansas City, Kans.—H. A. Mendenhall, mayor (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1881):  
 "We have one of the cleanest and most moral cities in the United States because we have absolute prohibition, which is the first and greatest aid. Our people are contented and happy, and we would not go back to the old state of affairs for any price."

5. Lake County, Oreg.—Fred G. Stickels, sheriff (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):  
 "Prohibition has been a great success; in fact, so much of a success that I have not seen a drunken man for years. When our county was 'wet' we had all kinds of serious criminal cases, and our jail was nearly always full. Now we have very few prisoners and these mostly for petty offenses."

6. Lansing, Mich.—J. W. Ferle, mayor (prohibition since May 1, 1918):  
 "I can not say enough for what prohibition has done for Lansing and the State of Michigan. It has worked very satisfactorily to the manufacturers, to business men, and to individuals. Last Monday we voted on the beer-and-wine amendment initiated by the saloon interests and it was turned down by over 150,000 majority." (Final figures, 207,520 majority.)

7. Nashville, Tenn.—William Gupton, mayor (prohibition since July 1, 1909):  
 "A few days ago Nashville entertained the largest crowd in her history. We had five arrests for drunkenness. A few years back on a corresponding day, with no unusual crowd, we had 73 arrests for drunkenness. Nashville has been bone dry for some time. Bank clearings have increased, business is better, and in general there is a remarkable change for the better."

8. Salt Lake City, Utah—J. Parley White, chief of police (prohibition since Aug. 1, 1917):  
 "During the 12 months after prohibition we arrested 308 persons for drunkenness compared with 3,353 during the 12 months immediately preceding. All minor crimes have decreased in about the same proportion. Bank deposits have increased to a remarkable extent. Business is much better. There are no vacant houses or business buildings in town. The school children are better clothed and better cared for."

9. Spokane, Wash.—Charles M. Fassett, mayor (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):  
 "Not only are those who voted 'dry' satisfied with the three years' experience, but thousands of our citizens who voted 'wet' are now openly and positively for prohibition. Business men who feared that the commercial interests would be injured by prohibition are now practically unanimous in its favor."

10. York County, Me.—Howen A. Roberts, sheriff (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1851):  
 "Until Gov. Milliken, the present governor, assumed office prohibition has not been properly enforced. To show you that prohibition can be enforced, and what its results are, I give you the following from the records of our jail:  
 1916, committed for intoxication..... 119  
 1918, committed for intoxication..... 15

"There is no doubt in my mind that prohibition, properly enforced, is a necessary thing."  
 Additional copies may be obtained from the secretary of the committee by addressing The Verdict, Boston University, 72 Mount Vernon Street, Boston, Mass.

Another speaker whose remarks I desire to call to the attention of the House was Mrs. Margaret Rooney, who led a delegation of women from Baltimore who claimed they were advocates of the Personal Liberty League.

I noticed those ladies marching down the Avenue with their purple umbrellas, all dressed up. I wonder who paid for the umbrellas. Mrs. Margaret Rooney was leading that procession

of women. Jack Dempsey and Jess Willard never had anything on Mrs. Rooney when she mounted the Capitol steps, and at the psychological moment she did not take the speaker's stand but jumped upon the speaker's table and said: "I am the first woman to advocate personal liberty in this cause, and you can bet your life we'll go to hell to get it." There was great applause from the crowd. I want to ask those who applauded that sentiment of Mrs. Rooney if they thought she was expressing the sentiment of the American mothers of our country. Shame on the woman who would stand on the Capitol steps of this Nation and use such language as that. Why, Mr. Chairman, if Emma Goldman were to stand on the Capitol steps and make such a statement as that she would probably be indicted under the espionage law and given a penitentiary sentence. I say such actions as those by Mrs. Rooney are insulting to American motherhood. [Applause.]

In conclusion let me say that the German brewers can howl their heads off, they can spend their millions, but prohibition is here, and it is going to stay regardless of any action or threats on their part. [Applause.] Now I will yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I did not intend to make any comment on the gentleman's argument, but to suggest a correction in his statistics. He said, if I understood him, that no State which had adopted prohibition had ever abandoned it.

Mr. COOPER. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. One State after about 50 years of prohibition went to local option, and after having local option for 12 years resubmitted it, and it confirmed that local option by a majority twelve times greater than when it originally adopted it. I want to say that I sympathize with a great part of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. RANDALL of California. If the gentleman will permit me, is it not a fact that the State that the gentleman from Vermont refers to afterwards ratified the prohibition amendment?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I may say that in the instance of the adoption of local option it was done by a popular vote, whereas the ratification of the prohibition amendment was by a legislature, where my friends on the other side are anxious that it shall go rather than to a popular vote.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman from Ohio repeat the quotation that he made from Mr. Gompers's speech last Saturday?

Mr. COOPER. I will be glad to.

He said:

The United States contains people of many nationalities, most of whom are, as I have said, accustomed to the use of beer and light wines. Conceive the opportunity thus given to agitators, anarchists, and the apostles of Bolshevism to go to these people, in their homes, in their factories, in their mills, their mines, their associations, their unions, and say, "Look here. This is what Congress has done to you. It has even taken away your glass of beer!"

It may sound but little to those who are accustomed to comfortable homes, to luxurious hotels. It may sound trivial to those who have never known the use of beer or wine. But to people so accustomed it is a source of constant discontent and never-ending nagging. It irritates and annoys and unsettles. And it puts them in a receptive mood for the deadlier propaganda that will follow.

The "No beer, no work" agitation is sure proof of this. It is claimed to be the work of agitators, the I. W. W., or the Bolsheviks.

Well, suppose it is? Who placed in the hands of these agitators the material to work with? And how are you going to tell whether it is their work or not?

In other words, Mr. Gompers says that Congress and the legislatures of 45 out of 48 States of the Union by legislating on prohibition placed into the hands of these people the material with which they will resort to anarchy. Mr. Chairman, I wear upon the lapel of my a coat a little emblem which I feel proud of. It is the emblem of one of the great labor organizations of our country, and as long as I am a member of this body I will defend till the last the thousands of decent, industrious, sober workingmen against the insults that were cast upon them last Saturday, June 14, by the unpatriotic, un-American brewers. [Prolonged applause.]

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Houghton, Mich., post office: For completion, \$19,500.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What the gentleman who has just taken his seat has said in his reference to Mr. Gompers, as indicated in his formal speech on the floor, and what Mr. Gompers actually said makes an entirely different proposition. I asked the question because I did not want it to go out before the country that Mr. Gompers made any such statement as intimated by the gentleman. I regard Mr. Gompers as one of the greatest Ameri-

can patriots of the day, a man who would be the last man in the world to spread riot or Bolshevism.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is not my intention to go into the question of prohibition at this hour, because I appreciate the fact that this sundry civil bill ought to be considered and gotten out of the way. But I will take advantage of the couple of moments the House has allowed me to say that we who oppose prohibition have no objection to its being considered and passed and carried out and made operative in every State of the country by popular vote. If the States want prohibition for themselves, they have the power to enact it and can have it. But it is my contention, and the contention of those opposed to prohibition, that in the 48 States of the Union there are so many different conditions of society, so many different atmospheres, that it is not wise overnight, on the 1st of July, to declare the whole United States under prohibition law, particularly against popular protest in many communities.

Now, I am speaking as a man who has preached and practiced temperance all his lifetime. I stated to Senator SHEPPARD and other men interested in the prohibition law that it is not the wise thing to attempt to carry out prohibition on the 1st of July, when this law shall take effect, because all signs point to the fact that the war is over; that peace will have been here and the armies practically demobilized. The men in the liquor business have been engaged in it for years by sanction of the Government. The Government is accepting their money now by hundreds of millions of dollars in every city and town of the United States where license obtains, and the Treasury itself is spending hundreds of millions of dollars gained from liquor fees.

It is only recently that the people have decreed prohibition, and we should go slow in assailing the point of view of men engaged in a business legalized by this Government since its foundation.

When this Congress passed the law it said, "Gentlemen, this law shall take effect in a year from the date of ratification by the last State," and these men, some of whose entire fortunes are in this business, who have carried it on in hotels and restaurants as well as saloons, have paid their taxes into the Treasury of the United States until January next, but they do not know now where they stand. They are looking to Congress to do them justice and see that the provisions of that act which said that this law shall not be operative until a year from January shall be carried out. You men who voted for this law a year ago made that promise to these men, and I simply ask you to carry it out. It is the decent thing to do.

The gentleman from Ohio knows little about the history of this country when he assails by the wholesale the character of the foreign born. Where would this country be to-day if it were not for the foreign born and the native born? Why, hardly any one of us has an ancestry of 100 years in this country. One of President Wilson's parents was foreign born, and numerous other Presidents had a like situation. There are villains among the foreign born, but the so-called native stock has its share.

As for the men in the liquor business, all they ask at this hour is an opportunity to get out of business as Congress agreed. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] talks about the German brewers. The gentleman ought to be above that sort of talk. That is gone by. Let us stick to the facts. Why should the people of North Carolina and Texas tell us up in Massachusetts how we should regulate our personal habits?

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

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

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to say to the gentleman that I shall not object to the two minutes but I shall object to any further extension of this sort of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let us get down to the State of Massachusetts—a pretty good Commonwealth. From 1620 until the hour the Twenty-sixth Division, from Massachusetts, drove the Germans at Chateau-Thierry her reputation has been unassailable. What are the facts in regard to that Puritan Commonwealth on the prohibition question? In the only popular elections that have been held in that State during the past six months, since this prohibition amendment went into effect, because of the manner in which that amendment was enacted, practically every town and village that has voted upon the

proposition of license has voted for license. Towns and villages down in Plymouth County and in other agricultural portions of the State, that never voted for liquor, voted for license, and liquor is being sold in those places now. The great, big city of Boston voted 2 to 1 for license. The great, big city of New York voted 5 to 1 for license, and in the great, big city of Chicago, in a recent election, they voted 3 or 4 to 1. The women of Chicago voted against prohibition. To hear the gentleman talk, all these people are anarchists. The gentleman spoke about Mrs. Rooney. That woman made a mistake. She said so when she got down from the table. She corrected her statement when she realized what she said. We do it here every day. Why is she not entitled to the same chance. She got excited. She did not step upon the table; I was there. She was lifted upon the table, and it is not fair to use the indiscreet language of an excited woman as an argument for prohibition. [Laughter.] Mrs. Rooney the gentleman from Ohio classes with the German brewer. She is just as much a German as MADDEN is. Everybody knows that. I thank the Chairman and the House for the courtesy extended to me. [Applause.]

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Orange, Tex., post office: For completion, \$10,000.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend page 7, line 22, by striking out the item authorizing \$10,000 for the Orange, Tex., post office. I move to strike out the entire line. The purpose of that is, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, strike out line 22.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is line 22?

The CLERK (reading)—

Orange, Tex., post office: For completion, \$10,000.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact this item came over from the former bill and is made for the purpose of enlarging the appropriation heretofore made, that is now wholly inadequate. The original appropriation was made in 1913, and I prefer to have this item eliminated, in order, at the proper time, to bring it before the committee and discuss the matter and get a proper appropriation.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, in this item for Orange, Tex., the law authorizes a building there to cost \$60,000. There has already been appropriated \$50,000 of the amount, and this is for the completion of that building. If this goes out, there will be no appropriation to complete that building at all in this Congress. This is for the next year, and I want the gentleman thoroughly to understand what he is doing. I am just as anxious as he is to make the bill as small as possible, and if Orange, Tex., does not want it I am willing to have it go out, and I will say to the gentleman if it goes out there will be some time before he will get some money down at Orange, Tex., and work will be stopped when the \$50,000 appropriation is expended.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I desire my position to be understood, and to say that no work has started on the project. The specifications were submitted, bids were rejected—nobody would undertake the work at the price named—and the amount is wholly inadequate. I would like very much to take up this project before the committee at the proper time.

Mr. GOOD. This is not the proper committee, and I will say to the gentleman he will never get more than \$10,000 in the report for this building from the Committee on Appropriations until Congress has made a new authorization, and that may be some years—

Mr. BOX. Then I will withdraw my amendment on the gentleman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to execute and give effect to the provisions of section 6 of the act of May 30, 1908 (35 Stat., p. 537): For additional salary of \$1,000 for the Supervising Architect of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1920; foremen draftsmen, architectural draftsmen, and apprentice draftsmen, at rates of pay from \$840 to \$2,500 per annum; structural engineers and draftsmen, at rates of pay from \$840 to \$2,500 per annum; mechanical, sanitary, electrical, heating and ventilating, and illuminating engineers and draftsmen, at rates of pay from \$1,200 to \$2,400 per annum; computers and estimators, at rates of pay from \$1,600 to \$2,500 per annum; the expenditures under all the foregoing classes for which a minimum and maximum rate of compensation is stated, not to exceed \$176,800; supervising superintendents, superintendents, and junior superintendents of construction and inspectors, at rates of pay from \$1,600 to \$2,900 per annum, not to exceed \$206,650; expenses of superintendence, including expenses of all inspectors and other officers and employees, on

duity or detailed in connection with work on public buildings and the furnishing and equipment thereof, and the work of the Supervising Architect's Office, under orders from the Treasury Department; for the transportation of household goods, incident to change of headquarters of supervising superintendents, superintendents, and junior superintendents of construction and inspectors, not in excess of 5,000 pounds at any one time, together with the necessary expense incident to packing and draying the same, not to exceed in any one year a total expenditure of \$7,500; office rent and expenses of superintendents, including temporary stenographic and other assistance in the preparation of reports and the care of public property, etc.; advertising; office supplies, including drafting materials, specially prepared paper, typewriting machines, adding machines, and other mechanical labor-saving devices, and exchange of same; furniture, carpets, electric-light fixtures, and office equipment; telephone service; not to exceed \$6,000 for stationery; not to exceed \$1,000 for books of reference, law books, technical periodicals and journals; not to exceed \$10,000 for transporting drawings, miscellaneous supplies, etc., for public buildings under the control of the Treasury Department; contingencies of every kind and description, traveling expenses of site agents, recording deeds and other evidences of title, photographic instruments, chemical plates, and photographic materials, and such other articles and supplies and such minor and incidental expenses not enumerated, connected solely with work on public buildings, the acquisition of sites, and the administrative work connected with the annual appropriations under the Supervising Architect's Office as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary and specially order or approve, but not including heat, light, janitor service, awnings, curtains, or any expenses for the general maintenance of the Treasury Building, or surveys, plaster models, progress photographs, test-pit borings, or mill and shop inspection, \$489,050.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee the necessity of providing for the additional salary of \$1,000 for the Supervising Architect for the Treasury for the fiscal year of 1920. It is a provision that has been carried for some time, and yet during the last two years, I do not know but five or six years, possibly not quite as long as that, there has been no Supervising Architect of the Treasury. Now, it seems to me that there is no necessity for carrying an increase of salary for an official who has not been appointed, and if we are not going to have a Supervising Architect of the Treasury, why should not we appoint the executive officer down there who has carried on this department for all these years, increase his salary to that of Supervising Architect, and eliminate the Supervising Architect?

Mr. GOOD. Well, I agree that there ought to be something done with regard to fixing the salary of the Supervising Architect and that the salary should not be carried in two bills. As the gentleman knows, we carry in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill an item of \$5,000 for the salary of this official and then have been carrying \$1,000 here. That was adopted sometime ago, and has been followed, as the gentleman has stated, for several years, and now, while we do not have a Supervising Architect of the Treasury, yet, I suppose, when the amount was estimated for it was contemplated to appoint some one to this vacancy. The matter was thoroughly considered by the former committee, and we simply adopted to this extent the former bill. We had no hearings upon this proposition. It is a matter that has been carried in the bill for a number of years, carried in the bill as reported and passed by the House, and we have carried it again here.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman from Tennessee make the familiar explanation as to why we have no Supervising Architect of the Treasury?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Tennessee can give the gentleman from Massachusetts no information as to why that position has not been filled further than the statement that for a number of years past Mr. Wetmore has been Acting Supervising Architect. I forget the name—

Mr. WALSH. Executive officer.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; but I say I forget the name of the last Supervising Architect. Now, I can not give the gentleman any information as to why this position has never been filled.

The bills have been carrying the salary, but the salary, as a matter of fact, has remained in the Treasury, and it has not been used. I think it would be unwise to drop it, because the position exists. It was created by law, and in the present situation, if the executive officer was for any reason to leave the office, it would be necessary to have some man of equal competency, and this position would probably be filled. Now, I have understood that the real reason this place has not been filled by the promotion or appointment of the present executive officer is that he is not a recognized or graduate architect, and under the law it would be necessary to appoint as Supervising Architect some one who is a recognized architect. Now, Mr. Wetmore does not come up to that specific requirement, regardless of the fact that we all know he is splendidly qualified as executive officer.

Mr. WALSH. How do we get around the provisions of law that require plans, and so forth, to be approved by the Supervising Architect when we have not a Supervising Architect?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. He is the Acting Supervising Architect.

Mr. WALSH. Then, if he is the Acting Supervising Architect, I think the committee having the matter in charge would see to it that he should get the architect's salary. He has the Supervising Architect's responsibilities and duties.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have just stated to the gentleman that, as I understand it, under the law, he can not be appointed to the position of Supervising Architect, because he has not the qualifications set forth in the law, in that he is not a qualified architect.

Mr. WALSH. Well, one of the reasons I am not rabid for this salary is that the executive officer of this department is performing the duties of an official who is getting \$6,000 while he himself is getting only \$3,500, and he ought to get the former salary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Architectural competitions: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to make payment for architectural services under contracts entered into prior to the repeal of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain plans and specifications for public buildings to be erected under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and providing for local supervision of the construction of the same," approved February 20, 1893, including additional commissions accruing under certain of said contracts due to increase in the limits of cost of certain buildings, except as otherwise specifically provided by law, and including payment for the services from July 1, 1912, of the architect of the Hilo, Hawaii, building, specially selected under the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1911, the unexpended balances of the appropriations for architectural competitions, public buildings, for the fiscal year 1919, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is continued and made available for said purposes during the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to get some information from the chairman of the committee in reference to the delay in the payment of this architect's compensation. I would like to know why this matter has been running so long?

Mr. GOOD. You have reference now to the Supervising Architect?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. To this architect on the Hilo, Hawaii, building. You are now providing for compensation from July 1, 1912, to 1919.

Mr. GOOD. That does not relate to the compensation for architect back to July 1, 1912. That is the date of the contract.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is the way I read it, beginning in line 7 and reading through line 8, "including the payment for the services from July 1, 1912, of the architect of the Hilo, Hawaii, building." I want to know why this man has not been paid out of this item right along?

Mr. GOOD. This matter was one of the items that passed the House before without objection, and the present committee did not hold any hearings on it at all, and the hearings before the former committee are not very extensive. There are just two or three questions and answers, as follows:

Mr. BYRNS. Under architectural competitions you are asking a reapportionment?

Mr. WETMORE. Yes, sir; we have been carrying that amount from year to year.

Mr. BYRNS. What have you on that account?

Mr. WETMORE. We have only two buildings under that. One is the proposed building at Honolulu, and the other is the New Haven building.

That is the only information that was given in the former hearings. As I said before, we took the bill as a basis where no objection was made or no new estimate was made. We simply did not have the time to go into the former hearings or hold new hearings on those items.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I merely call the chairman's attention to the item at this time, and I may ask the chairman to consent to return to it if we get some information on it before we conclude the bill. It seems to me unusual that the salary of this architect should have been running along since 1912, and we now propose to pay him for the service.

Mr. GOOD. I shall be very glad to get the information for the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Operating supplies: For fuel, steam, gas for lighting and heating purposes, water, ice, lighting supplies, electric current for lighting and power purposes, telephone service for custodian forces; removal of ashes and rubbish, snow, and ice; cutting grass and weeds, washing towels, and miscellaneous items for the use of the custodian forces in the care and maintenance of completed and occupied public buildings and the grounds thereof under the control of the Treasury Department, and in the care and maintenance of the equipment and furnishing in such buildings; miscellaneous supplies, tools, and appliances required in the operation (not embracing repairs) of the mechanical equipment, including heating, plumbing, hoisting, gas piping, ventilating, vacuum-cleaning and refrigerating apparatus, electric-light plants, meters, interior pneumatic-tube and intercommunicating telephone systems, conduit wiring, call-bell and signal systems in such buildings (including the custom-

house in the District of Columbia, but excluding any other public building under the control of the Treasury Department within the District of Columbia, and excluding also marine hospitals and quarantine stations, mints, branch mints, and assay offices, and personal services, except for work done by contract or for temporary job labor under exigency not exceeding at one time the sum of \$100 at any one building), \$2,300,000. The appropriation made herein for gas shall include the rental and use of gas governors, when ordered by the Secretary of the Treasury in writing: *Provided*, That rentals shall not be paid for such gas governors greater than 35 per cent of the actual value of the gas saved thereby, which saving shall be determined by such tests as the Secretary of the Treasury shall direct: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to contract for the purchase of fuel for public buildings under the control of the Treasury Department in advance of the availability of the appropriation for the payment thereof. Such contracts, however, shall not exceed the necessities of the current year.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

What is the purpose of authorizing these contracts for fuel in advance of the appropriation for the payment and to restrict the contract to the necessities of the current year? Does that mean the fiscal year or the current calendar year?

Mr. GOOD. The current fiscal year.

Mr. WALSH. Does it mean that?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. That was the intention. The department finds that it can not go in the market now and make its contract for coal after the 1st day of July, whereas all other concerns and industrial establishments let their contracts for fuel along in the months of March and April. Now, under the present arrangement and without this legislation they can not let contracts for the fuel until after the appropriation is made. Now, if this provision is carried next spring it will permit the Treasury Department to make their contracts for fuel in advance of an actual appropriation, but not to exceed the necessities for the current year.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I do not agree with the gentleman that the phrase "current year" means the current fiscal year. I think you will find that means the current calendar year.

Mr. GOOD. They have not so treated it.

Mr. WALSH. They have not so treated it because it was not in the authorization before. And I think in order to make that free from doubt you should insert the words "current fiscal year."

Mr. GOOD. I move, then, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the point of order—

Mr. GOOD. I move that after the word "current" the word "fiscal," in line 20, be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 20, after the word "current," insert the word "fiscal."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HICKS. As I understand the chairman of the committee, this proviso was put in there, of course, with the idea of saving money.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; it was.

Mr. HICKS. Because in the spring of the year you can buy coal more cheaply than at any other time in the year. It seems to me that is a wise provision and will stand for economy in Federal expenditures.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and they will be assured of a supply.

Mr. HICKS. Does the gentleman know how much we shall save in this department, figuring the price of coal in April or May as compared with the price in August of this year?

Mr. GOOD. We did not go into that at all, except as to the principle.

Mr. HICKS. You went into the principle, but not into the details?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries of all necessary employees, other than employees required for the administrative work of the bureau of the class provided for and specified in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, and plate printers and plate printers' assistants, \$2,300,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, including \$8,400 for custody of dies, rolls, and plates: *Provided*, That no portion of this sum shall be expended for printing United States notes or Treasury notes of larger denomination than those that may be canceled or retired, except in so far as such printing may be necessary in executing the requirements of the act "To define and

fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes," approved March 14, 1900.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. Will the chairman of the committee state why this item is increased some \$140,000 over the February bill and more than \$1,500,000 over the last year's appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and his assistant all are of the opinion that they will use all of this money. They complained very bitterly because their estimate had been cut in the former bill, and they took this view of the matter, that if the reduced appropriation as carried in the last bill were adopted it would be necessary for them to reduce their force and also reduce the wages of the employees in order to get the work done. While the committee called their attention to the fact that their expenditures would depend upon the amount of work they would actually do, yet they were positive that they would be compelled to do at least all the work they had estimated for, and that if the estimates were reduced they would take it as an invitation by Congress to reduce wages. We felt that was a matter over which Congress had no control, and we knew nothing about the wages, whether they are right or wrong. But we felt that the Director of the Bureau was rather "passing the buck" to Congress in regard to establishing wages when we knew nothing about it at all and could not investigate it at this time.

Mr. WALSH. Of course that is the usual practice. They have not got to print any Liberty bonds down there in the future, and there was a lot of work that was put on the bureau during the war that will be eliminated. Of course they will say, "If you do not increase our appropriation, we will have to cut down wages or have to reduce our force." That would be a public calamity in the view of the chiefs of these departments. But it seems to me there ought to be some better excuse than the fact that they are afraid that if they do not keep everybody busy down there they will have to reduce wages.

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

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I think it was developed at the hearings that they have reduced their force a thousand employees, and that every day they were reducing their force. To be exact, they have reduced their force by 1,600.

Mr. WALSH. Well, we have increased the appropriation \$140,000 in a few months' time. I do not think there is very much consistency or sound financial reasoning in such a policy as that. Last year we appropriated only \$1,800,000, and they managed to struggle along on that and print all these Liberty bonds, and, if I mistake not, a lot of these thrift stamps and war-saving certificates. All that work will have been eliminated by the time this appropriation will be available, and yet they have increased the amount \$140,000 over the amount reported in the bill which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] had charge of last February. I would like to know if the committee was informed as to any extra work or new kind of duties or responsibilities that were to be imposed upon the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing which make this appropriation necessary?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the persons who are being discharged in the main are employees who were engaged on the bond work, which is not paid for out of this appropriation at all. The engraving of the bonds was taken care of out of a special fund. This fund is intended to pay for the work specified in lines 21 to 24. I agree with the gentleman that the excuse is not a very good one. I think that the bureau ought not to say to Congress and say to their employees that if Congress does not give the full amount they will have to reduce wages. The manly thing for the bureau to do would be to say, "The wages are so much, and if we have enough work that must be done and Congress has not appropriated the necessary money, we will ask for an additional appropriation."

But that was not the proposition that was put up to the committee at all. Somebody encouraged employees to come by the scores representing the bureau, saying that if we did not give this amount of money they would be discharged in many instances and in other instances their wages would be reduced, in order to do this amount of work with a given amount of money.

Now, last year they did appropriate \$1,960,000 all told; but I will say to the gentleman that there is before the bureau an estimate for a large increase in this class of work, and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the Secretary of the Treas-

ury anticipate that they will have enough work at the present scale to use up this entire appropriation. At any rate, I will say to the gentleman that the committee did not see that it could go into the question of wages at all; that it was not up to the committee to assume the authority that had already been delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury. Therefore we felt that while we were giving an enlarged amount it was not an invitation to employ more people than were necessary, it was not an invitation to pay a cent more than the work was worth, but was only an appropriation that was wrung from the committee in this way, in order to prevent what might be the happening of a disaster if they should reduce wages below a living wage and then throw all the blame upon Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Suppose we grant this increase upon that argument and contention. Where are we going to be with the rest of the Government departments if they come drumming up appropriations with the same kind of an argument? Are we going to grant these unwarranted increases in the appropriations that will mount up to nearly a billion dollars?

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. The gentleman understands that they have an established scale of wages in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing?

Mr. WALSH. It has been increased within a year or so.

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. I do not understand that this contemplates the slightest increase in the scale of wages, but the statement was made by the director of the bureau that he can not do the work which he will have to do during the next fiscal year with the appropriation that has been made, and that he must have an increase. I will say to the gentleman that the increase he said he must have was considerably more than the committee allowed. He was very frank in saying to the committee that he would have to come back for a deficiency. My idea is that in these bills we ought to appropriate what we know the Government will need for the next fiscal year, when it can be ascertained, and not force a deficiency.

Mr. GOOD. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to this fact: They asked for \$269,000 more than the bill carries. We gave them \$140,000 more than the former bill. But one of the principal contentions, in which, I think, there is some merit, is that the former bill, caring for the plate printers, in lines 19 to 25, carried practically all that was asked for, whereas this item was a reduction, and that there is a corresponding relation between the two, and that if that item was cut to that extent, then they claimed this other item ought also to have been cut. But they did not cut that. The former Congress permitted them to have practically what they asked for the plate printers.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. WALSH. In line 8, page 24, strike out "\$2,300,000" and insert "\$2,160,000."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 24, line 8, strike out "\$2,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,160,000."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the amount that was carried in the other bill, and it would seem from the statements of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] and his colleague upon the committee [Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee] that the requirements of the bureau are no different than they were when the bill was reported in February—that that bill covered practically the same amount of work to be done and the same number of sheets, with a few changes, perhaps, and, as far as the committee knows, the same scale of wages paid. I think we ought not to encourage a demand for unwarranted increases unless it can be shown that the work of a particular department has been greatly increased. I submit to the committee that, even though they have increased the estimates, they have not shown the necessity for jumping up the appropriation in this respect \$140,000. I trust the committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the committee did not feel that there was anything sacred in the amount fixed by the former committee and the amount adopted by Congress. There was no discussion over the item. The action of the former Congress reduced the estimates by \$269,000. We have added \$140,000 to the amount carried in the former bill, and even that is \$129,000 less than the estimate. The committee felt that Congress could not afford to say how many men the Bureau of Engraving and Printing should employ. We could not say how many bills the Government would actually en-

grave, and we had to take the advice of some one, and we rather anticipated that they might be able to make some reduction, and therefore we made a reduction of \$129,000. I admit it is a guess.

Mr. WALSH. How did the committee arrive at \$129,000? How does the gentleman know that will not cripple them before the end of the year? How is it that you did not give them the entire amount if you have such faith in that branch that you can not say how many employees they will have?

Mr. GOOD. It was the judgment of the committee that a reduction would bring this item more into harmony with the item that follows.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MCKENZIE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. CURTIS, Mr. JONES of Washington, and Mr. SMITH of Maryland as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, had requested a conference with the House upon said bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. GRONNA, Mr. NORRIS, and Mr. SMITH of Georgia as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For wages of plate printers, at piece rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed the rates usually paid for such work, including the wages of printers' assistants, when employed, \$2,035,455, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That no portion of this sum shall be expended for printing United States notes or Treasury notes of larger denominations than those that may be canceled or retired, except in so far as such printing may be necessary in executing the requirements of the act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes, approved March 14, 1900: *Provided further*, That no part of this sum shall be used to increase the wages of plate printers until all printers' assistants receive not less than \$2.24 per day.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman a question, if I may be excused. I was absent from the Chamber meeting a delegation when page 18 was read. On that page you appropriate money for the mechanical laborers with the custodian of the public buildings under the Treasury, bottom of page 18 in the bill. I want to inquire of the chairman if that was for the purpose of bringing the rate of wages up to the standard paid for the same service in the localities in which these men are employed? I understand the fact to be that all over the United States the men who have been in the employ of the custodians of public buildings doing mechanical work—plumbers, electricians, carpenters, bricklayers, blacksmiths, all trades requiring skilled labor—have not received an increase in their wages notwithstanding the fact that there has been an enormous increase in the wages throughout the communities in which they live. It seems to me to be a great hardship and I wondered if this was to rectify that, and if not, I think we ought to.

Mr. GOOD. I think there is some increase in the bonus that these men will be entitled to. During the present fiscal year they are entitled to, I think, \$120, and under the provisions of the law now they will get \$240 a year. This item is an increase of \$150,000 over the appropriation of the present year.

Mr. CALDWELL. Did the committee give them all they asked for?

Mr. GOOD. They asked for \$3,775,000 and we have carried \$3,650,000.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does the gentleman remember the reason why it was cut \$125,000?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that one of the reasons for increasing the estimate—

Mr. CALDWELL. I am not criticizing the increase; what I want to know is why the men are not paid the prevailing wages, because the Government ought to be the best employer of labor.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman will have to go to the Secretary of the Treasury; the Committee on Appropriations has nothing to do with the wages.

Mr. CALDWELL. But they ask for \$3,775,000.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and when they asked for that they did not know that the increase in bonus would be made and the bonus is paid from another appropriation.

Mr. CALDWELL. I see; and that is what I wanted to know. The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of quarters in the District of Columbia, \$10,000.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to inquire about the provision on line 10 for rent of quarters in the District of Columbia, \$10,000. What is that item for?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, a part of the Arlington Building will not be ready for occupancy for at least 60 or 90 days. When that addition is complete that building will be of sufficient size for housing the entire bureau, but it is not sufficient now to take care of it. The bureau is occupying the Southern Building at a rental of \$40,000 a year, which is something over \$3,300 a month. This is simply to pay the rent on that building by the month until the new addition to the Arlington Building is complete, and the Bureau of War Risk Insurance can be moved in there.

Mr. HICKS. Then I understand this \$10,000 for that building provides for a contract which may be terminated at the end of the month? We have not a yearly arrangement?

Mr. GOOD. No; it is a month-to-month contract.

The Clerk read as follows:

Distinctive paper for United States securities: For distinctive paper for United States currency, national bank currency, and Federal reserve bank currency, 142,800,000 sheets, in order that the Bureau of Engraving and Printing may deliver 136,000,000 sheets of United States currency, national bank and Federal reserve bank currency, including transportation of paper, traveling, mill, and other necessary expenses, \$685,440; expenses of officer detailed from the Treasury Department, \$50 per month when actually on duty, \$600; 3 registers, at \$1,380 each; 6 counters, at \$800 each; guards—1, \$1,000, 4, at \$900 each; 2 skilled laborers, at \$840 each; in all, \$701,260.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There is somewhat of an increase in this item. Last year it was \$630,985 and is not \$701,260. Is not this a part of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. A part of the force that is printing these sheets?

Mr. GOOD. This is for paper entirely. No part of this can be expended for personal services.

Mr. WALSH. Well, there is a provision there for six counters, at \$800 each, and for guards.

Mr. GOOD. Those people are not stationed in the bureau at all. They are at the mills and are detailed in the mills where the paper is made for counting purposes, and so forth. That is not for any work on the paper. The increase is accounted for because of the fact that it is an increased quantity of paper that is to be purchased.

Mr. WALSH. Fifty dollars per month when actually on duty means these counters when they are at the mill?

Mr. GOOD. That refers to one officer detailed from the Treasury, when he is actually on duty.

The Clerk read as follows:

Scales for customs service: For construction and installation of special automatic and recording scales for weighing merchandise, etc., in connection with imports at the various ports of entry under direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, \$75,000.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so to ask the chairman why that item on page 30, beginning on line 11, was increased to \$75,000. The year before it was \$27,000. What is the reason for that tremendous increase?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, last year an appropriation was made of \$27,000, and the unexpended balance was reappropriated. This year they practically have no unexpended balance and are asking for a considerably larger sum. They asked for \$130,000 for automatic electric weighing machines to weigh sugar at certain ports. I think they have already installed some of these weighing machines at Boston, and they desire, because of the safety, and they think of the saving and prevention of fraud in the weighing of sugar, to install the modern automatic machines at other points. The committee gave them what would be sufficient to install machines in some other ports where sugar is admitted.

Mr. HICKS. The experts think these machines would obviate such frauds as we had perpetrated seven or eight years ago in the weighing of sugar?

Mr. GOOD. That was their opinion, that it would eliminate fraud in the weighing of sugar and expedite the work.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I read some days ago that people were smuggling goods into our country by means of aeroplanes. Can the chairman inform me if any amount of this \$10,000,000 is to prevent such smuggling, or whether that question was taken up at all by the committee?

Mr. GOOD. I understand the \$10,000,000 or any part of it may be used to prevent frauds upon the customs service. That is a pretty broad term. I should think it could be used pretty generally to prevent the smuggling of any goods in any way which would be a fraud upon the Government.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I wanted to know whether the subject had been brought to the attention of the committee when they were considering this special appropriation. I refer to the question of smuggling by aeroplane.

Mr. GOOD. No; the committee did not hear any statement on that, but accepted the item carried in the former bill.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to find out from the chairman of the committee in reference to this \$10,000,000 appropriation in line 10. Is that an annual affair? Is that what we are spending each year?

Mr. GOOD. Last year it was \$10,500,000, and this year we are carrying it at \$10,000,000, but that is practically the amount that has been carried, as I understand, for the last few years.

Mr. KREIDER. It seems to be quite a large amount.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Prevention of epidemics: To enable the President, in case only of threatened or actual epidemic of cholera, typhus fever, yellow fever, smallpox, bubonic plague, Chinese plague or black death, trachoma, influenza, or infantile paralysis, to aid State and local boards, or otherwise, in his discretion, in preventing and suppressing the spread of the same, and in such emergency in the execution of any quarantine laws which may be then in force, \$400,000: *Provided*, That a detailed report of the expenditures hereunder shall annually hereafter be submitted to Congress.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Does not the gentleman think it would be wise to put in an amendment by saying "or other epidemic," so that if it becomes necessary they can quarantine or guard against some new disease coming along? For example, we had the influenza this year.

Mr. GOOD. The department itself has not asked for this, and if we did adopt the suggestion some officer might think anything an epidemic and thereby commence spending this money that is only intended for the prevention of epidemics which are epidemics that might result in injury to health or life in a general way. I think the gentleman can see the objection.

Mr. CALDWELL. The word "influenza" is put in this bill for the first time.

Mr. GOOD. That is at their request.

Mr. CALDWELL. The bill did not have it in before, and if they had had it in before it could have been used against the influenza.

Mr. GOOD. There was a special appropriation, as is suggested to me by the gentleman from Massachusetts. There is no special appropriation here.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of equipment and furniture for the additional building of the Hygienic Laboratory, \$20,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, 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. 6176, the sundry civil bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BROWNING, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BURDICK, for two days, on account of important business.

To Mr. MURPHY, for one day, on account of illness in his family.

#### LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted—

To Mr. FULLER of Illinois to withdraw from the files of the House the papers in the case of Lizzie M. Worster (H. R. 5882,

1st sess., 65th Cong.) and in the case of Ruth McClay (H. R. 9725, 2d sess., 65th Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

To Mr. ASHBROOK to withdraw the papers in the case of Annie Myers (H. R. 15602, 65th Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, June 20, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reference to the letter of January 28, 1919, printed as House Document 1746, Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, containing a list of 156 buildings and 7 extensions of Federal buildings which had been authorized and not yet constructed (H. Doc. No. 124), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. NOLAN, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5726) to fix the compensation of certain employees of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 49), 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. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 6217) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Knoxville, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6218) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Indianola, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6219) increasing the limit of cost of a public building and site at Tullahoma, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6220) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lewisburg, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 6221) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in the Osage civilization-fund claim of the Osage Nation of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 6222) to remove a certain tract or lots of land in Cristobal, Canal Zone, from the operation and effect of the Executive order of the President of December 5, 1912, pursuant to the act of Congress of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat., ch. 390, 565); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6223) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Montezano, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6224) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hoquiam, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6225) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Centralia, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6226) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Camas, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6227) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kelso, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6228) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chehalis, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6229) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sumner, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6230) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate the city of Puyallup, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6231) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Stadium High School, Tacoma, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6232) providing for the payment of mileage to certain officers of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6233) to amend section 4 of the act approved June 29, 1906, entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization and to provide a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States"; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6234) authorizing the Secretary of War to remove or dispose of timber on the Three Tree Point Military Reservation and the Fort Canby Military Reservation, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6235) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to increase the monthly salaries of registers and receivers of local land offices; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of the Interior.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 6236) to provide for an investigation to ascertain the feasibility of the construction of a reservoir and irrigation project in the Canjilon and Cebolla Rivers, in the county of Rio Arriba, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. LAZARO (by request): A bill (H. R. 6237) to revive with amendments an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Medical Society of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 6238) to provide a tariff and to obtain revenue in connection with the metallic contents of zinc ores and products thereof, and repealing existing laws fixing the rates of duty on such commodities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 6239) repealing section 630 of the act to provide revenue, and for other purposes, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 6240) to amend section 630 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6241) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Greencastle, Putnam County, Ind., four German cannons or field pieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6242) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Danville, Hendricks County, Ind., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6243) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newport, Vermillion County, Ind., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6244) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Terre Haute, Vigo County, Ind., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6245) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Brazil, Clay County, Ind., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6246) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rockville, Parke County, Ind., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6247) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Poplarville, Pearl River County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6248) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Waynesboro, Wayne County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6249) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Ellisville, Jones County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 6250) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Alden, Delaware County, Pa., one captured cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 6251) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Salyersville, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 6252) to increase pensions for total deafness; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ACKERMAN: Resolution (H. Res. 121) requesting the President to furnish information as to the need for continuing the censorship of mails; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: Resolution (H. Res. 122) requesting the Secretary of State to furnish copies of correspondence pertaining to Mexican affairs from January 1, 1915, to date; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 123) to investigate in re payment of interest and principal on Russian bonds; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WINGO: Resolution (H. Res. 124) to print 2,500 copies of the Soil Survey of Miller County, Ark.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LANGLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 125) to print for the use of the House 1,000 copies of the speech of Hon. F. C. Hicks on the American flag; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KAHN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 126) to thank the women of America for their splendid devotion to the cause for which their country entered the great World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of New York, urging enactment of a measure relating to the Federal home-loan bills; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of New York, urging enactment of a measure relating to Federal home-loan bills; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of New York, urging the enactment of a measure relating to Federal home-loan bills; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, for modification of the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. BEE: A bill (H. R. 6253) for the relief of certain employees of the Bureau of Lighthouses; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6254) for the relief of Ethel Fredrickson and daughter Ethel; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6255) for the relief of estate of J. P. Dieter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6256) for the relief of A. H. Rebirthish; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6257) granting a pension to Charles W. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 6258) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Christy, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULLEN: A bill (H. R. 6259) granting a pension to George H. Bruckner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6260) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. I. Beall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 6261) granting a pension to Henry Hazlett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6262) granting an increase of pension to Michael Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6263) granting a pension to Irwin R. Troxell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 6264) granting an increase of pension to Reuben P. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6265) granting a pension to Alwill Hacklander; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 6266) for the relief of Alexander Read; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 6267) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Tyler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6268) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint William Shelby Barriger captain of Cavalry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 6269) for the relief of the heirs of James A. Frey, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6270) granting a pension to Joseph B. De Langevin, alias Joseph Louis Lansberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6271) granting a pension to Timothy O'Neill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6272) granting a pension to Peter Thomasen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6273) granting a pension to Fidelia A. Baker-Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6274) granting a pension to Jane Mathilda McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6275) granting a pension to Charles Youngblood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6276) granting a pension to Aurelia E. Wilkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6277) granting a pension to Amanda Ball Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6278) granting an increase of pension to William D. Vaughn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6279) granting an increase of pension to Albert M. Kenyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6280) granting an increase of pension to John P. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6281) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hanshaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6282) granting an increase of pension to Ione D. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6283) granting an increase of pension to Charles Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6284) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6285) granting an increase of pension to Riley A. Reeves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6286) granting an increase of pension to Ellen A. Cortright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6287) granting an increase of pension to Helen E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6288) for the relief of George F. Weaver; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6289) for the relief of the heirs of Robert Laird McCormick, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6290) for the relief of William McCutcheon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6291) for the relief of E. Willard; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6292) for the relief of Thomas J. K. Looney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6293) for the relief of Augustus Sipple; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6294) for the relief of Lon Lewis, alias Alonza E. Schneider; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6295) for the relief of Tacoma Tug & Barge Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6296) authorizing the Cowlitz Tribe of Indians residing in the State of Washington to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 6297) granting an increase of pension to John H. Schoonover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 6298) granting a pension to John P. Simpson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 6299) for the relief of the heirs of Solomon Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 6300) for the relief of Herbert R. Cornforth; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 6301) for the relief of Nathan Manzer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 6302) granting a pension to David Rushlon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6303) granting a pension to Ferdinand Lambert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6304) granting a pension to Eliza M. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6305) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6306) to correct the military record of Benjamin Jadwin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6307) to correct the military record of Jesse Cooper; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 6308) granting a pension to George Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6309) granting a pension to Isaac Slygh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 6310) granting a pension to Margaret Howell Butler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 6311) for the relief of Patrick Doonan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 6312) granting a pension to Harry L. Frizzell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6313) granting a pension to Thomas Spurrer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 6314) granting an increase of pension to George Bellamy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 6315) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Hasson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 6316) granting an increase of pension to Israel W. Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6317) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Brubaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6318) granting a pension to James R. Burroughs; 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 the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Biscuit & Cracker Manufacturers' Association, New York City, urging retention of zone advance; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of Joe A. Corpo, Prost G. V. Conti, P. Americo, S. Paruelli, E. Fersarino, P. Matteo, Joe Monaco, representing 100 members of Italian Society, for justice in Italian affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of C. H. Smith and other citizens, of Cleveland, Ohio, to remove tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Slova, No. 173, S. N. P. J., Slavonian Society, for justice in Jugo-Slav questions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND of Virginia: Petition of citizens of Tangier, Va., opposing repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of citizens of Galveston and Harris Counties, Tex., requesting repeal of revenue tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream when served at soda fountains and ice-cream parlors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARSS: Petition or memorial of soldiers and citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of residents of Ohio against repeal of war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the Biscuit & Cracker Manufacturers' Association of the United States urging retention of zone system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COLE: Petition or memorial of Hancock County Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Findlay, Ohio, protesting against any measure being enacted to discontinue war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of residents of Cleveland, Ohio, and vicinity, requesting repeal of section 904 of revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against taxes on candy, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of city council of Cleveland, Ohio, urging the loaning of money for the construction of homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, for legislation to enforce national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, for the repeal of sales taxes on automobiles and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition and memorial of sundry citizens of Hancock County, Ill., protesting against the modification of the war-time prohibition act to permit the manufacture and sale of beer and wine, as recommended by the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of National Guard Association of United States of America for the establishing of

a National Guard Corps of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of The Bronx Board of Trade of New York against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Biscuit & Cracker Manufacturers' Association of the United States, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KIESS: Petition of Jobs Corners Grange, No. 1110, Millerton, Pa., protesting against any repeal of war-time prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Williamsport and Newberry, Pa., favoring a repeal of tax on soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the Maryland Bankers' Association, the Baltimore Clearing House, and numerous trade bodies of Baltimore, Md., for prompt return of railroads to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lyon, Conklin & Co. (Inc.), Baltimore, Md., favoring the budget system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Henry Wampole Co., pharmacists, Baltimore, Md., against House bills 3458 and 3461; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, numbering almost 1,000,000 women, for war prohibition and against any repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Garrett Park Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, with membership of over 400, Baltimore, Md., asking for enforcement of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of over 4,000 residents of the District of Columbia, urging repeal of section 630 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCARTHUR: Petition of churches of Portland, Oreg., on subject of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of United War Work Campaign, urging passage of bill for support of expenses of war work; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of New York Public Library, relating to reading matter for the blind and approving House bill 2847; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. PLATT: Petition of Beekman Lodge, 576, in relation to enforcing prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of California Pharmaceutical Association, protesting against the excise taxes as mentioned in sections 630 and 907 of the revenue bill for 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hon. John Joy Edson, chairman of the board of management of the bureau for placing returning soldiers and sailors and marines in the District of Columbia, endorsing the work of the United States Employment Service and asking for an appropriation to carry on the work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Manufacturers' Association of California against the Federal Employment Service and asking for the discontinuance of the same; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Robert Schwatz, of New York, for the repeal of the war-time prohibition so far as it relates to beer and light wine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of John B. Densmore, of Washington, D. C., protesting against the repeal of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Ernest A. Fay, of New York, for the home-loan bills now pending in Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, by Alfred Reeves, general manager, of New York, for the repeal of taxes on passenger automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the members of the Union Congregational Church, of Churchville, N. Y., urging the early passage of adequate enforcement legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEIGEL: Petition of Young Men's Hebrew Association of New York, protesting against pogroms in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Homer City, citizens of Foxburg and vicinity, favoring repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of members of Clarion churches, Clarion; United Presbyterian Church and Methodist Episcopal Church,

Freeport; Methodist Episcopal Church, United Presbyterian Church, Eddyville Reformed Church, Rev. L. O. Carbaugh, and Rev. G. W. McIntyre, Dayton; Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Armstrong County, Appolo; Rev. L. E. Elbel, Shipperville, all of the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pioneer, Ohio, protesting against the proposed enactment of the war prohibition act eliminating beer and wine from its provisions, also urging the speedy enactment of the war and Federal constitutional enforcement code to enforce constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Lion Society of Christian Endeavor, Marion Township, Henry County, Ohio, protesting any modification of the prohibition law and urging immediate enactment of stringent laws for the strict enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition from business men of Ridgway, Colo., urging repeal of war tax on sodas, ice creams, soft drinks, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Glade Park, Colo., protesting against light wine and beer amendment to national prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Delta County, Colo., urging the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition for repeal of taxes on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: Petition of Franklin County (Me.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union convention, asking for legislation to make effective the eighteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINGO: Petition of various citizens of Fort Smith, Ark., urging repeal of tax on ice cream and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, June 20, 1919.

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

Almighty God, we pause at the threshold of another day, a day inviting us to service, labor, and sacrifice, to spend one sacred and holy moment in Thy presence, believing that if we lift up reverent and loving hearts to Thee we shall go out upon the tasks of the day better equipped for the service that we may render, that we shall know better the meaning and import of the tasks of life, and that we shall read more clearly the final issue and the eternal relation of the questions which we must face. So we pray Thee to guide us this day by Thine own unerring counsel. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore (Mr. CUMMINGS) took the chair.

PETER GOELET GERRY, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, appeared in his seat to-day.

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, and Mr. LEVER managers at the conference on the part of the House.