

When the future historian traces Theodore Roosevelt's extraordinary career he will find these embodied ideals planted like milestones along the road over which he marched. They never left him. His ideal of public service was to be found in his life, and as his life drew to its close he had to meet his ideal of sacrifice face to face. All his sons went from him to the war and one was killed upon the field of honor. Of all the ideals that lift men up, the hardest to fulfill is the ideal of sacrifice. Theodore Roosevelt met it as he had all others and fulfilled it to the last jot of its terrible demands. His country asked the sacrifice and he gave it with solemn pride and uncomplaining lips.

This is not the place to speak of his private life, but within that sacred circle no man was ever more blessed in the utter devotion of a noble wife and the passionate love of his children. The absolute purity and beauty of his family life tell us why the pride and interest which his fellow countrymen felt in him were always touched with the warm light of love. In the home so dear to him, in his sleep, death came, and—

So Valiant-for-Truth passed over and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side.

BENEDICTION.

Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, pronounced the following benediction:

And now may the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all evermore. Amen.

ADJOURNMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The purpose for which this joint session of the Congress of the United States this day assembled having been satisfactorily concluded, it is now adjourned.

Whereupon (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, February 10, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

MONDAY, February 10, 1919.

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

Almighty God, Thou hast given to us our place in the world and called us to places of responsibility at a time when the world is seeking the paths of peace and the nations are conferring with each other about the way for the establishment of justice and right among all men. We pray that we may all turn back to the ancient statutes of the Lord and may find that upon building on these we may build with security and with hope and with confidence the temple of human justice and right. Grant us willing hearts to respond to the divine command and active lives to express our consecration to the divine will. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, February 7, 1919, when, on request of Mr. SHEPPARD 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 agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12863) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

S. 1847. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Wyoming National Forest;

H. R. 1607. An act for the relief of David E. Gray;

H. R. 12996. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio;

H. R. 12997. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio;

H. R. 13232. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North, between Traill County, N. Dak., and Polk County, Minn.;

H. R. 13273. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insur-

ance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and an act in amendment thereto approved October 6, 1917; and

H. R. 13353. An act to extend the provisions of the homestead laws touching credit for period of enlistment to the soldiers, nurses, and officers of the Army and the seamen, marines, nurses, and officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps of the United States who have served or will have served with the Mexican border operations or during the war between the United States and Germany and her allies.

SENATOR FROM NEBRASKA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following credentials of election of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], which will be read and placed on the files.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows: To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November, 1918, GEORGE W. NORRIS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Nebraska a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1919.

Witness: His excellency, our governor, S. R. McKelvie, and our seal hereto affixed at Lincoln, Nebr., this 23d days of January, A. D. 1919.

SAMUEL R. MCKELVIE, Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

D. M. ANSBERRY,
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM ARKANSAS.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my colleague [Mr. ROBINSON] and ask that they may be read and placed on the file.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the credentials.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows: To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November, 1918, JOE T. ROBINSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arkansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1919.

Witness: His excellency, our governor, Charles H. Brough, and our seal hereto affixed at Little Rock, this 5th day of February, A. D. 1919.

CHARLES H. BROUGH, Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

TOM J. TERRAL,
Secretary of State.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I purpose asking unanimous consent to call up House joint resolution 200, and preliminary to that I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LODGE. Has morning business been disposed of?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; nothing has been done.

Mr. BORAH. Does that dispense with—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Harding	Martin, Va.	Smith, S. C.
Baird	Henderson	Moses	Smoot
Bankhead	Hitchcock	Nelson	Spencer
Beckham	Hollis	New	Sterling
Borah	Johnson, Cal.	Norris	Sutherland
Brandegee	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Swanson
Caldor	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Thomas
Caldor	Jones, Wash.	Page	Thompson
Culherson	Kellogg	Penrose	Townsend
Cummins	Kenyon	Pittman	Trammell
Curtis	King	Poindexter	Underwood
Dillingham	Kirby	Pollock	Vardaman
Fernald	La Follette	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Lenroot	Rensdell	Walsh
France	Lewis	Robinson	Warren
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Saulsbury	Watson
Gay	McCumber	Shafroth	Williams
Gerry	McKellar	Sheppard	Wolcott
Gore	McLean	Sherman	
Gronna	McNary	Smith, Ga.	
Hale	Martin, Ky.	Smith, Mich.	

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

Mr. LENROOT. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] is absent on official business.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is detained by illness.

Mr. BECKHAM. I desire to announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] is detained on official business.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SHIELDS] is detained by illness.

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

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It has been suggested that it would be satisfactory to the Senate to dispense with the morning business and proceed at once to the consideration of House joint resolution 200. A week ago I gave notice that on to-day the

joint resolution would be called up for consideration, and I will now ask unanimous consent that we may proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution. I will withhold the motion for a little while if any Senator has anything urgent to present.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection at all to the request the Senator is making, but there is a little morning business that I think we all wish to dispose of and would be glad to put in now—petitions and things of that sort.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then I will withhold the request for a short time.

Mr. LODGE. I am much obliged to the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have here a petition against what are known as the luxury taxes, signed by some 10,000 persons. They request to have stricken from the pending revenue bill the so-called luxury taxes, and give their reasons, which are very brief, and I shall ask to have the petition printed in the RECORD.

I merely wish to say that I am getting many letters on this subject, as well as these great petitions. I wish to state for the benefit of the petitioners that those taxes—so-called luxury taxes, most of them being on objects of prime necessity—were put in in the House while we were at war when it was necessary to raise \$8,000,000 of revenue. After the armistice the committee of the Senate struck them out, and the House was anxious to have them stricken out, looking on them only as an extreme war tax. But the Senate in its wisdom saw fit to restore them, and by restoring them put them beyond the power of the conferees. It was impossible for the conferees to take them from the bill and nothing can be done further with that bill. It may be possible to pass a joint resolution later removing them, for they are excessive taxes which ought not to remain. I send the petition to the desk and ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

To the SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS FROM MASSACHUSETTS:

The undersigned consumers respectfully request that you use your votes and influence to have stricken from the pending internal-revenue bill the so-called luxury taxes.

We request this action, because these taxes are discriminatory, will be an unjust and annoying burden to the consumer, will throw out of employment many workmen engaged in manufacturing the articles taxed at a time when it would appear to be necessary to prevent unemployment and because of the fact that the Government will derive a comparatively small revenue at an exceedingly heavy cost of collection.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I simply rose to say that I have received similar petitions from nearly every institution in the State of Utah signed by the employees of all the dry-goods and grocery stores of that State. I am not going to present them to the Senate, because they are of a character similar to those already presented and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition adopted at a meeting of 1,000 citizens of Brookline, Mass., under the auspices of the Brookline Civic Forum, and a petition of sundry members of the National Academy of Sciences, praying for the creation of a league of nations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the Rotary Club of Lynn, Mass., praying for the return to private ownership of the telephone and telegraph lines, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Local Union 1A, Telephone Operators' Union, of Boston, Mass., and a telegram in the nature of a petition from Local Union No. 142, Inside Telephone Men's Union, of Boston, Mass., praying that an investigation be made of the Federal administration of telephone and telegraph lines, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented the petition of Henry H. Edes, W. M. Davis, and 136 other citizens of Massachusetts, members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, of Boston, praying for action by the President and Congress with a view toward establishing a league of nations for the maintenance of peace, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, it will be remembered that a few days ago we had before the Senate a bill reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency providing that the law be changed so that a national bank may loan more than 10 per cent upon its capital and surplus. I have received a great many telegrams on this subject, but I shall present only one, and I ask to have it printed in the RECORD. It is from the North

Dakota Bankers' Association. They favor the provision recommended by the board and the Comptroller of the Currency.

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

FARGO, N. DAK., February 8, 1919.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

North Dakota national banks very much in favor of bill increasing loaning capacity to 20 per cent of capital. Will greatly aid in development of industries.

NORTH DAKOTA BANKERS ASSOCIATION.

Mr. GRONNA. I also present two telegrams, one from the chairman of the North Dakota Council of Defense, of Bismarck, N. Dak., and one from the chairman of the committee on agriculture of the General Assembly of Connecticut and the president of the Farmers' Association of Connecticut, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BISMARCK, N. DAK., February 4, 1919.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The woman's committee of the North Dakota Council of Defense finds the home demonstration agents invaluable in carrying out Government requests. Work just now well underway, and any decrease in fund available for this purpose will be fatal. Woman's committee urges you to do your utmost to defeat bill cutting appropriation.

Mrs. F. L. CONKLIN, Chairman.

HARTFORD, CONN., February 6, 1919.

Senator ASLE J. GRONNA,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The farmers association of the Connecticut General Assembly is shocked at the news that the United States Congress is taking away nearly all of our appropriation for extension work in agriculture in our State, and we are appealing to your judgment and for your assistance in preserving this most useful and efficient instrument that assists us in feeding our people. Please help us in this crisis.

CLIFFORD E. HOUGH,
President Farmers Association,
Connecticut General Assembly of 1919.
WATSON WOODRUFF,
Chairman Committee on Agriculture,
Connecticut General Assembly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. My colleague and myself have received a telegram from the Michigan State Legislature in the form of a resolution which was adopted January 2 in behalf of woman's suffrage, practically ratifying the provision to be submitted to the people. This being, as I understand it, the first State to adopt such a resolution, I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

LANSING, MICH., February 8, 1919.

Senator CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,
Washington, D. C.:

Following is copy of resolution adopted by the Michigan Senate and House of Representatives in joint convention on January 2, 1919:

Whereas an amendment to the Federal Constitution providing that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged in the United States or any State on account of sex" has passed the House of Representatives and is now pending in the Senate; and

Whereas during the war, in recognition of the value of woman's war service the Parliaments of Great Britain and Canada enfranchised the women of those countries, and those of France and Italy have virtually promised the same act of political justice; and

Whereas immediately after signing of armistice autocratic Germany and Hungary gave women the ballot; and

Whereas in our own country women vote on same terms as men in 15 States and have some voting rights in 20 others laboriously acquired during a struggle of 40 years; and

Whereas the electors of Michigan defeated woman suffrage five years ago by 96,000 votes, two months ago it carried by nearly 35,000 votes, an indication of the great change in sentiment throughout the State; and

Whereas the leaders of all political parties, major and minor, have demanded the passage of this amendment, and the national committee of the major political parties have earnestly indorsed it: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the members of the Michigan State Legislature in joint session assembled, in recognition of the justice of women's demands and of their contribution to society in war and in peace, do hereby call upon the Senate of the United States to pass the woman suffrage amendment and give the States opportunity to ratify the same.

DENNIS E. ALWARD,
CHARLES E. PIERCE,
Secretaries of Joint Convention.

Mr. PITTMAN. I present a telegram from the governor of Nevada, transmitting resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Nevada urging the passage of the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for woman suffrage, and requesting the Senators from that State to vote for it. I ask that the telegram may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read, as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

CARSON, NEV., February 8, 1919.

Hon. KEY PITTMAN.

Hon. CHARLES B. HENDERSON.

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Assembly joint and concurrent resolution No. 2 was approved by me February 4, 1919, and is as follows:

"Whereas there is now pending before the Senate of the United States a resolution to submit to the several States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting the right of suffrage to women; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has urged the passage of such resolution not only as an act of justice to the women of America, but as a means to encourage the acceptance of democratic ideals throughout the civilized world; and

"Whereas the world war laid its burdens and sacrifices with even hand upon men and women alike and demanded and received from both the fullest measure of patriotism and devotion, in order that the great purposes for which the war was successfully fought might be permanently secured for the benefit of mankind; and

"Whereas in the period of readjustment and reconstruction upon which we have entered there will arise the most difficult and far-reaching moral, social, economic, industrial, and political problems that must of necessity affect the lives of all our people for generations to come and in the solution of which men and women must equally be concerned: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Senate of the United States be hereby requested to immediately pass such resolution to submit to the States for their approval the Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators from Nevada be requested to present this resolution to the United States Senate and to energetically and actively support the resolution submitting such amendment."

EMMETT D. BOYLE, Governor.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask leave to have published in the RECORD, following the telegram just read, the list of the names of the women representing the National American Woman Suffrage Association of the State, which has indorsed the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

Assembly joint and concurrent resolution.

Whereas there is now pending before the Senate of the United States a resolution to submit to the several States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting the right of suffrage to women; and

Whereas the President of the United States has urged the passage of such resolution, not only as an act of justice to the women of America but as a means of encouraging the acceptance of democratic ideals throughout the civilized world; and

Whereas the world war laid its burdens and sacrifices with even hand upon men and women alike and demanded and received from both the fullest measure of patriotism and devotion in order that the great purposes for which the war was successfully fought might be permanently secured for the benefit of mankind; and

Whereas in the period of readjustment and reconstruction upon which we have entered there will arise the most difficult and far-reaching moral, social, economic, industrial, and political problems that must of necessity affect the lives of all our people for generations to come and in the solution of which men and women must equally be concerned: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Senate of the United States be hereby requested to immediately pass such resolution to submit to the States for their approval the Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators from Nevada be requested to present this resolution to the United States Senate and to energetically and actively support the resolution submitting such amendment.

Helen T. Belford, Sadie D. Hurst, Mrs. I. B. Church, Emma G. Vanderheith, Mrs. W. H. Hood, Mrs. Mark Walser, Mrs. F. G. Patrick, Fannie V. McKenzie, Mrs. C. H. Burke, Mrs. R. D. Eichelberger, Mrs. W. H. Bray, Mrs. Christina W. Clark, Mrs. Tegwen M. Daniel, Mrs. O. H. Mack, Mary Franzman, Mary A. Boyd, Nevada Suffrage Ratification Committee of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, indorsed by the Woman's Citizens' Club, of Reno, Nev.

Mr. KELLOGG. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Minnesota Legislature, session of 1919.]

Resolution by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring), memorializing Congress to provide means for purchasing and moving of the wheat still remaining in the hands of the farmers.

Whereas fully one-third of the wheat crop of the Northwest tributary to the terminal markets of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth still remains in the hands of the farmers, who are anxious to dispose of their grain, but are advised by grain buyers that they are unable to purchase any more wheat for the reason that an embargo has been imposed against all shipments of grain; and

Whereas in some parts of Minnesota and North Dakota the granaries are not in condition to carry grain for any considerable period, and if the embargo against the shipments of grain is not lifted at once and the wheat disposed of there will be a great loss sustained by the farmers of this section, who, responding to the call of the Federal Government to produce this wheat, did so under personal sacrifice and under difficult conditions, owing to the fact that many of their young men were taken into the Army: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring), That we request the Government of the United States to cause some provision to be made for moving of such

wheat as speedily as possible, and we ask and urge the Representatives of the State of Minnesota in Congress to do all in their power to have some means provided for the purchase and movement of the wheat crop still in the hands of our farmers: Be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house is hereby instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of Agriculture and to each of the United States Senators and Congressmen from Minnesota.

Adopted February 4, 1919.

Attest:

W. I. NOLAN,
Speaker of the House.

OSCAR ARNESEN,
Chief Clerk.

Mr. KELLOGG. I also present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

[Minnesota Legislature, House of Representatives, session of 1919.]
A concurrent resolution to the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States.

Whereas the successful prosecution of the recent world war would have been impossible without the staunch and loyal cooperation of the Nation's workers; and

Whereas many of these workers have, while engaged in industry, sustained injuries as serious and as enduring as those suffered by soldiers on the field of battle and are as greatly in need of rehabilitation in order that they may be restored to capacity for useful pursuits; and

Whereas there is now pending in Congress a bill known as the Smith-Bankhead bill (S. 4922; H. R. 12880), which would make available for industrial and other crippled the same advantages of retraining that have been extended to soldiers wounded in the line of duty, granting aid from the Federal Treasury for the reeducation and placement of the disabled and giving the invaluable assistance of the Federal Government in standardizing and developing such work: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring), That we earnestly and urgently petition your honorable body to give early and favorable consideration to the aforesaid Smith-Bankhead bill, both as an act of justice and as a fitting recognition of the splendid service of American labor during the recent world crisis.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Minnesota.

Attest:

W. I. NOLAN,
Speaker of the House.

OSCAR ARNESEN,
Chief Clerk.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Ottumwa, Iowa, praying that better service be rendered by the express companies, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Town Club of Marshalltown, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the return to the United States of any person who was engaged in opposition to the United States and its allies in the war, and for the deportation of all enemy aliens, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch United Textile Workers of America, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the establishment of an eight-hour workday for textile workers, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Monday Evening Club of Washington, D. C., praying for the passage of the so-called Johnson-Nolan minimum-wage bill, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented memorials of the Ida County Farm Bureau; of Rev. Howard P. Young, of Boone; of S. F. Buck, of Diagonal; of F. J. Ritchie, of Cherokee; of H. L. Vander Hammer, of Ireton; and of Raymond Murphy, of Denmark, all in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the reenactment of the so-called daylight saving bill, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Arthur, Iowa, praying for the early return of our soldiers from abroad, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Creston, Waterloo, Dubuque, and Des Moines, all in the State of Iowa, praying for Government ownership of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. NELSON. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Minnesota, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Minnesota Legislature, session of 1919.]

Resolution by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, the Senate concurring, memorializing Congress to provide means for purchasing and moving of the wheat still remaining in the hands of the farmers.

Whereas fully one-third of the wheat crop of the Northwest, tributary to the terminal markets of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth, still remains in the hands of the farmers, who are anxious to dispose of

their grain but are advised by grain buyers that they are unable to purchase any more wheat for the reason that an embargo has been imposed against all shipments of grain; and

Whereas in some parts of Minnesota and North Dakota the granaries are not in condition to carry grain for any considerable period, and if the embargo against the shipments of grain is not lifted at once and the wheat disposed of there will be a great loss sustained by the farmers of this section, who, responding to the call of the Federal Government to produce this wheat, did so under personal sacrifice and under difficult conditions, owing to the fact that many of their young men were taken into the Army: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring), That we request the Government of the United States to cause some provision to be made for moving of such wheat as speedily as possible, and we ask and urge the Representatives of the State of Minnesota in Congress to do all in their power to have some means provided for the purchase and movement of the wheat crop still in the hands of our farmers; be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house is hereby instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of Agriculture and to each of the United States Senators and Congressmen from Minnesota. Adopted February 4, 1919.

W. I. NOLAN,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

OSCAR ARNESON, Chief Clerk.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, which I ask to have printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House resolution 11.

Whereas the largest metal-mining industry in the State of Kansas is the zinc-mining industry; and
Whereas the said industry has been greatly crippled by reason of the immense importations of zinc ore from foreign countries, which said importations amounted in four years ending July 30, 1918, to the huge total of 824,000 tons; and
Whereas the War Industries Board has recently removed the embargo of April, 1918, which prohibited the use of ship bottoms for the importation of zinc ores; and
Whereas there are now 350,000 tons of zinc ore concentrated in Australia ready for shipment to the United States, together with a potential importation of 150,000 tons of zinc ore per year from Mexico and Canada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, That immediate action is necessary to save the zinc-mining industry of the State from destruction by reason of these huge importations, and therefore the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to take immediate action to save said industry by attaching a rider to the present revenue bill providing for a tariff of 2 cents per pound upon the metallic content of all zinc ore imported into the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Congressmen from the State of Kansas be requested to immediately confer with the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House, with a view to having such a provision incorporated in the revenue bill. Adopted February 5, 1919.

W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Speaker of the House.
CLARENCE W. MILLER,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a telegram in the nature of a petition from the president of the Kansas Council of Women, which I ask to have printed in the Record.

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

TOPEKA, KANS., February 10, 1919.

Senator CHARLES CURTIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Kansas Council of Women, representative 80,000 enfranchised, prays Senate vote simple justice to American womanhood; trusting justification to grateful centuries. 'Tis the Kansas way; make it national.

EFFIE GRAHAM,
President Kansas Council of Women.

Mr. COLT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Providence, Willimantic, West Kingston, Auburn, and Bristol, all in the State of Rhode Island, praying for the early withdrawal of our troops from Russia, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of Crawford County Branch of the Kansas Division of the Farmers' Education and Cooperative Union of America, praying for the enactment of legislation to guarantee \$2.20 per bushel for the 1919 wheat crop, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Dodge County, Kans., praying for the proposed extension of Federal control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WARREN. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, favoring the adoption of the woman suffrage amendment, which I ask to have printed in the Record.

The resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Wyoming, ss:

I, W. E. Chaplin, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of enrolled act No. 1, House of Representatives, Fifteenth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, being original house joint resolution No. 1, has been carefully compared with the original filed in this office on the 4th day of February, A. D. 1919, and is a full, true, and correct copy of the same and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 7th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]
W. E. CHAPLIN,
Secretary of State.
By H. M. SYMONS,
Deputy.

[Enrolled joint resolution No. 1, House of Representatives, Fifteenth Legislature of the State of Wyoming.]

A joint resolution relating to woman's suffrage.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring):

Whereas there is now pending in the Senate of the United States a resolution providing for the submission of a constitutional amendment, which will grant full rights of suffrage to the women of the Nation; and

Whereas the right to vote was granted to the women of Wyoming in the year 1869, and 50 years' experience in this State has proven the real merit and worth of woman's suffrage; and

Whereas we heartily indorse said resolution and sincerely believe that suffrage for all women of this Nation would be not only a great moral and social benefit but also a practical success: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States is hereby earnestly requested to pass said resolution at an early date; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded at once by the Hon. W. Chaplin, secretary of state, to Senator JONES, of New Mexico, and also to the United States Senators from Wyoming.

E. J. SULLIVAN,
Speaker of the House.
T. G. POWERS,
President of the Senate.

Approved:

ROBERT D. CAREY,
Governor.

FEBRUARY 3, 1919—6 p. m.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia presented a petition of sundry citizens of Portsmouth and Norfolk, in the State of Virginia, praying for Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HALE. I present a petition of certain members of the Seventy-ninth Legislature of the State of Maine, praying for the passage of the woman suffrage amendment, which I ask to have printed in the Record.

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

To the Hon. FREDERICK HALE,
United States Senator from Maine, Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned members of the Seventy-ninth Legislature of Maine, believing that in response to the demand for a more complete and consistent democracy in this country inspired by the ideals of the world war, there has been a change in the attitude of the people of Maine toward the question of the enfranchisement of women since the referendum submitted in 1917, and that the proposed Federal amendment to the Constitution granting the franchise to women would, if submitted, be ratified by the legislature of this State, do hereby, without assuming the right in any way in our capacity as legislators to dictate what your course of action should be, respectfully request you to give your vote and support to secure the passage of that measure.

WILLIAM L. WALKER AND OTHERS.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of Twin City Council, No. 160, United Commercial Travelers of America, of Auburn, Me., praying for the return to private ownership of the railroads of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Philomothian Club of Fort Fairfield, Me., and a petition of the Woman's Literary Club of Caribou, Me., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MOSES. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, requesting Congress to use its influence with the Government to pay our private soldiers and noncommissioned officers promptly, which I ask to have printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution passed by the New Hampshire Legislature February 6, 1919.

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That whereas we have heard with regret of the delay in the payment of wages to our soldiers;

Resolved, That we request our National Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their influence with the Government—

First, to pay our private soldiers and noncommissioned officers promptly; and,

Secondly, to give every private soldier, noncommissioned officer, and sailor, at the time of his honorable discharge, the sum of \$200.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I present two telegrams from citizens of my State relative to the national suffrage amendment, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., February 9, 1919.
HON. KENNETH D. MCKELLAR,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

As representative of 20,000 organized-labor men of Tennessee, we call upon you to do all in your power to secure the passage of the national suffrage amendment Monday. We expect you to use every legitimate means of influence with Democratic Senators to win the one vote needed. Defeat of this measure, justice to American women, would bring everlasting discredit upon your party.

TENNESSEE FEDERATION OF LABOR.
JNO. O'CONNOR, President.
PAUL AYMON, Vice President.
W. C. BIRTHWRIGHT,
Secretary and Treasurer.
HAS HANSLEY,
Legislative Chairman.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., February 9, 1919.
HON. KENNETH D. MCKELLAR,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Tennessee women are looking to you not merely to vote for the suffrage amendment, but to work hard and fast to secure the one vote still needed. We will never forgive the Democratic Party if it allows our measure to be defeated on Monday.

Mabel F. Chumley, Mrs. W. T. Bland, Mrs. Margaret Severance, Mrs. Franklin Harris, Mrs. Y. L. Abernathy, Mrs. J. D. Alsop, Mrs. Claudia Griscom, Mrs. B. B. Crandall, Mrs. Florence W. Hughes, Mrs. Paul Moross, Ella F. Dyer, Mrs. D. H. Barker, Mrs. Mary V. Grayson, Mrs. J. W. Westbrook, Mrs. Benj. Bush, Mrs. H. A. Burnett, Marjorie B. Burton, Frances Pursell, Mrs. Edward Mulley, Mrs. Dorothy M. Donahue, Mary Donahue, Mrs. Wm. Hoge, Katherine E. Shirley, Mrs. W. H. Robinson, Selma J. Robinson.

Mr. SPENCER. I present a telegram from the speaker of the house of representatives of the Legislature of Missouri, which I ask to have read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., February 9, 1919.
Senator SELDON SPENCER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress on Federal woman-suffrage amendment passed by Missouri Senate and House. Official text follows.

S. F. O'FALLON, Speaker.

Mr. BORAH. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial 3, by Pettibone (by request), which was filed in this office on the 4th day of February, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 5th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1919 and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.]

ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

[Legislature of the State of Idaho, fifteenth session. In the Senate. Senate joint memorial 3. By Pettibone (by request).]

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho respectfully represent that—

Whereas the construction of a suitable wagon road over which auto trucks can be operated up the South Fork of the Clearwater River, in Idaho County, State of Idaho, beginning either at the town of Stites or the city of Grangeville, both being railroad terminal points, thence up said river to the gold-mining districts of Elk City, Dixie, and Buffalo Hump is a great public and national necessity; and

Whereas since the announcement by the honorable Secretary of the Treasury: "That next in importance to war munitions and food-stuffs was a greater production of gold," the question of a greater production of gold has ever since and now is being seriously considered by the National Government, and that said question is now being considered by the national committee, with a view of determining what is the best method of bringing about the desired results, and that in all probability there soon will be large appropriation made for the construction of highways into the gold districts, where needed; and

Whereas said proposed highway would intersect the gold-mining districts as follows: Clearwater, Ten Mile, Elk City, Dixie, Oro Grande, and Buffalo Hump, all known to be gold-producing sections, and with proper transportation would yield a large output of the precious metal, now so much desired by the Government; and

Whereas the construction of such a road was contemplated something like two years ago, and data compiled and submitted to the Government, showing the necessity for such a road from a cheaper postal-operating expense as well as the operating of the National Forest Department, and that the same was approved by the Government on a basis of 50-50; and

Whereas under present conditions the constitutional limitations of the State of Idaho prohibit the raising of a sufficient fund to meet the

Government on said 50-50 basis, and that locally the county and State are bonded to their limit for other road purposes, including the North and South Highway, which is now under construction; and Whereas such a highway would not only be a great benefit in opening up the several gold districts mentioned but would ultimately be extended and be another artery or highway extending across the country, connecting with said North and South Highway, and would be a great benefit to the Government in lessening the operating expenses from both Parcels Post and Forest Reserve Departments, and would also open up a vast grazing country and timberlands, and would be a great accommodation to something like 250 homesteaders along said route or adjacent thereto: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, do recommend that \$500,000 be appropriated, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to construct said highway or wagon road, as aforesaid.

The secretary of state is hereby instructed to forward copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and copies of the same to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This joint memorial passed the senate on the 24th day of January, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 30th day of January, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within joint memorial 3 originated in the senate during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

PAUL DAVIS,
Secretary of the Senate.

(Indorsed: Received and filed, Feb. 4, 1919. Robert O. Jones, secretary of state.)

INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS IN PORTO RICO.

Mr. SAULSBURY, from the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, to which was referred Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 211) authorizing the appointment and sending of a commission to Porto Rico to study its industrial and economic conditions, and for other purposes, reported with amendments and submitted a report (No. 701) thereon.

FEDERAL COMMISSION ON RECONSTRUCTION.

Mr. OVERMAN. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back without recommendation the bill (S. 4968) to provide for the creation and establishment of a Federal commission on reconstruction, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 700) thereon.

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

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES ON RECONSTRUCTION.

Mr. OVERMAN. I also report from the Committee on the Judiciary, without recommendation, Senate concurrent resolution 25, submitted by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] on November 21, 1918, to provide for the appointment of certain joint congressional committees on reconstruction, and I submit a report (No. 699) thereon.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on next Saturday morning I shall endeavor to bring before the Senate for its consideration the resolution just reported from the Committee on the Judiciary by its chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. I give this notice for the convenience of Members of the Senate.

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

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND NATIONAL QUARANTINE.

Mr. THOMPSON. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate resolution 443, submitted by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDALL] on the 8th instant, and I call the attention of that Senator to the resolution.

Mr. RANSDALL. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized, during the Sixty-fifth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 5563) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hankinson, in the State of North Dakota, captured German cannon, cannon balls, or shells, and gun carriages, condemned United States cannon, cannon balls, or shells, and gun carriages; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 5564) granting a pension to Nancy Herrald (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 5565) granting a pension to Mary E. Gray (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 5566) for the relief of the claimants of certain unsurveyed lands in Mississippi County, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 218) changing the name of the Panama Canal to the "Roosevelt Canal"; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

By Mr. GORE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 220) empowering and requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to ascertain the cost of producing cereals, cotton, live stock, and other staple farm and food products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 221) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to adjust and settle certain claims and making appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

EXTENSION OF INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS.

Mr. NEW. I introduce a joint resolution and ask for its immediate consideration:

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 219) to extend the time for filing income-tax returns to April 15, 1919, was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NEW. It is very evident, as seen, I can not obtain unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution; but I shall call it up to-morrow for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has to go to the Committee on Finance. It is a joint resolution.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WEEKS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for cooperative agricultural extension work, etc., from \$1,500,000 to \$4,573,680, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted an amendment relative to the repeal of appropriation and authorization, housing for war needs, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the third deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMERICAN TROOPS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and I desire that it may be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 444) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate, United States soldiers should be withdrawn from Russia as soon as practicable.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I understand that under subdivision 5 of Rule IV, the resolution lies over for one day, but I give notice that I shall call it up at the earliest possible moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over and be printed.

FREIGHT RATES ON FERTILIZER MATERIAL.

Mr. GORE. I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 445) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate the following information in regard to the proposed consolidated freight classification No. 1.

(1) The freight rate as proposed under said classification on cotton-meal seed cake and hulls and other fertilizer materials, including nitrate of soda, acid phosphate, potash, etc., in less than carload lots, as compared with existing freight rates on such articles and materials:

(2) The proposed rates under such classification on said articles and materials in less than carload lots, as compared with the proposed rates in less than carload lots on commercial fertilizers; and

(3) The freight rates under the proposed classification on such articles and materials in less than carload lots, as compared with the rates proposed on such articles as automobiles and furniture, in like lots.

AGENTS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN MICHIGAN.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 446), as follows:

Whereas it is known that a large number, to wit, more than 25 men have been in the State of Michigan for a great portion of the time since August, 1918, representing themselves to be agents of the United States Department of Justice, and many are there now; and Whereas said men are accused of indulging in unlawful and unwarranted practices: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether he has sent any special agents into Michigan; and if he has, how many have been sent, together with their names; how many are there now; the purpose for which they were sent and are now retained there; and what instructions, if any, were given these men by him.

Mr. ASHURST. Let the resolution go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not wish the resolution to go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. If I can not get unanimous consent to have it considered at this time, I desire that it go over.

Mr. ASHURST. I desire to have the resolution go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections before it is considered by the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is merely a request for information, with which I think the committee has nothing to do.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Michigan yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The Senator who is chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections does not seem to be in the Chamber.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not think the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] will have any objection to the resolution. I am perfectly willing, if any Senator objects, that it shall go over a day for consideration.

Mr. KING. Under the circumstances, I think it should go over.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes over until to-morrow.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE IN HONOR OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT (S. DOC. NO. 384).

Mr. SMOOT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 447), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "Address of Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, in honor of Theodore Roosevelt before the Congress of the United States, Sunday, February 9, 1919," be printed as a Senate document, and that 10,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

OIL AND GAS LANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, there is on the desk a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) which authorizes the signature of JAMES D. PHELAN, a Senator from the State of California, to be attached to the conference report upon the oil and gas land leasing bill. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may go over without prejudice until to-morrow morning.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear the request of the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I simply requested that the resolution to which I referred may go over until to-morrow morning without prejudice.

Mr. SMOOT. The resolution has not as yet been presented to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been read, and went over under the rules on objection.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It was presented to the Senate, was objected to, and was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well, then.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over until to-morrow without prejudice.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Tuesday, the 11th of February, 1919, or as soon thereafter as possible, I shall move to suspend that provision of paragraph 3, of Senate rule 16, prohibiting any amendment proposing general legislation to any general appropriation bill, for the purpose of offering the following amendment to the river and harbor bill (H. R. 13462), now pending, by adding a new section to the bill, as follows:

Sec. —. To resume and prosecute work on projects and units thereof under the reclamation act stopped during the war, and to begin and prosecute existing projects and units thereof which are practically ready for prosecution, to be immediately available and to be expended under the terms and conditions of the reclamation act, except that in the matter of employment a preference shall be given to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, \$50,000,000.

DELEGATE TO MARMORA CONFERENCE.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I present an article from the New York Sun of issue of February 8, 1919, relating to George D. Herron, named as one of the two delegates to the conference at Princes Island, Sea of Marmora, to meet the Bolshevist representatives, if any representatives shall be sent. I do not ask that the article may be read; but, in view of the remarks I submitted here on the conditions attending women under the Bolshevist government and certain decrees of the Soviet council on their treatment under that government and the maintenance and care of the offspring as wards in common of the state, I ask that this article be incorporated in the RECORD, without reading, but that it be printed in full. I think it very material.

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

FREE LOVER TO BE UNITED STATES ENVOY—GEORGE HERRON NAMED AS ONE OF TWO DELEGATES TO MARMORA CONFERENCE—WILLIAM A. WHITE IS OTHER—EXPELLED EDUCATOR AND AFFINITY TRIED TO FOUND MARRIAGELESS COLONY.

PARIS, February 7.

William Allen White, of Emporia, Kans., and Prof. George Davis Herron have been appointed the American delegates to the Marmora conference with the Russian factions.

George D. Herron, socialist, writer, lecturer, expelled pastor, and free-love advocate, first loomed large on the American horizon when he persuaded his wife to divorce him and immediately thereafter announced that he and Miss Carrie Rand were living together.

This was the climax of one of the most sensational stories that had startled the country in years, for Herron and his affinity contemplated a sequel in a "free-love colony" in Metuchen, N. J., where all with the same beliefs—and money—could come for rest, love, and joy.

METUCHEN CITIZENRY OBJECTED.

The couple had bought several hundred acres of the lands around Metuchen and intended splitting it up into farms for the soul mates, but certain hardware of the solid citizens persuaded them to abandon their love-promotion scheme. In later years, though, the couple returned to the Jersey town and were cordially received.

Stories of the day were to the effect that Miss Rand had bought and paid for her affinity with \$50,000, which she settled upon Mrs. Herron to get a divorce from her husband. The wife admitted having been paid.

The mother of Miss Rand, Mrs. E. D. Rand, widow of a lumberman who had grown wealthy, saw possibilities of a new Messiah in Herron, whom she endowed with a chair in Iowa College. She is said to have paid \$60,000 for it. He was made professor of applied Christianity, and proceeded to apply his version of it until the college expelled him years later.

He was expelled by the Congregational Church of Iowa because of his free-love views blooming in his sermons, much to the consternation of the farmers who hadn't even heard of Utah. Their wives objected, too.

EXPELLED AFTER DESERTING FAMILY.

Herron held on at the college, however, for some time. Finally, when he deserted his wife and two children to go and live in the same house with the Rands, this was more than the good professors could stand, so they expelled him, too.

The divorce followed, and the Rands and Herron came on to New York, where they plighted their announcement late in May, 1901, in 50 West Forty-fifth Street. The ceremony consisted in repeating the phrase, "We intend to live together as man and wife." Then some one sang "The Land of Heart's Desire," and with it the idea of the love colony was formed.

Flinding a timetable handy, the name "Metuchen" being novel and odd and likely to be remembered when all else was forgot by the strolling lovers of love colony, the Herron-Rand combination settled upon it for their Eden. But the citizens would not have it so. Like another famous garden, it was "to let" shortly after the couple arrived and let the neighbors nibble of the apple that they had bitten voraciously. The dream was over.

In the same year Herron was hissed and rebuked by an audience at Harvard when he told its members, all Harvard students, that the university was a parasitic institution. He added that Theodore Roosevelt, who was then Vice President, was a "bully and an enemy of the people." The latter remark also applied to Rudyard Kipling, he said. Harvard never invited him any more to address it.

Herron incurred the anger of the ministry by saying: "It is not Jesus that we ought to follow, but the highest truths of our own souls." After this observation many men, among them Mayor Gaynor, refused to attend dinners at which Herron was present.

AFFINITY DIES IN ITALY.

Under the constant criticism Herron's health failed. He and his affinity went to Florence, Italy, where they lived for several years, returned to this country, and again went to Florence, where Miss Rand died January 15, 1914.

While Herron was in Florence trying to recuperate Mrs. Rand founded the Rand School of Social Science, and hoped that he would return to conduct it. The future of the school was made secure with a fund of \$200,000, and it is now running in East Fifteenth Street. Herron was generally considered by his college associates as being "daft or worse," according to a symposium of opinions gathered at the time of his free love affair announcement.

Recently Herron was involved in an alleged "peace scheme" in Switzerland, when Chancellor von Hertling is supposed to have sent Prof. Quiddie to Herron to effect peace between Germany and the United States. Herron was styled in German newspapers a personal friend of President Wilson. His peace formula didn't please the Germans, because, they said, it advocated "killing the Germans first and then make peace with them." Throughout Europe, according to dispatches from The Hague, the peace scheme was a farcical play among unauthorized parties.

William Allen White is proprietor and editor of the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette and is well known as a newspaper man and writer throughout the United States. He is a former member of the Progressive Party national committee and was chairman of the Progressive publicity committee.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on January 25 approved and signed the following acts:

S. 3299. An act authorizing the President to reappoint Maj. Chalmers G. Hall, retired, to the active list of the Army; and S. 4924. An act to amend section 336 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the annual report on the statistics of commerce and navigation of the United States with foreign countries.

DISPOSITION OF SEIZED LIQUORS.

Mr. KING. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably with an amendment to the bill (H. R. 10851) to provide a method for disposing of intoxicating liquors now or hereafter in the possession of United States court officials, and I submit a report thereon.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the Attorney General is very anxious to have this bill passed. I do not believe there will be any objection to it, because it only authorizes the disposal of liquor that has been seized. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. PENROSE. Let the bill be read, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill and the amendment, which was to add—

Or to order the same sold for such purposes, the proceeds to be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I object.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an objection. The bill goes to the calendar. Is there any further morning business? [A pause.] The morning business is closed.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House joint resolution 200.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 200) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

Mr. POLLOCK obtained the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to move an amendment, in order that it may be pending, to insert the word "white" just before the word "citizens."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the state of the rules the joint resolution is not subject to amendment save by unanimous consent, it having passed to the third reading.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is utterly useless to ask unanimous consent, so I shall not take up the time of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution has passed to the third reading. The sole question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, when the representatives of the people are called upon to decide a momentous issue upon which their constituents are greatly divided, and to grant or refuse a right to which it is claimed the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to their course. Let this then be my excuse and apology for consuming a little of the time of this greatest of all deliberative bodies in presenting to the Senate of the United States, and through it to the people of the whole Nation, my reasons for the vote which I shall cast on the pending resolution to submit to the various States the justice and the advisability of so amending the Constitution of the United States as to extend to the women of America the right or privilege of suffrage on the same condition as that right or privilege is extended to men.

The Members of this body have been referred to as Senators of certain States, but no student of our Constitution could for a moment claim that any Senator is a Senator of a particular

State. On the contrary, he is a Senator from a certain State of the United States of America. As a Senator coming from South Carolina, one of the original thirteen colonies that voluntarily entered into the Union and helped frame the Constitution of our common country and became one of the thirteen original States; coming from the State of John C. Calhoun, the leading exponent of State rights; coming from the State that first exercised the right to secede from the Union, I want to say that we of South Carolina are happy and rejoiced that we were not permitted to remain out of the Union, and we are to-day as true and as loyal as any part of this great country of ours. We honor its flag, we glory in its history, we rejoice in its wonderful power and resources, and we are proud to be a part of the best country upon which God's sun shines. We have long since ceased to regret that in the Providence of God we were not permitted to set up a separate government of our own. We had the right to secede under the Constitution. My father, my kindred, and my countrymen fought for that right, but the Constitution of the United States was amended at Appomattox when Lee tendered his sword to Grant, and when, with the sword, it was written into the Constitution the immortal words of Lincoln on the field of Gettysburg:

It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that the Nation shall, under God, have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

From that day forward the greatest of all State rights was destroyed, the States in their separate sovereignty ceased to exist; and now we have a nation the wonder and the admiration of the world instead of forty-eight separate and independent petty States; and in this day of world upheaval when the foundations of civilization and of human liberty have been shaken, when the last great struggle between barbarism and civilization, between slavery and freedom, has been fought out on a scale heretofore undreamed of, thank God that America, the young giant of the West, my country and your country, is one and inseparable, so that America could in part at least fulfill her mission on earth to destroy autocracy and set up democracy, to banish human slavery and set up human liberty, to take away special privilege and establish equal rights to all, to break the power of the strong oppressor and give the opportunity of self-government to the weak, and I must believe that in God's appointed time all these things will come to pass, and that it is for us to hasten its coming.

In approaching a discussion of this resolution it seems to me that two considerations must of necessity enter—the one of principle and the other of expediency. Principles are eternal, expedients are temporary. A principle is right to-day, to-morrow, and forever. An expedient may appeal to us to-day and be obnoxious to us to-morrow.

We should enter upon the consideration of this resolution from the standpoint of principle, because it is now sought to incorporate the pending resolution in the permanent statement of principles that constitute the organic law of our country. I hold, with Thomas Jefferson, that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it." I hold, sir, that man is not more than the equal of woman. I hold, sir, that woman has the same right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as man. I hold, sir, that this Government was instituted to secure these rights as much for woman as for man. I hold, sir, that our present form of Government has been and is destructive of these ends in that it has denied to woman the liberty to which she is entitled, the right to have a voice in her government; the right to participate in the selection of her officials; the right to counsel in the enactment of the laws under which she and her children shall live, upon which her life, her liberty, and her happiness depend. I hold, sir, with the Revolutionary fathers that taxation without representation is tyranny, and that to-day our country, our Government, controlled, directed, and administered by the manhood of America is tyrannically treating the best women of the world by exacting taxes from them without their express consent.

What could give to any citizen of a country a right to vote except a stake in that country? Who could have a greater stake in a country than a wife, a mother, a mistress of a home? I say to you that the family rather than the individual is the proper unit of government. I say to you that a combined family has a greater stake or interest in our country than any individual can have. I say to you that on that account a family should have a greater voice in the affairs of the Nation

than any individual—that a man with his wife and daughter should have greater power than any single man, and yet, under our system of government, of voting, the bachelor's vote counts as much as the family's, and this can only be remedied by giving to woman her just right—the right to vote and thus participate in her Government. I say further that there are thousands—yes, hundreds of thousands—of women in this land who have been forced to go out into the world to make a livelihood for themselves and those who are dear to them; they are living by their own labor, and they have as much right to vote as any man. There are more than 400,000 women public-school teachers in America—about 80 per cent of all teachers in the common schools—and they are molding the opinions of the oncoming generation who will administer our Government, and yet they themselves are denied the privilege of participating in their Government.

Whence came the right of man to vote? Was it given under the Constitution of the United States? Search that wonderfully compact instrument from beginning to end, and nowhere will you find that the right to vote and hold office was ever granted to man to the exclusion of woman.

Under the XIV Amendment to the Constitution it is provided:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

Article II, section 5, of the Constitution, prescribed the qualifications for President, and nowhere does sex enter into it, but merely citizenship, age, and residence. The same is true as to Representatives in Congress as laid down in Article I, section 2, and the same is true as to Senators as laid down in Article I, section 3. The word "person" is used, and under the XIV Amendment all persons, whether male or female, are included in the term citizen. Therefore, since the adoption of the XIV Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, denying to the States the right to abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States, and denying the States the right to deprive any person of liberty or the equal protection of the law, I respectfully submit that as a matter of constitutional law we have no right to say to woman "Thou shalt not vote."

Who gave man the right to vote? It will be answered that the States conferred that privilege. And who controlled the States? The manhood of the States, and the men assumed a power, a privilege that every impulse of human nature, every dictate of conscience, every high and noble and worthy sentiment should have required that they should have shared with woman. They won the right to exercise full citizenship only with the aid, the comfort, the sympathy, and the patient endurance of hardship of the women—they won this by force of arms with the assistance of woman—and then when they had won the victory of American independence and freedom and liberty they withheld from woman, without whom they could not have won, her fair share of that freedom and liberty. She is a citizen without its privileges, a taxpayer without a voice, a partner without her profit, and all this because she can not bear arms and fight wars for her own independence and freedom and liberty, just as man could not do without her comfort and assistance.

For more than 140 years in America we have had freedom and liberty for half our people, and we have had patient and uncomplaining slavery for the other half. For nearly a century, and a half we have had democracy for one-half of our people and tyranny for the other, and I say, sir, to-day that this Nation can not and will not endure forever one half free and the other half serf. The hosts of democracy are marching on, they are toppling over kings and thrones and setting up governments of the people; they are destroying special privileges and setting up equal rights; they are annihilating brute force and they are establishing justice; they are doing these things in foreign lands, and they will soon accomplish them here so that our country will not only be known as the land of the free and the home of the brave, but it will also be known as the land of truth, of justice, and of righteousness the world over.

This is no new proposition before the American people. For 40 years and more the women of America have been carrying on the unequal struggle, but they have been slowly gaining ground, so slowly, in fact, that perhaps men might have become discouraged; so gradually that if they had been engaged in a less honest cause they themselves might have abandoned it; but with the devotion and constancy of womankind, in the face of defeat after defeat, having nothing but the justice of their cause to hearten them, they have made the fight, they have kept the faith, they have endured hardship and heart burns even to the point where they brought censure and ridicule on them-

selves in order that they might keep the flame burning, in order that the conscience of man might be touched to hear their plea and do them justice. And now a brighter day is dawning. God grant that it may be my good fortune, in the brief time that I shall be a Member of this body, to aid in bringing about the adoption of this resolution whereby the political shackles shall be broken from the hands of the women of America, and whereby they shall be permitted to step out in the full bright light of American citizenship.

No sound reason has ever been advanced why woman should not have this privilege accorded to her, nor can any sound reason be advanced. She is a human being just as is man, she is subject to the laws of the land just as is man, she is required to contribute to the maintenance of the Government just as is man, she is interested in good government just as is man, she responds to the call of her country just as does man, she bears and rears the whole citizenship of the country, she loves her country and sacrifices for it even more than does man. That she should have this privilege is right, therefore it can not be wrong. To exercise that privilege is honorable, therefore it can not be dishonorable; and the manhood of America has already indorsed woman's right to vote from one end of America to the other. A number of the States of the Union have accorded the right; the Republican national convention has indorsed the principle; the Democratic national convention has indorsed the principle; a two-thirds majority in the National House of Representatives has voted its approval; a large majority—nearly two-thirds—of the Senate of the United States has voted its approval; the people of America, through their representatives in the two great political conventions, have spoken for the principle and have declared the claim of the women is just; the people, through their representatives in the Congress of the United States, have tried to accord this privilege to them; the President of the United States, speaking as only Woodrow Wilson can for the democracies of the world, has appealed to this body to do this simple act of justice to the mothers, the wives, and the daughters of this land just as Britain has done.

They had earned this consideration at the hands of the manhood of America before this awful war, and who will say that the women of this land have not doubly earned all that they ask, all that they desire, all that could be bestowed upon them by their magnificent spirit of patriotism since we have been engaged in this war for world freedom? They have, without a murmur, given up their husbands, their sons, their sweethearts, and placed them on the altar of their country; they have sacrificed their own home life that the homes of all might be safe; they have gone into the hospitals and ministered, as only a woman can, to the sick, the wounded, and the dying; they have laid aside their personal comforts and pleasures and have joined the great Red Cross army that the men over yonder might suffer less; they have taken up man's work in order that men might be free to fight for liberty and civilization; they are working in the offices, the factories, the mercantile establishments, and on the farms that industry may not die and the world suffer therefrom; aye, they have done all things that befit a woman, a good citizen, and if any doubt should have existed heretofore as to woman's right to vote it does seem to me that she has by her conduct in America during the past two years dispelled that doubt.

When nurses were needed she has volunteered, when laborers were needed she has responded, she has aided in the great campaigns for floating the Government's bond issues, she has subscribed liberally from her own funds, and by her enthusiasm and charm has caused the men to do their duty. When men have become discouraged she has heartened them, when men have lagged behind she has encouraged them.

America has done and is doing with woman's help what she never would have done without it.

The argument that this is a matter for action by the States, and that to pass this resolution is a violation of State rights, is not a reason but an excuse on the part of many for opposing this resolution, and a very poor excuse at that.

When a respectable portion of the American people ask that the question of amending the Constitution of the United States be submitted to the States for their approval or disapproval, it is a denial of State rights to refuse to let the States through their legislatures act. There is but one right that each separate State has under the Constitution which can not be taken away from it without its consent, and that is to have equal representation in the Senate, but the Constitution may be amended in all other particulars when three-fourths of the States so decree. And surely no one will say that the right of any one State should be greater than the right expressly conferred upon three-fourths of the States acting jointly through

their several legislatures to amend the Constitution in other respects. The right of three-fourths of the States to amend the Constitution is one of the highest rights of all State rights, and when this resolution shall have passed this body by the necessary two-thirds vote, as I feel sure that it will, then the right—the States' right—to adopt or reject the proposed amendment will be conferred upon the States rather than withheld from them. I do not hesitate to say, sir, that to refuse to pass this resolution under the circumstances is to refuse to give to three-fourths of the States a right which they have under the Constitution, and that under the pretext that we would be giving to three-fourths of the States the power to take away from a single State a power or right which it does not possess under the Constitution.

No one State has the right to say what the qualifications for voting shall be when three-fourths of the States express themselves otherwise, and no State has the right to say to three-fourths of the States that they shall not amend the Constitution other than as to equal representation in this body. John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, possibly the greatest exponent of the doctrine of State rights in America, the patron political saint of South Carolinians and one of the greatest statesmen that our country has ever produced, in his masterly reply to Webster in 1833, speaking of the rights of the States under the Constitution, said:

In this compact they have stipulated, among other things, that it may be amended by three-fourths of the States—that is, they have conceded to each other by compact the right to add new powers or to subtract old by the consent of that proportion of the States without requiring, as otherwise would have been the case, the consent of all—a modification no more inconsistent with their sovereignty than any other contained in the document.

And so, Mr. President, occupying for the time being the same seat so well and ably filled by Mr. Calhoun, I find that in disagreeing with those who take the position that to amend the Constitution in this way is to despoil the doctrine of State rights I am but following the lead of the greatest of State rights statesmen.

The original Constitution is silent as to the powers delegated to the United States or prohibited by it to the States—the question of the right to vote was not delegated, it is true, to the United States, nor was it prohibited by the Constitution to the States, and it was provided in the tenth amendment as follows:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved in the States, respectively, or to the people." This amendment was adopted by the votes of 11 of the then 14 States, and South Carolina was the fourth State, January 19, 1790, to adopt this amendment. Had it not been for the passage of this amendment, it might be now debatable whether the power to prescribe the qualifications for voting was in the United States or in the several States, because, as you will note in Article I, section 2, it is provided that the qualification for suffrage for Members of Congress shall be the same as that provided in the different States for the most numerous branch of the legislature of that State, and the seventeenth amendment is practically a repetition of that provision in the Constitution in so far as the qualification for suffrage for the United States Senate is concerned. Had it not been for the passage of this amendment, it might be now debatable whether the power to prescribe the qualifications for voting was in the United States or in the several States, because the power was neither delegated to the United States nor expressly retained by the several States; but since the adoption of the tenth amendment any doubt that may have existed has been removed—the power is in the several States—and the Federal Government can only take away or limit this right by amending the Constitution of the United States; and by the adoption of the fifteenth amendment the power to limit the right of the several States to abridge the right of suffrage has been expressly recognized and upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The right on the part of three-fourths of the States to amend is therefore stronger than the right of any one State to prevent the amendment, and while I do not believe, as a matter of policy, that the fifteenth amendment should have ever been placed in our Constitution, and while I would go as far as any man to repeal that amendment, we must all admit that the power to adopt the amendment was not an abridgment of State rights.

It is argued that we should not submit this proposed amendment to the various States on account of the race question in the South. Do Senators realize that when two-thirds of this body, representing two-thirds of the States in this Union, shall have passed this resolution, as pass it we will, that this resolution must then be adopted by the legislatures of not a majority, not two-thirds, but three-fourths of all the States of the Union?

Do they realize that the legislatures of 13 States out of the 48 States can prevent its adoption, that it will require favorable action on the part of the legislatures of 36 States before this resolution can become a part of the organic law of the land? Will any Senator say that there is more wisdom, more fairness, and more justice in any 33 Members of this body than there is in the representatives of 36 of the States of this Union?

Are we living up to our professions of democracy, of faith in our people, when we refuse to permit them to decide these questions themselves? Are we sincere, and can we make the world believe that we are sincere, when we say that we entered this great war from purely altruistic motives, in order that the peoples of the earth may govern themselves, not only in selecting their officials, enacting their statutory laws, construing and executing their own laws, but making and changing their constitutions upon which all these things depend, and still deny to our own people the right to settle this question that involves the liberty and freedom of one-half of our citizenship? Sir, I say here to-day that I have confidence in the white people of America—blood is thicker than water. Efforts may be made by certain politicians to force upon us the rule of the ignorant, the vicious, and the inferior; some men who do not appreciate the burden of the white man in the South may undertake to turn over to the negro the control of our affairs in the South, but I have confidence in the white manhood of the North; I believe in the white womanhood of the North; I have faith in the white civilization of the whole United States.

We may have to fight the same political battles that we fought in reconstruction days in the South, but it will be white people against negro people. The black man could not control the white man, and the negro man and the negro woman combined can not any the more control the white man and the white woman combined, but to quote the words of a distinguished citizen and statesman of the South, "Never, sir, will a single State of this Union, North or South, be delivered again to the control of an ignorant and inferior race. We wrested our government from negro supremacy when the Federal drum beat rolled closer to the ballot box and Federal bayonets hedged it deeper about than will ever again be permitted in this free Government. But, sir, though the cannon of this Republic thundered in every voting district in the South, we still should find, in the mercy of God, the means and the courage to prevent its reestablishment." And here to-day, speaking in behalf of the womanhood of America, speaking as a representative of a section that has been much misunderstood, and naturally so, I swear anew my allegiance to my own people, my own blood, my own race, and while you of the North, the East, and the West, who are not set about with our own peculiar problem, can not pass this resolution without assistance from the South, I pledge you that in my capacity as a Senator of the United States I know no section, I see only my whole country, and I covenant with you, and you covenant with me, that you will do under this amendment as you have done under the fifteenth amendment—you will not undertake to place in control over us a race of people that you would never allow to govern you. The white men have outvoted the negro men, and that under trying conditions, and, God helping us, from this day forward the white men and the white women will outvote the negro men and the negro women.

Mr. President, in the short time that I have been a Member of this body the three greatest social questions that ever have engaged the attention of a people have been before the American people. It has been my good fortune to witness the ratification of the last amendment to the Constitution whereby liquor was driven out of America. It has been my privilege, sir, speaking my own sentiments, and as God is my judge, believing I speak the sentiments of the people of America, to speak for the peace of America and for the peace of the world.

So to-day another opportunity is presented to me which I gladly grasp. That is, not only to raise my voice in behalf of human liberty and freedom for the women of America, but it shall be my privilege to cast a vote for that which I know to be right and which therefore can not be wrong.

Mr. President, when this joint resolution was last before the Senate of the United States it needed but two votes to pass it. Since that time it has been my fortune to come here. It is now my privilege, my pleasure, to present to the womanhood of America one-half of all the votes that were needed when the joint resolution was here before. I do not know what changes there may have been, but I do know that if all those who voted for the joint resolution when it was here before shall vote for it again to-day, when that vote is supplemented by my vote the

women of American can need but one vote to-day. So the responsibility is placed squarely up to every Senator in this body who may vote "nay." You can grant or you can deny justice to the women of America. Each man has the whole responsibility resting upon him. Dare you deny that right? You who hesitate, you who believe in it, you who want to follow your President, you who want to follow your legislatures, you who want to follow the American people, you who hear the call of justice, will you dare assume all the responsibility, because if the joint resolution fails to pass to-day each and every man who votes "nay" will thereby take upon his own shoulders the whole responsibility for the failure of the measure.

Sir, I come from the South. I come from a State that has a majority of negro population. Some men have said that they do not want to force anything on the South. I tell you, speaking for the new South, speaking for the real South, speaking for the American South, we want this privilege. We feel that the women are entitled to it, and we know that we can handle any race question that comes up in this enlightened age. We know there is no danger from it. You need not withhold your vote because you think that some of us down there do not want it.

Let me call this further to the attention of the Senate. The Republicans are committed to the principle. The Democrats are committed to the principle. The two great political conventions have put it in their platforms. It is just a question now of the method by which you will get it.

Let me tell you that no man will be nominated for the Presidency by either party who is not an advocate of woman suffrage. Let me tell you that neither convention of either party would dare fail to place in its platform when it meets in convention next year a plank calling for the passage of this joint resolution. Everybody will be for it when the next conventions meet. You will be bound to vote for it then whether you will or no.

Let me tell you, you may defeat it to-day, but you only postpone it. You may postpone it for a few months, it may be possible for a year, but this Congress, as it is gradually dying, has the opportunity to make itself immortal. If you do not pass this joint resolution the incoming Congress will pass it. You can not prevent the passage of the joint resolution. You can not prevent giving women the right to vote. They are going to have it. It is just a question whether you will do it to-day or whether you will do it a little later.

I beg Senators, when only one vote is needed, not to turn deaf ears to 50,000,000 of people. It is too late now for any man belonging to either party to doubt the wisdom of women voting. We are all committed to it. It is coming; it is here. I believe, Mr. President, that the joint resolution is going to pass to-day, and this Senate will go down in history forever more on account of that than on account of any other one thing that it may have done during its time.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I shall vote for the joint resolution because I believe in it, and because I know that if it is adopted and the women of the entire country are given the vote they will use it intelligently. I did not rise in my place to discuss that subject particularly this morning, but just to occupy the time of the Senate for a few moments on a matter which deals with it relatively.

Mr. President, the other day the Secretary of War presented to the ranking officers of the Army in this country distinguished-service decorations. The newspapers heralded the fact, and properly so, for I think it can fairly be said that no group of men in this country rendered more valuable service in our war with Germany than did these very officers.

We have all read the published accounts of the fact that many of our officers and men abroad have been cited for bravery in action, but I have failed to observe where the women of America who enlisted in the Army and rendered patriotic service as nurses back of the very front lines have received any unusual consideration at the hands of our Government. This fact prompted me to address a communication to the Secretary of War the other day, of which the following is a copy:

JANUARY 29, 1919.

HON. NEWTON D. BAKER,
The Secretary of War, War Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY BAKER: I observe that the War Department is awarding to a number of officers and enlisted men, both in France and in this country, medals of honor for meritorious services performed during the war, all of which, in my judgment, were well earned; but it occurs to me that there are many women who served with the Army in France in our hospitals who are equally entitled to consideration for services rendered, and if medals of honor can be awarded to these women under the law, I trust that they will not be overlooked. If, however, you can not do this, I will be pleased if you will prepare and send to me a bill that will cover the situation. This country

has reason to be proud of its women, particularly those who have made such great sacrifices to take care of the men who have been wounded in battle.

Yours, very truly,

This letter was published in many of the New York newspapers, and as a result I have received a number of responses, among them the following, which I am much pleased to bring to the attention of the Senate as an evidence of the sympathy existing between the boys who fought overseas and the girls who took care of them when they were sick and wounded:

Mr. President, I now desire to read the following letter:

UNITED STATES EMBARKATION HOSPITAL No. 3,
New York City, January 30, 1919.

Senator CALDER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: To-night I read with interest your letter to Secretary Baker regarding medals to be issued to women war workers. Nothing would please the overseas boys more than to see our overseas and home girls receive the service medals so well earned. I know the home girls have done wonderful work in supplying our overseas Army with all the comforts possible. Here in New York they are treating us royal, but, Senator, it brings tears to my eyes when I think of the hardship the girls endured on the other side—the long hours they worked, the conditions they worked under, and the miserable accommodations they had. God bless them, Senator; you have got to be there to fully appreciate what the girls have done for us. I for one will never pass up the big drum again, and I will always honor the Salvation Army. I have seen the Red Cross hospital raided by the Huns and several nurses who gave all—much more than I. I hope the people as a whole will honor all women war workers, as they most surely deserve it.

It is true we left many of our boys over there, but is it not true that we left some of our girls over there as well?

This is one subject Congress can and will agree upon, and I know our President will be more than pleased to award the medals.

How I wished that I commanded words to express my appreciation of all war workers.

Thanking you for your interest taken on behalf of our girls—you know, Senator, we overseas boys call all lady war workers our girls, and we love to think of them as such—and that the honor that is their due will soon be theirs, I am,

Yours, very truly,

Pvt. GUSTAVUS A. BETTS.

Hospital. 1084914.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that in the hurry and rush of war we have failed to pay the tribute due these wonderful women who were willing to make every sacrifice for their country. Thousands of our best women have been with our Army from the beginning of the war, at times under most difficult circumstances, and some have been under fire repeatedly. I have in mind one Miss McDonald, a nurse, who went over with a unit from the Presbyterian Hospital, of New York City. Miss McDonald was wounded at Ypres, losing an eye, and was treated for several months but returned to service again. I am informed that she received a British decoration, but, so far as I can learn, she has not yet been cited by her own Government. This should not continue a day longer. These splendid women ought not, under any circumstances, to be overlooked. They did more than they were asked to do, not only in France but here in this country as well.

No war was ever won by any nation without the united support of its women, and it is true, indeed, the American women have rendered every service in their power for their country. I call this matter to the attention of the members of the Military and Naval Committees especially, and hope, if legislation is required to properly honor these women, that such measures as may be necessary be immediately brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, when the joint resolution was pending before the Senate last fall I offered the following amendment to it:

On page 1, line 11, after the word "sex," insert the following: "but no male person who is not a citizen of the United States shall exercise the right of suffrage at an election for Senators and Representatives in Congress or for electors for President and Vice President of the United States, and no female person who is not such a citizen otherwise than by marriage, or who, having acquired citizenship by marriage, has not complied with such requirements and conditions as may be prescribed by the Congress, shall exercise such right."

At that time, in speaking upon the amendment, I said:

"I am in favor of a constitutional amendment properly drawn which will permit the worthy women of this country who are citizens, either by birth or through the regular and orderly processes of naturalization, to have the right of suffrage; but I want that amendment so drawn that it will protect the worthy women, who should vote, against the unworthy, who should not vote, and I want it so drawn that Congress can hereafter pass laws properly protecting this enlarged and increased electorate. I conceive it to be our duty under our oath as Senators to pass an amendment that will do this."

"Generally, married women are regarded as citizens of the country of which their husbands are citizens. This principle is recognized by the laws of the United States, section 1994 of the Revised Statutes providing that—

"Any woman who is now or may hereafter be married to a citizen of the United States and who might herself be lawfully naturalized shall be deemed a citizen."

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does not the Senator recognize the fact that this is a House joint resolution, and that if any amendment, no matter what it might be, should be offered to it and passed by the Senate it would send the resolution back to the other House for concurrence, and, therefore, it would be impossible to pass the measure during this session of Congress?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That may be a prophecy of the Senator from Colorado, but I am not aware that the ordinary processes of legislation should be stopped by reason of such a prophecy. I want to point out to the Senate, and to make it emphatic, that either we should amend this joint resolution or we should immediately address ourselves to amending our immigration laws before the proposed amendment to the Constitution is ratified in the event it shall pass the two Houses of Congress. I hope, therefore, the Senator from Colorado will allow me to continue, inasmuch as I wish to be placed on record in regard to this resolution—

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SHAFROTH. I trust the Senator will bear with me for just a moment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield further to the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator from New Jersey may not have been in the Chamber when the Vice President announced that no amendment whatever would be in order to the joint resolution, because in the parliamentary status of the joint resolution it has been read a third time, which is the final action that can be taken before the passage.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I was in the Chamber when the Vice President announced that ruling; I am aware of it; but I know of no ruling which will deprive me of speaking on the joint resolution, which I am doing at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey will proceed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In my remarks on the occasion referred to I continued:

"It is of fundamental importance that in considering this provision of law the fact shall not be overlooked that Congress, in adopting it, was proceeding in pursuance of authority conferred upon the Congress by Article I, section 8, paragraph 4 of the Constitution—the authority 'to establish a uniform rule of naturalization.' Therefore, the marriage of a foreign woman to an American citizen is, in its effect upon the status of the woman, a process of naturalization, and it must be borne in mind that the woman who acquires citizenship in this manner is, by virtue of the language of section 1994 itself, as fully naturalized as though she had gone through the court processes of naturalization required in the cases of males and in the cases of unmarried females, and as completely a citizen of the United States as though she had been born here. The Constitution 'contemplates two sources of citizenship, and two only—birth and naturalization'—said the Supreme Court in the leading case on citizenship, entitled *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* (169 U. S., 649, 702).

"The procurement of United States citizenship by a foreign woman through marriage to a citizen is not, of course, surrounded with any of the safeguards that are, and have been for many years, placed around the procurement of citizenship through the regular court processes provided by law. Some of those safeguards are the following:

"A male alien desiring to become a citizen of the United States must make a declaration that he is not an anarchist, a polygamist, or a believer in the practice of polygamy, and that it is his intention in good faith to become a citizen of the United States and permanently to reside therein. Not less than two years and not more than seven years after he has made his declaration of intention he must again petition the court and take an oath that he is not 'a disbeliever in or opposed to organized government, or a member of or affiliated with any organization or body of persons teaching disbelief in organized government,' and so on. Then he is examined by the United States examiners, and if the court so directs he becomes a citizen, but under the Revised Statutes a foreign woman who has attained her citizenship by marriage to an American citizen is not held to conform to that process of law."

"Is it not essential that we should write in the Constitution a provision which will enable Congress to pass legislation that will restrict the menace arising from this condition? I do not think the amendment as drawn does this, and I believe that Congress should take the precaution to lay the foundation for protecting the country in this regard. After consultation with the legal advisers of the Immigration and Naturalization Bureaus I am firmly of the opinion that if the amendment should be adopted as drawn it will not be possible thereafter for Congress to remedy the situation described by me by passing legislation. In other words, the constitutional amendment, unless it shall be changed in some such manner as that I suggest, will prevent the passing of any legislation to place any restriction with regard to the exercise of the franchise upon foreign women who have become citizens by marriage.

"This citizenship-by-marriage provision was enacted by the Federal Congress when women could not vote and at a time when Congress had no thought of giving them the vote, its object being to protect property and dower rights and to care for many legal and international questions. To accomplish these purposes Congress conferred the benefit of such citizenship upon such women. Now women are asking for the additional benefit of the right of suffrage—too long denied them—but a changed situation is created, which Congress should carefully consider before passing a constitutional amendment. The view has been expressed by some lawyers that Congress could afford protection to the elective franchise under this constitutional amendment by hereafter passing statutes naturalizing foreign women married to citizens and worthy of the privilege of voting. Possibly a statute could be passed that hereafter would protect the electorate and compel married women who have become citizens by marriage to be naturalized in a court proceeding before they vote, but I do not believe it."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point the entire address I delivered on that occasion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Sept. 30, 1918.]

"Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, a few days ago I proposed an amendment to the pending joint resolution. While I realize that the Senate is fatigued, I shall be forced to be away to-morrow if I can arrange a proper pair, and I would like to speak briefly upon my amendment. I ask that the Secretary may read the amendment.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

"The SECRETARY. At the end of the joint resolution add the following:

"but no male person who is not a citizen of the United States shall exercise the right of suffrage at an election for Senators and Representatives in Congress or for electors for President and Vice President of the United States, and no female person who is not such a citizen otherwise than by marriage, or who, having acquired citizenship by marriage, has not complied with such requirements and conditions as may be prescribed by the Congress, shall exercise such right.

"Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, the avowed and the obvious object of the resolution now pending before the Senate is to place women who are citizens of the United States upon an equality with men who are such citizens in the matter of the exercise of the right to vote; to confer suffrage upon female citizens of this country throughout the length and breadth thereof. My object in proposing an amendment to that resolution is to make it possible, in what seems to me the best way open to us, for the resolution actually to accomplish that obvious purpose and to avoid what seems to me to be the very serious danger that, in the very act of conferring the right to vote upon women and of abolishing the inequalities in that regard which have heretofore existed, we shall perpetuate and increase evils already existing and create new ones that will prove a constant and increasing source of embarrassment to us in the future administration of governmental affairs.

"At the outset I desire to make it perfectly plain that I am not opposed to the adoption of the woman-suffrage amendment—on the contrary, I am distinctly in favor of its adoption—but my attention has been attracted to the situation which I shall now endeavor to explain to the best of my ability, and I have felt that this situation is so serious that I should be derelict in the performance of my duty as a Member of this body should I fail or neglect to call its dangers to the notice of each and every Member of the Senate.

"With this by way of preface, I shall proceed to state the purposes of and reasons for the additions to the proposed constitutional amendment which I have offered in the form of an amendment to the resolution. My first object is this: To place in the Constitution itself a provision which will safeguard the country against the exercise of the right of franchise in Fed-

eral matters by aliens residing or sojourning within our midst. And it has seemed to me that not only is this of such great importance as to justify efforts toward the accomplishment of the reform at any and all times, but the pendency before the Senate of the resolution under discussion affords an opportunity for its accomplishment in an appropriate and efficient manner that ought not by any means to be overlooked.

"Under the constitutions of seven States of this Union aliens now exercise the right of franchise in connection with every elective office candidates for which are ordinarily voted for in the other States, to wit, Indiana, Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Texas. Recognizing the menace to the safety of government of such a policy as this, a number of States have recently amended their constitutions so as to allow only native-born persons and persons who are fully naturalized under the regular legal process to vote therein, to wit, Alabama, Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, and others that I can not recollect.

"To show the abuses which arise under such a policy, which is contrary to the very spirit of the Federal naturalization laws, attention might be directed to the fact that the following methods have recently been applied in a certain Western State where the declarations of intention made by aliens in the course of a year would hardly approximate two dozen and the declarations made within 30 days preceding and including election day—made under the influence of vote manufacturers—have approximated a thousand or more in several of the courts exercising naturalization jurisdiction in the State: The ambitious candidate has his henchmen line up all the foreigners in the district whom he can enlist. He makes his drive through the industrial plants, foregathers with the aliens in their club organizations, extols the virtues of his candidate—and this applies regardless of party—and by various inducements and blandishments prevails upon the foreigners to assemble at convenient places and in the day and night time the accommodating clerk of the court supplies the necessary blank forms and accepts the statutory fees coming from an appropriate source. Up to and including election day this business continues. All day long, in the presence of Government officials, the stream of aliens has been seen to enter the room where the clerk of the court is located and to leave that room with statements from the clerk showing that the aliens have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, and, in the light of the provision of the State constitution, showing also by implication that such aliens have become clothed by the mere act of declaring an intention to become citizens with such character, intelligence, and understanding of our institutions that they are entitled to exercise the franchise in the same way and with the same effect as a person born in our midst.

"Under the resolution pending before the Senate, unless the part of my amendment directed to this situation, or some similar amendment, should be adopted, the evils and abuses to which I am calling attention will not only be perpetuated but will, perhaps, be practically doubled; for if and when the amendment proposed in the resolution is ratified by the requisite number of States, each and every foreign woman now living in the seven States I have mentioned and each and every one who shall take up residence there later who has attained the statutory age will be able to declare her intention, if she is unmarried, and by that simple act will be clothed with the right to vote alongside of the man.

"With this situation existing, any unmarried woman coming from the most anarchistic section of Russia, from the fastnesses of Bolshevism, from the I. W. W. ranks, or from any other source inimical to our interests or even believing in the utter destruction of our Government—any unmarried woman, no matter what her character may be, might be induced in the States mentioned to declare her intention to become a citizen, whereupon she could proceed to stamp the impress of her views and of her character, through the exercise of her right to vote, upon the laws of this country. This is an illustration none too extreme; but even if it should be regarded as extreme, the answer is that we must think through to the very depths of the possibility of an evil if we are correctly to measure the extent of such evil.

"Is it desirable or wise to lay a foundation in a constitutional amendment for the perpetuation of such a situation as this, especially when it may be so easily guarded against? I think not, and because of that view I have inserted in my proposed amendment the provision—

"But no male person who is not a citizen of the United States shall exercise the right of suffrage at an election for Senators and Representatives in Congress or for electors for President and Vice President of the United States.

"And have, in addition, so worded the remainder of my proposed amendment, the direct purpose of which is to meet an-

other situation, to the description of which I am about to proceed, that the same result will be accomplished with regard to females.

"The second object which I have in view is this: To insure that, in conferring the right to vote upon women who are citizens, we do not create a legal situation in which foreign women might, through the operation of the almost universally recognized principle that a married woman's citizenship follows that of her husband, qualify to exercise the franchise in Federal elections, although wholly unfitted by character, education, residence within the country, and knowledge of and regard for its institutions, or otherwise, to have a voice in public affairs. My second object, in other words, is so to change the wording of the resolution before us that it shall be made actually to confer upon women rights equal to those enjoyed in this regard by men, and not greater than those enjoyed by men.

"Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

"The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New York?

"Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the Senator rises to ask me a question, I would be very glad to answer it after I conclude. I know the Senate wants to adjourn, and I hope the Senator will not interrupt me now.

"Mr. CALDER. Very well.

"Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As I have already remarked, the object of the pending resolution is to place women on the same footing as men so far as the right of franchise is concerned. I am in favor of a constitutional amendment properly drawn which will permit the worthy women of this country who are citizens, either by birth or through the regular and orderly processes of naturalization, to have the right of suffrage; but I want that amendment so drawn that it will protect the worthy women, who should vote, against the unworthy, who should not vote, and I want it so drawn that Congress can hereafter pass laws properly protecting this enlarged and increased electorate. I conceive it to be our duty, under our oath as Senators, to pass an amendment that will do this.

"I do not know who prepared the pending constitutional amendment, but I believe it has been drawn without proper consideration or study of the Constitution and conditions that exist under our naturalization statutes, the careless disregard of them, the abuses that have crept into the making of citizens, and the apparent indifference of some authorities to the grave menace to the institutions of popular government that thus arise.

"In giving to this subject that careful study which its gravity demands, my attention has been attracted to two circumstances in particular. The passage of a resolution of this kind is closely related to the precarious situation in regard to aliens which has been brought about by the war and our participation in it. Congress has been forced to pass drastic laws at the eleventh hour to protect this country against sedition, treason, and deep-seated disloyalty, arising from the fact that so many foreigners reside amongst us and that Germany has carried on a surreptitious propaganda here ever since the war and evidently, from latter-day developments, even for many years before the war. It is not necessary for me to recite the many outrages, bombings, dynamitings, murders, committed by the disloyal foreigners residing here. The consideration of this amendment conferring upon female citizens the right to vote necessarily brings up at this critical time the grave question of our immigration and naturalization laws and policies, especially in their relation to and effect upon women of alien birth already here or who may hereafter come.

"The other particular circumstance was not fully appreciated by me, in its relation to the constitutional amendment as drawn, until I conferred with officials of the Bureau of Immigration and learned its extent and seriousness. It arises from the abuses that exist in connection with the traffic in women for immoral purposes. While our immigration laws have been framed with the object of protecting society against this traffic, nevertheless many women become citizens of the United States through pro forma marriages contracted simply for the purpose of giving the poor, unfortunate women a status of citizenship under our laws and preventing them from being deported. The pimp, the procurer, these vice scavengers of humanity, products of the swill barrel of foreign lands, carry on their immoral, unspeakable practices almost within the shadow of Ellis Island, the women being brought in from Europe, from the Orient, and from the Latin countries, and, except in the cases of Chinese and Japanese, a pro forma marriage contract can be entered into and these women become citizens of the United States and can not be deported unless the Government can show—under the most recent amendment to section 19 of the immigration act—that the marriage was contracted after the woman became liable to deportation under the law; and heretofore the enforcement of the act has been seriously impeded through the fact that a foreign

woman, no matter what her character, can secure citizenship simply by going through with a marriage ceremony, the other party to which is an American citizen.

"The foregoing are the two respects in which, it seems to me, the importance of the second part of my proposed amendment is made especially apparent at this time. I desire now to proceed to a more detailed discussion of the matter in its legal as well as its practical aspects.

"Generally, married women are regarded as citizens of the country of which their husbands are citizens. This principle is recognized by the laws of the United States, section 1994 of the Revised Statutes providing that—

"Any woman who is now or may hereafter be married to a citizen of the United States and who might herself be lawfully naturalized shall be deemed a citizen.

"It is of fundamental importance that in considering this provision of law the fact shall not be overlooked that Congress, in adopting it, was proceeding in pursuance of authority conferred upon the Congress by Article I, section 8, paragraph 4, of the Constitution—the authority 'to establish a uniform rule of naturalization.' Therefore the marriage of a foreign woman to an American citizen is, in its effect upon the status of the woman, a process of naturalization, and it must be borne in mind that the woman who acquires citizenship in this manner is, by virtue of the language of section 1994 itself, as fully naturalized as though she had gone through the court processes of naturalization required in the cases of males and in the cases of unmarried females, and as completely a citizen of the United States as though she had been born here. The Constitution 'contemplates two sources of citizenship, and two only—birth and naturalization,' said the Supreme Court in the leading case on citizenship, entitled *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* (169 U. S., 649, 702).

"The procurement of United States citizenship by a foreign woman through marriage to a citizen is not, of course, surrounded with any of the safeguards that are, and have been for many years, placed round the procurement of citizenship through the regular court processes provided by law. Some of those safeguards are the following:

"A male alien desiring to become a citizen of the United States must make a declaration that he is not an anarchist, a polygamist, or a believer in the practice of polygamy, and that it is his intention in good faith to become a citizen of the United States and permanently to reside therein. Not less than two years and not more than seven years after he has made his declaration of intention he must again petition the court and take an oath that he is not "a disbeliever in or opposed to organized government, or a member of or affiliated with any organization or body of persons teaching disbelief in organized government," and so on. Then he is examined by the United States examiners; and if the court so directs, he becomes a citizen, but under the Revised Statutes a foreign woman who has attained her citizenship by marriage to an American citizen is not held to conform to that process of law.

"What is the object of the resolution? It is to give men and women the same rights under the Constitution, to place them upon an equality in regard to the elective franchise. Does it do that? Will it attain its object?

"Under the Federal statute already quoted an alien woman who marries a man who is a citizen of the United States by birth or naturalization becomes a citizen, and under this resolution, as drawn, she would be entitled to vote; but a male alien or a female alien not married must be naturalized in a regular court proceeding under our naturalization laws before he or she becomes a citizen qualified under this proposed resolution, as drawn, to vote. Is that equal rights?

"A male alien—a German, for instance—marries an American woman, but he does not thereby become a citizen, and under this constitutional amendment he could not vote by reason of that marriage relation. But a female alien—a German woman, for instance—marries an American citizen, perhaps a German who has been naturalized. She thereby, ipso facto, becomes a citizen, and under this constitutional amendment could vote. Is that equal rights? Certainly not. It is conferring upon married women rights not conferred upon unmarried women or upon any man—rights which ought not to be conferred upon either women or men in any such haphazard, unregulated fashion.

"Again, the foreign man or unmarried foreign woman must reside here continuously for at least five years before the boon of citizenship will be conferred; but the foreign woman may by marrying a citizen become invested with all the rights and privileges of citizenship immediately upon landing upon our shores, including, if the constitutional amendment as proposed should be adopted, the right to vote. The foreign man or unmarried woman seeking in good faith, through the regularly

ordained channels, to become a citizen of this country must be of 'good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same.' But in the case of the foreign woman who marries a citizen no such standards are enforced; the marriage, ipso facto, confers citizenship, even though she is of bad character and even though she knows nothing and cares less about the principles of the Constitution. She does not have to be of good character, because the Supreme Court long ago held, in the case entitled Kelley against Owen, Seventh Wallace, 496, that the qualifying phrase, 'and who might herself be lawfully naturalized,' found in section 1994 of the Revised Statutes, means no more than that she must be of the general class—races—for which naturalization is authorized. Under this situation will the rights conferred be equal? Obviously not. Upon this fact too great emphasis can not be placed: If this resolution passes in its present form, foreign women married to citizens will become voters without any of the safeguards of naturalization through court processes.

"Mr. President, how many foreign women are there in the United States?"

"The census of 1910 recorded 13,500,000 persons of foreign birth in our population. During the years 1911 to 1914, 3,000,000 more were added, according to the estimate of the Immigration Bureau. This is net—makes allowance for those who returned to their native lands. From 1915 to 1918 it is estimated immigration has been about 300,000 a year, making in these years of the war 1,200,000 immigrants added to our population. The total number of foreign-born persons here would, therefore, seem to be about 18,000,000.

"Mr. President, there are in the United States to-day 5,821,757 women of foreign birth. They are mostly in the large industrial States. I shall not read the statistics relative to them now. Suffice it to say that New York State has 1,296,849; Massachusetts, 526,922; Pennsylvania, 586,085; but that number has been increased by reason of the fact that the figures that I have read are from the census of 1910, and since that time immigration has increased by over 3,000,000. Therefore it is safe to assume that there are nearly 7,000,000 women of foreign birth in this country. I ask to have the letter which I hold in my hand from the Department of Labor giving these statistics inserted in the RECORD.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"The letter referred to is as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
"Washington, September 24, 1918.

"MY DEAR SENATOR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 23d instant requesting certain data regarding alien women in the United States, and will reply to your inquiries seriatim.

"1. Table 15, page 259, volume 1, of the Census Report of 1910, gives the number of foreign-birth white women in the United States as 5,821,757, divided as follows:

New England:	
Maine	52,165
Vermont	21,939
Massachusetts	526,922
Rhode Island	87,442
Connecticut	151,691
Middle Atlantic:	
New York	1,296,849
New Jersey	301,652
Pennsylvania	586,085
East North Central:	
Ohio	251,104
Indiana	62,139
Illinois	528,965
Michigan	261,867
Wisconsin	222,130
West North Central:	
Minnesota	222,529
Iowa	116,055
Missouri	97,040
North Dakota	63,523
South Dakota	40,932
Nebraska	74,284
Kansas	54,096
South Atlantic:	
Delaware	7,496
Maryland	49,857
District of Columbia	11,434
Virginia	9,900
West Virginia	19,773
North Carolina	2,197
South Carolina	2,335
Georgia	5,554
Florida	13,137
East South Central:	
Kentucky	18,442
Tennessee	7,336
Alabama	7,139
Mississippi	3,431
West South Central:	
Arkansas	6,302
Louisiana	22,139
Oklahoma	14,414
Texas	103,162

Mountain:	
Montana	27,084
Idaho	12,845
Wyoming	7,003
Colorado	48,777
New Mexico	7,822
Arizona	16,238
Utah	27,447
Nevada	4,172
Pacific:	
Washington	80,476
Oregon	33,241
California	191,833

"2 and 3. Section 1994 of the Revised Statutes provides as follows: 'Any woman who is now or may hereafter be married to a citizen of the United States and who might herself be lawfully naturalized shall be deemed a citizen.'

"Section 4 of the act approved March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. L., pt. 1, p. 1228), which is merely declaratory of section 1994, Revised Statutes, provides as follows:

"That any foreign woman who acquires American citizenship by marriage to an American shall be assumed to retain the same after the termination of the marital relation if she continues to reside in the United States, unless she makes formal renunciation thereof before a court having jurisdiction to naturalize aliens, or if she resides abroad she may retain her citizenship by registering as such before a United States consul within one year after the termination of such marital relation.'

"4. The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution defines those who shall be deemed citizens by virtue of their birth. Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution gives Congress power 'to establish a uniform rule of naturalization. * * *'. The various provisions of law under this authority will be found in the Revised Statutes.

"Yours, very truly,

"JOHN W. ABERCROMBIE,
"Acting Secretary.

"Hon. J. S. FRELINGHUYSEN,
"United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

"Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, it will be seen from the foregoing that we already have here a very large number of foreign-born women. Of course, many of these are illiterate, many have had no educational advantages. Another fact that should not be overlooked is this: The tendency to enter into marital relations is marked among these immigrant races. Of course, we know little or nothing about their loyalty and the real allegiance of these women and less about their character; many of them may be anarchists, nihilists, polygamists, yet these women may, simply through the performance of a marriage ceremony, become citizens of the United States.

"Is it not essential that we should write in the Constitution a provision which will enable Congress to pass legislation that will restrict the menace arising from this condition? I do not think the amendment as drawn does this, and I believe that Congress should take the precaution to lay the foundation for protecting the country in this regard. After consultation with the legal advisers of the Immigration and Naturalization Bureau I am firmly of the opinion that if the amendment should be adopted as drawn it will not be possible thereafter for Congress to remedy the situation described by me by passing legislation. In other words, the constitutional amendment, unless it shall be changed in some such manner as that I suggest, will prevent the passing of any legislation to place any restriction with regard to the exercise of the franchise upon foreign women who have become citizens by marriage.

"This citizenship-by-marriage provision was enacted by the Federal Congress when women could not vote and at a time when Congress had no thought of giving them the vote, its object being to protect property and dower rights and to care for many legal and international questions. To accomplish these purposes Congress conferred the benefit of such citizenship upon such women. Now women are asking for the additional benefit of the right of suffrage—too long denied them—but a changed situation is created, which Congress should carefully consider before passing a constitutional amendment. The view has been expressed by some lawyers that Congress could afford protection to the elective franchise under this constitutional amendment by hereafter passing statutes naturalizing foreign women married to citizens and worthy of the privilege of voting. Possibly a statute could be passed that hereafter would protect the electorate and compel married women who have become citizens by marriage to be naturalized in a court proceeding before they vote, but I do not believe it.

"To hold that it can be tantamount to holding that the Congress can by statute compel a woman who has already been naturalized by marriage and who has by that process of naturalization become as full a citizen as though born here, to go through another process of naturalization—the court process—before she will be allowed to vote, notwithstanding a provision in the Constitution prohibiting the United States or the several States from denying or abridging on account of sex the right of a citizen to vote. No law will or can be passed hereafter in that regard that will protect the electorate against the unworthy or unqualified women who are given this right under this con-

stitutional amendment unless you lay the foundation in the amendment itself by the use of words that will confer upon Congress the power to do so.

"Perhaps it might be thought that the second section of the article of the amendment proposed in the resolution, providing that the Congress shall have power by appropriate legislation to enforce the provisions of the article, would lay a sufficient foundation for subsequent legislation dealing with the subject I am discussing. But I think that, obviously, such is not the case. The purpose of the second section of this proposed article of amendment is exactly the same as the purpose of section 2 of Article XIII, section 5 of Article XIV, and section 2 of Article XV of the Constitution. Its purpose is to indicate which of the three branches into which our Government is divided is to be charged under the Constitution with the enforcement of the particular article; and it confers a power to enforce—that is, carry out—a power to modify, regulate, abbreviate, or extend. If it conferred a power of the latter character it would, moreover, be absolutely inconsistent with the first section of the proposed article of amendment.

"I contend that under this amendment providing that the right to vote shall not be abridged or denied on account of sex, the right being conferred when this constitutional amendment is ratified by the States, such right having been created through marriage—which marriage relation is possible because of sex—the moment you attempt to compel these women to go through any additional requirements before they exercise the franchise you will be doing the very thing the amendment prohibits, because you will be abridging the right of a female citizen to vote. Any such statute, if passed, would be unconstitutional. Of course, I do not contend that Congress can not at any time, under the authority conferred upon it by the Constitution to pass uniform naturalization laws, either amend or repeal section 1994 of the Revised Statutes. The power of Congress in this regard is no doubt plenary. This fact might naturally lead some to ask the question, 'Why attempt to cover this point in a constitutional amendment? Why not leave it to Congress to repeal the statute lying at the foundation of the difficulty?' But to such a question there are two sufficient answers.

"In the first place, section 1994, although a statute and therefore open to repeal or revision, is simply declaratory of a principle of law that is almost universally recognized and runs infinitely into important legal questions of both a local and an international nature. It is not likely, therefore, that Congress will ever go so far in amending and extending the naturalization laws as to abandon this principle. And just so long as citizenship can be acquired by women through the performance of a marriage ceremony will there exist the inequalities and evils to which attention has been called.

"In the second place, by such a constitutional provision as that proposed by me, the past as well as the future can be cared for. There are, of course, now in the United States a great many women, formerly foreigners, who have acquired citizenship through marriage. It may be seriously doubted that Congress could legally divest these women of the citizenship already acquired in that manner. The Supreme Court has said, in the Wong Kim Ark decision, already mentioned, that 'the power of naturalization vested in Congress by the Constitution is a power to confer citizenship, not a power to take it away.' But wholly aside from this legal doubt, it would hardly be fair and just to pass a law changing the status of these women from that of citizenship to that of alienage—certainly it would not be just or fair in many of their cases. On the other hand, no unfairness or injustice—and nothing in any sense illegal—is involved in so qualifying the conference of a constitutional right to vote as to make it possible for Congress hereafter to enact legislation requiring those whose citizenship arises merely from marriage to meet, in every substantial respect, before they will be allowed to exercise the right of suffrage, the conditions that males and unmarried females are required to meet before citizenship is conferred upon them.

"Accordingly the purpose I have in mind in inserting in my proposed amendment the provision that 'no female person who is not such a citizen otherwise than by marriage, or who, having acquired citizenship by marriage, has not complied with such requirements and conditions as may be prescribed by Congress, shall exercise such right' is to pave the way for the passage through Congress, in the event that the constitutional amendment should be adopted, of a law which would compel foreign women who acquire citizenship in the instantaneous and unregulated manner of going through a marriage ceremony to meet conditions and requirements similar to those now governing the conference of citizenship through court processes before they would be permitted to stand alongside men and women born here and men and women born abroad and natural-

ized here in the regular safeguarded manner and cast votes having the same effect in determining the course of government as the votes cast by the native-born and regularly naturalized citizens.

"I repeat, Mr. President, I am in favor of adopting a constitutional amendment which will bring about equality between men and women citizens in the matter of the vote; but I am also in favor of so wording such amendment that we will not perpetuate and increase already existing evils and create new inequalities that could not hereafter be rectified otherwise than by the slow and uncertain method of adopting still another constitutional amendment.

"I ask to append to my remarks, without reading, a statement showing citizenship qualifications for voting in woman-suffrage States.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

"The statement referred to is as follows:

"CITIZENSHIP QUALIFICATIONS FOR VOTING IN WOMAN-SUFFRAGE STATES.
"FULL SUFFRAGE.

"Arizona: Citizens only. (Const., VII-2.)
"California: Citizens only. Naturalized citizens must have been admitted to citizenship 90 days prior to the election. (Const., II-1.)

"Colorado: Citizens only. (Const., VII-1.) 'The same qualifications as to * * * citizenship * * * required by law to entitle male persons to vote shall be required to entitle female persons to vote.' (Courtright's Stat., 1911, sec. 2147.)

"Idaho: Citizens only. (Const., VI-2.)
"Kansas: Citizens and persons who have declared their intention to become citizens. (Const., V-1.) An amendment has been submitted to be voted on at the 1918 election limiting the right to vote to citizens of the United States. (Laws, 1917, c. 353.)

"Montana: Citizens only. (Const., IX-2.)
"Nevada: Citizens only. (Const., II-1.)

"New York: Citizens only. Must have been a citizen for 90 days. A citizen by marriage must have been an inhabitant of the United States for 5 years. (Const. amend., Laws, 1917, p. 2784.)

"Oregon (a senate joint memorial [Laws, 1917, p. 975] has been submitted to Congress requesting 'that equal qualifications be required of and equal privileges granted to each individual voter, irrespective of sex or the marriage relation in the States adopting woman suffrage') : Citizens only. (Const., II-2.)

"Utah: Citizens only. (Const., IV-5.)
"Washington: Citizens only. (Const., VI-1.)
"Wyoming: Citizens only. (Const., VI-5.)

"LIMITED SUFFRAGE.

"Illinois: Citizens only. (Const., VII-1; Laws, 1913, p. 333.)
"Michigan: Citizens only. (Const., III-1; Laws, 1917, No. 191.)

"Nebraska: Citizens and persons who have declared their intention to become citizens at least 30 days prior to election. (Const., VII-1; Laws, 1917, c. 30.)

"North Dakota: Citizens only. (Const., V-121; Laws, 1917, c. 254.)

"Rhode Island: Citizens only. (Const. amend., VII; Laws, 1917, c. 1507.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I know that there has been a ruling by the Vice President that no amendment can be offered to the joint resolution, but I had heretofore prepared an amendment, after the word "sex," on line 11, to add the following:

Provided, That no married woman shall be entitled to vote who would not be so entitled if she were a single woman.

Unless we can pass an amendment to our immigration laws to enable us to correct the evil to which I have referred, this proposed constitutional amendment will enfranchise thousands—yes, millions—of alien women who have never taken the oath of allegiance which the male alien is compelled to take, and who have never been compelled to undergo the searching investigation by United States officials, who examine every male applicant for citizenship. We will, therefore, if the proposed constitutional amendment is adopted unamended, enfranchise, through the provision of the Revised Statutes to which I have referred, millions of women without throwing this protection around the electorate. It is a mooted question whether an amendment can be made to the immigration laws, and therefore I feel that here and now is the place for us to write into the fundamental law of the land a prohibition against a condition that no patriotic American citizen wants to see.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment to which I have referred.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I object to unanimous consent.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico desire to be heard before the Chair rules?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] having read the proposed amendment, I presume it is not necessary to have it read again at the desk.

This amendment was presented to the Senate last September, and on that occasion I stated at some length the reasons why I felt compelled to oppose any amendment to the joint resolution. Did I not feel the same way now I should be inclined to waive the parliamentary point of order and permit the Senate to con-

sider the amendment, but it is quite obvious that the vote on the joint resolution itself would be greatly jeopardized if we were to amend it in any particular.

As has been stated by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], if an amendment were made to the pending joint resolution, it would require it to be again passed upon by the House. The time of this session of Congress is very short, and we feel that the joint resolution itself would be jeopardized by attaching any amendment to it.

As stated on the former occasion, the proposed constitutional amendment in its present form is the same as that which has been presented to the Congress for many years in the past. In a sense it has become sanctified by age, and I know that it would lead to the opposition of the great masses of the women of this country who have been so faithfully and so persistently advocating the passage of this proposed constitutional amendment in its present form.

If it were not for these considerations, Mr. President, I should not raise the point of order; but, under the circumstances, I feel compelled to do so. Therefore I raise the point of order that the amendment can not be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the joint resolution having been ordered to a third reading and having been read the third time, the amendment is not in order. The only question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, the question of woman suffrage has been discussed before this honorable body from every angle. Every Senator has his convictions and doubtless has well fixed in his mind just how he intends to vote when the roll is called; but, Mr. President, having only recently become a Member of the Senate, I desire to avail myself of the opportunity presented to briefly set forth my position on this great question.

I favor giving women the right to vote. As a member of the Louisiana Legislature I voted to submit the question to the people of Louisiana in the form of an amendment to the constitution of the State of Louisiana.

Following the legislative session of 1918 the senatorial campaign was waged for the seat made vacant by the death of Senator Broussard. The question of woman suffrage was not a vital issue in that campaign; but, as a candidate, I announced in public print and from the stump my intention to vote for the amendment to the constitution of Louisiana giving the women of my State the right to vote. I worked for its adoption and voted for it on November 5 last; but, Mr. President, during the campaign I told my people everywhere that should I be elected to the Senate I would vote against the Susan B. Anthony amendment. I consider that statement as binding.

At an extra session of the General Assembly of the State of Louisiana held in August, 1918, a joint resolution was adopted memorializing the Congress of the United States to reject the pending amendment to the Federal Constitution, which joint resolution reads as follows:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the people of Louisiana (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to reject the so-called Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Federal Constitution requiring each State to grant suffrage to the female sex without choice or limitation, and authorizing Federal power to enforce the amendment, the said Congress of the United States to declare by this action that the democracy of each separate American State is safe against the force and power of a combination of other American States; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon our sister States of the Union to likewise declare for State integrity and the safety of American democracy and vigorously oppose Federal interference or control with State franchise; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each House of Congress in the United States.

Mr. President, this, briefly, represents my point of view, and I heartily concur in the principles here set forth.

It is impossible for us who have the racial question to deal with to close our eyes and treat with indifference a problem which has been a boil upon the body politic for more than a generation, and which, happily for the welfare of both races, has been resting quiet for 15 or 20 years by the enactment of just laws in every State of the South.

Under these laws the South is prosperous. Crime has been reduced, and justice is meted alike to both races.

The passage of this amendment would again open an old sore, revive questions pregnant with dangerous consequences to the South, and would in time extend the power of Federal control to male suffrage and cause a most serious situation.

I have no patience with that little band of women, the militant suffragists, who seek notoriety and bring reproach upon the cause which so many noble women have espoused.

There is no denying the fact, Mr. President, that woman is entitled to the same authority in all questions governmental as

man. She has risen even higher than ever before in the estimation of mankind through the wonderful sacrifices and patriotism which she has shown in this war, from which we have just victoriously emerged. She should have the same right and expression by the ballot that men to-day exercise, but let that right be given promptly by each sovereign State of our Union.

The eminent jurist from Louisiana, my distinguished predecessor, Senator Guion, stated on the floor of the Senate:

My objection to the amendment now pending in the Senate is that under our form of government the right to give or withhold the privilege of suffrage rests with the States and is not given to the General Government.

Suffrage is a matter of local or domestic concern, to be dealt with by each State, acting in its sovereign capacity in the exercise of the power reserved to the States under the Federal Constitution, and as may best subserve and accord with existing local conditions and without interference by the Federal Government.

Holding these views, Mr. President, and having pledged myself to my people, I will now fulfill that obligation and will record my vote against the pending amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Henderson	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Baird	Hitchcock	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Hollis	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Johnson, Cal.	New	Smoot
Borah	Johnson, S. D.	Norris	Spencer
Brandegee	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Sterling
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sutherland
Colt	Kellogg	Page	Swanson
Culberson	Kendrick	Penrose	Thomas
Cummins	Kenyon	Pittman	Thompson
Curtis	King	Poin Dexter	Townsend
Dillingham	Kirby	Pollock	Trammell
Fernald	La Follette	Pomerene	Underwood
Fletcher	Lenroot	Ransdell	Vardaman
France	Lewis	Robinson	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Saulsbury	Walsh
Gay	McCumber	Shafroth	Warren
Gerry	McKellar	Sheppard	Watson
Gronna	McLean	Sherman	Weeks
Harding	McNary	Simmons	Williams
Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll discloses the presence of 84 Senators. There is a quorum present. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. SHAFROTH, Mr. SHEPPARD, and Mr. HOLLIS called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLIS (when Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S name was called). On this question the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN] are paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. If the Senator from Kentucky were present, he would vote "yea"; if the Senator from Oregon were present, he would vote "yea"; and if the Senator from Missouri were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I am released from my obligation on this question, and therefore I vote "yea."

Mr. HOLLIS (when Mr. GOFF'S name was called). On this question the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] are paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]. If the Senator from West Virginia were present, he would vote "yea"; if the Senator from Oklahoma were present, he would vote "yea"; and if the Senator from Tennessee were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. HOLLIS (when his name was called). On this question the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and I are paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. If at liberty to vote, the Senator from Utah and I would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]; but I understand that he is in favor of the passage of this joint resolution and otherwise paired, and therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KING (when his name was called). The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] and I have a pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. Owing to the absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania I withhold my vote.

Mr. HOLLIS (when Mr. PHELAN'S name was called). On this question the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] are paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. If at liberty to vote, the

Senator from California would vote "yea," the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

Mr. SPENCER (when Mr. REED's name was called). I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is detained from the floor by sickness.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Maryland was called). The senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is confined to his home by illness and unable to be present.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], but in view of the announcement made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS], I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. My colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Chamberlain], is detained on important public business.

The roll call resulted—yeas 55, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—55.

Table listing names of Senators who voted 'yea', including Ashurst, Calder, Colt, Culberson, Cummins, Curtis, Fernald, France, Frelinghuysen, Gerry, Gore, Gronna, Harding, Henderson, Johnson, Cal., Johnson, S. Dak., Jones, N. Mex., Jones, Wash., Kellogg, Kendrick, Kenyon, Kirby, La Follette, Lenroot, Lewis, McCumber, McKellar, McNary, Myers, Nelson, New, Norris, Nugent, Page, Pittman, Poindexter, Pollock, Ransdell, Robinson, Shafroth, Sheppard, Sherman, Smith, Ariz., Smith, Mich., Smoot, Spencer, Sterling, Sutherland, Thomas, Thompson, Townsend, Vardaman, Walsh, Warren, and Watson.

NAYS—29.

Table listing names of Senators who voted 'nay', including Baird, Bankhead, Beckham, Borah, Brandegee, Dillingham, Fletcher, Gay, Hale, Hardwick, Hitchcock, Lodge, McLean, Martin, Va., Moses, Overman, Penrose, Pomerene, Saulsbury, Simmons, Smith, Ga., Smith, S. C., Swanson, Trammell, Underwood, Wadsworth, Weeks, Williams, and Wolcott.

NOT VOTING—12.

Table listing names of Senators who did not vote, including Chamberlain, Fall, Goff, Hollis, King, Knox, Martin, Ky., Owen, Phelan, Reed, Shields, and Smith, Md.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas are 55, the nays 29. The joint resolution, not having received the votes of two-thirds of the Senators voting, is rejected.

The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 15140.

THE CENSUS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I desire to avail myself of this opportunity to make a brief announcement.

On the 15th day of January the Senate adopted an amendment to the census bill, upon which amendment I submitted some preliminary remarks, not having had an opportunity to fully discuss the amendment. The amendment was adopted in the Senate and rejected by the conference committee. I desire to give notice that when the conference report is presented I shall discuss it at some length. However, as I am compelled to be absent some of the time from the floor of the Senate in committee work I shall appreciate it very much if the chairman in charge of the conference report will send for me if the same shall be brought up during my temporary absence from this body.

THE REVENUE—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I present, on behalf of the conferees on the part of the Senate, the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the House bill 12863, known as the revenue bill. I wish to state, in connection with filing the report, that upon the request of some conferees on the part of the Senate and other Senators I shall not ask for the consideration of the report at this time, but tomorrow morning as soon as the morning business is disposed of I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 15140) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "District of Columbia," on page 2, after line 18, to strike out:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

For payment of necessary expenses connected with the organization and conducting of community forums and civic centers in school buildings, including equipment, fixtures, and supplies for lighting and equipping the buildings, payment of janitor service, secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks, including the purchase of one motor vehicle for use of the central office for strictly official business not exceeding \$1,200, and maintenance of same, and employees of the day schools may also be employees of the community forums and civic centers, \$12,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to say to the Senator having charge of the bill that I had some doubts as to the advisability of striking out this provision when the matter was in the committee, but I had so little information about it that I permitted the bill to be reported with this amendment. I thought at that time this deficiency had probably been incurred largely because of the abnormal conditions in the District of Columbia while the war was going on.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is not a deficiency at all. They still have \$6,000 of the \$15,000 that was appropriated, which will certainly carry them until the next deficiency bill comes along; and if it is necessary to make any further appropriation, no harm can result by its going over until that time. I myself confess I felt some doubt about it, but I am informed there is not a present deficiency, that there is \$6,000 of unexpended money to the credit of this service, and another deficiency bill will be along very soon. I was very anxious to get this bill through, because it will save the Treasury \$15,000,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am very glad to hear that statement from the chairman of the committee. While I am not in favor of bureaus or divisions or departments of the Government creating deficiencies regardless of the amount of money that Congress may appropriate, I did think that this work is of such importance, especially under the conditions existing now, that we would hardly be justified in being too strict with this organization. Ordinarily I would not be in favor of this or any other organization for which we have appropriated money that we thought was necessary to carry on the work going on just because its appropriation ran out and proceed as if it had unlimited money to carry on its activities.

As I said, I thought there was some justification even for this organization creating a deficiency at this time, but as the chairman says there is not in fact a deficiency, and they have \$6,000 already on hand, and as we know there will be a general deficiency before the end of the month or by the first part of next month, I can not see that the work will be particularly interfered with or cramped. Therefore on that statement of the chairman I shall not oppose the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if striking out this appropriation is going to interfere with carrying on the work.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand from the chairman that it will not, that there is in fact the sum of \$6,000 still available of the appropriation we made to carry on the work, and that this is really no deficiency at all.

Mr. KENYON. What I want to get at is whether the work can still go on.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have no doubt about that. There is no reason in the world why it should not go on. There is \$6,000 on hand, and another deficiency bill will be coming along right behind, and the regular bill will not be very far behind that.

Mr. WEEKS. May I ask a question of the Senator in charge of the bill? The next item relates to the fire department. I notice in that item the heading "permanent improvements." Why do permanent improvements which seem to be original appear in this deficiency bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I understand that that appropriation became necessary because of the change from horse-drawn vehicles to motor vehicles.

Mr. WEEKS. It seems to me an appropriation of this kind should appear in the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is a deficiency.

Mr. WEEKS. Has the money been spent?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is certified to as an actual deficiency. That is the reason why it is not in the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. WEEKS. Why call them "permanent improvements"?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Because the improvement is permanent, but the appropriation was not. That resulted in a deficiency.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the chairman, in answer to the question asked by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], stated that he desired this bill to be hastened to passage as quickly as possible as it will save the Treasury of the United States \$15,000,000,000. That impression has gone out to the people generally throughout the country. In letters that I receive complaining of the passage of the revenue bill raising \$6,000,000,000, the writers state their objection owing to the fact that as long as the Treasury has \$15,000,000,000 in cash on hand, and more than that, there is no necessity for raising this amount of money.

It ought to be distinctly understood that the money is not in the Treasury of the United States at all for these purposes. There has been a part of it appropriated in the regular way that the departments of the Government can spend unless it is repealed. There is another part, and a major part of it, that are authorizations, where the appropriations have not actually been made, and of course that could not be expended by the Government until an appropriation had been made. What it means is simply that there is no repeal of legislation that has been placed upon an appropriation bill authorizing the expenditure, and there are also direct appropriations amounting to \$15,400,000,000.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Employees' Compensation Commission," on page 4, line 16, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$9,000" and insert "\$5,000," so as to make the clause read:

Not to exceed \$5,000 of the appropriation of \$25,000 for carrying on the work of the commission in France, contained in the deficiency appropriation act, approved July 8, 1918, may be expended in the District of Columbia for the purposes named in the act: *Provided*, That no per diem in lieu of subsistence shall be allowed in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," subhead "Office of Auditor for War Department," on page 6, after line 14, to strike out:

The bureaus and offices of the Navy Department now housed in the Navy Department Annex on New York Avenue shall be removed therefrom to the Navy Office Building in Potomac Park as soon as possible and the space vacated thereby in the Navy Annex shall be occupied by the office of the Auditor for the War Department: *Provided*, That rent for the said building for the remainder of the fiscal year 1919 shall be paid by the Marine Corps.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether there are any restrictions in any law as to the compensation that may be paid to those who are employed under this authorization?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There is a restriction in the provision on page 5, beginning at line 15.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator is in error. If he will pardon me, that relates to the Treasury Department and the general supplies of that department, whereas the item to which I have invited the Senator's attention—

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It applies to the entire appropriation.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I invite his attention to page 6, line 14. It seems to me that there is no limitation provided and the provision to which the Senator refers does not apply.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the Senator from Utah my understanding of the item. It grows out of war conditions, where it was necessary to have a very much larger force than usual for the auditors, and especially for the Auditor for the War Department. It is apparent to anyone that these clerks are not permanent, and therefore no permanent status is taken. It is necessary, not knowing the exact condition, to give a lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. KING. Was there anything before the committee which indicated the maximum that would be paid to any employee under the appropriation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not that I know of. The auditor's office of the War Department function under the civil-service requirements, and the assumption is that the clerks will be appointed on the same basis.

Mr. KING. The Senator will keep in mind the fact that in some of the departments, where lump-sum appropriations are made and no restrictions upon the amount of compensation has been provided in the various bills, those having charge of the expenditures have gone into other departments and paid increased compensation and thus drained departments of the Government.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is undoubtedly true, but I do not think that applies to the old departments of the Government. The auditor's office of the War Department is one of the old organizations.

Mr. KING. I will say to the Senator, if he will pardon me, he is mistaken in that because the complaint was made to me by officials in some of the old departments of the Government. Complaint has been made in that way of the Treasury Department, that many of their competent clerks and employees have been taken away by some of the new bureaus, agents, and instrumentalities created during the war.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is true, but the Senator misunderstood me. I thought he meant that the old organization where they had to get additional clerks for war purposes maintained the old basis of salaries, and this is one of the old organizations and not a new one.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Virginia a question about the item? Is the Navy Department Building on New York Avenue a Government building?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the Senator that the building belongs to private persons. It was rented by the Navy Department for an annex, and now the Navy Department has informed the committee that it can move that portion of its clerical force from that building down to the new building, which belongs to the Government on B and Seventeenth Streets. The purpose was to transfer it to another department. The reason why the committee struck out the paragraph was because in the last part of the bill we propose an amendment appointing a commission to take care of the distribution of space in all public buildings, and we did not want to limit the hands of the commission, if that amendment is agreed to, by an enactment of law in reference to this particular building.

Mr. WEEKS. Is it in this building that the headquarters of the Marine Corps are now located?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; that is, it is the building on New York Avenue right opposite the Emergency Hospital.

Mr. WEEKS. I assume it is under a lease for a year?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think it is under a lease, but I think that lease is subject to cancellation by the Government.

Mr. WEEKS. The reason why I ask the question is because I think in every case where it is possible a leased building should be given up and the new building which we have constructed should be occupied.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the policy pursued in this bill.

Mr. WEEKS. Therefore the fact that it was stricken out of the bill attracted my attention.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama whether the Government would not have to pay rent for this building in the meantime after it is determined that it is no longer of use to the Government.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not sure, but my understanding is that the terms of the contract under which the building is leased can be canceled at the option of the Government. I want the Senator to understand that that is not a positive reply but that is my understanding after making some inquiry.

Mr. SHAFROTH. In view of the fact that Congress strikes this provision out of the bill, will the Government feel justified in canceling the lease for the building?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the provision in the last part of the bill providing for a commission to allocate space in the various buildings is passed and the commission determines not to occupy this building, it will have to cancel the lease.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; but how long will it be before that commission will meet?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know about that.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Is the commission to be composed of Senators and Representatives?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; it is to be composed of Senators and Representatives.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Then, it is likely we shall have to pay six months' rent on the building.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that if the House provision should remain in the bill, the building would not be vacated, for it is provided that—

The space vacated thereby in the Navy Annex shall be occupied by the office of the Auditor for the War Department.

The committee felt that there was plenty of office room in the District of Columbia for every department of the Government. It is true that the annex to the Winder Building—and that is what this is—is leased by the Government of the United States.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, in view of the explanation of the Senator from Utah, it seems to me that the amendment is a proper one.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is no doubt about it. Not only that, but I think the Government of the United States has

the right to cancel a lease which was not made within the session of Congress when payment was begun under it; in other words, that one session of Congress can not bind another to make an appropriation for a lease which was authorized by a previous Congress. I have not looked up the law, but I know from personal experience that the Government has taken that position and has so acted in the past. In the nineties, long before I was in public life, I erected a building in my home city for the Government of the United States, to be used as a courthouse. The plans were drawn by the department, the rooms were located and arranged according to those plans; the vaults were put into the middle of the building, and they ran through every story of the building.

No one would ever have constructed a building such as I then erected without a lease running for at least 10 years. The lease was made for 10 years, but that building was occupied but a few months over a year. Statehood came for our Territory; the Government had no further use for the building; it moved out; and when I asked the officials to live up to their contract they simply said: "The contract is void after the close of the Congress which was in session at the time the building was occupied." I desire to say to the Senator that in order to utilize the building for other purposes it was necessary to change the construction so as to make it almost a new building. In fact, I lost over half the cost of the building through the action of the Department of Justice.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I can readily see that that was a great hardship, but I presume that these Government leases all contain a clause providing that upon certain notice—and that notice ought to be of reasonable length, probably six months or a year—the Government shall have the right to cancel the lease of any building.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no doubt even though this language was used in the House, should the office of the Auditor of the War Department be moved into the building the Government could cancel the lease. I think the amendment offered by the committee is absolutely right and just, for I do not want to see the Government of the United States pay a dollar of rent from now on if it is possible to use the buildings which we have, and those buildings cover acres and acres of ground. So far as I am concerned, no further rents shall be paid by the Government of the United States if we have the space to house the different departments, bureaus, and divisions of our Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Contingent Expenses," on page 7, after line 2, to strike out:

For purchase of boxes, book rests, chairs, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, \$23,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "War Department," subhead "Temporary Employees," on page 7, line 23, after the word "demand," to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000," so as to read:

For the temporary employment of such additional force of clerks and other employees as in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be proper and necessary to the prompt, efficient, and accurate dispatch of official business in the War Department and its bureaus, to be allotted by the Secretary of War to such bureaus and offices as the exigencies of the existing situation may demand, \$5,000,000.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I wish we might have some explanation about this little increase of a million dollars.

Mr. KING. I am going to move to cut it down to three million.

Mr. KENYON. Perhaps it is trivial to inquire about the way we are spending Government money, but I understood we were trying to get rid of some of these clerks. The House allowed \$4,000,000 for this item of clerk hire, and it seems to be a rather large increase to raise it to \$5,000,000. What is the reason for that?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In the legislative bill, which is now pending in the Senate, the committee has cut down the number of these clerks; that is, they have refused to make an allowance for next year as to the number of additional clerks. Of course, this item applies to this year up to the 1st of July. There were a great many clerks there, and it was stated to the committee by Gen. Lord, who is acting as the financial agent of the War Department, that he must have \$6,000,000 instead of \$4,000,000, but after considering the question the committee reduced the amount of the request for an increase by Gen. Lord to \$5,000,000; in other words, we gave them a million dollars more than the House did on his statement that he would otherwise fall short.

Mr. KENYON. Was Gen. Lord before the House committee, I will ask the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think he was.

Mr. KENYON. And all of his evidence was given to the House committee, and they allowed only \$4,000,000?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They allowed \$4,000,000; but after the Senate committee heard Gen. Lord and received a letter from Secretary Baker on this subject, which, if the Senator from Iowa desires me to do so, I shall send to the Secretary's desk and have read, we took this action.

Mr. KENYON. I should be very glad to have the Senator have the letter read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read, as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 31, 1919.

HON. THOMAS S. MARTIN,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

MR. DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: I feel very strongly that the department will need all of the \$6,000,000 which has been estimated for as necessary for the pay of additional temporary employees till June 30, if the limited-service men who have been on duty in the various bureaus are discharged from the service, which in a large number of cases will require the appointment of civilians to replace them.

The estimates submitted to me by the bureaus aggregate nearly \$9,000,000, or, to be exact, \$8,785,082.85. In my desire to cooperate to the utmost with Congress in securing the reduction of this temporary force now that the great emergency which had called it into existence had in large measure diminished, I made an arbitrary cut of about 32 per cent, reducing it to \$6,000,000, which was the amount submitted. I am now inclined to think that if the reduction made is adhered to it will prove more costly to the Government in the end. In the desire to hasten as rapidly as possible the restoration to normal conditions, I perhaps gave too little consideration to the fact that the \$9,000,000 estimated for by the bureaus contemplated the necessity of replacing limited-service men on duty in various bureaus. The total number of such men on duty at the time of the signing of the armistice was 5,811. January 1 it had been reduced to 2,823, and the discharge of limited-service men is proceeding steadily under the plan of military demobilization.

The pay roll for additional employees for December was, in round numbers, \$1,602,000, and the average number of employees on the roll during that month was 16,111. The net reduction of this force from November 11 to December 31 was 1,506 employees. I am inclosing a table showing that on the basis of a deficiency appropriation of \$6,000,000, it would be necessary to separate from the service 6,611 employees by June 30, or at the average rate of over 1,100 a month from January 7. If the reduction should be continued at the same rate, the force would be reduced by November 30, 1919, to 4,000 people, making a reduction of 13,500 in a year's time from the signing of the armistice. It seems to me that, all things considered, such a reduction as this contemplates is the maximum that it would be wise to make at this time, and I feel this all the more strongly because it is clear that the discharge of the limited-service men will necessitate a large number of new appointments, which I did not have immediately in mind at the time I made the arbitrary reduction from \$9,000,000 to \$6,000,000 in the estimates that were submitted to me by the chiefs of bureaus.

Very truly, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Statement showing the proposed rate of expenditure for additional employees for the balance of this fiscal year based upon a deficiency appropriation of \$6,000,000.

Month.	Estimated payroll.	Average number employees (estimated).	Estimated decrease.	
			Payroll.	Number employees.
December ¹	\$1,602,000	16,111
January ²	1,450,000	14,500	\$152,000	1,611
February ²	1,300,000	13,000	150,000	1,500
March ²	1,200,000	12,000	100,000	1,000
April ²	1,100,000	11,000	100,000	1,000
May ²	1,000,000	10,000	100,000	1,000
June ²	950,000	9,500	50,000	500
	8,602,000	652,000	6,611
Deduct:				
December roll paid.....	\$1,602,000			
January 15 roll paid.....	741,000			
Balance of appropriation (approximate).....	304,000			
	2,647,000			
	5,955,000			

¹ Actual.

² Estimated.

The additional force on November 11, 1918, was in round number 17,500. To get down to 9,500 by June 30 will be a reduction of 46 per cent in seven and two-third months or at the rate of about 1,050 a month.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that in his testimony before the committee, on page 13, Gen. Lord made this statement:

As I stated, I called a meeting yesterday of the representatives of the bureaus as to this deficiency, as to this \$4,000,000 for the balance of this year, and went over with them very carefully their needs, and

went into the items of the particular need that made it necessary that they should have any particular number of additional employees; and the total of their estimate called for 14,252 additional employees between now and June 30.

And then he inserted the table.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Alabama permit an interruption?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. KING. Are the 14,000 clerks, which the Senator just mentioned, in addition to the 12,000 or 14,000 or 16,000 which the department now has?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I do not so understand. But it means that the department had about 15,000 clerks before, and the Secretary now thinks between this time and the end of the fiscal year he will need 14,252. He has lost a number of clerks who were working for the War Department on soldier's pay. Of course there is a very great difference between a typewriter working for \$30 a month as a soldier and a typewriter working for \$100 or \$125 a month as a civilian.

I think I am in accord with the view expressed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] that the number of clerks employed in the departments should be largely cut down; I think the good service of the Government requires that; I think that they have too many clerks; that what we need is more efficiency and fewer clerks; but with the large number of telegrams that are pouring into the War Department about the men in Europe, the large amount of correspondence that is coming there now about the American Expeditionary Forces, I think we should be safer if we allowed this additional million dollars as an actual deficit than we would be to strike it out of the bill. Therefore I want to ask the Senator from Iowa at least to allow the additional million dollars to remain in the bill, so as to allow the matter to go to conference. If in conference we find, after discussing the matter with the other House, that we can get along without it, of course, the Senate conferees will agree that it go out; but if we strike it out now we shall have a hard and fast rule to hold them down to \$4,000,000. This is a deficit; it is not something that can be taken care of in the future. We may make a mistake in an appropriation contained in an annual appropriation bill and later in the year, if we have not provided sufficient money, we may make it up as a deficit; but this is a deficiency; and, if we do not give the money, these clerks will have to be discharged.

Mr. KENYON. Is it not true that they are calling for a large number of additional clerks between now and June 30, according to the testimony of Gen. Lord?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think they desire additional clerks.

Mr. KENYON. How could there be a deficiency if these are to be used as additional clerks?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is a deficiency incurred in running the department. I think the deficiency is caused to some extent by the discharge from the service of enlisted men who were serving in the clerical force there. It is due also to the fact that Gen. Harris, the Adjutant General of the Army, is calling for, I think, 6,000 clerks to take care of the congested condition of the mail in his office. I do not think it is necessary for us to bring in proof that there is a congested condition in that office.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I think there is a congestion of clerks, and I think they would do more efficient work if there were fewer of them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am in accord with the Senator, and in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill we refused to authorize many items of this kind. In that bill, however, we can afford to do so, for, if we make a mistake, we can take care of it in the future; but I think it would be unwise to strike out the additional million dollars provided for in this item.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Iowa that I was unfavorably impressed with the proposition of granting more than \$4,000,000 until I made a thorough examination of the situation in the War Department. There have been 1,046 enlisted men on duty in the various offices of the War Department who have left that department since November 11. There was a total number of 4,917 at the date of the signing of the armistice, while on January 31 of this year that number has been decreased, as I have it, by 1,046. The reason for this appropriation, however, is not found in that decrease of 1,046 enlisted men who were there employed. The estimate made by the Secretary of the Treasury for \$6,000,000 shows that it was to pay for the original demands of the War Department for 14,250 employees for five and one-half months at an average of \$1,200 a year, making a total expenditure of \$7,838,600. That was, as has been stated, cut down to \$6,000,000 in the estimates. Then the House cut that sum to \$4,000,000, but the showing made by Gen. Lord was such that the committee thought

the safest way was to increase the appropriation by \$1,000,000, in view of the work that has been imposed upon the War Department since the signing of the armistice, involving the closing of accounts in France, the transfers there being made, and particularly the work in The Adjutant General's office, which has immensely increased. In fact, Gen. Harris made the statement that unless they had 6,000 additional employees it would be almost next to impossible for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance to arrange for the settlements due the injured soldiers and the allotments to the families of soldiers, the delay in connection with which all of us have so bitterly complained of in the past. It was for that reason that I thought perhaps it would be better to give this million dollar increase.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Iowa that when this matter came up before the subcommittee having charge of this bill I think it was the unanimous feeling of the committee that this item should not be increased beyond the amount contained in the bill as it came to us from the House. Gen. Lord and Gen. Harris came before the committee and insisted upon making a showing as to the necessity for it; and they showed so clearly the overwhelming necessity for it, that we added \$1,000,000. In my judgment, assuming their statements to be correct—and we have no reason to think they are not—it would have been wisdom on the part of the committee to have given them the \$6,000,000 asked for, because they showed clearly that, in their judgment, at any rate, from their knowledge of the conditions in their offices, they would need \$6,000,000 between now and the 1st of July in order to do what is actually necessary to be done in connection with the demobilization of the Army and to discharge the work that has been imposed upon the department since the armistice.

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

Mr. JONES of Washington. In just a moment. We all know of the complaints that come to us from the country with reference to delays and the failure to hear from the boys, the failure to get information regarding them, and all that sort of thing, and we know of the requests for discharge, and of the letters inquiring why discharges are not made more rapidly. Gen. Lord and Gen. Harris both stated that, unless they got this money, the work in their department would be absolutely demoralized; that it would be so congested that that of itself would cause additional delay and make additional expense. So the committee felt that it was absolutely necessary to make this increase, and, as I have stated, in my judgment, the showing warranted a larger increase than we made.

Now I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have recently been at the War Department, indeed, I have been there very frequently during the past two or three months, and I have been there a number of times during the past few weeks. According to my observation, many of the clerks are doing but very, very little, and many who are there employed now could be dispensed with. I recall going into one office a few days ago, where I saw seven stenographers who told me they had only had two letters during the entire day.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What branch of the War Department was that?

Mr. KING. That was in the munitions building. My observation is that there is a lack of system, a lack of economy in the clerical work of the War Department. I think that it is wrong to give this amount. If I had my way I would cut it down to \$4,000,000. I think that if we told Secretary Baker and his aids that \$4,000,000 is all they could have the work would be done.

A lady who is at the head of one branch and has some 20 or 30 clerks under her immediate supervision told me that it was difficult to get work out of those who were under her, and that the same condition existed elsewhere in the department. When I asked her why she did not discharge them or recommend for discharge those who are incompetent, inefficient, and inept, or who refused or failed to do their duty, she stated, in substance, that it was a very difficult thing to get anyone discharged, and her intimation was that it would not be approved by those who are her superiors.

From my observation, I make bold to charge that there is gross inefficiency in the War Department. I refer now to the handling of the work by the clerks in the War Department. I will not at this time pretend to state who is at fault, but I think some of the chiefs of divisions and bureaus are censurable for inefficiency and for the waste that is going on in the War Department. I not only hope that the committee amendment will be disagreed to, but, if the opportunity is afforded, I shall move to make this appropriation not more than \$4,000,000. I have no doubt in the world that, if the clerks will do their duty and if the higher officials in the department will also do their duty, the work can be done for \$4,000,000.

I think it is about time that some of these various departments were taught that they may not create divisions and employ, without limit, any number of clerks that their fancy or caprice impels them to employ and then call upon Congress to make appropriations to pay them. There ought to be some economy in the administration of the affairs of the Government in these various departments. I ask the Senator now if, notwithstanding the pressure of business that is alleged, any of the departments have asked their employees to work eight hours a day?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know as to that.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact that they have not done so, although the law specifically requires that they shall do so when there is a pressure of business?

Mr. JONES of Washington. As I understand, the law authorizes the heads of the departments to require the clerks to work overtime if necessary, but I do not know that any orders have been issued of that nature. I do know, however, that I have been informed by some of the heads of some of the bureaus in the Quartermaster General's Office—I do not know what the conditions are in other branches of the War Department—that they have asked their clerks to work overtime and that the clerks have done so, and have done so cheerfully.

Mr. KING. That is the only branch of the public service here, to my knowledge, where such a policy has been pursued.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That may be true. I have no doubt that there is much basis for the suggestions and the criticism the Senator makes. I do not know that, however, from personal knowledge or personal observation. I do know that I have been brought in contact with some of the officials of the Quartermaster General's Office and, in my judgment, that office is being handled just about as efficiently as it is possible to do it under the circumstances; that is, I am satisfied that the head of that branch or division of the War Department is doing everything in his power to do his work efficiently. I know that he does not want to stay in the Army; I know that he does not want to stay in the position that he is in, and that he is staying there simply as a patriotic duty. He may not be efficient; I do not know; I believe that he is, and I believe that he is handling the work about as well as any man could handle it.

I think I appreciate the difficulties that the head of a department or the head of a great organization in the War Department must face in trying to get effective service out of his subordinates. Of course, that depends very largely upon the ability and the executive capacity of the heads of the bureaus, their relationship with their employees, and the feeling that exists between them and their employees. One man will get splendid service out of a corps of a hundred men and women under him while another man would probably not get half the work out of the same force. I have been in some branches of the Quartermaster General's office and, so far as my observation could go, good work was being done and everybody seemed to be busy. Just what they were accomplishing, of course, I can not say; and the committee, my recollection is, had no information as to the needs of any branch of the War Department except the Quartermaster General's office and The Adjutant General's office. Unless we are absolutely and wholly to discredit these men, we must give them this money or run the risk of disorganizing the service.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. May I ask the Senator whether this information came before the House committee, and if so, how does it happen that they made the amount \$4,000,000?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know.

Mr. KENYON. According to the letter of the Secretary of War the amount must be \$6,000,000 to save the force from being demoralized.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not think the Secretary knows very much about that. He just gets his information from the other officials; but I want the Senator to bear this in mind: I think it would have been better for us to have made it \$6,000,000, and I do not believe that the letter of the Secretary was laid before the subcommittee. I do not remember ever hearing of that letter before; but the Secretary states that the recommendations to him amounted to about \$9,000,000, and he simply cut that amount, arbitrarily, 33 per cent. In other words, he had absolutely no reason whatever for cutting it down unless he distrusted the capacity and the ability of those who submitted the estimate to him to submit a proper estimate. If these are the right kind of men, who know what they are doing, we ought to have the right to think that their estimate of \$9,000,000 is more nearly what will actually be necessary for them to do the work that they have to do than \$6,000,000. This

\$6,000,000 was simply arrived at, in an arbitrary sort of way, by cutting off 33 per cent.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, is not that so about every request that comes to us?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think very likely it is.

Mr. KENYON. An arbitrary sum is fixed, and we are told that if they do not get it things are going to be demoralized; and so we go ahead and vote whatever they ask.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Well, no; I do not know of any item that has been before the Appropriations Committee for which the necessity was so clearly shown as this item, unless we are not to place any reliance whatever on these men who come down before us. Gen. Lord and Gen. Harris were there. Gen. Lord, who made the principal statement before the committee, impressed me as a patriotic man. He impressed me as a man who is trying to get the very best possible service out of the force in his department, and he impressed me as a man who knows something about the work he has to do. I may be mistaken about it, but that is the way it impressed me.

It may be that the clerks under him are not doing the work that they ought to do. I do not know about that; but that is a matter of administration that will have to be cared for in an administrative way. We can not make clerks do more work by simply cutting down appropriations. If they are not doing the work they ought to do, they ought to be dismissed and clerks put in who will do it; and if the bureau chiefs are not looking after their clerical help as they ought to do it, then they ought to be gotten rid of. When the head of a department that has to do with the discharging of these men and sending them to their homes as quickly as possible comes in here and says that unless this money is appropriated the work can not be done, I think we ought to discharge our responsibility and provide the money, and then place the responsibility of failure where it really belongs.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MOSES. I should like to ask the Senator if either of these generals appearing before the committee specified the bureaus or divisions in their department in which the work is in arrears, where these clerks are needed, and where demoralization will result if they are not provided?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Practically in all their lines of work. The Quartermaster General's office has a certain line of work in connection with demobilization and in connection with the Army. I do not know the exact scope of it, but I took it that it applied to their work generally, to each of these two divisions or departments, or whatever they may be called.

Mr. MOSES. In other words, this is another one of those cases in which Congress is told, "If I do not receive this ungrudgingly, I shall not know how to deal with other more important matters," and then no information is given us as to what those other more important matters are?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No, Mr. President; that is not correct. That is correct in the case of some of the requests that come from some of the executive branches of the Government, but it is not correct with reference to this particular item or request of the Quartermaster General's office. Gen. Lord did not refuse to answer a single question of the committee. He came there and was ready to give us all the information that we asked for. He explained just as fully as the committee saw fit to allow him to go into the matter. If we had seen fit to ask him with reference to the particular bureaus or particular bureau chiefs, or the duties of a particular bureau or a particular bureau chief, I have not any doubt in the world but that he would have gone into it fully. There was no attempt at concealment on his part at all.

Mr. MOSES. If, in my absence, the Senator has given the information which I am about to ask for, I will not ask him to repeat it; but did the committee elicit from either of these generals—Gen. Lord or Gen. Harris—the number of clerks now employed in their branches of the department, and how many more could be employed for the additional \$1,000,000?

Mr. JONES of Washington. My recollection is that they stated about the number of employees they have, although I am not sure; but Gen. Lord did state, according to my recollection, that they would need from 13,000 to 14,000 more clerks between now and the 1st of July to do the work that they felt they would have to do in order to anything like keep up with the demands in connection with the demobilization of the troops. I think about six or seven thousand of those would be required for The Adjutant General's Office, and the remainder for the Quartermaster General's office. I think that is the statement he made. Those would be the employees, not for the \$1,000,000 but for the \$6,000,000 that they asked for. The House gave them \$4,000,000, and we gave an additional \$1,000,000, making it \$5,000,000 to take care of these employees.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I am not competent to speak for Gen. Lord, but so far as Gen. Harris's office is concerned I have not noticed any very considerable delay in replying to communications which I have sent there. On the contrary, I think the replies from The Adjutant General's Office have been more prompt and more satisfactory than from any other of the offices in the War Department with which I have had occasion to do business; and in view of the information which I have growing out of my own experience in conducting business with The Adjutant General's Office, I can not see how additional money could advance that work very much. When one can make inquiry about an individual in an Army as large as ours and receive a detailed reply in three or four days, as I have most frequently in addressing inquiries there, I should think that was nearly the acme of expedition in sending out and giving information.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to say to the Senator that it used to be so that when we sent a letter to The Adjutant General's Office one day we got a reply the next day. That was almost uniformly true.

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

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I can tell the Senator now the number of employees that there were in the department on November 1, 1918, and the estimated number that will be required during the balance of the fiscal year.

On November 1, 1918, there were employed in the War Department 17,156. It is estimated that there will be employed an average, during the fiscal year 1920, of 10,140 additional employees over and above the number that were originally employed in the War Department before the declaration of war; and now it is estimated that they will require for the balance of this fiscal year, up to June 30, 1919, 14,586.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, may I draw from the encyclopedic knowledge of the Senator from Utah whether this augmented number of employees will be required after the 30th day of June, and if so, how long?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator desires, I can give the number that will be required after June 30 in every office, as I have it here; but it would take too long a time. I wish to say, however, that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, it is estimated that over 15,000 employees will be required in the War Department; and in that connection, Mr. President, if the legislation is passed that has been asked for by the introduction of bills in the House and in the Senate—and I will admit that I introduced, at the request of the adjutant general of my State, a similar bill, not knowing what it was going to cost the Government of the United States when I introduced it—if that legislation passes, requiring the Government of the United States to compile information as to the complete record of every soldier who was in the war, whether serving in this country or in France, and send that information to the adjutant general of every State, it will take over 1,000 additional employees to do it.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah has, in compact tabulated form, the information of which he speaks, showing the number of employees who will be required in all of the different bureaus after the close of the present fiscal year, will he be good enough to put it in the RECORD in connection with his remarks? He need not bother to read it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask, then, that there may be printed in connection with what I have stated, if the Senate has no objection, this tabulated statement, showing the total additional number of employees January 31, 1919, the total enlisted men employed January 31, 1919, the grand total employed, and then the estimated number for the balance of the year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Statement showing number of additional employees and enlisted men on hand in the various offices of the War Department January 31, 1919, and number of additional employees required for balance of year (5½ months).

	Total additional employed Jan. 31, 1919.	Total enlisted men employed Jan. 31, 1919.	Total.	Estimated number for balance of year.
Secretary of War.....	474		474	1,265
Adjutant General's Office.....	3,592	251	4,143	6,000
Judge Advocate General.....	89	40	129	119
Inspector General.....	39	3	42	39
Signal Corps.....	273	98	371	200
Quartermaster General.....	2,900	378	3,278	12,392
Surgeon General.....	1,219	37	1,256	850
Ordnance Department.....	4,028	73	4,701	13,355

! Average.

Statement showing number of additional employees, etc.—Continued.

	Total additional employed Jan. 31, 1919.	Total enlisted men employed Jan. 31, 1919.	Total.	Estimated number for balance of year.
Engineer Department.....	211	35	246	211
Bureau of Insular Affairs.....	13		13	13
Militia Bureau.....	11		11	11
Chemical Warfare.....	118	10	128	92
Coast Artillery.....	38	3	41	33
General Staff.....	401	67	468	338
Tank Corps.....	6	1	7	10
Motor Transport Corps.....	268	50	318	268
War Credits Board.....	6		6	6
Total.....	14,586	1,046	15,632	14,252

14,252 employees for 5½ months, at \$1,200 per year, \$7,838,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, just a word, and I am through.

I do not know how it is with other Senators, but I know that my work has more than trebled since the armistice was signed. The requests coming from parents with reference to their boys, repeated over and over again, and requests from boys to get out, have more than trebled since the armistice came on. Now, if my work has trebled and the work of other Senators has trebled in that way, I can very easily see how the work of the War Department must have been very greatly increased; and it will continue until we reach the peak and begin to go down on the other side of getting these boys out of the Army.

Mr. President, if there is any increase as to the necessity of which I have been satisfied upon the showing made by the men who were responsible for the work that must be done, it is the increase that we have made here; and the only fear I have is that we have not given them an ample increase to discharge the burdens that will be placed upon them.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I wish to add a word to what has been said relating to this paragraph. I am not confident that it is necessary to add a million dollars to it. I have not given that matter careful consideration, and I do not know that it can be done at this time; and yet I want to say that in my judgment, if there were a proper redistribution of employees from one bureau to another in the War Department, it would not be necessary to add anything to the appropriation.

There were 1,500 employees in the casualty office at the end of the war. On the 27th of November the Chief of Staff announced, as the result of a cablegram from Gen. Pershing, that there were 264,000 casualties in the Army. Naturally, there have been a few from disease since that time; but there have been practically 240,000 casualties now reported to the public, and I presume by the end of February or some time in March that number will have been covered. Then, there will be 1,500 employees who can not be required for that particular service, and I want to suggest to Senators that unless Congress cuts off these employees they will be continued in the positions which they hold as long as there is a possible excuse to keep them there.

I was informed not long ago that in looking around for quarters in the District of Columbia at the beginning of the war, when there was great demand for additional accommodations, somebody found, out in the southwest section of the city, a considerable number of men and women employed in compiling and sorting records of the War of 1812, 108 years before. That is simply indicative of what we will have from this very much greater war unless Congress is assured that men and women are discharged when their services are not absolutely essential to the Government. I do not think we can depend upon the heads of bureaus to take that step in all cases. I think it must be taken by cutting off the appropriations.

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

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I saw the other day a report purporting to emanate from the Government, in which it was stated that there had only been a reduction of 3,000 employees in all of the departments since the armistice from the peak which had been reached during the progress of the war; in other words, that there were only 3,000 less now than there were when the highest number of employees were in the various departments of the Government; and in some of the departments they have increased the number.

Mr. WEEKS. What the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] has stated is undoubtedly true in the cases of many Senators; and yet that condition must be getting better every day as men are discharged from the service. The correspondence which the Senators and Representatives and the department are having will gradually decrease; and there should be

some means of compelling a gradual decrease, at the same rate, of the number of employees who may not be needed.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator having this bill in charge, referring to the department to which the Senator from Massachusetts has just referred, the casualty department, in which it was stated that there were 1,500 clerks employed, whether this bill makes provision for compensation for them in any way; whether there is any deficiency claimed with respect to that department?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There was no testimony before the committee with reference to those particular clerks; and of course any clerks that are on the rolls are being paid out of sums that were appropriated in the past. This additional appropriation has nothing to do with that proposition.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know whether there is any provision in any appropriation bill or in any other enactment requiring these various heads of departments to dismiss and discharge their employees when they cease to have sufficient work for them to do?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to my friend from Utah that if we ever get this bill through, we will do more to clear up the situation he is talking about than any bill that has ever been before Congress, because, while the first two pages of this bill take care of deficiencies, the last pages of the bill cover back into the Treasury cash that has already been appropriated for the Army to the amount of \$6,856,835,124.70, and to the Navy \$334,361,866.98, making a total of cash covered back into the Treasury, in the Army and Navy Departments, of \$7,191,196,991.98. The bill also cancels the following contractual obligations that are now outstanding: For the Army, \$8,190,629,294.70; for the Navy, \$31,000,000; making a total of contractual obligations that are being canceled by this bill of \$8,221,029,294.70; or a total cancellation of cash that is covered back into the Treasury and contract obligations that are canceled of \$15,412,266,286.38.

I know of no more effective way of limiting abuse in the expenditure of money than to put it back in the Treasury, and this bill is accomplishing more along that line than any piece of legislation that ever passed the Congress of the United States; so that the question of the smaller items that we are discussing now is insignificant in comparison with what will be accomplished if we are enabled to pass the bill.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. KING. Of course the figures to which the Senator has just called attention were based upon appropriations made and contracts authorized, but which appropriations have not been contracted for or expended, and which the War Department, or the various other departments to which the credits were given, would not proceed to expend, or contract to expend, even though this bill were not enacted into law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The presumption, of course, is as the Senator says, but we are turning this money back into the Treasury so that there will be no presumption about it.

Mr. SMOOT. Not back into the Treasury. We have not got the money.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, we are canceling the cash obligations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, some Senators were called out, and they asked, if this matter came to a vote before they got back, to have a quorum called. I promised them I would do it, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Johnson, Cal.	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Baird	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Smoot
Bankhead	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Spencer
Colt	Kellogg	Page	Sterling
Cummins	King	Penrose	Sutherland
Curtis	Kirby	Poin Dexter	Thomas
Dillingham	La Follette	Pollock	Trammell
Fletcher	Lenroot	Pomerene	Underwood
Frelinghuysen	Lewis	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Gay	Lodge	Robinson	Walsh
Gerry	McCumber	Saulsbury	Warren
Hale	McKellar	Shafroth	Weeks
Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Wolcott
Henderson	Moses	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] on official business. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 9, after the word "each," to strike out the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of any appropriation herein shall be used unless all former Government employees who have been drafted or enlisted in the military service of the United States in the war with Germany shall be reinstated on application to their former positions appropriated for herein, if they have received an honorable discharge and are qualified to perform the duties of the position.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this provision in relation to the reemployment of soldiers was stricken out because it was a mere limitation on the appropriation in this bill, and has been put by the House as a limitation on the appropriations in other bills. In the legislative bill instead of leaving it as a limitation on the appropriation, we changed it so that it would be a matter of general law and would not have to be carried on every bill. We thought at the time the legislative bill was reported that it would go through first, and therefore this should be stricken out; but in order that there may be no mistake about it, if there is no objection, I will move to amend it so that it will conform to what was the recommendation of the committee in reference to the legislative bill and make it the existing law for all bills. I move to amend by striking out of the bill the words reported to be stricken out by the committee and add a period after the word "each" in line 9, page 8, and then to insert the following language as a separate paragraph:

That all former Government employees who have been drafted or enlisted in the military service of the United States in the war with Germany shall be reinstated on application to their former positions, if they have received an honorable discharge and are qualified to perform the duties of the position.

That is what the House passed, except that the House passed it as a limitation on an appropriation. We recommend it as a permanent piece of legislation.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Navy Department," subhead "Contingent expenses," on page 10, line 6, after the words "Navy Department," to strike out "\$2,570.84" and insert "2,614.84," so as to make the clause read:

For rental of additional quarters for the Navy Department, \$2,614.84.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 21 on page 15.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee a question in regard to these items. I have seen it stated that under this bill we save \$15,000,000,000. I see very large appropriations here. How is that saving effected?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. They are appropriations made heretofore by law which are revoked.

Mr. LODGE. It revokes the other appropriations?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. These are additional appropriations. These are deficiencies, and in the bill later on there is a repeal.

Mr. LODGE. I had not looked at that part of the bill. I wanted to know where those appropriations have been revoked.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. We shall come to it in a very little while.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator from Massachusetts will turn to page 20, line 6, he will see where the repealing clause commences in reference to these appropriations.

Mr. LODGE. I will wait until we get to that page, and then I will ask the Senator about it.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the chairman if these large amounts on page 15 are all deficiencies.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. They are actual deficiencies. They have been actually incurred and estimated and certified as such.

Mr. SMOOT. They apply to different departments of the Navy from those where more than was necessary was appropriated.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is true.

Mr. SMOOT. Those where more than was necessary was appropriated are repealed, and these departments have fallen short of what they actually had to have?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is the case.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to page 19, on line 7. The last paragraph read being as follows:

To pay the widow of Jacob E. Meeker, late a Representative from the State of Missouri, \$7,500.

Mr. ROBINSON. I offer an amendment and call the attention of the chairman of the committee to it. I move to strike out lines 6 and 7, on page 19, and to insert:

To pay to the legal guardian of Dolan Meeker, Naomi Meeker, Miriam Meeker, and Louise Meeker, minor children of Jacob E. Meeker, late a Representative from the State of Missouri, \$7,500.

I think the chairman of the committee is familiar with the exceptional circumstances in this case, and I will ask the chairman if he feels that he is in a position to accept the amendment and let it go to conference.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I hesitate very much to make a change about a matter that belongs peculiarly to the House. Under the comity between the two Houses each is expected to control its own expenditures. This is for the family of a deceased Member of the House, and it seems to me that the House membership ought to be in a better position and better entitled to determine the disposition of the fund than the Senate could be.

Mr. ROBINSON. I understand the Senator declines to accept the amendment. Am I correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I would rather not. I am entirely without information on the subject.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I am perfectly well aware of the custom which prevails in Congress of paying the widows of deceased Members of Congress \$7,500. It is general legislation, and it is, of course, based upon the assumption of dependency. I stated that the facts in this case are exceptional. Under the facts which, I think, are known to practically every Member of the Senate I believe these minor children should have the benefit of this provision and that this appropriation should not go to the widow. The facts, as I understand them—

Mr. SPENCER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SPENCER. Does the Senator from Arkansas know that Mr. Meeker at his death left \$30,000 of insurance, \$10,000 of which was used to pay his debts and \$20,000 for the minor children, the widow securing none of the insurance?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. SPENCER. The only provision for the widow, if it is allowed to stand, being this provision which the House has inserted.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes. I was just about to state that some time prior to his death Mr. Meeker was divorced from a former wife and left the four children whom I have named in the amendment, the youngest being 5 years of age. He did carry, as I am informed by a letter from the former widow, policies of insurance for the benefit of his minor children. His estate was badly involved. Seven hours before his death, in anticipation of his death and for the express purpose of depriving his legal heirs—those who otherwise would have been his legal heirs—of this provision he married his former clerk.

Those are the circumstances, extremely exceptional, which I believe make it the duty of Congress to see that this money goes to those who were in fact dependent upon Jacob E. Meeker and to whom he owed an obligation.

I do not know that there is anything further I can state concerning the matter. My information is that when the allowance which, under the statutes of Missouri, goes to his widow has been paid, when her dower interest in his personal property has been paid to her, there will be very little left except the insurance to provide for the minor children. The mere fact that he made some inadequate provision for the support of the children does not, in my judgment, justify Congress in setting the precedent which would be set in this case if this amendment is not adopted.

The matter was not called to the attention of the House of Representatives. Twenty-five Members of the House have solicited me to offer this amendment, and I do it in the firm conviction that the Senate has a duty in this matter.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Has the Senator any information as to whether this is a statutory allowance or is it just a custom of the two Houses that has grown up?

Mr. ROBINSON. There is no statute. It is a pure gratuity which the Congress has customarily granted to the dependents of a dead Member, and if it has any justification in reason or in principle it is the obligation of Congress to pay it to those who were dependent upon the deceased Member.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Are the children minor children, and how many are there?

Mr. ROBINSON. They are minor children and they are four in number. I can give the ages as represented to me: Dolan, 17 years; Naomi, 17 years; Miriam, 9; and Louise, 5.

Mr. MCKELLAR. How long had he been divorced?

Mr. ROBINSON. I can not state. That is all I desire to submit upon the subject.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I hold no brief for Mrs. Meeker in this case. I did not know the matter was coming up, but I do know the facts in the case. Mr. Meeker was my friend, and the Representative in Congress from the city where I live.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is misinformed as to the facts. It is true that seven hours before Mr. Meeker died he married a lady who had been employed in his office, but it is not true that the marriage was for the purpose of giv-

ing any estate away from the children, because the marriage had been arranged and a home had been arranged and furnished in Washington weeks before. The marriage had been arranged for November, which was four or five weeks after the Representative died.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Whatever the purpose or whether there was any such purpose, would not the ordinary and natural effect of the marriage just before his death take this \$7,500 away from the minor children?

Mr. SPENCER. The reason that would appeal to my mind would be the fact that long before his death a house had been secured and furnished for their occupancy upon their marriage, which was to have occurred late in November had not death intervened. That had all been arranged, the marriage was fixed, and then when Mr. Meeker suddenly without warning was taken ill and the doctors said he was upon the eve of death he called in the judge of one of the circuit courts to perform the marriage ceremony.

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

Mr. SPENCER. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. I understand the Senator to say that as a matter of fact the date for the marriage had been set at a time which was actually subsequent to the time of the death of the Congressman who, in anticipation of death and knowing that he was probably to die, arranged to consummate the marriage earlier?

Mr. SPENCER. The Senator is quite right. A house has been furnished and everything that the Senator and myself would be expected to do previous to marriage has been arranged between these two. There was nothing unusual in it. The only unusual circumstance in connection with the matter was that death intervened, and on the eve of death the man himself sought to have the marriage ceremony performed sooner than it would otherwise have been performed.

Mr. ROBINSON. What was the object of that?

Mr. SPENCER. I presume it was to get married.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator makes a jest of a very solemn matter. The Senator has said that the man knew he was within a few hours of his death, and I think the Senator can not seriously say that he expected this lady to perform the obligation and the relationship of a wife to him in fact.

Mr. SPENCER. If I may answer the Senator, the thing that appealed to me and appeals to me now is that every ordinary provision for marriage had been made before his sickness, which to my mind absolutely controverts any idea of marriage upon the deathbed merely for the purpose of taking away from the children the money which otherwise might have been expected to go to them.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KING. What provision did he make for his little children?

Mr. SPENCER. The Senator from Utah evidently was out of the Chamber when I answered that question previously. Mr. Meeker left \$30,000 of insurance. Ten thousand dollars of the insurance was used to pay his debts. Every dollar of the remaining \$20,000 went to the children and not one dollar to the widow. It is but fair that the record should show that long before his death Mr. Meeker, in taking up the question of this insurance, suggested that the insurance policies be transferred to the woman whom he was about to marry, and upon her solicitation the insurance was allowed to remain where it was at the hour of his death—payable entirely to his children. Outside of that insurance money I am informed there is a piece of land heavily encumbered, but, as my information goes, of substantially no value. So the only thing the man left was his insurance and this possible contingent gratuity which might come from Congress and which is now in question.

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

Mr. SPENCER. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Do I understand from the Senator that it was the desire of Mr. Meeker to deprive his children of this insurance and it was on the protest of the lady who afterwards became his wife that that desire was not carried out?

Mr. SPENCER. The information as it comes to me is that the insurance, all payable to his children, ought in fairness to have had some division in connection with it, the same provision that would have been made by law if it had not been insurance but had been property otherwise. I understand it was Mr. Meeker's intention not to cut out the children, but to proportion the amount between the children and his wife, because a part of the insurance money which went to pay his debt was to pay an allowance which the court had made to his former wife, and that of course was paid in full.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] whether it would not be an equitable distribution of this \$7,500 to give one half of it to the widow and the other half to the children. That is the way in which it would be distributed if the person had died in my State without any will. In view of the fact that at present there is no law which controls it, and inasmuch as it is subject to our discretion as to what shall be done with it, I believe it would be fair to give to the wife one half and to the children the other half.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I really know nothing in the world about the moral obligation which Mr. Meeker owed to his wife and to his children. We have had no opportunity or occasion to investigate those obligations. All we know is that if there is anything about which the two Houses of Congress are jealous it is the right of each House to control its expenditures for its own Members. Mr. Meeker was a Member of the House, and the House has made such disposition of this matter as it saw fit. It seems the children already have \$20,000, and all the widow can possibly get is this gratuity from Congress. Mr. Meeker saw fit to make this lady his wife, and she is now his widow. He was a Member of Congress, and he no doubt knew the custom of Congress in this respect. At any rate, the responsibility is on the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives has given this money to the widow, and if that is not done by the Senate it will be a violation of the comity that for many years has existed between the two Houses and will no doubt lead to acrimonious controversy when the conference committee meets. I hope the Senate will observe the long-established rule and permit the House to dispose of this matter as it sees fit.

Mr. ROBINSON. The logic of the statement of the Senator from Missouri is not forceful. This is the first exception, the first controversy, that has ever arisen concerning the subject. I say that every consideration of justice, every consideration of honor and recognition of the obligations that ordinarily control men in public life, make it your duty and my duty, when we are voting away public money for the benefit of dependents of a deceased Congressman, to vote it to those who were dependent upon him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas. [Putting the question.] The Chair is unable to decide.

Mr. ROBINSON. I call for a division.

The question being put, on a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, if it is necessary, I want to give notice that the matter will be again brought up in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri reserves the amendment for a separate vote in the Senate.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of line 15, on page 20, the last clause read being as follows:

REPEAL OF APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORIZATIONS, MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

SEC. 2. That the following unexpended balances or portions of unexpended balances or combined or unexpended balances or combined portions of unexpended balances of appropriations for the support of the Military Establishment contained in appropriation acts or for fiscal years enumerated in this section shall be carried to the surplus fund and be covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act, namely:

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I understand that the items that now follow in the bill are the amounts covered back into the Treasury?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is correct.

The reading of the bill was resumed and concluded.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have been asked by a number of Senators to make a brief statement showing when the appropriations named in the pending bill are repealed and, taking into consideration the amount of the appropriations that were made for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, what the balance of appropriations would be. Briefly stated, it is as follows:

The total appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, amounted to \$36,119,536,082.75. The pending bill repeals items to the amount of \$15,400,186,239.38, leaving a net total of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, after deducting this \$15,400,186,239.38, as provided for in this bill, of \$20,719,349,843.37. In the pending deficiency bill there is appropriated \$295,244,329.45, making the total appropriations, less the amount of \$15,400,186,239.38, \$21,014,594,172.82. That, Mr. President, is the total of the appropriations for the fiscal

year ending June 30, 1918, as they now stand. That, I will say, includes not only the direct appropriations, which are called "cash appropriations," but it also includes the appropriations which are authorized.

Mr. President, it is estimated that the expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, will be \$18,000,000,000. Upon that estimate will be based the amount of the next liberty loan; in other words, \$18,000,000,000 is supposed to be all that can be expended by the United States Government during the present fiscal year. So, Mr. President, there is no danger whatever in the deduction of these amounts from the amount that was appropriated for the year, for it will be noticed that, with all the repeals, there still remains appropriated \$21,014,594,172.82, or \$3,000,000,000 more than the actual estimates for the expenses of the Government for this year.

I will frankly admit that, when I first read over the bill and noticed the repeals, I thought perhaps in some particulars we were going too far; but I am now quite convinced that we could have gone \$3,000,000,000 further, and never in any way have interfered with the successful carrying on of the finances of our Government.

At the request of a number of Senators I have put these figures in concise form, so that anyone who desires to refer to them may do so without hunting for and figuring out the totals in the different appropriation bills.

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

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] has reserved an amendment for a separate vote in the Senate. The question is on concurring in the other amendments made as in Committee of the Whole. [A pause.] They are concurred in, without objection. The question now is on concurring in the amendment reserved by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, is the amendment which was adopted as in Committee of the Whole, on which I reserved a separate vote, now before the Senate for consideration?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is whether the amendment shall be concurred in.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, there are several Senators now present who were not here when the question was decided as in Committee of the Whole. Very briefly I have this to say—

Mr. SMOOT. 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:

Bankhead	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Spencer
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sutherland
Cummins	Kellogg	Page	Swanson
Curtis	King	Pomerene	Thomas
Fletcher	La Follette	Ransdell	Trammell
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Robinson	Underwood
Gay	Lewis	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Hale	Lodge	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Hardwick	McCumber	Sheppard	Warren
Henderson	McKellar	Sherman	Watson
Hitchcock	McNary	Simmons	Wolcott
Johnson, Cal.	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	
Johnson, S. Dak.	Moses	Smoot	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on concurring in the amendment, made as in Committee of the Whole, found on page 19 of the bill.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, on page 19 the House of Representatives made an allowance of \$7,500 to the widow of Jacob E. Meeker. The Senate, in Committee of the Whole, changed the allowance from the widow and made it payable to the four children of Mr. Meeker by a former marriage.

The facts in the case are precisely these: Mr. Meeker was serving his third term in the House. He was divorced from his wife, who had borne him four children. His divorced wife and the four children are still living. Alimony, substantial in character, was awarded in that divorce proceeding and was paid.

Some months before Mr. Meeker's death—just how long I do not know—he had planned to marry a lady who was in his employ. The house in Washington was selected, the furniture was bought; and when, suddenly, sickness of serious character laid Mr. Meeker low and the doctors told him that death was near, in the full possession of his faculties he summoned Judge Garesche, of the circuit bench, whom I well know and with whom I have talked about this matter—and that conversation is largely the reason of what I am saying here to-day—who assured me that Mr. Meeker was in the full possession of his faculties and remained so for some hours afterwards; and

upon those facts he was married upon his deathbed to this woman, and he died seven hours afterwards.

Mr. Meeker's estate consisted substantially of \$33,000 of life insurance. And I ask particular attention to these figures, Mr. President, for in my judgment the crux of the whole matter lies here. Three thousand dollars of that total of \$33,000 of life insurance went to his former wife, besides \$8,000 of additions, making \$11,000 to his former wife; \$20,000 went to the four children. His present wife did not receive one dollar of it. The remaining \$10,000 was used to pay the debts of the estate, and his present wife did not receive one dollar of it. As I am informed, in addition to the life insurance, all that he had was an equity in a farm, heavily encumbered, of which equity four-fifths would belong to his children and one-fifth would belong to the present wife. So that we have this result: If this gratuity—for there is no law for it—of \$7,500 which the House has voted to the widow of this man is denied her, she goes out as the widow of the man without a single dollar, and the money which, by custom at least, has always gone to the widow, so far as I know, irrespective of the calendar arrangement of the marriage, is given entirely to the children.

I think that is unfair. I think that the woman, right or wrong, whom Mr. Meeker chose for his wife, and married, is entitled to the allowance which always has gone to the wife of the man upon his death.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as a number of Senators have entered the Chamber since this amendment was agreed to in Committee of the Whole, the amendment being reserved for a separate vote in the Senate, I feel it appropriate to state the grounds which, in my judgment, justified me in offering this amendment, and which I think make it our duty to concur in it.

This case is exceptional. It is perhaps the first instance in which a controversy has arisen in the Congress as to the payment of a gratuity to the dependents of a dead Congressman. There is no statute authorizing such payments. It is the custom to make these appropriations, and I think it has been the universal custom to make the appropriation to the widow. There is no wide divergence or difference as to the facts as stated by myself and the Senator from Missouri, as I understand him to state the facts.

Mr. Meeker and his former wife were divorced. By that marriage he had four minor children, the oldest being 17 and the youngest 5. Seven hours before his death, for the purpose of giving her the benefit of this gratuity, he married a lady who had been formerly a clerk in his office.

My position can be stated in a moment.

In voting public money to dependents of deceased Members of Congress it is the duty of Congress to make it available for those who were in fact dependent upon the deceased Congressmen. The undisputed facts are that the lady who is his widow did not occupy the relationship of wife to him; she was not dependent upon him; she earned her own living when she worked in his office, and she earns her own living now when she works in the office of another Congressman; but these children, who are flesh of his flesh and blood of his blood, are entitled to whatever gratuity Congress may see fit to bestow upon his dependents.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I only desire to say a single word about the practice of the two Houses.

It is an unwritten but very rigid rule that neither House should interfere with the appropriations made by the other exclusively for its own purposes. I have known one or two cases on a deficiency bill where an appropriation had been omitted by the House, and they would come in at the last moment, at the close of a session, and ask us to put it in; and that was done officially by the proper representatives of the committee. I think, Mr. President, it would be a very unfortunate thing to undertake to amend a provision of the House for one of its own Members on what is obviously a disputed question.

I am not going to discuss the merits of the matter, though I must say I think the case presented by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] is quite unanswerable; but that is neither here nor there. My sole point is that we ought not to take such a step as this, and I agree entirely with the Senator from Virginia on that point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole be concurred in? [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes seem to have it.

Mr. ROBINSON. I call for a division.

On a division the amendment was nonconcurred in.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, is an amendment to this paragraph in order now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Any amendment is in order.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I move to strike out "\$7,500," at the end of line 7, page 19, and to insert in lieu thereof "\$3,750" and the words "and to his children \$3,750."

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator state that amendment again?

Mr. SHAFROTH. The amendment would give the widow \$3,750 and his children \$3,750.

Mr. President, if Mr. Meeker had died and this had been a part of his estate, in my State that would have been the exact division to which the persons who are next of kin would be entitled. In other words, in my State the widow gets one-half and the children get one-half. Inasmuch as this is a gratuity we have a right to apportion it in any way we deem proper.

As I understand, the matter was not the subject of discussion in the House. The question which has been raised by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] was not presented in any manner; and if this amendment prevails the conferees can examine into the matter more closely. But as we are making this appropriation for the purpose of giving to those who are dependent upon this man \$7,500, we can make no mistake, it seems to me, in giving to the widow one-half and to the children one-half. That is the way it would have gone to them, in the absence of any will, in my State.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Can the Senator tell me whether Congress ever has divided up these gratuities or whether they have always been granted to the widow?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know. I have not looked into that question. My impression is that Congress has made a change in some of the beneficiaries. What I mean by that is, if my recollection serve me right, they have in some instances given the gratuity to the executor or to the administrator; but I do not think there has been any action to change the beneficiary from the widow to any other person.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The cases the Senator has in mind were cases where there was no widow, and the gratuity went to the estate, were they not?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I think in another instance the children were made the beneficiaries when there was no widow.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not doubt that. What I was asking was, Does the Senator know of any case where there was a widow where the allowance was not made to her?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will say to the Senator that I have just heard of this matter within the last hour, and I have not looked up the matter at all. I do not know the precedents, nor do I pretend to, except from general remembrance of some things that occurred in past Congresses.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I will say that my experience on these bills has been that wherever there was a widow the fund has always gone to the widow, and where there was not a widow it has gone to the children, but never to anyone else aside from those who were dependents.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may ask the Senator a question, because his experience on appropriation bills is greater than mine, the question of dependency never arises at all, as I understand. The allowance is given to the widow or children whether they are dependent or not. They may have independent property.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Absolutely. Congress has never locked into the question of how much independent estate was left. It is a gratuity that has gone to the widow through all time, and when it subsequently turned out that there was no widow it went to the children, and that is all there is to it. To make any change in this respect would be an entire change of precedent.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it seems to me the method proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] is open to the same objection that I have made before. I think we ought to observe the usual relation of comity between the two Houses in a matter of this sort. Where the House has provided in its own way with reference to one of its own Members, I think we should be very slow to intervene in any way.

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

Mr. SHAFROTH. If the Senator will allow me, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], in presenting this matter in Committee of the Whole, stated that he had been requested by a large number of Representatives to change this very item so as to give all of the gratuity to the children. By adopting this amendment the matter will be in conference, and the conferees can examine further as to what is the will of the House; but if the House provisions is concurred in there will be no opportunity to do so.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on that theory we should be obliged to make an amendment whenever a small minority of the House, or any handful of Members, came over here and asked us to make the change. This bill is the work of the majority of the House and of the majority of the committee that had it in charge. Unless we receive something from the Committee on Appropriations or from the House representing the majority of the House, I do not think we can undertake to meet all the objections that any small group of Members may desire to bring over.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, in stating the case a while ago, I think I said that this was the first instance in which a question had arisen in Congress as to the beneficiary in the granting of a gratuity to the heirs of deceased Members of Congress. My attention has since been called to the case of an Iowa Congressman, in which, at the instance of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], an amendment was adopted providing for a division of the fund so as to authorize paying a portion of it to the father of the deceased Congressman instead of paying all of it to the widow.

With respect to the point raised by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and by others that the adoption of an amendment changing the name of the beneficiary in a provision of this character originating in the House of Representatives would disturb the comity existing between the two Houses I desire to say that, to my way of thinking, that suggestion is totally without force. In the first place, the granting of a gratuity is not a matter of right. It occurs under a custom that has prevailed for a long time. In the next place, when Congress votes away public money it ought to vote it to somebody who is entitled to it; and if Congress sets the precedent which is implied in this case, in my judgment it will be acting unwisely.

The question was not raised in the House of Representatives. Whether or not it was discussed in the committee I do not know. Of course, under the rules it could not be officially known; but I do know that a number of Members of Congress—none of them, however, from Missouri—have discussed the question with me, and my information is that if the House had the opportunity it would not be averse to paying this fund to the real dependents of the deceased Congressman.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator to say that this matter was not an issue in the House in any way?

Mr. ROBINSON. There never was any question raised about it. The committee reported the provision as it is now in the bill, and there was no amendment offered in the House, and no discussion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was just a perfunctory proceeding?

Mr. ROBINSON. Just a perfunctory proceeding.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly.

Mr. SPENCER. Is the Senator aware that in the House there was voluminous correspondence about this very matter with the city of St. Louis and Judge Garesche to determine the mental condition of Mr. Meeker, and that there was a considerable inquiry in regard to the matter?

Mr. ROBINSON. I assume if the question was raised in the committee the committee made some investigation of it, although I do not know about that. I stated that the proceedings of the committee could not be officially known under the rules of the House of Representatives, but that no point was made upon the matter in the House of Representatives; that it went through in a mere perfunctory way.

As to the sanity or insanity of Mr. Meeker I do not raise any question. I made the statement myself that for the purpose of giving this lady the benefit of this provision, which would otherwise have gone to his children, in the presence of death, seven hours before it came, he married her, and upon that statement of fact, undisputed, I say that the decent thing for Congress to do is to pay the gratuity to the children.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri a question. Did the Senator say there was some suggestion in the House in reference to Mr. Meeker's sanity at the time?

Mr. SPENCER. None with regard to his sanity, but the very fact that he died within seven hours after the marriage ceremony led to the query as to what was his real mental condition at the time, and therefore they wrote to Judge Garesche, who performed the ceremony, and whose reply was so satisfactory as to the clear mental condition of Mr. Meeker, both at the time of his marriage and for some hours subsequent to it, that it all vanished out of sight.

Mr. MCKELLAR. But that question was raised?

Mr. KENYON. I wish to ask the Senator from Arkansas a question. He referred to an Iowa case. I have just entered the Chamber, and I do not know to what case he alluded.

Mr. ROBINSON. I am not sure myself, although the Senator from Iowa will recall the case in which a portion of the gratuity was paid to the father of the deceased Congressman on the motion of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. That was the case of Congressman Pepper. He left no widow, and the father was very much dependent upon him. I was told at that time that it was contrary to the usual custom, but it was so voted.

Mr. ROBINSON. There was a division of the gratuity.

Mr. KENYON. It all went to the father. There was no widow. Of course, I have always taken the position myself that we have no right to do this at all. I do not know what right we have to make a present of a year's salary to the widow.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I think it would be a mistake for the Senate to interfere with matters that concern the House and concern the House alone. We have always insisted on the part of the Senate in reference to our clerical pay, our contingent fund, our action here where money was expended for the benefit of the Senate, that only the Senate was responsible, and the House has taken the same position.

Two years ago, at the request of a number of Members who came over here, the Senate attempted to make, and did make, a vital change in reference to the clerical pay of the secretaries of Members of the House. Of course, when it went to the House and went to conference, the House conferees informed the Senate conferees that they could take their bill back; that they knew how to run their own business and proposed to do it; and the result is the conference committees on the part of the Senate of these appropriation bills have never heard the end of it yet.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think it is a fair comparison to which he has just referred with the situation which is now confronting us?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think it is a fair comparison.

Mr. KING. I make this suggestion to the Senator: Suppose the question should arise in the House of increasing the compensation of Congressmen to \$10,000 each per annum, would not that be a part of the business of the Senate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But that is a change of existing law. I am talking about what is purely a gratuity on the part of Congress. The Senate never attempts to define the gratuity for a Member of the House nor the House for the Senate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does not the Senator think there is this distinction between the two cases, that the matter of clerks' pay is a subject matter to be dealt with as having to do with the machinery of legislation in the House, the process of legislative business, whereas this is merely a matter of appropriating money to a widow, and has nothing at all to do with legislation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to my friend this is a very much more dangerous proposition than for the Senate to interfere with the mere appropriation of money. This is purely a matter of sentiment based on nothing in the world but sentiment, that the family of a deceased Member shall be taken care of by the Congress.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. Why does the Senator assume that the House of Representatives would resent the Senate making a change in the beneficiary if the Senate thinks that that change should be made?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will tell the Senator why. I am informed since the Senator first brought this matter up—I did not have the information then—that the House committee went into this entire proposition and decided what they thought it was proper for the House to do, and the House accepted it; and I have no doubt the House, although it was not brought out on the floor of the House, understood the facts in the case, or many Members did, when the question was voted on.

Mr. ROBINSON. Now, let me call the Senator's attention to the case cited a while ago, and in this connection I want to get that case in the Record right,—the case discussed between the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and myself. In the case of deceased Congressman Pepper the House of Representatives refused, or failed at least, to make any provision whatever for the relatives of the Congressman, and this body wrote a provision in the bill, notwithstanding the oversight or failure or refusal of the House to make any provision, and that did not bring on any revolution either in Congress or anywhere else.

I must say to the Senator from Alabama, in view of the fact that the adoption of an amendment merely places the provision in conference, it seems to me absurd to say that the Senate is under the obligation to make an appropriation of \$7,500 in a case of this sort to a beneficiary that the Senate does not believe is entitled to it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, there is where the serious proposition comes in, one where I think the Senate is going to face a serious issue with the House. Mr. Meeker represented a district in Missouri for a number of years. He had a constituency which honored him with a large majority for a number of years. He had many friends in the House of Representatives. I had the honor to serve with him myself. He was a capable, sincere, and earnest public servant.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Just wait a minute, if the Senator will allow me. He died in a most heroic way. I do not know of any man under the dome of this Capitol who sacrificed himself more devotedly to public duty. The influenza was marching through this country carrying a swath of death with it greater than that from which our troops suffered in Europe. A camp near St. Louis had thousands of young soldiers down and dying by the hour, without nurses and without help. Volunteers were asked to come to the rescue, and this Congressman, valuing the cause of his country, went to the aid of these young soldiers and offered himself as a nurse. There he contracted the influenza that turned into pneumonia and caused his death. He was engaged to be married; the date was set; and under these circumstances on his dying bed he married the woman he was engaged to. When you fail to follow the vote of the House of Representatives and the precedent of the Congress and refuse to vote this money to the woman he left as his lawful widow, you put a blot forever on that woman's name and you strike at the man, the one man under the dome of this Capitol who gave his life to the young soldiers of this country and died a hero's death. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Does the Senator think that any real true friend of Mr. Meeker would take umbrage because the Senate saw to it that his helpless minor children were given this gratuity? I think it is not entirely the widow who ought to be considered in this matter. I think the children have just as strong a right as the wife to our consideration.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that I myself was a friend of Mr. Meeker, though we did not sit on the same side of the Chamber.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I was also. I liked him very much, and I indorse all the Senator has said about him.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He was my friend. I believe he knew what he wanted to do in this matter and, as far as I am concerned, I am willing to stand by him.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, what we have to do with it is simply to give the House, after the matter is brought to their attention, a fair opportunity to reconsider this question. It can be done by the adoption of this amendment. It can not be done if the amendment is not adopted.

If the House wants to insist upon it the conferees on the part of the Senate will unquestionably yield to the House, and under the rule which the Senator from Massachusetts has announced it probably ought to do so; but it seems to me, in view of what has occurred here this afternoon, and the fact that these minor children ought to be taken into consideration, a division of this money ought to be made, unless there is strong objection made by the House to it after a consideration of the entire matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH].

On a division the amendment was rejected.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. WARREN conferees on the part of the Senate.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13462) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is rather too late to go on with the bill this afternoon. I am going to ask, however, that the Senate shall take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I hope the Senator will not do that, because there are some matters pending here—particularly the resolution in reference to a conference report—that should be considered. If the Senator will promise to yield, so that those

matters can be taken up the same as if we had regular morning business, I will have no objection.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I would suggest that the Senator may not be able to yield for morning business without displacing his bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

OMAHA TRIBE OF INDIANS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. From the Committee on Indian Affairs I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 3992) to investigate the claims of and to enroll certain persons, if entitled, with the Omaha Tribe of Indians, and I submit a report (No. 702) thereon.

This is a very urgent matter and is recommended by the Committee on Indian Affairs. Therefore I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

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

The amendments were, on page 2, line 1, after the word "Barada," to insert "Phil Frost, Charles Frost, Leonard Frost, Frank Frost, Mary Frost, Sarah McCreary, Benjamin Peters, Emiel Peters, Frank Sailors, Edgar Sailors, Garlie Sailors, Bryan Sailors, and Edward Turpain"; and in line 10, after the word "Indians," to insert "Provided, however, That the enrollment of any of the persons named in this bill shall not be permitted to disturb or affect any allotment which has been made heretofore to the Omaha Tribe of Indians, or to any of them, nor to share in the distribution of any money now in the Treasury to the credit of such Omaha Tribe of Indians"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, directed to investigate the claims of Thomas Barada, Mitchell Barada, Waring Barada, Maggie E. Rockwell, Mart Peters Sailer, Celestine Barada Kuhn, Margaret Kuhn, Josephine Kuhn, N. Edward Kuhn, John A. Kuhn, George F. Kuhn, Mary Kuhn, Stella Kuhn James, Barbara Kuhn James, Ethel Kuhn Ruthledge, Frank A. Peters, Jacob Peters, Frank E. Peters, Ernest C. Peters, Ruth Barada Sandage, Josephine Peters Mitchell, Pine Barada Beck, Toy Barada, Blade Barada, Nellie Barada Mott, Mary Barada Martin, Mrs. Era Barada Phillip, Mrs. Ada Barada Barber, Miss Alice Barada, William Barada, Walter V. Peters, and Job Barada, Phil Frost, Charles Frost, Leonard Frost, Frank Frost, Mary Frost, Sarah McCreary, Benjamin Peters, Emiel Peters, Frank Sailors, Edgar Sailors, Garlie Sailors, Bryan Sailors, and Edward Turpain to enrollment and membership in the Omaha Tribe of Indians; and if such investigation shows the persons named, or any of them, to possess Omaha Indian blood from a common Omaha Indian ancestor, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to enroll the persons named, or so many of them as possess Omaha Indian blood from a common Omaha Indian ancestor, with the Omaha Tribe of Indians and to accord to such persons so enrolled all the rights and privileges of any enrolled member of the Omaha Tribe of Indians: *Provided, however,* That the enrollment of any of the persons named in this bill shall not be permitted to disturb or affect any allotment which has been made heretofore to the Omaha Tribe of Indians, or to any of them, nor to share in the distribution of any money now in the Treasury to the credit of such Omaha Tribe of Indians.

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.

FEDERAL BUILDINGS AT SANTA FE, N. MEX.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5516) to amend an act approved March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes."

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat., p. 875), as authorized the erection of a building for the accommodation of the post office and United States courts at Santa Fe, N. Mex., be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to require that said building shall be for the accommodation of the post office and other governmental offices, exclusive of the United States courts.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate adjourn until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 11, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10, 1919.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

John W. Troy, of Juneau, Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska, to fill an existing vacancy.

Malcolm A. Franklin, of Columbus, Miss., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 32, with headquarters at Honolulu, Hawaii. (Reappointment.)

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Joseph T. Carruth, of Idaho, to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho, his present term expiring January 24, 1919. (Reappointment.)

Dallas C. Weyand, of Colorado, to be register of land office at Glenwood Springs, Colo., his present term expiring January 19, 1919. (Reappointment.)

Edward J. Hoefnagels, of Colorado, to be register of the land moneys at Lamar, Colo., his present term expiring January 12, 1919. (Reappointment.)

Nathaniel Campbell, of Oregon, to be register of the land office at Portland, Oreg., his present term expiring January 21, 1919. (Reappointment.)

Alonzo L. Beavers, of Colorado, to be register of the land office at Lamar, Colo., his present term expiring January 12, 1919. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Robert J. McGrath, of Colorado, to be receiver of public moneys at Lamar, Colo., his present term expiring January 12, 1919. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE COAST GUARD.

The following-named third lieutenants to be second lieutenants in the Coast Guard from the 7th day of June, 1918:

Earl G. Rose,
Edward H. Smith, and
Henry Coyle.

Third Lieut. Rae B. Hall to be second lieutenant in the Coast Guard from the 21st day of July, 1918.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT, BY PROMOTION, IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Herbert Coleman Smith to be first lieutenant with rank from October 30, 1917.

PROMOTIONS IN THE PORTO RICO REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Urbino Nadal, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, to be captain with rank from November 1, 1918.

Second Lieut. Luis F. Cianchini, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, to be first lieutenant with rank from November 1, 1918.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Edwin A. Anderson, an additional number in grade, to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 28th day of November, 1918.

Capt. Charles W. Dyson, an additional number in grade, to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 16th day of December, 1918.

Commander Douglas E. Dismukes to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 15th day of August, 1918:

Edward H. Campbell and
Martin E. Trench.

Lieut. Commander Henry C. Dinger to be a commander in the Navy from the 26th day of May, 1918.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

James H. Comfort,
William V. Tomb,
George B. Landenberger, and
William Norris.

Lieut. Commander Harold E. Cook to be a commander in the Navy from the 23d day of July, 1918.

Lieut. Aubrey W. Fitch to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 20th day of March, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Robert V. Lowe,
John B. Rhodes,
Robert A. Theobald,
Guy E. Baker,
William F. Newton,
Frank N. Eklund, and
Willis W. Bradley, jr.
The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 23d day of July, 1918:

Earle F. Johnson and
Henry K. Hewitt.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Howard B. Berry to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1918:

Virgil C. Griffin, jr.,
Ernest G. Small,
Andrew C. Bennett,
William D. Taylor,
Robert R. Thompson,
Albert B. Sanborn,
Donald W. Hamilton,
George W. La Mountain,
De Witt C. Ramsey,
John H. Holt, jr.,
Marc W. Larimer,
Mahlon S. Tisdale,
Davis De Treville,
Nelson W. Hibbs,
Wentworth H. Osgood,
John H. Falge,
Hugh C. Frazer,
Baylis F. Poe, and
Ingram C. Sowell.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Francis E. M. Whiting,
Stanley G. Womble,
Charles A. Lockwood, jr.,
Charles S. Alden, and
Hubert V. La Bombard.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Leonard N. Linsley to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1918.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1918:

Arthur D. Struble,
Vincent H. Godfrey,
Donald MacL. Dalton,
Frank D. Wagner,
Armit C. Thomas,
John B. Kneip,
Marshall B. Arnold,
Irving R. Chambers,
Lloyd V. H. Armstrong,
Hubert E. Paddock,
Theodore E. Chandler,
Allan R. Wurtele,
Ryland D. Tisdale,
James P. Brown,
Edward Breed,
David McL. Collins, and
James M. Lewis.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1918:

William D. Sullivan and
Richard S. Bulger.

Medical Inspector Charles E. Riggs to be a medical director in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 15th day of October, 1917.

Medical Inspector Frank L. Pleadwell to be a medical director in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 8th day of January, 1918.

Surg. Benjamin H. Dorsey to be a medical inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 1st day of February, 1918.

Surg. Lewis H. Wheeler to be a medical inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander from the 1st day of July, 1918:

George C. Thomas,
Alfred L. Clifton,
George F. Cottle,
George B. Whitmore,

Glenmore F. Clark,
Joseph R. Phelps,
Chandler W. Smith,
William L. Mann, jr.,
John G. Ziegler, and
George A. Riker.

Dental Surg. Clark E. Morrow to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 3d day of July, 1917.

Dental Surg. Louis B. Lippman to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 30th day of July, 1917.

Dental Surg. Hyman Mann to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 16th day of October, 1917.

Dental Surg. Frank A. Zastrow to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 9th day of February, 1918.

Paymaster Eugene C. Tobey to be a pay inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 1st day of July, 1917.

Ensign Perry R. Taylor to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 23d day of September, 1918.

Civil engineer Leonard M. Cox, an additional number in grade, to be a civil engineer in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 29th day of August, 1916.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists in the Navy from the 17th day of January, 1918:

Allen I. Seaman and
John Gallagher.

Pay Clerk Alexander C. Kozlowski to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 9th day of June, 1917.

Pay Clerk Benjamin H. White to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 15th day of January, 1918.

Pay Clerk Walter E. Morton to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 7th day of May, 1918.

Pay Clerk William J. Smith to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Pay Clerk Floyd J. Farber to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 14th day of August, 1918.

Pay Clerk Edison H. Gale to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 27th day of August, 1918.

Pay Clerk Herman W. Johnson to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 10th day of September, 1918.

Pay Clerk Percy J. Hutchison to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 11th day of September, 1918.

Pay Clerk Maurice T. Scanlan to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 12th day of September, 1918.

Pay Clerk Marcus E. West to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 13th day of September, 1918.

Pay Clerk John B. Daniels to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 20th day of September, 1918.

Pay Clerk Michael J. Dambacher to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 25th day of September, 1918.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Ernest C. Keenan, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Harry C. Ridgely, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy from the 4th day of December, 1918.

Passed Asst. Surg. Judson L. Taylor, retired, to be a surgeon with the rank of lieutenant commander on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named assistant surgeons on the retired list of the Navy to be passed assistant surgeons with the rank of lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Rice K. McClanahan,
Henry La Motte,
George M. Olson, and
Arthur C. Stanley.

Asst. Paymaster Jacob D. Doyle, retired, to be a paymaster with the rank of lieutenant commander on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named boatswains on the retired list to be chief boatswain on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Hjalmar E. Olsen,
Charles Wouters,
Lee R. Boland, and
William Johnson.

The following-named gunners on the retired list to be chief gunners on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Henry J. Tresselt,

Frank A. McGregor,
Vista R. Thompson,
Peter Hanley,
Humboldt J. Palmer, and
Theodore C. Wester.

The following-named machinists on the retired list to be chief machinists on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

James L. Baart,
August Anschuetz,
Herbert E. Kershaw,
Joseph J. Duffy,
Charles W. Jackson,
George M. Heinen,
John McPhee,
William P. Little,
Martin Casey,
William C. Dronberger,
William J. Powell,
Edwin J. Cuthrell,
James Wilson,
Peter J. Hanlon,
William E. B. Grant,
Daniel J. McCarthy, and
Thomas F. Hobby.

Machinist Harlan B. Heath, retired, to be a chief machinist on the retired list of the Navy from the 21st day of July, 1918.

The following-named carpenters on the retired list to be chief carpenters on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Benjamin D. Pender, and
Joel D. Griffin.

Sailmaker Herman Hansen, retired, to be a chief sailmaker on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Pharmacist William H. Huntington, retired, to be a chief pharmacist on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Pharmacist Isaac N. Hurd, retired, to be a chief pharmacist on the retired list of the Navy from the 14th day of September, 1918.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward Crouch to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of August, 1918:

Daniel J. Sullivan,
Edwin W. Hill, and
Claude S. Padgett.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward J. Carr to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 29th day of September, 1918, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously confirmed.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 5th day of November, 1918:

Thomas F. Morris and
Walter B. Buchanan.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 21st day of September, 1918:

Roy Childs,
Hardy M. James,
Patrick J. Sullivan,
William Crofut,
George H. Toepfer,
Luther C. Crow,
William Kasburg, and
Leo Kampman.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of December, 1918:

Frank McGlothien,
Wallace Hanna,
John C. Redman,
Frederick W. K. Mielke,
Ewell K. Jett,
Edward J. McCarthy,
Leslie W. Beattie,
Henry T. Hausten,
William McDade,
Robert H. Barnes,
Frank R. Wills,
Joseph R. Laing,
Charles D. Connor,
Roy M. Dyer,
William Province,

Joshua W. M. Simmons, and
Clyde H. MacDonald.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of December, 1918:

Bradford M. Melvin,
Eugene Bastian,
Marshall M. Angleton,
Victor A. Leonard,
Harold S. Vigab,
Frank Gawrych,
James A. Duryea,
Richard Tainter,
Ned P. Baugh,
William J. Clark,
George P. Hall,
Herman H. Roloff, and
Rudolph P. Bielka.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of December, 1918:

Linwood L. Curtis,
Otmar L. Olsen, and
Robert W. Ralston.

Ensign Arthur Bernstein of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be an ensign in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 8th day of September, 1918.

Paymaster Elijah H. Cope to be a pay inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 10th day of October, 1918, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously confirmed.

Acting Pay Clerk Samuel L. Bates to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 15th day of September, 1918, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously confirmed.

Asst. Paymaster James Wilson of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 15th day of November, 1918.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 15th day of December, 1918:

Claude C. Hanan,
Charles E. Leavitt,
Harrison W. McGrath,
Harry C. Mechtoldt,
Henry J. Taylor,
Charles W. Fox,
William S. Cooper,
Archie B. McKay,
Josephus M. Lieber,
George J. Schoonover,
Otto E. Matheny, and
Everett W. Brown.

The following-named assistant paymasters of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 15th day of December, 1918:

Forrest F. Fulton, and
John W. Mears.

The following-named officers to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 15th day of October, 1918:

Herman R. Newby,
Lott C. Newton, and
Goldsboro Sessions.

Carpenter Emerson W. Amos to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 15th day of December, 1918.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William N. Eichorn, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 15th day of December, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade), on the retired list, to be lieutenants on the retired list of the Navy, for temporary service, from the 21st day of September, 1918:

Alvah M. Smith,
Charles C. Beach,
Jesse E. Jones,
John Westfall,
Charles G. Wheeler,
William G. A. Schwerin,
Henry Feehan,
John L. Kelley,
Herbert J. Wiseman,
Edgar A. Robie,

Arthur Rogier,
Edmund H. Klamt,
William C. Staufer,
Norman McIntire,
Daniel R. Shackford, and
James Munro.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 10, 1919.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Jouett Shouse to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

SOLICITOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

D. M. Kelleher to be solicitor of internal revenue.

SECRETARY OF EMBASSY OR LEGATION.

Clarence B. Hewes to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 4.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

John F. A. Merrill to be United States attorney, district of Maine.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate February 10, 1919.

POSTMASTER.

MINNESOTA.

Charles J. Hohenstein, Gibbon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, February 10, 1919.

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

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

O Thou, who hast made us and the laws which environ us, open Thou our understanding that we may perceive and obey them.

Thus, as individuals and as a Nation, expand our intellectual, moral, and spiritual life; that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in us, as in Heaven; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 8, and the Journal of the proceedings of Sunday, February 9, 1919, were read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address delivered by my colleague, Mr. WILLIAM R. WOOD of Indiana, on the late Theodore Roosevelt, in my home city yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a speech made by Mr. WOOD of Indiana on the life, character, and public services of Mr. Roosevelt. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PROHIBITION AMENDMENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House communications from the following States, giving notification of the ratification of the prohibition amendment, for filing in the archives of the House:

Michigan, West Virginia, Iowa, Tennessee, New Mexico, California, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Carolina, Wyoming, Idaho, Illinois, and Missouri.

THE NAVY.

Mr. PADGETT. 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 naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 35, noes 3.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, that is entirely too small a number to consider the vast increases in this naval program. I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] makes the point of no quorum. The Doorkeeper will

close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees. Those in favor of the House resolving itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union 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 268, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 160, as follows:

YEAS—268.

Alexander	Ellsworth	Knutson	Randall
Almon	Elston	Kraus	Rankin
Anderson	Essen	La Follette	Rayburn
Ashbrook	Evans	LaGuardia	Reavis
Aswell	Farr	Lampert	Reed
Austin	Ferris	Larsen	Robinson
Ayres	Fordney	Lee, Cal.	Rogers
Baer	Foss	Lee, Ga.	Ronjue
Bankhead	Poster	Lehlbach	Rose
Barkley	Freeman	Leshner	Rouse
Barnhart	Gallagher	Lever	Rubey
Beakes	Gallivan	Little	Rucker
Beshlin	Gard	Littlepage	Sanders, Ind.
Black	Garner	Lobeck	Saunders, Va.
Bland, Va.	Garrett, Tenn.	London	Schall
Blanton	Garrett, Tex.	Longergan	Scott, Iowa
Bowers	Gillett	Longworth	Scott, Mich.
Brand	Glynn	McAndrews	Sells
Brodbeck	Godwin, N. C.	McArthur	Shackleford
Browne	Good	McClintic	Sherwood
Browning	Gray, Ala.	McCormick	Shouse
Ruchanan	Green, Iowa	McFadden	Sinnot
Burnett	Gregg	McKeown	Sisson
Burrroughs	Griffin	McLaughlin, Mich.	Slomp
Butler	Hamilton, Mich.	McLemore	Sloan
Byrnes, S. C.	Hamilin	Magee	Small
Caldwell	Hardy	Maher	Smith, Idaho
Campbell, Kans.	Harrison, Miss.	Mann	Smith, Mich.
Candler, Miss.	Hastings	Mansfield	Snell
Carter, Okla.	Haugen	Mapes	Stafford
Cary	Hawley	Martin	Stagall
Chandler, Okla.	Hayden	Mason	Steele
Church	Heflin	Mays	Steenerson
Clark, Pa.	Hersey	Merritt	Stephens, Miss.
Classon	Hicks	Miller, Minn.	Sterling
Claypool	Hilliard	Miller, Wash.	Stines
Collier	Holland	Mondell	Summers
Connally, Tex.	Hollingsworth	Moon	Sweet
Connelly, Kans.	Hood	Moore, Pa.	Switzer
Cooper, Ohio	Houston	Morgan	Tague
Cooper, W. Va.	Howard	Mott	Temple
Cooper, Wis.	Huddleston	Neely	Thomas
Crago	Hull, Tenn.	Nelson, A. P.	Thompson
Cramton	Humphreys	Nelson, J. M.	Tillman
Crisp	Hutchinson	Nichols, S. C.	Timberlake
Crosser	Igoe	Nolan	Vare
Currie, Mich.	Ireland	Oliver, Ala.	Vestal
Dale	Jacoway	Oliver, N. Y.	Vinson
Dallinger	James	Osborne	Volstead
Darrow	Johnson, Wash.	Overmyer	Walsh
Davey	Jones	Overstreet	Wason
Decker	Kearns	Padgett	Watkins
Denton	Keating	Parker, N. J.	Watson, Va.
Dickinson	Keheo	Peters	Weaver
Dies	Kelley, Mich.	Phelan	Webb
Dill	Kelly, Pa.	Polk	Welling
Dillon	Kennedy, Iowa	Pou	Welty
Dixon	Kennedy, R. I.	Powers	Whaley
Dominick	Kettner	Purnell	White, Me.
Doolittle	Key, Ohio	Quin	Wilson, La.
Doughton	Kiess, Pa.	Ragsdale	Wilson, Tex.
Dowell	Kincheloe	Rainey, H. T.	Wingo
Drane	King	Rainey, J. W.	Wood, Ind.
Dunn	Kinkaid	Raker	Wright
Dyer	Kitchen	Ramsayer	Young, N. Dak.
Eagan			Young, Tex.
Elllott			Zihlman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Emerson

NOT VOTING—160.

Anthony	Dent	Graham, Pa.	Moore, Ind.
Bacharach	Dewalt	Gray, N. J.	Montague
Bell	Donovan	Greene, Mass.	Morin
Benson	Dooling	Greene, Vt.	Mudd
Birch	Doremus	Griest	Nichols, Mich.
Blackmon	Drukker	Hamill	Norton
Bland, Ind.	Dupré	Hamilton, N. Y.	Oldfield
Booher	Eagle	Harrison, Va.	Olney
Borland	Edmonds	Haskell	O'Shaunessy
Britten	Esch	Heaton	Paige
Brumbaugh	Estopinal	Heintz	Park
Byrnes, Tenn.	Fairchild, B. L.	Helm	Parker, N. Y.
Campbell, Pa.	Fairchild, G. W.	Helvering	Platt
Cannon	Fairfield	Hensley	Porter
Cantrill	Fields	Hull, Iowa	Pratt
Caraway	Fisher	Husted	Price
Carew	Flood	Johnson, Ky.	Ramsey
Carlin	Flynn	Johnson, S. Dak.	Riordan
Carter, Mass.	Focht	Juil	Roberts
Chandler, N. Y.	Francis	Kahn	Rodenberg
Clark, Fla.	Frear	Kreidtr	Rowe
Cleary	French	Lazaro	Rowland
Coady	Fuller, Ill.	Lufkin	Russell
Copley	Fuller, Mass.	Lundeen	Sabath
Costello	Gandy	Lunn	Sanders, La.
Cox	Garland	McCulloch	Sanders, N. Y.
Curry, Cal.	Goodall	McKenzie	Sanford
Davis	Goodwin, Ark.	McKinley	Scully
Delaney	Gordon	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sears
Dempsey	Gould	Madden	Shallenbergcc
Denison	Graham, Ill.		Sherley

Siegel	Stevenson	Towner	Watson, Pa.
Sims	Strong	Treadway	Wheeler
Slayden	Sullivan	Van Dyke	White, Ohio
Smith, C. B.	Swift	Venable	Williams
Smith, T. F.	Taylor, Ark.	Voigt	Wilson, Ill.
Snook	Taylor, Colo.	Waldow	Winslow
Snyder	Templeton	Walker	Wise
Stedman	Tilson	Walton	Woods, Iowa
Stephens, Nebr.	Tinkham	Ward	Woodyard

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. RUSSELL with Mr. STRONG.
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. GOODALL.
 Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. COSTELLO.
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. EMERSON.
 Mr. WHITE of Ohio with Mr. NORTON.
 Mr. BOOHER with Mr. TREADWAY.
 Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. MCKINLEY.
 Mr. BENSON with Mr. BLAND of Indiana.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. WINSLOW.
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. COOPLY.
 Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. CURRY of California.
 Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee with Mr. CANNON.
 Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. DAVIS.
 Mr. BELL with Mr. BACHARACH.
 Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. DEMPSEY.
 Mr. CARLIN with Mr. EDMONDS.
 Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. WILLIAMS.
 Mr. CLEARY with Mr. FREAR.
 Mr. COADY with Mr. FRENCH.
 Mr. DENT with Mr. KAHN.
 Mr. DEWALT with Mr. FULLER of Illinois.
 Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts.
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. GARLAND.
 Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. GOULD.
 Mr. DUPRE with Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois.
 Mr. EAGLE with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. SIMS with Mr. ESCH.
 Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.
 Mr. HARRISON of Virginia with Mr. GREENE of Vermont.
 Mr. HELM with Mr. GRIEST.
 Mr. HELVERING with Mr. HASKELL.
 Mr. LAZARO with Mr. HUSTED.
 Mr. LUNN with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
 Mr. OLDFIELD with Mr. KREIDER.
 Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. LUFKIN.
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. MCKENZIE.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.
 Mr. SABATH with Mr. MUDD.
 Mr. SEARS with Mr. PAIGE.
 Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH with Mr. PARKER of New York.
 Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. ROWE.
 Mr. SNOOK with Mr. SANDERS of New York.
 Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. SANFORD.
 Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. SIEGEL.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas with Mr. SNYDER.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. TINKHAM.
 Mr. VENABLE with Mr. TOWNER.
 Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. WARD.
 Mr. WALTON with Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] will take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15539, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15539, the naval appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15539) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51: "Increase of the Navy."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. These paragraphs on page 51, under the heading "Increase of the Navy," are numerous. Will they be considered paragraph by paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. They will be considered paragraph by paragraph. That is always the rule on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MASON rose.
The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise.

Mr. MASON. I rise to ask permission to proceed for five minutes out of order in order to place in the RECORD a copy of a—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not recognize the gentleman at this moment for that purpose. The Clerk will read.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding I ask unanimous consent to return to pages 17 and 18 for the purpose of offering some amendments to correct the language.

There is legislation in the bill authorizing transfers from the Naval Reserves into the regular Navy and also providing for extensions. When the bill was before the Committee of the Whole for consideration and these paragraphs were reached I stated to the committee that the effect was that where a person was given authority, as provided here, to extend for one year or two or three or four years, he would have to serve out the four years in order to be entitled to receive the benefit of the four months' continuous service provided under existing law. Where a person under existing law enlists or serves a four-year period and gets an honorable discharge, he may within four months reenlist and get the benefit of the four months' pay. That is existing law, and has been for years.

Now, when this matter was before the Committee on Naval Affairs in the hearings we inquired very carefully into this, and we were informed that that was the interpretation and was the purpose of the legislation, and the committee reported it with that understanding, and so stated to the House. But since then—since the adjournment the other day—I have taken the matter up with the officers in the Bureau of Navigation, and they tell me that they think under this language they would be entitled to four months if we extend it for one year, and if we extend it for two years he would be entitled to it, or if we extend it for three years he would be entitled to it, or he would be entitled to it if we extend it four years.

That was not the purpose of the committee, and I think it was not the purpose of the Committee of the Whole when we passed upon it. I then stated otherwise. So I wanted to offer amendments to make it clear that men would get the benefit by the extending of the law, which now is that they shall serve four years, so as to add what they have already served to what they might serve in the regular Navy, and make it four years before they would get the benefit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to return to pages 17 and 18 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman made a statement which doubtless he understood himself and which members of the Naval Committee understood, but I confess I do not understand. Let us have the amendment. Let us know what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to offer amendments and have them read for the purpose of information. The Clerk will read the first one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PADGETT offers the following amendment: Page 18, line 4, strike out "(other than a dishonorable discharge)" and, at the end of line 8, change the period to a colon and add: "Provided, That said enlisted man is otherwise entitled to an honorable discharge."

Mr. PADGETT. That is upon a different question, Mr. Chairman; but the language there, as it was accepted and submitted, reads "other than a dishonorable discharge." There are bad-conduct discharges.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I reserve the right to object. We should have this thing explained.

Mr. PADGETT. I will explain it. We considered that it reached all of those, but we understand that there is a dishonorable discharge and a bad-conduct discharge. Under this language, as it is in the bill, a person would get an honorable discharge if he was not given a dishonorable discharge, and his record might be such that he would have a bad-conduct discharge or an ordinary discharge. This is to make it the same as on lines 14 and 15 of page 18—the proviso—that he shall have an honorable discharge if his conduct otherwise entitles him to an honorable discharge.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. It was stated here on the floor recently several times that the Navy, in granting discharges to men who had enlisted for a term of four years, did not grant honorable discharges but only a discharge.

Mr. PADGETT. An ordinary discharge.

Mr. MANN. I do not know what an "ordinary discharge" is, but it is not an honorable discharge.

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. This provision as it stands would allow transportation to those men. But the way the gentleman amends it, it would not?

Mr. PADGETT. No. They would get an honorable discharge if, not having served out the full term of their enlistment—

Mr. MANN. Let us get at the practical facts. That is what I want to know. Of course the gentleman is able to talk in naval language, which I do not fully appreciate. Here is the case of a man who enlisted for a term of four years, supposing he was enlisting for the term of the war. The Navy now in granting him a discharge, it is stated, does not grant him an honorable discharge. I believe this bill is designed in one place to correct that, but not in this paragraph.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Yes. It says he shall have an honorable discharge.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. He may prescribe an honorable discharge if the man is otherwise entitled to an honorable discharge.

But under the existing law they say that he is not entitled to an honorable discharge. Now, the language of the bill as it stands will grant him an honorable discharge and grant him transportation if he does not receive a dishonorable discharge; but under the language of the amendment which the gentleman suggests he would get then just what he gets now, a discharge, without saying whether it is honorable or dishonorable, because under the existing law they say he is not entitled to an honorable discharge.

Mr. PADGETT. No; the effect of this amendment is that a man could, if he should, be given a bad-conduct discharge—not a dishonorable discharge, but a bad-conduct discharge. He would not be entitled to an honorable discharge, but under the bill as it is written he does not get a dishonorable discharge, therefore he is compelled to have an honorable discharge. This would allow them to give him a bad-conduct discharge if his record justifies it.

Mr. MANN. I understand that part of it, but that does not answer my inquiry. What I want to know is whether a man who supposed that he was enlisting for the term of the war, but who made an actual enlistment for four years, will get an honorable discharge and get his transportation under this amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. That is the way I understand it. In view of what the gentleman says, perhaps it might be plainer if it read "(other than a dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge)," just leaving the parentheses.

Mr. MANN. That is all right.

Mr. PADGETT. That is what is intended. I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment, and, in line 4, after the word "dishonorable," insert the words "or bad conduct."

Mr. LITTLE. As I understand it, the amendment has not been offered yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has not been offered. The question is whether there is objection to returning to this paragraph of the bill.

Mr. LITTLE. Reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first state the question. The question is, Is there objection to the committee returning to page 18 for the purpose of offering an amendment?

Mr. LITTLE. Reserving the right to object, are we to understand that the boys who prefer to be discharged and to go home and go to work or go to school, instead of hanging around doing nothing, have been refused honorable discharges?

Mr. PADGETT. Under the existing law it is understood that a man is entitled to an honorable discharge only when he fully complies with his contract.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman may understand that, but I do not. Who is responsible for that understanding—each individual officer who is discharging the men, or somebody at headquarters?

Mr. PADGETT. That has been the interpretation all along, before the war and during the war. The Secretary has recommended that the law be amended so that all of them discharged since November 11, the date of the signing of the armistice, shall have an honorable discharge.

Mr. WINGO. Why does not the gentleman offer that as an amendment in this connection? There has been a great deal of confusion and complaint throughout the country about it. Why does not the gentleman provide that a man who enlisted for the war and who has been discharged since November 11 shall be entitled to an honorable discharge?

Mr. LITTLE. I do not know of any rule of law, and I never heard of any before, under which anybody could be refused an honorable discharge simply because he was discharged before his term of service had expired.

Mr. PADGETT. That has been the ruling and is the ruling, and we are trying to correct it, so that these men shall have an honorable discharge if they are discharged before the termination of the four years or before the termination of the war; that is, if discharged since November 11.

Mr. LITTLE. I have known hundreds of instances in which men have received honorable discharges in that way.

Mr. PADGETT. They have not been granting them, and in order to provide that they shall grant them we offer this amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. If the gentleman will permit me, I have known of hundreds of instances in which men have received honorable discharge before the term of service expired, where there was some good showing made. That has been the case in the Army, and I am profoundly astonished that the Navy has enforced a different rule. It is not the law.

Mr. PADGETT. They have been doing it, and I am trying to correct it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If this amendment which the gentleman proposes prevails, will it enable a man to get his full travel allowance?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have received complaints that the men who were discharged in the manner the gentleman has described were not getting their full travel allowance.

Mr. PADGETT. That is the principal object of it—to give them an honorable discharge and their travel pay.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. While the gentleman says the object is not only to provide travel pay for those men who enlisted for the war and who are discharged upon their application, without waiting for the department to discharge them, but also to give them an honorable discharge, the language does not provide it.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it says they shall have an honorable discharge and shall be furnished with transportation. That is provided in lines 6 and 7, on page 18.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman think that language will give them an honorable discharge?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I know it will.

Mr. WINGO. I understood the gentleman's explanation to be that the language would not do that.

Mr. PADGETT. No; I said the existing law would not, and this amendment is simply to provide that those who receive bad-conduct discharges will be excluded, as well as those who receive dishonorable discharges. A man with a bad-conduct discharge ought not to receive this consideration.

Mr. WINGO. Certainly. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri demands the regular order, which is, Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object for the present.

Mr. WINGO. Unless we can get information about this, we are compelled to object.

Mr. PADGETT. I am trying to give the gentleman all the information he desires.

Mr. WINGO. I am not criticizing the gentleman from Tennessee. He is always courteous and patient in the conduct of his bills.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 17 to offer the following amendment.

Mr. WALSH. I think we ought to wait until we dispose of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to return to page 17 to offer the amendment which the Clerk will report.

Mr. WALSH. I object for the present. I am not objecting to the amendment, but I think we ought to wait until we dispose of the bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department 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. BANKHEAD, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. HARDWICK, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. WEEKS as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Increase of the Navy, construction and machinery: On account of hulls and outfits of vessels and machinery of vessels heretofore and herein authorized, to be available until expended, \$107,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 51, line 11, strike out \$105,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$50,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the amendment, if adopted, will open a way to cut down a little bit the money appropriated in the bill. I should like to say that I have had the advantage of seeing the mysterious telegram from the President of the United States to the Secretary of the Navy in regard to this naval bill and the building program it authorizes.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; certainly.

Mr. PADGETT. This appropriation is for the ships heretofore authorized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Which can not be built in the time covered by this bill.

Mr. PADGETT. But this amount is needed to carry on the work on the ships authorized during the year 1919-20.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am inclined to doubt that the full amounts proposed can be used within the time. At any rate, I offer the amendment. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have seen the telegram sent by the President of the United States, and I have also seen the telegram sent to the President by the Secretary of the Navy. I think those Members who have asked to see the President's telegram should ask to see the Secretary's telegram. To understand one, it is necessary to see the other. The other day, when the chairman of the Naval Committee and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] were talking the matter over, the chairman asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania to take 10 steps forward and see the telegram personally. I said that I thought if one saw it we all ought to see it. I was invited to see it and did see it, and in my opinion the telegram of the Secretary of the Navy to the President in Paris was a polite invitation to the President to help this doubtful bill across the Congress. That is what I think the Secretary was cabling about, and his words were nicely put. The President's reply, as has been indicated by the chairman, without giving the exact words, was just such a reply as the Secretary of the Navy expected in order to influence Congress.

Unfortunately, in my opinion, the reply of the President is couched in such words that it would not be proper to give it general publicity, although I suppose the interpretation has been printed and well understood. I have introduced this amendment for the purpose of calling attention, whether this is the exact place to bring down the appropriations or not, that this House of Representatives labored all day Saturday on the conference report on a bill to raise \$8,000,000,000 at once, and next following resumed consideration of a naval bill appropriating more than enough for all the ships we can build in four or five years, and authorizing a further tremendous program.

We do this when we know that the great nations of the world for 20 years will be low in their exchequers and unable to build naval vessels any faster than we can. Now is the time to get busy with the pruning knife.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Are we to understand that the telegram from the President was simply in response to a suggestive invitation from the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have intimated that.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I had nothing to do with the President going abroad. I think he made a political mistake in going, but the fact is he is there. He represents this country at the peace table in France, and while there is no reason to vote for this large increase other than the telegram and his request I am opposed to embarrassing the President while he is in France. [Applause.]

If we are going to punish him, wait until he returns to America. He is there, perhaps unfortunately. I had nothing to do, as I said, with his going, but I shall do nothing to embarrass him while he sits at the peace table.

Now, we do not know what nation we may get into war with next. Some years ago England and Germany were fighting against France. To-day England and France are fighting against Germany. Wolves hunt in packs, and we do not know what the next alignment may be. I believe not only in military

preparedness, but in social preparedness and in industrial preparedness and in educational preparedness. I believe that now is the time for us not to do anything that will hamper the acts of the President while there. He will be punished sufficiently when he returns to this country. The body at the other end of the Capitol is going to force an extra session for no other purpose than to punish him.

There is but one justification for any Member of this House to vote for this large appropriation for the Navy, and that is the request of the President. I confess I can see no reason why we should have this enormous increase; perhaps it is because I am unable to see all things that I should see.

The President has asked for this large amount. I must call your attention to the fact that the President is now in France sitting at the peace table; whether rightfully or wrongfully, he is there representing this country. He is our President, representing the United States of America at an international conference, and it is our duty not to embarrass him while he is there. Whether he was justified or not in going history alone can answer. I had nothing to do with his going; do not think he should have gone; think a very large majority of the people feel as I do about this matter; think he should have remained in this country and taken charge of reconstruction here. I feel he made a political mistake in going; think he will find that he is playing statecraft with some crafty and wise old statesmen; think he will find England and France will dominate at the peace table.

But in spite of all these opinions he is there as the representative of my country, and far be it from any purpose of mine to do anything to embarrass him in this hour.

When you come to think of it, he is our only representative there, for we never hear of the others.

I promised my constituency in all my campaigns that in all international matters I would stand by the President of the United States, and that is what I am going to do now.

I shall vote for this increase because I am informed it may embarrass him, and if he has wrongfully advised this Congress we can hold him responsible and the people of this country will hold him responsible. It is the plain duty of Congress to uphold the hands of the President while he is officially abroad, and if we have any criticizing to do let us reserve that until he returns.

I remember very well that my good father and mother never punished me in the public streets or in the presence of the company at the table, but reserved that for the more quiet and convenient place, when they spoke to me kindly but firmly. I feel that they did right. So if we have spanking to do, let us reserve that for a more opportune time and place. Wait until he returns. I am informed that the body at the other end of the Capitol is going to force an extra session of Congress so that they may do this very thing.

If the President has made a blunder, he will have to answer for it, and the people of this country will hold him strictly to account for what he does while in France.

But let us not humiliate him while he is there.

I believe he has made a personal, political, and national mistake by going, but I wish him well and hope he returns to this country covered with glory, and as a result of his labors these United States of America may take their place among the most powerful and influential nations of the earth.

And besides, we do not know what country we may have to fight next. Wolves hunt in packs, and we do not know what the next alliance may be.

One hundred years ago England and the German States were fighting side by side against France; now England and France are fighting side by side against Germany.

Washington said, "In time of peace prepare for war." We are inclined to construe preparedness to mean cannons, guns and soldiers, battleships and sailors, but that is not necessarily what Washington meant. We should have industrial preparedness, educational preparedness, military preparedness, not necessarily in terms of guns and cannons and battleships.

We should have preparedness by training our young men physically for war, if it becomes necessary; educate them in order to make them good citizens; educate them to have respect for the flag and the Constitution and the laws of the land.

If we did this, we would always be prepared for enemies abroad, for we would have none at home.

Under our laws the people rule, make the laws, elect their officials, so we do not need a Bolsheviki by force.

We can have a revolution peaceably at the ballot box at least every four years and the people can elect whomsoever they choose President, Senators, or Congressmen. They elect their State and local officials, and if our citizens are educated we need have no fear of internal discord.

If we want respect from other nations, we first must have confidence in and respect for ourselves.

I want to see the time when an American citizen walking the streets of London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Petrograd, or any of the streets of any of the cities or towns of any country on the face of this earth it will be said, "Beware, there walks an American citizen; behind him stands the protection of the Stars and Stripes backed up by over a hundred million free people."

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of a big Navy, and always have been. I am in favor of a Navy large enough to meet the needs of this Government in its relations with all the other Governments on the face of the earth. I think, however, that that Navy should be built upon an intelligent basis and that any program adopted now should be intelligently formed so that it may be intelligently carried out. Who is there among us who knows the needs of the United States Navy now with reference to an increase in ships and armament? Who is there upon the face of the earth who knows what the possibilities of the future are to be? It strikes me that we are getting the cart before the horse; that our naval program ought to be made to fit the peace program and that any program that we formulate at this time is just as apt to be a misfit and more apt to be a misfit than it is to be a fit. If we are to enter upon a species of internationalism proposed by some gentlemen, we will need one kind of a Navy. If we are to become the guardians of the peace of Europe, we will need quite a different character of Navy. If there is to be a complete disarmament, then we will not need nearly the Navy that we otherwise might need. We do not know what is going to be done over there. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON] said that the President of the United States is now at the peace table. The trouble is that he has never gotten to the peace table. If we were given a treaty of peace, so that we would know what the relation of the United States is to be with reference to the belligerent nations, who are entitled to have this peace treaty executed at the earliest possible moment, then with some degree of intelligence we might formulate this program.

While it has been said here that this new program does not anticipate the appropriation of money to carry it out at this time; that it is to be left to the future; that we can repeal it if the necessity arises, then I ask why go to all this trouble? The program that is inserted in this bill to-day for the building of so many ships or the authorization for the building of so many ships may not be the character of program that we want after we know what the peace treaty is. We may need an entirely different character of ship, either more in number or fewer in number, and thus these necessities may require entirely different designs, so that it strikes me that the treaty of peace should be formulated and completed first, and then our naval program made to fit it.

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

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman is making exactly the argument, as I recall it, that the President himself did prior to the time we went into the war, when he contended we could not foresee what type of ship we might need, and that therefore he was against preparedness then being asked.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is but another demonstration of the fact that our President very often changes his mind. The thing that the people of the United States are interested in now and the thing that all of these belligerent nations are interested in now is the completion of a peace treaty. It strikes me that the greatest service the President of the United States can render his people and can render the people of these other belligerent nations is to get down to brass tacks at the peace table and do the work that this congress is assembled over there to do. We may have different ideas about this league of nations. There are very many different ideas about it.

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

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The people who are interested in this peace treaty are not the only ones interested in this proposed league of nations, and these eggs should not be scrambled together. It will be a splendid thing when the President comes home. Then the real peace commissioners may be heard from occasionally, and they then will have an opportunity at least to commence the work for which they were called together. Every day that the making of a treaty of peace is delayed but adds to the difficulties of agreeing upon the terms of a treaty and adds to the constantly increasing troubles in the business world, which are already growing alarming in the United States.

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

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the first word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves to strike out the first word.

Mr. PADGETT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not prevail—

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thought I had the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the practice the chairman of the committee would be entitled to preference.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. Is the chairman of the Naval Committee entitled to the floor after the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole has recognized some one else?

Mr. PADGETT. If some one else has been recognized, I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas has moved to strike out the first word, and to be entirely frank about the matter the Chair supposed that the gentleman from Tennessee had risen to make a request.

Mr. PADGETT. I shall make one directly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. LITTLE. I would yield any time to the chairman in charge of the bill, but I want to know what I am doing. I do not know why the floor should be taken away from me in that way.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, have I the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri can not take the gentleman from Kansas off his feet by a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LITTLE. Unless there is somebody else who wants to take the floor away from me, I will proceed, but I want only a few minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] has developed the most important feature of this debate, one that is conclusive on the strongest argument that has been adduced. It now develops that this telegram from the President, which has received great consideration and which should, was in response to a suggestion or an invitation from the Secretary of the Navy. In other words, the Secretary needed help, and, as lawyers say, he asked a leading question and he got an answer according to his suggestion. If the President of the United States, surrounded by great responsibilities, should go to the extent of sending a telegram or suggestion to this House, and I had a chance to see it, I should read it very carefully, and I should consider it carefully. I should depend upon my judgment, because the people who send me here expect me to do that, but I should be very careful before acting. Now, there is nothing to it at all. Mr. Daniels wanted a little help, and he worded a telegram in a manner that brought an answer that would help him, and that is all there is to it. It seems to me that all of this hullabaloo has been about a matter of no real bearing on the subject. I think it is very kind of the President to give him a little boost, and it would be a very unkind President who would not back him up a little.

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

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the gentleman any information as to what has caused the Secretary of the Navy to become so blood-thirsty of late?

Mr. LITTLE. I have not. Perhaps the fact that the Navy got through this war not much hurt encouraged him.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. I will.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Do I understand the gentleman has seen this telegram of the Secretary of the Navy to the President?

Mr. LITTLE. No; I have not; but my friend from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], in whom I have great confidence, has related the facts, I think, sufficiently to make it absolutely certain that we do not have to give so much consideration on that point to that program.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman does not belong to this clique that is in possession of that secret information?

Mr. LITTLE. No; I only know what the gentleman from Washington said, and I have great confidence in him.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Does the gentleman know how many men are in the confidence of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and who have gotten to see this cablegram?

Mr. LITTLE. No; I do not.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have stated to the House several times the substance of the Secretary's telegram, and also that of the President. I did not give the exact words and shall not, for reasons that any gentleman can recognize are entirely

proper. The Secretary submitted to the President a statement of the conditions and the opinion prevailing here; that in regard to the league of nations and disarmament question some were thinking we should postpone, others that on account of the delay of the building program and the war condition we should delay the building of big ships, and asked the President whether anything had happened over there to change his recommendation. That is the substance of it—that there was a division in the House on the matter. Now, the President in substance has stated that he still insists and desires the three-year building program carried out, that he has not changed his mind, and requests the Congress to carry out that program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Now, quite aside from what was said in Secretary Daniels's cablegram and what the reply of the President was, is it not a fact that the three-year building program is badly delayed, in reference to big ships, owing to the necessity of building smaller vessels?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly; and that is one thing the Secretary stated to the President in his telegram.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. So that in ordering these big appropriations now we are simply crowding the horses to no purpose.

Mr. PADGETT. No; we are not crowding them to no purpose.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PADGETT. I do.

Mr. TOWNER. I want to call attention to what I think perhaps is a misunderstanding. As I understand it, these appropriations on pages 51 and 52 are for the purpose of carrying out the existing three-year program. They have nothing whatever to do with the contemplated new three-year program.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is slightly in error. There are \$5,000,000 that were included in this appropriation for the new program suggested herein—

Mr. TOWNER. That is a very small part—

Mr. BUTLER. That was not the understanding; that word "herein" is to be stricken out.

Mr. PADGETT. The department first recommended \$137,000,000. Then it was reduced to \$105,000,000, and that was for the authorization heretofore made. In the discussion with the committee it was understood and was represented by Admiral Taylor that he might be able to use about \$5,000,000 on the new program during this coming fiscal year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is the way of getting us committed to a brand-new program.

Mr. PADGETT. No. Now, then, we just left the amount at \$105,000,000 that had been estimated for the present program, but it was understood that he might be able to use between February and June 30, if the program continued, not exceeding \$5,000,000 out of the odds and ends of the program heretofore authorized; but the sum and substance of it is for the 1916 program.

Mr. TOWNER. Now, that is just exactly what I want the committee to understand and what I wanted to understand myself. I think the committee, if I can understand the sentiment of those who are here and who speak about the matter in private conversation—the sentiment of those with whom I have talked is overwhelmingly in favor of supporting the gentleman's committee with reference to every dollar that might be needed to carry out the 1916 program, but they are equally opposed to any part of the appropriation for carrying out or for the adoption of the three-year program that is proposed in subsequent provisions of the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. They need the \$105,000,000; they asked for \$137,000,000—

Mr. TOWNER. I understand that.

Mr. PADGETT. For the 1916 program.

Mr. TOWNER. I have understood all the time, I will say to the gentleman, that the appropriations on pages 51 and 52, which I want to support if they are limited to the 1916 program, were in fact limited to that program; and now I understand the gentleman to say that that is true with the exception of \$5,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. I said it is true they might be able to use that much out of it between February and July. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, which provides for the reduction of \$50,000,000, and I move to make the figures "\$100,000,000," striking off the "\$5,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment which he pro-

posed and offer another amendment. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the amendment? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] offers a further amendment. Which one does the gentleman wish read?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The new amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 51, line 11, strike out "\$105,000,000" and insert "\$100,000,000."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield the floor to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, with reference to this item of \$105,000,000 for construction and machinery for the increase of the Navy, I desire to say that it was my understanding that this entire sum was to be used for the construction of ships heretofore authorized; that we consented to leave the words "and herein" in this paragraph in line 10 just for the sake of regularity, because that is the way this item is always drawn. But the \$5,000,000 which was originally proposed for new construction was eliminated from the bill. We consented to \$105,000,000 for this item, but there is no amount included for new authorizations, and if the chairman of the committee insists that that interpretation be placed upon it I shall move to strike out the words "and herein" in line 10, page 51.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In order to keep the camel from getting his nose under the tent.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I do not think the amount carried under this item should be reduced.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me ask my colleague a question. If for no reason it is to be used in this program, why can not we reduce it \$5,000,000? The gentleman is entirely right. Why not be consistent?

This item was once \$109,000,000. It was said we could do without \$4,000,000. Consequently—and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] will bear me out—we reduced the item to \$105,000,000, some state \$104,000,000, the understanding being that no part of it was to be used on what is known as the presidential program.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If there is any question, I will say to my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], of the construction of this paragraph, it can all be cleared up by striking out the words "and herein"; but I do not think the item of \$105,000,000 should be reduced if we intend to go on with one year's construction under the old 1916 program.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I agree entirely with the gentleman, and I would very much prefer to vote first on his amendment. The trouble with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington would be that, even if we reduced this amount to \$100,000,000, you would not be sure that this \$5,000,000 would not be expended out of that amount unless you struck out the words "and herein." I think that is the essential thing, and I think that amendment ought to be voted on first.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that amendment.

Mr. McCORMICK. Is it not the intention of the gentleman from Michigan to give this House an opportunity to vote for a Navy and not for a threat?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say that the intention of the committee was that we were willing to authorize this new program recommended by the President, but that all construction be held up, pending such time as might reasonably be required to work out a reduction of armament in conference, and that no expense should be incurred in connection therewith during the time that the President and his commissioners might reasonably require to work out a reduction of armament. I think the policy of the committee was wise. I do not believe the words "and herein" should remain in this paragraph if the chairman insists that any money is provided in this section for the new construction. So I move that these two words be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the Chair understand the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] to withdraw the last amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have not yet withdrawn it, and I should only like to withdraw it temporarily; but I

see no reason why we could not have the reduction and then take care of the "and herein."

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it important whether the amendment of the gentleman from Washington be agreed to or not if we leave the amount at \$100,000,000 instead of \$105,000,000. I had my bill marked to offer an amendment to strike out the words "and herein" when the gentleman from Michigan gave notice that he would offer that amendment. That is the essential feature of the proposition. We might possibly reduce the amount to \$100,000,000, but it probably will not make any great difference, because \$105,000,000 and more still will have to be appropriated sooner or later for the vessels heretofore authorized, and it is likely that the \$105,000,000 will be extended during the next fiscal year and it will be available until expended. But the important thing is that under the language of the bill we allow \$105,000,000, or any part of it, within the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, to be used for the new ships if he did not make a contract for it, because the only limitation in the bill is that he shall not make a contract prior to a certain date. He might go ahead and order these ships made in the navy yards or elsewhere, and the authority in the bill is to spend any portion that he pleases. I have lived long enough to know that these tacit understandings, which even the Committee on Naval Affairs did not know about, do not amount to that much when it comes to spending the money. Let us declare here what we appropriate the money for.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Surely.

Mr. MANN. If we are in favor of letting the Secretary of the Navy have this large sum of money to spend on vessels not heretofore authorized, leave in the words "and herein." If we are in favor of making an appropriation here for the purpose of building the vessels already authorized, adopt the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], to strike out "and herein" and leave that as a matter for future development. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, to simplify the matter, I suggest that we agree to striking out the words "and herein."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Strike out the words "and herein," on page 51, line 10.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Page 51, line 10, strike out the words "and herein."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to:

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Increase of the Navy, torpedo boats: On account of submarine torpedo boats heretofore authorized, to be available until expended, \$17,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee as to whether the committee considered the policy of curtailing the building of submarines, in view of the contemplated action by the peace council in making that character of warfare illegal?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; and under the provision down here we repeal the mandatory provision of the last act, directing the Secretary to commence the construction of all ships heretofore authorized in the 1916 program. That would leave out the construction of 12 destroyers. As I am informed, they do not wish to build those 12 destroyers. A great many of these others, however, are so far completed that they should go ahead and complete them. But there are 12 that have not yet been begun, and they do not wish to construct them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has substantial construction yet begun on submarines as enumerated in lines 20 to 25, inclusive, on page 52?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the construction of all of those been begun—substantial construction?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know the extent of all of them.
 Mr. STAFFORD. Then I go back to my original question and inquire whether the committee has considered the abandonment of the policy of construction of submarines, in view of the prospective action of the peace council to make that character of attack unlawful?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; because I do not think, and I do not think the committee thinks, so far as I am advised, that any condition is going to develop where the United States will not use submarines on our coast defense, covering thousands of miles.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I would state to the gentleman that one reason for inserting later a provision repealing the law that we passed at the last session, requiring the Secretary to let all of these vessels authorized in the 1916 program before July 1, was this, that Admiral Taylor stated to the committee he desired this done in order that he might not be required to build 12 destroyers and 9 fleet submarines authorized by the August, 1916, bill, and the appropriation here asked includes nothing for 9 submarines and 12 destroyers.

Mr. PADGETT. That is of the fleet submarine type?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; and the same applies to a submarine tender and a torpedo-destroyer tender. It is the purpose of the department not to ask for appropriations for these, but to request repeal of the law requiring the contracts to be let before July 1.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] to the hearings, page 875, in which it appears that about 100 submarines are now in process of construction, and range between about 30 per cent completed and 97 per cent completed. It is my understanding that the amount carried in this item is for the completion of those, and not for those that are not yet begun.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is unquestionably correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do we understand that all the submarines designated by number on page 52, on lines 20 to 25, have been undertaken and are in actual construction, and that the construction is substantially advanced?

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman will yield, I will say I understood the Secretary of the Navy to say that he did not contemplate the construction of any further submarines at this time. Consequently this appropriation is to be used to finish the many submarines that are now under construction, but the others will not be begun.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The press of yesterday contained the information that the allied Governments are going to enter into an agreement to do away with submarines and prohibit the use of submarines in future wars.

Mr. STAFFORD. We have just received information from the members of the committee that the appropriations carried in this section are not for the purpose of providing for building submarines that have not already been launched, but for completing those that have been undertaken and are about 30 per cent or more completed.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, in common with all Members of the House, I have been giving this subject some consideration, and it will take me about 10 or 12 minutes to develop my ideas. I think I can express them in discussing two amendments, and I would ask that when my statements appear in the Record they shall be put together without being divided.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. OSBORNE. My request is that when my remarks are finished—I am going to speak again—they can be put together.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can withhold his remarks if he desires.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I have long been in favor of a strong Navy for America. I have never seen the time

when I felt that our Navy was as powerful as it ought to be. Capt. Mahan's great work on "Sea Power" awakened our people and the world to the importance of naval strength to national security and influence upon world affairs. The lessons taught in that most interesting book have been marvelously emphasized by the present world war.

The United States should always be guarded by a great, powerful, modern Navy. We are not a military people in the sense that we care to maintain a large standing army. We make a very good showing when we are forced into war, but it is not to our liking, and in the protracted periods of peace we are likely in the future, as in the past, to neglect military preparation and training. I hope for some form of universal military training for our young men; it will be good for them as citizens physically and morally, but whether we get it remains to be seen.

Whether we have an army or not, and especially if we do not, a powerful navy is our first and strongest line of defense. We are constructing an immense merchant marine, to be taken care of and made safe on the seven seas. I have noticed that those countries that carry the cargoes of the world have strong navies, whose great warships appear periodically in the various ports of the world on friendly visits to foreign nations.

We have a vast coast line to guard in troublous times on the Atlantic, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Pacific Ocean. This is a vast responsibility, and heretofore it has been only partly performed. For many years the people of the Pacific coast of America have earnestly called for some portion of the Navy to be ordered to the Pacific to guard against or forestall possible, though happily not probable, dangers. It is a rule of naval tactics, however, that naval power, and especially if limited, should be concentrated. I presume that is a sound rule. Therefore our fleet is and always has been concentrated in the Atlantic. The entire naval strength of the Pacific Fleet, so called, is not equal in efficiency to a single battleship. This has been the condition for several years—always, in fact. There is absolutely no navy or naval defense worthy the name on the Pacific Ocean. This includes the vast shore line from Bering Sea, omitting the Dominion, to the Mexican border at Tia Juana, the Hawaiian Islands, and the Philippines. There are no sufficient dry docks on the Pacific coast for warships of the first class.

A naval commission appointed by direction of Congress, known as the Helm Commission, has reported to the Secretary of the Navy a well-considered plan for the naval defense of the Pacific coast. This plan contemplates the building of a dry dock of sufficient capacity to accommodate any warship of the United States Navy somewhere near San Francisco. It embraces lighter naval works in Puget Sound, the Columbia River, Los Angeles Harbor, and San Diego. This is the first comprehensive plan of defense that has ever been formulated so far as I have learned, and the present war has made it impossible to proceed further than its submission to the Secretary of the Navy.

It is difficult for some to realize that way out there on the Pacific we have a continental coast line nearly as lengthy as that of the Atlantic, and including Alaska and the islands, many hundred miles longer. But it is there. And that coast is inhabited by people who have no superiors anywhere in intelligence, in refinement, and in loyalty to our country. They are entitled to consideration in the way of naval force on the Pacific.

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Would not a few mines scattered along the coast in time of war and a few submarines make it quite impossible for any battleship or fleet of battleships to injure any city there?

Mr. OSBORNE. I do not think so.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSBORNE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to ask the gentleman as to the statement he has made about dry docks on the Pacific coast. Do I understand him to say that there is no dry dock on the Pacific coast that will accommodate our largest battleships?

Mr. OSBORNE. There is not a dry dock on the Pacific coast that will do so.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was given to understand that the enlargement of the dry dock on Puget Sound, at the Bremerton yard, was intended to accommodate our largest battleships.

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman will yield a moment, the Navy entered into a contract with the Union Iron Works in San Francisco, and they are building a dock to be 1,100 feet long, I think, with over 40 feet of water on the sills. Then

there is one at Balboa that is to be 1,100 or 1,200 feet long, and then there is one about 700 feet long at Puget Sound.

Mr. LITTLE. Did not mines and submarines protect the coast of Germany during the recent war?

Mr. OSBORNE. I will ask gentlemen to refrain from further questions, and that the time which has been occupied by the questions which have been asked shall not be counted against me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to extending the gentleman's time as indicated?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSBORNE. I am not anticipating trouble from any particular source. I do not care whether Great Britain has more or less vessels than we have. I am not one of those who fear that we shall ever have war with our neighbor and friend, Japan. That great and progressive country, however, faces our Pacific coast on the opposite side of the Pacific Ocean, with a vastly greater and more powerful fleet than we sustain on the Pacific. I do not believe that it would be thought unfriendly or suspicious that we should maintain a fleet on the Pacific equal to that of our friends the Japanese.

Regarding the organization of a league of nations and an agreement as to disarmament, there will be a league of nations in the sense that the present parties to the peace conference form such a league and prescribe the rules for peace. I hope that it will go far in making future wars as nearly impossible as human foresight may permit. I expressed myself many times during the war before this House to the effect that the war we were waging was "a war against all wars." I believe that if the war had been extended a little longer, until the German armies had been actually surrounded and had surrendered unconditionally, this purpose of preventing future wars would have been better served. However, it may come out all right, and we hope that it will. But I am doubtful as to the nearness of the millennium, and that human nature, greed, and selfishness in nations or in individuals have all been changed by the signing of the armistice. I believe that the path of prudence will be best trod with caution and preparedness, and that the advice of one who has gone, "to speak softly and carry a big stick," is still worthy of following.

As to the manner in which the President has sought to convey his approval of this bill, whatever we may think of its propriety or consistency, it does not seem to me to have much bearing on the merits of the bill itself. I have repeatedly said on this floor that, in my humble judgment, the President made a great mistake when, at the beginning of the war, he failed to constitute a coalition Cabinet, and thus bring the entire country into confidential relations with the Executive. With the same deference, I feel sure the President was in error when he failed to take the coordinate treaty-making power, the Senate, into his confidence as to what he desired to accomplish at the peace conference before he went to Europe and thus assure himself that those objects had their sympathy, as in the end they must have. But whether he has made errors or not, or whether he should have gone to Paris or not, he is there, and, along with the glory, he is having a whole lot of trouble. During the war we in Congress did whatever the President asked of us, always hoping that it was the best that could be done and believing it was our patriotic duty not to quibble about it. I do not feel that the war is altogether over. The peace settlement is fully as important in its results as the fighting. Possibly the President's urgency as to the passage of this bill may have some relation to the peace negotiations which he regards as very important and which might be frustrated by more publicity. If such be the case, it shows that facts and common sense, in the last analysis, have a great advantage over the loftiest and most eloquent abstract declarations, even those which declare for "open covenants, openly arrived at."

In any event, the question under consideration here is not the conduct of the President or the wisdom or unwisdom of his attendance at the peace conference. He is our representative there, and in every way that we conscientiously can we should assist and back him in his extremely difficult work. Every Member must decide for himself, upon his own conscience, what that assistance may require. For myself, I should have supported this bill to sustain and strengthen the American Navy had the President said nothing about it, or given no intimation of his wishes. Now that he has done so, I shall not vote against it for that reason, but, on the contrary, I give it my hearty support and vote, and incidentally hope that it may be of some slight help to him in sustaining American interests in the congress of peace at Paris. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman, but I desire to say that

I do not oppose in any regard the statements which he has made. I am in entire accordance with them. I want to see the Pacific Fleet and the Pacific coast so strengthened that American security will be adequate and ample. I want to call the attention of the committee, however, very briefly to the situation.

As I understand it, we have now eliminated all of the items on pages 51 and 52 that might by any possibility apply to any new program which is proposed on pages 53 and 54.

I hope that there will be no opposition to the full carrying out of every single item in the program of 1916. I hope that we will put in operation all of the items of that program, and if more money is required for its completion I hope it will be granted. I am in favor of every increase asked on page 52, because after reading the evidence before the committee and talking with the members of the committee I am quite sure that in order to carry out the program of 1916 these increases will be required.

Gentlemen, there is not any question but that we will have our hands full in carrying out this program. It will require all the facilities that we now have and some that we do not now have, but which are preparing, in order to carry out this program of 1916, and according to the testimony before the committee it can not be completed until 1921. It is true that officers of the Navy say, "But we can increase the facilities in order to build additional vessels other than those that are required to carry out the 1916 program." That is very true, but to increase the facilities means the addition of hundreds of millions of dollars to our expenses. When you talk about increasing the facilities, it is not a very slight thing. The evidence before the committee showed that in order to increase the facilities in one navy yard for the purpose of building two battle cruisers it would require \$17,000,000 merely to increase the facilities for building those vessels. So, gentlemen, I am not in favor of entering upon any such extension of the program until we know "where we are at," to use the expression of the gentleman from Texas. We on this side stand for a strong Navy and do not want to be placed in any attitude of opposition to it. We are building a strong Navy. The program of 1916, if carried out by 1921, will give this Nation incomparably the strongest Navy in the world—stronger than any three others—except that of Great Britain alone. So we are entirely justified in giving to the committee and in giving to the Secretary of the Navy every one of these items on pages 51 and 52; and then, being ready and able and willing, I hope to see that this additional program, which is nothing but a threat, will not be carried out until we know whether it is better for the country to adopt it or not.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Even if it should be advisable to make any of the increases provided for in the new program, the gentleman, of course, notes that none of the construction is authorized until February 1, 1920, and there will be plenty of time even if this provision is beaten in this bill.

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly there will; and a motion will be made to strike out this program.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The money appropriated in this bill is carried at the bottom of page 52. Pages 53 and 54 do not appropriate any money. In other words, the new program which the gentleman is speaking about and which the President adopts does not cost anything now.

Mr. TOWNER. No; we have all we can do to carry out the program until 1921, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I think I can take less than five minutes by asking permission to insert in the Record the copy of an order published at headquarters Coast Defense, Potomac, Fort Washington, Md.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing the matter referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. SHOUSE. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas objects.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I stated the other day that I saw a bulletin posted at a camp notifying soldiers that they would be punished by court-martial if they applied to anybody outside of the camp for assistance in matters of discharge. In the time I have I want to call attention to this one which was posted at Fort Washington, within a very few minutes ride of this Capital.

Mr. SHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas makes the point of order that the gentleman from Illinois is not address-

ing himself to the amendment, and the amendment is to strike out the last word. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the lack of a quorum. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members present, a quorum, and the gentleman from Illinois will proceed.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MASON) there were 3 ayes and 40 noes.

So the motion was lost.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that the Chair has just counted a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that the point of the gentleman from Illinois is dilatory, that the Chair has just counted a quorum. The Chair sustains the point of order and the gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. Does the RECORD show who it was that objected to my request to print in the RECORD the order of the commanding officer threatening court-martial to all boys who asked for outside assistance?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I objected, and I want the RECORD to show it.

Mr. MASON. Does the record show the gentleman's name?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. MASON. I have nothing further to offer, Mr. Chairman. The Clerk read as follows:

Increase of the Navy, armor and armament: Toward the armor and armament for vessels heretofore and herein authorized, to be available until expended, \$32,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the committee having stricken out the words in line 10, the words "and herein" should be stricken out of this paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PADGETT: Page 51, line 17, strike out the words "and herein."

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee for what purpose the \$32,000,000 is to be used, whether any is to be used in the construction of an armor-plate plant that we authorized several years ago?

Mr. PADGETT. No; it is for armament to go on the big ships and destroyers. No armor plate goes on the destroyers, but armament does.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is this armor plate to be manufactured, in private establishments or Government plants?

Mr. PADGETT. The Government plant is not yet prepared to manufacture armor plate. This will be done by contract. The armament is manufactured, some of it, in Government navy yards.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do the hearings disclose the price that the Government is paying private establishments for armor plate for battleships and large cruisers?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think we went into that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are the private manufacturers increasing the price for armor plate over what they charged before the Government authorized the establishment of an armor-plate factory?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We have not bought any armor plate lately, because we have not been constructing battleships. The ships we have been constructing during the last year have been destroyers and small craft.

Mr. STAFFORD. Before we got into the war there were battleships that had to be completed and for which armor plate was necessary, and we had to purchase it by contract.

Mr. PADGETT. There was a big increase just prior to the war in the price of armor. It went up very substantially, and for that reason the Government authorized the construction of an armor-plate plant.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, Mr. Chairman, it was not for that reason. The price had not gone up at the time the Government authorized the establishment of a Government-owned armor-plate plant. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] well knows that he led the fight against the demand of the Secretary of the Navy for the establishment of an armor-plate plant, and

that the price had not then gone up. That was not the reason for the Government going into the manufacture of armor plate.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, as far as I know I can say to the gentleman that there has been no increase in the price of armor plate on the battleships that are now being completed. If there is I never heard of it.

Mr. BUTLER. Neither did I.

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I not only favor the pending amendment, but I favor striking from this bill every other reference to the so-called additional naval construction program. In discussing that proposition I do not think it is necessary to go into the question of the adequacy of the Navy in any manner whatsoever. This proposition goes solely to the question of the propriety now of authorizing an extravagant additional program under which no battleships can be contracted for prior to 1920, a program which can not be completed short of seven years.

The great nations of the world are staggering under a debt that will take a century of peace and prosperity to remove. Our own Nation is bonded to an extent which will require \$1,000,000,000 annually for interest alone. Soldiers' insurance and other war liabilities are accumulating daily. At a time like this Congress should at least insist upon good and sufficient reason being shown before authorizing additional fighting ships costing approximately half a billion dollars.

Has anyone advanced a good reason for this additional authorization now? I have listened in vain to hear a single word that would warrant this action. You propose to authorize the President of the United States to undertake, prior to July 1, 1922, the construction of the greatest naval program ever suggested in the history of the world. You propose such a scheme when your docks and yards are overcrowded with construction work on battleships ordered by the last Congress. Some of those ships already authorized have not been contracted for, and can not be completed in less than three years.

When half the world was on fire and our own security threatened, the Secretary of the Navy could not then see reason for preparation upon a scale like this. Now, when Germany has been humbled in defeat, crushed, and her navy surrendered to us and our allies, and the peace conference in session, we have the spectacle of our President preaching disarmament to the world and sending a mysterious message back to his own country asking us to authorize him to launch the greatest naval program in the world's history.

No wonder we are beginning to hear that British statesmen doubt his sincerity and ours as well. Is it any wonder that George Bernhard, in the Vossische Zeitung, quotes Secretary Daniels on his naval plan as indicating hostility between England and America? Whom are we getting ready to fight? When Germany had its great navy which threatened the peace of the world the most enthusiastic Navy advocates in this country never asked more than that the United States should have a Navy second only to that of Great Britain. Now it would seem that our President and our Secretary of the Navy are not content unless we have a Navy greater than the English Navy.

Let us apply good "horse sense" to this situation. Why do we need to place such a burden upon the people of this country and provide now for such a navy? Is there some likelihood of our engaging in war with England? I, for one, am absolutely unwilling to believe that such a situation is within the realm of possibility. If conditions have come to pass where such a thing is possible, God pity us and the future. If these English-speaking nations were obliged to engage in such a struggle, testing supremacy, both might fall the victims of anarchistic forces now busy throughout the world.

Why do I speak of England? Because we now have a Navy second only to that of Great Britain, and equal in strength to the combined navies of Japan, France, and Italy. Common sense tells me that there can be no reason for this extravagant program, unless those in authority would prepare us to possibly test strength with the British Navy. If this is not the purpose, then the proposal will go down in the annals of diplomatic history as one of the meanest, crudest bluffs ever recorded. [Applause.] I am satisfied that that is just what it is.

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

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan. In the same manner that the contents of the President's mysterious cablegram has leaked out over the world, so the information of where this bluff originated at a Cabinet meeting has leaked out. I have heard upon suffi-

cient authority to satisfy my mind that this idea did not originate with the President, nor with his Secretary of the Navy. It came from the fertile brain of another member of the Cabinet who is accredited with having suggested to the President of the United States the famous appeal to his "fellow countrymen" that the President issued just preceding the November election. Was the President sincere then? Is he sincere now?

I recall, during the debate on this bill, while the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] was speaking, that he was interrogated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, who propounded this question:

Does the gentleman recall the secret treaty entered into between Great Britain and Japan, that gave to Japan the islands in the Pacific, some of them surrounding our great naval base, in the last three years?

Can any other inference be drawn from the query than that England might be more friendly to Japan than to the United States? If that were true—but it is not—then it is not only England's Navy that we should prepare to engage but we must have a Navy greater than the combined navies of England and Japan.

My friends, if this is not a bluff, is it not possible then that those who advise this extravagant program at such an inopportune time are the unconscious victims of German propaganda? So subtle is the German influence that during the early years of the war neither the President of the United States nor the Secretary of the Navy was able to distinguish between the wrong of Germany and the right of the allies. To-day Germany's master stroke would be to divide the allies at the peace table. She could accomplish nothing greater than to stir enmity between England and America. If we are to take such a course as is proposed here, we follow in the footsteps of Germany and proclaim our belief that "might makes right," and that brutal force is yet destined to rule the world.

If I remember history correctly, about 12 years ago Germany, all ready with its powerful army, launched forth a great naval program which threatened in time even the supremacy of the British Navy. France and England recognized this menace to their future peace. France requested Germany to agree upon a limitation as to military forces. Germany spurned the suggestion. England appealed for a limitation in naval armament by proclaiming to the world that she proposed that year to diminish by half her naval construction program. Germany's answer was to increase threefold her program for construction of battleships. England again to-day makes this suggestion for limitation in naval armament, and will the United States at a time like this, with the peace conference in session, answer by doubling her naval program?

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

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan. We have acquired the habit during the war to make every appropriation that those in executive authority demanded or requested. Now we are beginning to learn of waste, extravagance, and incompetency on every hand; but in spite of it all, while the war was on, handicapped because information was denied us, it was impossible for us to have done differently.

When those in authority asked for six hundred and forty millions for aviation purposes we were admonished in a mysterious manner not to ask questions, but to blindly vote the money, and we did it, and we added millions more for this purpose. We did it with a patriotic spirit, believing that American dollars should be spent lavishly if they would save American lives.

Now we learn that, with a billion dollars spent, not one combat plane from this country reached the front, at least before the very closing days of the war. The time has come when we should ask questions and insist upon information.

When the President appeared before us early in December bidding us farewell, among other things he told us that he had taken over the cables, so that we would be in close communication with abroad.

A few days ago we received a brief cablegram from the President, which we were all proud to have the permission to read, but, of course, giving no information, requesting Congress to vote \$100,000,000. We sought information in vain, but at last concluded that, even without information, as the closing act of the great war we should resolve all doubts in favor of the request, and we added another burden of one hundred millions upon the people of this country.

When the President learned that Congress did not yet appreciate the transition from war to peace conditions, and that he could get us to appropriate one hundred millions without his giving any detailed information, he seems to have concluded that he can send another cablegram, which the ordinary Member of Congress is not even permitted to see or read, and get us to authorize him to enter upon a naval-construction program which would cost the people a billion dollars before it could be completed.

Now, to summarize briefly, it is proposed, in addition to the program already authorized, and which can not possibly be completed within three years, to authorize the President of the United States, prior to July 1, 1922, to burden the people of this Nation with a further program, 10 first-class battleships, 10 cruisers, and in addition to ask the Secretary of the Navy to tell Congress next December what additional ships he needs to "complete and round out the Navy of the United States."

None of these additional ships can be contracted for prior to February 1, 1920, so even if developments at the peace conference should indicate the desirability of our preparing to defeat the British Navy or the combined navies of the world, the naval-construction program of the United States will not be expedited one single moment by any action which the present Congress may take.

There is not a Member on the floors of Congress who does not realize that the outcome and decision of the peace conference now in session will be by far the greatest single factor in determining what our future naval program should be. In fact, the Committee on Naval Affairs expressly admits this by the provision at page 54 of this bill. I quote as follows:

If at any time before the construction authorized by this act shall have been contracted for there shall have been established with the cooperation of the United States of America any tribunal or tribunals competent to secure peaceful determination of international disputes, and which shall render unnecessary the maintenance of competitive armaments, then and in that case such naval expenditure as may be inconsistent with the engagements made by the establishments of said tribunal or tribunals, may be suspended when so ordered by the President of the United States, and no contracts for the construction of vessels herein authorized shall be entered into prior to February 1, 1920.

The peace conference may fail to provide a tribunal making possible the disarmament of nations, and we may disagree as to the application of the conclusions reached by that conference, but there is not a man in Congress who does not realize, and know, that the conclusions reached by the peace conference will at least afford us the best possible information upon which to base our future naval policy.

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

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at the end of three minutes, the gentleman to have those three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I desire to have some time.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, there are lots of other paragraphs.

Mr. LANGLEY. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall close in three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan. Our Constitution charges Congress with the responsibility of providing for the Navy, and at a time like this, when there is no emergency, I, for one, shall refuse to sublet that authority to anyone, not even to the President of the United States.

When I realize that not one day's time can be gained by action now, I will refuse by my vote in this Congress to sanction the policy that may unnecessarily burden the people of this country with obligations running into countless millions. Nothing, in my judgment, would be so conducive in assuring the English and our other allies of our sincerity and our good faith as to have the American Congress refuse to put itself in a position of offering what might be construed as a hostile challenge to a friendly ally.

The American people do not expect the present Congress, in advance of decision by the peace conference now sitting, to decide our future naval policy. If we act now, we do so without any information. If we wait until the next session of Congress, our Navy will not have been handicapped in the least, not one single day will have been lost; but we will then be able

to act intelligently in the light of developments and the result of the peace conference. The sponsors of this program ask us to act now in the darkness preceding the dawn. For one, I shall not do so. I hope this provision will be stricken from the bill. [Applause.]

By unanimous consent, Mr. CURRIE of Michigan was given leave to revise and extend his remarks in the Record.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total increase of the Navy heretofore and herein authorized, \$179,000,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman not offer to strike out those words "and herein"?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the same amendment in reference to that, to strike out the words "and herein" in line 22.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Padgett: Page 51, line 22, after the word "heretofore" strike out the words "and herein."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to inquire of the Committee on Naval Affairs just what portion of the 1916 three-year naval program has been carried out. And also would like to know how long it will take for the department to complete the 1916 program.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS], I believe, has the statistics with reference to exactly what portion of this program has been completed and how far the department has gone in carrying this out, and I ask if he will be kind enough to state to the committee the exact condition with reference to this program.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the inquiry made by the gentleman from Iowa, if he will yield, let me say that, according to the report of Admiral Taylor, the 1916 three-year program, calling for 10 battleships, 6 battle cruisers, and 10 scout cruisers, was, on the 1st day of February, and there has been very little change since then, as follows: None of those 10 battleships have been completed; 6 are zero done. They are being designed, and, while contracts have been let, no construction has been undertaken; four are from 5 to 40 per cent completed on the ways. The six cruisers are not being built. They are being designed, and some contracts for material have been let, but no keel has been laid. The 10 scout cruisers are from zero to 25 per cent finished. According to Admiral Taylor, of the 1916 program the first battleship could be completed in 18 months, and the last of that program, which would be the battle cruiser, the most complicated in design and the most difficult to build, would not be finished until five years from date. The total amount expended on the 1916 three-year program on December 1 was, roughly, \$113,000,000. The amount necessary to complete the program from beginning to end is, roughly, estimated at \$815,000,000. We have appropriated, including the amount expended of \$113,000,000, about \$240,000,000, leaving appropriations necessary to carry the program to completion \$575,000,000, roughly. On February 1 we had 85 submarines in service, 73 building, and 9 authorized. On that same date we had 112 destroyers in service, 212 building, and 12 authorized. Does that answer the gentleman's inquiry?

Mr. DOWELL. I believe it is the judgment of the Members present that we should at present continue to carry out the 1916 program and vote whatever appropriations are necessary to carry it out. The treaty of peace, however, is just now being formulated, and after the treaty of peace has been completed and signed, it would seem to me, we should then proceed to formulate and present a naval program dependent upon the conditions of the treaty of peace. The people of the country will then be able to know exactly the character of navy they want and need and will be able to correctly formulate a future policy.

Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY rose.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the gentleman from New York has made the request that he may hereafter have some time to discuss the program and announced that he would like to have 10 minutes, may I ask him whether it would be satisfactory to him if I can take his name from the list?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 minutes at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may pro-

ceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this bill, whether we wish it or not, has a significance much broader than its title indicates. It is not simply a bill to provide for increases in the Navy, but it has become an international bill by reason of the use of the cables. Now, to see whether or not it is wise that we should respond to and obey this cable message, let us look at the situation. We find first that it is totally unnecessary for us to prepare against Germany, because the German Navy is extinct. So the preparation must be as against our own allies, and as to the question of preparation against our allies let us see the state of feeling which existed at the close of the war and the change of feeling to which we are tending in the last few days. Starting with the feeling at the end of the war, the whole allied world gazed to the United States as coming to its rescue at a time when they were in dire extremity, and they were prepared to look upon us with feelings of the utmost friendship. We had millions of boys about to return to the pursuits of peace. We were building ships. We had to the south of us the great South American trade and territory. Looking back to 50 years ago we all believed that those boys, with the great experience of this war, with broadened vision, increased and ripened experience, would come back and man those ships and go to South America and conquer that trade. We believed we would have our vessels floating upon every sea and under every breeze, and we believed, go where they would, they would go to a welcoming people, who would say that the Nation from which these vessels come are the people who came to us when we were in straits, who loaned us money when we could not have borrowed it in the ordinary way and upon credit, they were the people who lined the battle line when it was thin and trembling and in distress, and so we were ready to conquer the commercial world and trade supremacy through the good will of the world that we had helped win the allied victory. What do we find now? We find that we announced at the end of the war that we had nothing to ask, that we asked no indemnities, we wanted no aggrandizement of territory, and yet we find that we have gone abroad and we have alienated those who up to this time were our allies. We find that from distant Australia there comes a cry that we should not interfere with their security by opposing their acquisition of the islands nearest to them.

We find we are in conflict with England to the extent that we want to issue this threat. We find that France is doubtful whether it is going to be isolated and made to stand alone in the future against the German threat. We find in the press of France and of England, instead of there being the acclaim for America which has prevailed to the present time, there is doubt and question; there is unfriendliness; there is something in the future that looms up like a cloud on the horizon. And we are asked now to authorize this increased naval program to carry out such a line of policy as has already alienated the feelings and affection and the attitude of those who up to this moment have been our allies.

Now, let us take the league of nations for a moment; let us take those who favor it and those who oppose it. Can you have any greater indictment of the feasibility and practicability of the league of nations than to say that you shall start it with a threat and accompany that threat by an appropriation of vast amounts to build up a great navy? Why, this league is one to enforce peace. This league is one to make wars impossible. Yet we are to make the basis, we are to make the foundation upon which we are to build this beatific, this peaceful league, armament and naval supremacy and preparation for instant war, and, above all that, the threat of war, the threat of war against those who to-day and through the weary days of the war have been our friends and our allies.

So, speaking entirely aside from the title of the bill, taking the broader purpose which this bill has assumed and in which it stands not alone before this Nation, but before the world, can we afford to begin an era of peace, can we afford to begin the millenium, so far as we are concerned, first, by a threat and, second, by an appropriation intended to enforce that threat? I say not. And then I say, so far as this program is concerned, we can well afford to leave to those who come after us what shall be done after February 1, 1920, because no contract is to be let until February 1, 1920. Are not our successors to be men of as great vision as we are, as patriotic and devoted to the public interest as we, and will not they have the advantage of seeing the situation as it then exists and provide, in the light of what has developed to that time, for the needs of that day? So, both from the standpoint of keeping the good wishes and the kindly thought of the world, keeping the world in harmony and unison with us, keeping the trade of the world,

in order to conquer the trade of the world, as we can conquer it—from that standpoint and from the standpoint of waiting to be in possession of all the facts, as we will be when the time comes, I am against this future authorization at this time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The provision in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1918, under the increase of the Navy, which reads as follows: "but not later than June 30, 1919," is hereby repealed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order?

Mr. MANN. That it is a repeal of law; that it changes existing law.

Mr. PADGETT. May I ask the gentleman to reserve that a moment?

Mr. MANN. I think we ought to get along with this bill. It is late in the day.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] say to the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. It is subject to a point of order. But it is very necessary to have that, in order to go ahead and facilitate the preparation.

Mr. MANN. I think there will be time enough after this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order, the gentleman from Tennessee admits the point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Battle cruisers numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 from \$19,800,000 to \$23,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As I understand it, all the vessels for which appropriation is made in these paragraphs have been authorized by preceding law.

Mr. PADGETT. This does not make appropriation. This simply authorizes the increase of the limitation of cost. All were authorized heretofore in the 1916 program.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman tell off-hand how much is to be appropriated, the sum total for all these vessels provided for on page 52?

Mr. PADGETT. I can not separate those. These are only a part of the 1916 program. It has been estimated and has been stated a number of times here that we have appropriated, I think, about \$240,000,000 all told, and there is something like \$400,000,000 yet to be appropriated to complete the 1916 program.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Upward of 30 vessels are appropriated for on this page?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. There were 56 vessels—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Fifty-six altogether?

Mr. PADGETT (continuing). In the 1916 program.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That includes battleships, battle cruisers, scout cruisers, gunboats, ammunition ships, submarines, and so forth. May I ask the gentleman if he has information as to the capacity of the shipyards of the United States to go on with this program now?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that for all of this that is mentioned here they have capacity and they are expecting to proceed with it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In the navy yards as well as in private shipyards?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; both.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Have contracts been prepared for this work?

Mr. PADGETT. Contracts have been prepared for all of it, I believe, except two of the battleships, and those are under negotiation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How about the shipyards and navy yards with respect to future work over and above that provided for here?

Mr. PADGETT. It was stated by Admiral Taylor they would be able to take care of the laying down or beginning the construction of two battleships and two of the scout cruisers in the new program during the latter part of the fiscal year 1920. That is, in about April or May they can begin the construction of the two battleships.

Mr. BROWNING. They said that they could lay down the battleships, but the United States would have to pay for the ways.

Mr. PADGETT. I did not so understand.

Mr. BROWNING. Oh, yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The point I am trying to get at is are we prepared for the construction of so many ships of one kind and another in the shipyards and navy yards of the United States?

Mr. PADGETT. At this time; yes. They said they would have opportunity to take on these dimensions in April or May of 1920.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is very important in connection with the discussion that will probably ensue after these paragraphs are passed?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That any additional ships that we may be called upon to construct for defense or for the purposes of the Navy generally could not be commenced, considering the capacity of the shipyards of the United States and of the navy yards, until April or May, 1920?

Mr. PADGETT. That is about the time.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. My recollection of what he said is that there would be a capacity for two battleships over and above what has been authorized.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman tell how extensive is the program following that which we are just reading—the program that is proposed to run along until 1920?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I do not quite get what the gentleman means.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The shipyards, according to the statement of the gentleman, and the navy yards, if they are all brought into service, will have all the work they can possibly do to complete the 1916 program.

Mr. PADGETT. Here is the language that Admiral Taylor used in an unpublished hearing. We had an informal hearing before the committee:

If necessary, could lay down this battleship of new program in a few months.

One thousand-foot ways now available at Puget Sound.

Could extend the ways at New York ship for battleship.

Could provide additional ships in private yards if necessary. Also one in Norfolk yard.

"New York ship" refers to the yard at Camden.

He stated that he could provide additional ships in the Norfolk yard, but to provide those additional ones referred to here would require additional ways.

Mr. BUTLER. And the expenditure of a lot of money.

Mr. PADGETT. He said he could lay down two of them in the early part of next year.

Mr. BUTLER. After they finished this next battleship they could begin.

Mr. PADGETT. When it goes off the ways it goes into the water.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. On page 54, lines 13, 14, and 15, there is this provision:

And no contracts for the construction of vessels herein authorized shall be entered into prior to February 1, 1920.

Now, the question arises with some of us—it has arisen with me: Why, if we are building to capacity now; why, if we provide for all the ships which our workmen and our shipyards are capable of producing, should we make provision in this bill for other vessels or for vessels already authorized and say that "No contracts for the construction of vessels herein authorized shall be entered into prior to February 1, 1920"?

I ask that question because this seems to involve the President's message to the committee, that something should be done covering the period between now and 1920. If we have provided for all the vessels that can be constructed, taking into account the capacity of all the yards we have in the United States and all the labor we can employ, why should we now, in 1919, say that we will provide for something or other but shall not make any contract for it until February 1, 1920?

Mr. PADGETT. The three-year program is the carrying out of a policy which Congress established in 1916. The provision was for the laying down during the first year of two battleships and two of the scout cruisers, and they were prepared to do that during the fiscal year. They can begin the construction and lay down those during the fiscal year.

The time—February 1, 1920—was fixed by the committee as a reasonable time in which to await the development of the establishment of a league of nations, or a society of nations,

or a program for disarmament, coupled with the power that the President could suspend this construction if such an arrangement was made.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask how the date February 1, 1920, happened to have been hit upon by the committee? Why not December 1, 1920, following November, 1920?

Mr. PADGETT. There were times mentioned, January 1 and February 1, and it was agreed in the committee as February 1, because it will allow from now until then and allow two months after the assembling of the next Congress.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would it be embarrassing to the committee if December 1, 1920, had been fixed?

Mr. PADGETT. It would allow additional time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. February 1 might be at the very inception of a campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Gunboat No. 21, from \$1,032,000 to \$1,100,000.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOWARD. I do so just to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question. The gentleman may have given to the House the information desired prior to this, and if he has done so I will not trouble him to answer it. But I want to find out, if I can, why this increase in the contract price of these vessels, ranging between two and three million dollars each. What is the reason for that?

Mr. PADGETT. It is on account of the increased cost of labor and material. We have gone into it very fully.

Mr. HOWARD. As I understood the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hicks] awhile ago, in response to some question asked by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Stafford], he stated the percentages of completion at which many of these vessels had arrived.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. Also there is another complication involved in it. It is the complication of lack of ways on the Pacific coast and in New York.

Mr. PADGETT. This is for the vessels themselves.

Mr. HOWARD. I understand. Do you attribute it to the cost of materials or the increased cost of labor?

Mr. PADGETT. Both.

Mr. HOWARD. And have you made any allowance for a normal condition in this country that will be bound to follow this declaration of peace?

Mr. PADGETT. When war was declared it was impossible in the disturbed conditions then existing to secure any lump-sum contracts. All of them were upon the cost-plus-a-profit basis, and the cost of labor has gone up about 100 per cent. The cost of material has gone up from 100 to 150 per cent, and the Government under these contracts pays the cost of labor and the cost of material. If it goes down in the future, the Government would get the benefit of whatever reduction there was. But this is estimated upon the present basis of the cost of labor and material.

Mr. HOWARD. The question I intended to impress upon the gentleman is this: Will the Government of the United States get any advantage of any decrease in any cost of material, or even any decrease in the cost of labor, if we authorize you now to increase the cost of these superdreadnaughts \$3,000,000 if labor or materials should decrease in value?

Mr. PADGETT. The Government would get the benefit of it.

Mr. HOWARD. To what extent—the extent of the decrease?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. Is that in the contract?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. The Government has a contract providing that it pays the cost of the labor and the cost of material. If the price of material goes down, the Navy pays only its cost; if the labor goes down, the Government pays only the cost of the labor.

Mr. HOWARD. Is it one of the cost-plus contracts?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; all of them are.

Mr. HOWARD. What percentage on the gross cost of it?

Mr. PADGETT. I could not tell you as to each one, but the Navy Department made a contract providing that the profit was not to exceed a certain total amount. They did not have just an unlimited cost plus. The profit was a certain per cent, but not to exceed so much in the aggregate.

Mr. HOWARD. Was it graduated along the same line as the now famous Council of National Defense contracts, the war con-

tracts, providing that they should get so much percentage on the first \$1,000,000 and decreasing as it went up?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and with a limit on the total. When the profit reached, say, \$200,000 or \$250,000, then there was no further profit.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman be generous enough to answer just one more question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. As chairman of the committee, has the gentleman any objection to extending the limitation of time within which these contracts must be let from February 1, 1920, to June 30, 1920, which is the end of that fiscal year?

Mr. PADGETT. We can discuss that when we come to it, but I think that would be ill-advised.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Gunboat No. 21 from \$1,032,000 to \$1,100,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, simply to ask the chairman of the committee if it is the policy of the department to include what is known as the gunboats in our naval fleet at this time?

Mr. PADGETT. This is a gunboat that is almost completed. It is not intended to begin the construction of the second one, No. 22, and it was for that purpose as to one of the ships that we inserted the provision that went out awhile ago upon a point of order. This gunboat is very largely completed.

Mr. WALSH. I thought it was agreed among naval experts that this type of craft had become obsolete.

Mr. PADGETT. No. This type of gunboat is a valuable ship, and No. 21 is 90 per cent completed.

Mr. WALSH. What is it valuable for?

Mr. PADGETT. It is very valuable. It is used in all shallow waters. It is used on the Asiatic coast, up the rivers, and in South America, and in the West Indies.

Mr. WALSH. Have we 20 other gunboats?

Mr. PADGETT. There have been 20 others that up to that time had been built or authorized. Whether they are all in commission or not I do not know.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know how many others there are in the fleet?

Mr. PADGETT. I have not the list here with me. The Navy list would show that. Heretofore we have been very short on gunboats, and the department has been recommending them year after year since I have been on the committee, but the committee heretofore have been emphasizing the large ship construction, depending upon securing the smaller vessels when they should be actually needed.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. How many gunboats will we have in the service when we complete the 60 Eagle boats, known as the Ford boats? They are rated as gunboats. How many will we have in all?

Mr. WALSH. The Eagle boat is not a gunboat.

Mr. BUTLER. We will use them for harbor work and river work.

Mr. WALSH. Where the water is thick enough so that it will not permeate the apertures in the hulls of the Eagle boats, probably they will float, but as I understand it they are not called gunboats, and are not even feeble imitations of gunboats. I was asking how many gunboats we would have in our naval fleet.

Mr. PADGETT. There are 30 gunboats that have been authorized up to the present time, as I understand it. Number 30 is the one numbered 22 that I mentioned awhile ago that has not been begun, and we do not contemplate beginning it.

Mr. WALSH. Can the gentleman state why that is?

Mr. PADGETT. Because they thought that in view of the addition of small craft during the war they did not need it. The other one, No. 21, is 90 per cent completed.

Mr. WALSH. If they do not need it, why should we spend \$68,000 additional to complete No. 21?

Mr. PADGETT. Because we have already spent over \$1,000,000 on it in getting it 90 per cent completed.

Mr. WALSH. Then they are going to need this No. 21?

Mr. PADGETT. If it was an original proposition I do not think they would build it; but having spent over \$1,000,000 on it and having it 90 per cent completed there is nothing to do except to go ahead and complete it.

Mr. WALSH. May I ask the gentleman, further, if that is the theory upon which these increases are asked in these various other items—that we have got them 90 per cent completed?

Mr. PADGETT. Some of them are not as much as 90 per cent completed, but where we have spent a million or two upon

a boat we can not scrap it. We have got to complete it and use it.

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

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the pro forma amendment. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee how these Ford boats are classified and what they call them.

Mr. PADGETT. They named them "Eagle boats." They were built for war purposes. They were intended to be used as submarine chasers. There were 112 contracted for altogether, but when the hostilities ceased they canceled the order for 52. Sixty of them had progressed so far that it was stated to the committee that it was economy and good business for the Government to complete them rather than attempt to scrap them. When completed they can use them for such purposes as may be available, or Congress can order them sold. They had reached such a stage that it was good business judgment and economy to complete them.

Mr. DENISON. How long are they and what do they cost?

Mr. PADGETT. I can not tell the cost. The contract was made—one of those cost-plus contracts. It was estimated by the Ford Co. that they could be constructed for \$275,000 each, but Admiral Taylor stated that he thought that was an underestimate, and if they could be completed around \$400,000 each, that would not be an unreasonable cost for a boat of that character.

Mr. BUTLER. It will take \$24,000,000 to complete them and cost \$100,000 each year to keep them up—man them with 80 men.

Mr. DENISON. Can the gentleman inform us where they could be disposed of?

Mr. PADGETT. I think they could be disposed of to some of these countries, but we are not ready to dispose of them yet.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise for information. I would like to ask the gentleman who on earth, or on the waters of the earth, would want one of these boats?

Mr. PADGETT. I am told that they are a very good boat. Admiral Taylor has gone into it, and he says that it is a good boat.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. For what purpose?

Mr. PADGETT. For war purposes; they were calling for them and demanding them.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But the war is over.

Mr. PADGETT. I know it; but before the war was over they had begun the construction of 60, and so far completed them that it was thought economy to finish them up.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What can they do with them now the war is over?

Mr. PADGETT. They will be used in harbor work to supplant gunboats as far as they can in the shoal waters and in river service, in the Asiatic service, South America, and the West Indies.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What will they do with them?

Mr. PADGETT. Do the work where you would not want to send a big cruiser or a battleship.

Mr. STAFFORD. They can be used as pleasure yachts; they are suitable for that purpose.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think so.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I do not know any more about it than I did before, but I concede that the gentleman from Tennessee has done his best. [Laughter.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amunition ship No. 1 from \$2,820,000 to \$3,250,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee in this connection why the Government increased to such an inordinate extent the appropriation for ammunition for the Navy, carrying, as it does, a threefold increase over the bill in war time?

Mr. PADGETT. The amount carried in the last bill was supplemented by further appropriations. This increase is on account of the large number of ships, the big ships, that they propose to go ahead in the construction of now, that were held up during the war. This is for the ships of the 1916 building program.

Mr. STAFFORD. If it will not violate any naval secret, will the gentleman inform the House as to the condition of the supply of ammunition at the present time?

Mr. PADGETT. The admiral stated it in a general way that we were fairly well off for powder, that we had a good big amount of powder, and yet, when you take into consideration the number of ships on the building program that are to be built and that would be authorized, taking the ships into con-

sideration, there were three types of projectiles that we have not a sufficient number of—the large projectiles, and also in the smaller there is a shortage.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was not the policy some years ago for the department to lay by a large reserve of powder in case of emergency?

Mr. PADGETT. They started on that policy, but before they got it completed the war came on.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the Navy had occasion to use much of this ammunition during the war?

Mr. PADGETT. No; other than they have used it all the time, or a good deal of it, for target practice.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought the gentleman intimated that the Navy had been engaged in some conflict where they had used a large amount of ammunition.

Mr. PADGETT. No; but when you take into account this large number of ships there is a great amount needed.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. How long does this powder last; does it deteriorate in time?

Mr. PADGETT. Years ago it did deteriorate very rapidly, but in later years, with improved processes of manufacture, they have lengthened the life of it very much, and they state now that 15 years or more is the life of the powder. A large amount of powder is required each year for target practice and the development in training purposes. They use the oldest powder each time, and the new powder is added to the supply. In using powder now they take it from the oldest, so that the new powder is added to the reserve.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Then it means that 15 years after powder is made it still can be used effectively in battle?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it may begin to deteriorate, but the powder is not wasted. They then put it into the mill and rework it at a cost of about 10 per cent of its original cost.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. And that restores its power and vitality?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it puts it back right into its power again.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee give us a little information about those large naval guns that we had on our western battle front, and what has or will become of them?

Mr. PADGETT. They are still over there. They were sent over by the Navy, and they were placed under the command of Gen. Pershing. He sent some of them into the Argonne Forest front, near Verdun, and two of them, I think, were sent down below there into the St. Mihiel sector, and we saw three of them. They had moved out two of them just a few days before we were at St. Nazarre, and they did wonderful work. The committee had a hearing upon that from Admiral Plunkett, who was in charge of that operation under the Navy. If the gentleman will refer to his statement he will find it very interesting. They did very satisfactory work. They were taken right up and some of them were used in the sector there above Nancy, up to the north of Verdun, right in view of Metz. While they did not shell the forts of Metz, because that was not regarded as the proper military thing to do, they shelled the railroads and approaches leading into Metz and created great confusion and disturbance, breaking up lines of communication and their means of getting in and out of Metz.

Mr. DENISON. Were they operated by men from the Army or the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. From the Navy.

Mr. DENISON. Will they be serviceable for naval purposes after this?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, yes. They were naval guns taken over there, and they were placed on a car built for that purpose. The car ran along the railroad track and the gun operated on that as its base, just as if in a ship. They could fire over 30 miles.

The Clerk read as follows:

Submarines (R) Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 from \$700,000 to \$840,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I undertook to get the attention of the Chair in order to discuss line 17, which provides money for the completion of a gunboat, not likely to be needed, as a part of the defenses.

Mr. PADGETT. That gunboat No. 21 is 90 per cent completed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; that is it.

Mr. PADGETT. No. 22 has not been started, and they do not want to begin it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. All right. I desire to call attention to the fact that there are many merchant ships on the coast of the United States in all stages of completion, and that one arm of the Government, the United States Shipping Corporation, followed in authority by the Shipping Board, proposes

to abandon a number of them upon the ground that the war emergency does not exist; that we can cut down the number of these ships and pay damages for contracts let, and let the ships go. I am wondering what the people of the country will think of that when it is proposed in this bill to complete more or less obsolete ships for naval purposes, gunboats, Eagle boats, and the like of that, because they are partially done.

Mr. PADGETT. This gunboat was ordered as of 1916, and is of the latest type, and it is a valuable and useful ship, of its type.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Of its type, of course; but at the same time we are trying to increase this appropriation and are in danger of hooking on another great program, so that future Congresses will find themselves in the same predicament as this Congress when it is asked to go on with the work.

Mr. PADGETT. We do not authorize or report any authorization for gunboats.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They have got to be paid for just the same, as we quickly find out, and at increased figures.

Mr. PADGETT. No; just simply the battleships and the scout cruisers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is to say, the authorization proposed is for new battleships and new cruisers—20 of them in all. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Howam] spoke about the cost of labor on these ships now building, and it was stated these increases are necessary largely because of the cost of labor. Can the chairman say how the labor scale in the navy yards runs with the wage scale established by the Government in the merchant shipyards, where we have now a number of strikes on the part of employees who are receiving Government authorized wages?

Mr. PADGETT. The navy yard had a scale of wages adopted and recommended by the labor boards that were established. The last one of them was known as the Macey Board.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is the same labor scale, then—

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; that fixed the labor for the Shipping Board, for the Army, and for the Navy. It increased wonderfully in amount and wonderfully in frequency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How does the gentleman account for the fact that the shipbuilders working for the shipping corporation in the construction of merchant ships at the Macey scale of wages strike and those in the yard of the Government working on warships do not strike?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know why men will strike in private concerns and not strike against the Government, unless it is the governmental influence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Perhaps the fact that the Government selects its navy yard workmen through the civil service, which requires them to be American citizens, has something to do with it. In that connection I would call attention to some of the mistakes in some legislation that we have passed. It seems that out in Seattle the immigration commissioner of the United States for all of that country is also the labor mediator, and he was until recently in charge of the United States Labor Employment Bureau. It strikes me that these positions, or any two of them, are inharmonious and should be in separate hands. In the Northwest the citizens have been trying for a long time to have a lot of revolutionary agitators—foreigners—deported, but for some reason it has not been done. Many of these foreigners, who have not even taken out their first papers, have been taken into the unions and have swamped certain unions. When the time comes for their deportation by the United States immigration commissioner, the step is made hard for that official and is likely to embarrass him in his capacity as Federal labor mediator. I have a telegram here that says there are not less than 500 aliens in Seattle, many of them labor agitators and leaders, who can be deported under the laws we have already on our statutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman tell from what fund this gentleman who holds these three positions is paid?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. May I have five minutes more?

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. From what fund is he paid?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I assume all of these positions are run by the Department of Labor. The Department of Labor has in it these and other bureaus, and we have made a great appropriation also for Federal employment agencies, and I suppose that is carried from the Department of Labor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And they are asking no additional appropriation now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not criticize the bureau or the United States official, but I call attention to the fact that the work of several should not be handled by one agent. I believe that has to do with a lot of our present trouble on Puget Sound. There are 500 unnaturalized Russians and Finns out there, who ought to be started out just as soon as possible. Send them back where the kind of liberty they want can be had.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the gentleman think the duties of this official to whom he refers are incompatible and conflict with each other?

Mr. PADGETT. Outside of that, the city has a very good reputation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. A splendid reputation and a great shipbuilding reputation and a war shipbuilding reputation. Mr. Chairman, I yield back any time I may have remaining and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, reported in Two hundred and sixteenth United States Supreme Court reports, page 499.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman ought to continue his statement as to what it is.

Mr. GORDON. It is in support of the proposition that executive officers are not authorized to settle claims for unliquidated damages. It is in support of that legal proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I do not see that that is pertinent to the subject under inquiry.

Mr. GORDON. It is just as pertinent as the preceding remarks. I will say to the gentleman, I have been engaged in committee—

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. I object.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. RANDALL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on January 25, 1919, approved and signed bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 3299. An act authorizing the President to reappoint Maj. Chalmers G. Hall, retired, to the active list of the Army;

S. 4924. An act to amend section 336 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the annual report on the statistics of commerce and navigation of the United States with foreign countries; and

H. J. Res. 372. Joint resolution to amend Senate joint resolution No. 78, approved October 5, 1917, entitled "Joint resolution to suspend requirements of the annual assessment work on mining claims during the years 1917 and 1918."

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Submarines (S) No. 1, 2, and 3 from \$1,200,000 to \$1,500,000.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. In line 20 I see the letter "R" is in brackets. Does that describe the type of submarines?

Mr. PADGETT. That describes its class or type, and the letter "S" describes another type.

Mr. KEARNS. I see for three submarines you have increased the amount \$300,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNS. And in lines 24 and 25 you have 37 U-boats of the same type as in line 22, where the increase is only \$450,000. What is the explanation?

Mr. PADGETT. The first three were begun earlier, and there was a great deal of material bought at a cheaper price than these later ones that came in of the same type.

Mr. KEARNS. If you had material bought when it was cheap, what is the reason now for the increase?

Mr. PADGETT. We did not begin all of them at the same time.

Mr. KEARNS. There is 1, 2, and 3; are those—

Mr. PADGETT. They are the same class, but they are a little bit different from the others. I think these others are a little later in type; a little larger or different in construction,

Mr. KEARNS. Here is the question I want to ask the chairman: Why is the increase for 3 boats \$300,000 and the increase for 37 boats only \$450,000?

Mr. PADGETT. That is what I stated—those first three are near completion and the larger part of work was done when the labor cost and material cost was not so great.

Mr. KEARNS. That is just the reason why the increase ought not to be so great. You have increased here \$300,000 for 3 boats and for 37 boats, which are not as nearly completed, you only increase those \$450,000.

Mr. PADGETT. We increase the first ones \$300,000 and increase the others \$450,000.

Mr. KEARNS. But in the first class there are only 3 boats and in the next class there are 37, and the first class, containing 3 boats, are almost completed?

Mr. PADGETT. Those 37 are not as far advanced as the 3 and they were made later and the latter price is higher than the earlier price.

Mr. KEARNS. Would not one think that is just the reason why increase for the 37 boats ought to be greater, or the discrepancy greater, than that set out?

Mr. PADGETT. From 4 to 41 the increase is \$450,000 each, and in the others the increase is only from \$1,200,000 to \$1,500,000, or \$300,000 each.

Mr. KEARNS. Oh, no; you have not gotten that right.

Mr. PADGETT. Submarines Nos. 1, 2, and 3—

Mr. KEARNS. You have got an increase there of \$300,000 for those three boats that you say were contracted for when the price of materials was cheap. And you have got an increase of \$300,000 for them.

Mr. PADGETT. For each one of them.

Mr. KEARNS. The whole thing.

Mr. PADGETT. It is for each one.

Mr. KEARNS. Your bill does not say so.

Mr. PADGETT. That is the limit of cost. It says:

The limit of cost of vessels heretofore authorized and herein below enumerated are as follows.

The limit of cost on the first 3 was fixed at \$1,200,000. Now, then, on the 4 to 41 the limit of cost was fixed at \$1,300,000. They could not complete them for that. And this is simply an authorization increasing the limit of cost. It is not an appropriation. It is just simply the limit of cost on each boat from \$1,200,000 to \$1,500,000 for the 3 and \$1,300,000 for the others to \$1,750,000 each. It is just the limit of cost. It is not an appropriation, and it is only an authorization to proceed with that cost.

The Clerk read as follows:

Submarines (S) from No. 4 to No. 41, both inclusive, from \$1,300,000 to \$1,750,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bottom of page 51 to offer as an amendment the provision which was stricken out on a point of order. I will ask the gentleman if he will consent to it?

Mr. MANN. So far as I am concerned, I am willing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to return to the bottom of page 51 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 23, page 51, insert the following:

"The provision in the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes,' approved July 1, 1918, under the increase in the Navy, which reads as follows: 'but not later than June 30, 1919,' is hereby repealed."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, what is the idea of restoring that? It is really legislation.

Mr. PADGETT. The act of July 1, 1918, that was passed the 1st of July, had a mandatory provision directing the Secretary of the Navy to begin the construction of all the ships authorized in the 1916 program before June 30, 1919. This repeals that mandatory provision. There are 12 destroyers which we do not wish to build. Unless that is repealed the Secretary is urged to begin the construction of them. The nine fleet submarines they do not wish to build at this time, for the reason that we are constructing three others that are now nearing completion, and they want to get them completed and tested and carried out before they build these nine. If they had to observe this mandatory direction in the act of July 1 last they will have to begin them on the same plans and designs of the three that they are now building; but they want to wait and get the benefit of the experiments and the testing and trial of these boats before they begin those nine.

Then, there are destroyer tenders Nos. 3 and 4 that they do not want to begin the construction of, and they do not think they want to build them at all. They do not think they need them. The submarine tender No. 3 they have not begun the construction of. They do not want to begin it; they do not think they will need it, and they do not want to build it. But under this provision they are compelled to begin construction before the 30th of June.

Then they do not want to begin the construction of transport No. 2, and they do not want to begin the construction of repair ship No. 1. They do not think they will need it. During the war they converted other ships into repair ships that are serving the purpose very well and very satisfactorily, and they think they can dispense with that.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. Is there any difficulty in the disinclination on the part of the experts to begin the construction of these ships based upon the fact that they are not large enough, and that consequently they are going to quit building these small fry and seek to get authorization for 10 first-class battleships and 10 scout cruisers—something that is worthy of their efforts?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. Take the submarines, for instance. I suppose that is what you refer to?

Mr. WALSH. I am referring to the ships you have been enumerating and which the experts do not want to begin.

Mr. PADGETT. As to the 12 destroyers, we have about 330 destroyers besides these 12. They say they think they have enough for the present, and they do not want to build any more of that type. If any others are to be built they would be of a type as the result of future investigation and consideration. The nine fleet submarines I explained about. They are about between 1,100 and 1,200 tons displacement.

Mr. WALSH. Still further reserving the right to object, I suppose the members of the Committee of the Whole are justified in assuming that the message from the Chief Executive expressing the desirability of this bill being passed by the House is predicated upon the fact that this repeal was in the bill, among other things, are they not?

Mr. PADGETT. There is no relation between the two, sir.

Mr. WALSH. I was just wondering whether the President knew that in place of or in addition to authorizing him to construct a vast number of other larger ships he also knew we were going to repeal provisions made for several smaller ships and stop construction on them?

Mr. PADGETT. It only repeals that part of it directing it to be begun at this time. It still leaves it open to be begun hereafter; but, as I stated, they do not want to build any more destroyers of that type. They do not want to build these nine submarines until they have completed the three that are nearing completion, until they have tested them and tried them out, to see whether or not it would be that type or whether they would come to Congress for authorization of a different type.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state, if this repeal is enacted into law, how long will they wait before they decide whether to build these other submarines, and whom they are going to practice on to find out how they work?

Mr. PADGETT. They would test out the three that are being constructed, and then they would have to come to Congress for an appropriation to build the additional ones, if they proceeded to build them, or if they were a different type they would submit the matter to Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Chairman, we might just as well overlook this one of the many absurdities in this legislation, and I will not object.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman if there has been any loss incurred by reason of the authorization of the building of these nine fleet submarines.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand not.

Mr. HENSLEY. None whatever?

Mr. PADGETT. That is as I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have reached the question of the new program, and I would like to see if we can not—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the first paragraph read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States the President of the United States is hereby authorized to undertake prior to July 1, 1922, the construction of the vessels enumerated below.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. What is the point of order?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this is legislation, not an appropriation. It does not purport to be an appropriation. It purports to be an authorization. An authorization is a change of existing law. Rule XXI, paragraph 2, which the Chairman will have before him, provides:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress.

Of course, that paragraph of the rules does not apply to the paragraph under consideration, because the paragraph in the bill to which I made a point of order is not an appropriation. That paragraph in the rules has been construed many times, and the construction given to that paragraph probably led the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] to think that an item of authorization in the naval appropriation bill is in order, whereas the rulings are quite the reverse.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole many years ago held—and his ruling has been followed ever since—that an appropriation for a new Navy vessel of a type already in existence was an appropriation in continuation of public works and objects already in progress. The ruling was that the building up of a Navy was a public work and object in progress, and that an item of appropriation for a new ship was in order, provided there was already in the Navy a ship of that type. But it was frequently held that even an appropriation for a new ship in the naval bill—a new ship of a different type from that already in the Navy—was not in order.

However, this is not an appropriation and does not purport to be an appropriation. It appropriates no money. It merely authorizes the construction of certain ships, and the second sentence of the same rule, paragraph 2 of Rule XXI, provides:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

The exception is not claimed to be covered by anything in this bill. There is no pretense that this is a reduction of any of the expenditures of the classes named in the rule, so that the provision in the rule which says "Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order" is an absolute provision as to this paragraph. What is the paragraph?

For the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States, the President of the United States is hereby authorized to undertake, prior to July 1, 1922, the construction of the vessels enumerated below

Under the existing law the President is not authorized to provide for the construction of these vessels. The existing law gives him no such authority, and it is proposed here to change the existing law by giving him that authority. So that the provision in the bill is purely one of legislation changing existing law, contrary to the provisions of the rule of the House, and hence it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair's recollection is that the original ruling was made by Mr. Chairman McCreary, of Kentucky. The Chair has before him volume 4 of Hinds' Precedents, section 3723, page 486, and if the gentleman will permit, the Chair will read:

On February 26, 1887, the House was in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union considering the naval appropriation bill, when Mr. Joseph D. Sayers, of Texas, offered an amendment authorizing the construction of "two swift double-bottomed steel cruisers" and making an appropriation therefor.

Mr. William S. Holman, of Indiana, made the point of order that there was no law authorizing the appropriation.

After debate the Chairman cited the rule and exception, and said:

That is to say, if the work be a public work, or if the object is a public object, and it is already in progress, then there need not be any previous legislation authorizing it.

What the Chair wants to ask the gentleman from Illinois is this: Has he before him the exact law that was passed at that time?

Mr. MANN. I have not, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything additional?

Mr. MANN. I have not; but my recollection is—and it has been ruled upon many times since—that that was an appropriation for the construction of vessels theretofore not specifically authorized by law, and the point of order was that it was an appropriation not authorized by law; and the ruling was, in substance—and it has been followed many times since—that an

appropriation may be carried in the naval bill providing for the construction of new naval vessels not theretofore specifically authorized by law as a public work in progress, the recent rulings, which extend back many years, specifically holding that such an appropriation was only in order if a vessel of the same type was already in use in the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question of the type—

Mr. MANN. That is not involved here.

The CHAIRMAN. Is not involved here. Does the Chair understand it to be the contention of the gentleman from Illinois that unless an appropriation is carried along with the authorization it is subject to the point of order?

Mr. MANN. My contention is, and that has been held by the various Chairmen at different times, that you can make an appropriation for a new naval vessel, but that is all you can do. The appropriation is, hence, an authorization for the President or the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of the vessel. The appropriation itself is the authorization. But that does not provide for a change of existing law by making an appropriation. Here, for instance, where no limit of cost is fixed, we can appropriate money for building an addition to the Capitol Building if we choose to, and it is not subject to a point of order. The appropriation is not subject to a point of order because it would be held that that is an appropriation for a public work already in progress. But we could not authorize, even in the appropriation, over a point of order, specific directions as to how that work should be carried on; nor could we in the appropriation bill make an authorization merely for an addition to the Capitol over the point of order. That arises as to all public buildings. We have frequently provided for that. We did it in the case of the insane asylum out here at St. Elizabeths. We appropriated money for the purchase of additional ground adjoining the ground already there, it being held by the Chairman that that was a continuation of a public work already in existence. That is an appropriation. There is no appropriation involved here. It is merely a change of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Chair may repeat it, the language as contained in the precedent is—

Mr. MANN. The Chair will note that the point of order made was that it was an appropriation not authorized by law. That was the point of order against that item.

The CHAIRMAN. There was coupled with the language that which is in quotation, "two swift double-bottomed steel cruisers," and making an appropriation therefor.

Mr. MANN. Yes; that was the language.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the quotation ends with the word "cruisers."

Mr. MANN. That was a mere appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. No; that was an authorization and an appropriation.

Mr. MANN. Of course, an appropriation for a specific object is itself an authorization for the expenditure of the money. Any appropriation, anywhere carried, is in itself an authorization for the expenditure of the money.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but the question which is in the mind of the Chair, under the rulings—and they are very numerous—is whether the appropriation must be coupled with the authorization in order to make it in order under the precedents?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there never has been a ruling of the Chair on the naval bill which has held, if my memory serves me right, and I think it does, that even as to these battleships we could give directions as to the character of the battleship, the radius of the battleship, or anything of that kind, because that is an authorization and subject to the point of order. We can make an appropriation for the battleship, and then it is within the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy under existing law as to the expenditure of the money, the method, and form of its expenditure; but when we attempt to direct his jurisdiction, that is a change of existing law. We have the authority to make the appropriation, but not to give directions, without legislation. Of course, the Committee on Naval Affairs can bring before the House a bill at any time giving specific directions about any of these things; but the authority of an appropriation bill is to make an appropriation. The Committee on Appropriations, in bringing in the sundry civil appropriation bill, for instance, or the fortifications appropriation bill, which will soon be before the House, has no authority to give directions to the executive officers about how the money shall be expended. They may add a limitation that it may not be expended in a certain way. All they can do under the rules, over a point of order, is to make the appropriation in the hands of existing authorities available to be disposed of under existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the fact that this is an extremely important parliamentary question. The Chair

will be glad to hear from any gentleman opposed to the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with parliamentary law and do not claim to be, but I have always understood that the rulings were that it was in order on the naval appropriation bill to authorize a continuance of the construction of the ships of the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. Without making an appropriation therefor?

Mr. PADGETT. I think so, because the first year that I was upon the Naval Committee we authorized, without any appropriation at all, and it was only after I had been upon the committee for a number of years that we changed the policy and began to carry an appropriation at the time of the authorization. In those days, on account of the fact that they were not ready with their plans and their specifications, we made the authorization one year and voted the initial appropriation the succeeding year. That was the practice for a number of years and was the practice at the time of this decision.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. We always provided for the plans the first year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. It has always been there, and the argument of the gentleman that you can make an appropriation for battleships, but that the House can not authorize battleships, is a logic that I confess I am unable to follow.

Mr. MANN. I made no such argument as that. The House can authorize battleships, but the question is whether it can do it in this way or not.

Mr. PADGETT. This provision here is merely an authorization to build battleships and scout cruisers. The wording of it is nothing else. The substance of it is nothing else except authorization to build 10 battleships and 10 scout cruisers, and the committee prescribes the type, and that is contained in the citation which the Chairman made there. It said "two swift double-bottomed steel cruisers." It does purport to indicate and to direct and to prescribe the characteristics of the ship, and if it was in order to prescribe it to a limited extent, it is in order to prescribe it in a more enlarged sense.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is what is troubling the mind of the Chair at the present moment: Whether you can make an authorization without expressly carrying with it an appropriation to carry out that authorization. In the case in which Mr. Chairman McCreery ruled an authorization was made and there was carried with it an appropriation. The Chair does not now recall any other rulings that have been made when any case was presented in which the authorization was not accompanied at the time by an appropriation.

Mr. PADGETT. As I stated, we did that for years. I do not know whether a point of order was made against it, or whether it was ever passed upon, but it seems to me that Congress can authorize an enlargement of its naval building program in a naval appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that under the precedents, if the authorization carries an appropriation, there would be no question about it. The precedents are that way, whatever might be the Chair's individual opinion; but where it is an authorization without an appropriation, then it raises a pretty serious question in the mind of the Chair.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I thrust myself into this discussion reluctantly, because I know the Chairman to be an expert parliamentarian and that he has the precedents before him, has given this matter careful consideration, and I have not, because I have just entered the Hall.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that the point of order came as a surprise to him, and therefore he has not given it his consideration.

Mr. CRISP. I am familiar with decisions, and so is the Chairman, to the effect that it is in order on the naval appropriation bill to appropriate for the construction of new vessels on the ground that it is in continuation of a public object already in existence. It is not necessary for me to cite the Chair to those decisions. They can be found under section 823 of the manual.

The point of order is against certain provisions in the bill which provides a new building program. It provides for the construction of a number of vessels. I understand the point of order of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois to be that the provisions in the bill do not carry any appropriation for the construction of any of these vessels, but simply authorizes their construction. If I am correct in stating the contention, it seems to me that the point is not well founded, because the greater always includes the lesser, and if it is in order to legis-

late on an appropriation bill by making an appropriation for the construction of vessels for the Navy, it seems to me clearly that it would be in order to also legislate by making an authorization for the construction of vessels.

The latter part of the bill giving the building program is clearly a limitation. The limitation simply provides that this program shall not be put in operation upon the happening of certain contingencies, and I am of the opinion under the precedents that the provision in the bill is in order on the ground that it is providing for the continuation of a public work already authorized, to wit, the Navy of the United States.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia is a distinguished parliamentarian, and I think I would take his judgment if he would examine that matter. I would take his judgment if he was the parliamentarian in the chair, but we are controlled by the rules of the House. The rules of the House provide that no appropriation shall be in order unless in continuation of appropriation for such public works and objects as are already in progress. That is what lets in the appropriation for new naval vessels; but the ruling is confined solely to the Navy. It does not let in new lighthouse vessels or new revenue-cutter vessels, because it is a specific work confined to the Navy.

Now, the language of the rule refers only to an appropriation in continuation of a public work. My friend from Georgia says that the greater includes the lesser. While the rule provides that you can make an appropriation, and there you stop, you can not change the law and make an authorization, because making an authorization for a new naval vessel is a change of existing law.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. I want to present this thought, and ask the gentleman's opinion. The crux of the whole matter is in the legislation—

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. CRISP. Obnoxious to the rule, not in order on an appropriation bill unless it comes within the excepted clause.

Mr. MANN. There is no legislation that comes within this excepted clause except making an appropriation. Of course there are a number of excepted clauses, but they are not applicable here.

Mr. CRISP. We are dealing solely with this appropriation. It seemed to me that here was legislation, an exception to the rule in order on an appropriation bill, not confined to an appropriation bill, for the continuation of a public object.

Mr. MANN. I know; but the rule does not say that you let in legislation in continuation of a public work. The rule says you let in an appropriation in continuation of a public work, and the next sentence says, "Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order except," and so forth. That is a specific prohibition of legislation changing existing law. It says "an appropriation in continuation of a public work."

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Crisp], who evidently has hastily looked at this without stopping to examine the rule, seems to be of the opinion that the authority to make the appropriation would include the authority to make the legislation. Very likely that would be true if it was not for the rule of the House. The rule of the House, in express language, prohibits the legislation. It authorizes an appropriation, and it is in order now, if this goes out on a point of order, for the gentleman from Tennessee to offer an amendment to appropriate the money necessary for the construction of these naval ships as a continuation of a public work already in progress. But, after all, we are supposed to fairly well live up to the rules of the House. There has been no precedent which held that an authorization in a naval bill for the construction of new vessels as a mere authorization was not subject to the point of order; there have been repeated holdings that the items were subject to the point of order. It is true that the mere making of an appropriation itself is an authorization to expend it. It is not a change of existing law, except to the extent that it makes the appropriation; but the rule expressly providing under the construction of prior chairmen that you can make an appropriation for a new naval vessel as a continuation of a public work already in progress, but that you can not change existing law by a provision in the bill or by an amendment, this item is clearly subject to the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Is not this language the same as has been used in all of them, to authorize the President to do this? Have we not used it time out of mind?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I can recall, without specifically being able to locate the place, where the whole item in a naval bill of this sort went out on a point of order, and then was

succeeded by an appropriation which was in order. It is true that as a rule no point of order was made on the increase in the Navy, because there are limitations which everyone desires to have in there if the appropriation is made. That does not affect the right of a Member to enforce the rules of the House. No one can tell what will follow this provision in the bill—

The construction of vessels enumerated below.

One can offer anything under that in the way of an amendment if that language stays in the bill. The Committee on Naval Affairs can not determine what the House or the Committee of the Whole will do, and if that provision stays in the bill they may amend it to include anything which would be germane to a naval appropriation bill.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LITTLE. Suppose the Committee on Military Affairs should bring in something like this, authorizing the President before a certain time to erect 10 fortifications, to cost \$200,000 each, at any place he designated, or suppose the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee should bring in a provision authorizing him to erect 10 post offices at a certain time, at \$20,000 each, wherever he should direct, would those be permissible?

The CHAIRMAN. While that is a parliamentary inquiry in a way, that is not before the committee now, and the Chair does not think the gentleman should expect the Chair to answer that question. That which is now engaging the attention of the Chair is a point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman has put this in the form of a question?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear any argument that the gentleman desires to submit.

Mr. LITTLE. I thought perhaps the Chair, with his familiarity with the subject, might be able to put his finger on a decision of that kind, which I can not, but I want to say this: It must be very clear that unless the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee can do that, unless the Committee on Military Affairs can do that, this is certainly new legislation and has no place here.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, it is with much hesitation, after this question has been discussed by such distinguished parliamentarians as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] that I venture to add a word, and I shall speak very briefly, indeed. It is important to consider this question at its beginning. It is a familiar rule that an appropriation not authorized is subject to a point of order in an appropriation bill. It is equally familiar that a mere authorization in an appropriation bill is subject to a point of order. I do not, therefore, regard it as at all important whether the appropriation and the authorization are joined. To my mind the paragraph would be equally subject to the point of order in either case, because the rule refers to authorizations previously made and not authorizations made in the bill. Here we have this program authorized for the first time. The Naval Committee is practically estopped from saying this is not the first authorization that has ever been made for the purpose of justifying the appropriations. One of two things is certain—either it was authorized before or it is authorized for the first time now. But I assume the Naval Committee will not claim any prior authorization.

If it had been authorized before, it would be admissible to make simply an appropriation. Without that authorization the paragraph is not in order at all and might just as well go out. But the Naval Committee evidently did not take that view of the case. They considered that they must make an authorization here and now, and consequently they have authorized this program for the first time. It has never before been authorized, and, in my judgment, it is subject to the point of order.

I wish to call the attention of the Chair that the ruling made by Chairman McCreary is said by Mr. Hinds to be very exceptional, and in a footnote to his citation of the decision he says in effect that if carried to its logical conclusion it would do away with the salutary provisions of Rule XXI. Other Chairmen in ruling later have invariably declined to broaden the decision of McCreary.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to add a word. The Chair is exactly right in saying that the pivotal point here is whether or not the decisions the Chair has cited holding that an authorization is justified, when coupled with an appropriation, are sufficient to carry an authorization alone. I hardly see how there can be much question in the mind of the Chair for this reason: The language of the rule applies to appropriations. An authorization and an appropriation at the same time are no greater, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has

well said, than the appropriation alone. In other words, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] well said, the lesser is swallowed up in the greater. An appropriation which includes an authorization is, therefore, within the rule, and if an authorization is made at the same time as an appropriation it is within the rule; but the Chair must find some authority for holding that the rule which says that an appropriation of this character is justified would include an authorization alone, and that, I think, the Chairman can not find.

I want to call attention just in that connection to this fact: It must be clear to the Chair that this is a change of existing law. We already have adopted as a part of our statutory law a certain naval program which this changes. We adopt a new and distinct law; it is a change, therefore, in existing law, and a serious and fundamental change.

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

Mr. TOWNER. If the gentleman will just pardon me for a moment I will. I want to call attention to the language in connection with the provision on page 54, which, it seems to me, must be considered in connection with this proposed adoption of a program, because it is a limitation of the program and therefore interprets the program. You certainly could not find a point of order which would not lie to this provision. Just let me call your attention to it.

If at any time before the construction authorized by this act shall have been contracted for, there shall have been established with the cooperation of the United States of America any tribunal or tribunals competent to secure peaceful determination of international disputes, and which shall render unnecessary the maintenance of competitive armaments, then and in that case such naval expenditure as may be inconsistent with the engagements made by the establishments of said tribunal or tribunals may be suspended when so ordered by the President of the United States, and no contracts for the construction of vessels herein authorized shall be entered into prior to February 1, 1920.

Could the Chair find that this was not new legislation? Could the Chair for a moment doubt that that provision would be subject to the point of order when taken in connection—and it must be taken in connection—with the provision we have under consideration, which is the adoption of a new program different from existing law? How can the Chair hold or for a moment entertain the idea that this does not change existing law? I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WINGO. Let me submit this to the gentleman: If the gentleman contends there is a limit under existing law to the construction of the Navy, then the contention of the gentleman from Illinois that an appropriation would be in order would fall. The basis upon which the Chairmen have heretofore held that an appropriation in the specific instance of two double-bottom steel cruisers upon which the question was raised in 1887, if the gentleman's contention is correct that there is a limit, then the reason for that ruling falls, because that decision was bottomed upon the specific statement of the Chair that there was no limitation of existing law on the construction of the Navy, but that the Navy as a whole must be considered as a continuing project; and for that reason an appropriation added to that construction by adding two double-bottomed steel cruisers was a continuation of the present existing progressive work, so if the contention that the three-year program specifically put a limitation upon the construction of the United States Navy is correct then you could not have an appropriation.

Mr. TOWNER. There is this which the gentleman does not take into consideration. The principle on which that decision was made with regard to the steel cruisers was that it was an appropriation and therefore within the rules.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman will permit me to read the statement upon which the Chair predicated—

Mr. TOWNER. I can not take the time to go into that more particularly.

Mr. WINGO. Very well; I will.

Mr. TOWNER. The language as stated here is very clear. In the case referred to it was not only an authorization but an appropriation, and as I tried to explain when an appropriation and authorization is made at the same time it is clear that it is an appropriation and comes under the provisions of the rule. That is not the case in this instance.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to say whether as contended an appropriation, would include an authorization, upon the principle of the greater including the less. The language of the rule says that an appropriation shall not be in order in a general appropriation bill unless in continuation of an appropriation for such public works and objects as are already in progress. The rulings that have been made allowing appropriations for additional ships in a naval bill carry the implication that the authorization has already been made for a continuing work, and the new ships appropriated for, are therefore really under an existing authoriza-

tion. But it is not necessary in this connection, it seems to me, to determine the question of authorization.

Mr. Chairman, there is another very material question to be considered and that is whether the whole matter on page 51 of the bill, and part of page 52, is not really one paragraph. The language from line 1 on page 51 down to line 16, page 52, is evidently one proposition, and should be considered as such.

The point of order should be considered as applying to the entire paragraph, and if there is any part of it that is not in order, of course under the rule, with which you are as familiar as anyone, the whole of the paragraph is out of order. If you look to the different sentences you will note that with reference to each one of these appropriations there is found this language at the conclusion of the sentence:

To be begun as soon as practicable, subject to the limitations herein.

As I have said this proposition is a concrete whole, and to be considered as such. It has been suggested, and I do not know whether that suggestion was intended to apply to the whole, or some part of the paragraph, that the language on page 52 is a limitation. I submit that this language can not possibly be a limitation, for the following reason.

A limitation is a negative inhibition upon the application of money. There are various illustrations of limitations:

A limitation must apply solely to the money of the appropriation under consideration, and may not be made applicable to money appropriated in other acts.

A limitation may not be applied directly to the official functions of executive officers, but may restrict executive discretion so far as this may be done by a simple negative on the use of the appropriation. (House Manual, p. 368.)

There are many familiar illustrations on that line. Then, again, on page 369 of the rules we find these decisions:

The fact that a provision would constitute legislation for only a year does not make it a limitation in order under the rule.

Nor may a proposition to construe a law be admitted. A limitation may withhold money from part of a designated purpose while appropriating for the remainder of it.

The language of the bill on the second page which is made a part of the propositions on the preceding page, remits the uses of the money to the discretion of an executive official. If an appropriation is made, it is not permitted to say that it shall be applied, or not applied, in his discretion by the executive officer, and undertake to denominate that authority in the officer, a limitation, yet that is precisely what is done here.

If you will look at page 52, you will find the following language:

If at any time before the construction authorized by this act shall have been contracted for there shall have been established with the cooperation of the United States of America any tribunal or tribunals competent to secure peaceful determination of international disputes, and which shall render unnecessary the maintenance of competitive armaments, then and in that case such naval expenditure as may be inconsistent with the engagements made by the establishment of said tribunal or tribunals may be suspended when so ordered by the President of the United States.

Now, that language remits to the determination of the executive officer the interpretation of some complicated arrangements, hereafter to be made, and if in his discretion, he construes those undertakings to carry a certain meaning, then the money which is hereby appropriated is not to be expended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman to insist that the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] on the first paragraph, at the top of page 53, can not be considered except in connection with any point of order that might be made to the paragraph?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. How can it be restricted to the following lines?

For the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States, the President of the United States is hereby authorized to undertake prior to July 1, 1922, the construction of the vessels enumerated below.

Standing alone this authorizes nothing.

At the end of these words is a colon, and then follow the items, each one referring to the limitation. I take it that it must be fairly considered that there is one concrete, comprehensive proposition presented in the language found on the page and a half to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN. And even if that point of order was sustained—I mean, when that paragraph is reached—of course, technically the Chair can not look ahead, even when that paragraph is reached, and if the point of order is made and it should be sustained, it would still leave some legislation here which would be entirely intelligent?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly. But what I am suggesting in this connection is that the selected words are not in the usual sense a paragraph, because all of this matter is related and lead together into one whole. If you look on page 51, line 9, you will see the language:

To be begun as soon as practicable, subject to the limitations herein.

It is not a positive direction to proceed, but a limited direction. The sentence has no independent meaning and to understand it, you must look to the conclusion of the paragraph. Therefore I maintain that this page and a half of matter is really a paragraph presenting a single, distinct proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule. This point of order came, the Chair will be frank to state, unexpectedly to the Chair, and he regrets that he has not had more opportunity to give closer study of it than he has had. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes the point of order upon the first paragraph at the top of page 53, which reads:

For the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States the President of the United States is hereby authorized to undertake, prior to July 1, 1922, the construction of the vessels enumerated below.

The point of order, as the Chair understands, is generally that that constitutes legislation upon an appropriation bill, which is not in order under the general rules of the House. Of course, all gentlemen are familiar in a general way with what has been the procedure upon naval appropriation bills with reference to the increases provided. The Chair stated in the beginning of the discussion that his recollection was that the first ruling was one made by Mr. Chairman James B. McCreary, of Kentucky, and, in so far as time has permitted for a hasty examination, the Chair was correct in his recollection.

Now, the Chair reads from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Forty-ninth Congress, second session:

On February 26, 1887, the naval appropriation bill being under consideration, the Clerk read as follows:

"INCREASE OF THE NAVY.

"For expenditure toward the construction and completion (exclusive of armament) of the five double-turreted monitors, the four vessels authorized by the act of March 3, 1885, and the vessels authorized by the act of August 3, 1886, \$2,500,000."

Mr. SAYERS. I move, after line 875, to insert the following:

The Clerk read as follows:
"For the construction of two swift double-bottomed steel cruisers, each of about 4,300 tons displacement, of the type of the *Newark*, except boilers and machinery, four of about 1,700 tons displacement of the type of gunboat No. 1, each, and one swift torpedo boat, said vessels to cost altogether, exclusive of armament, not more than \$4,950,000, the sum of \$2,470,000 is hereby appropriated."

To that Mr. Holman, of Indiana, made the point of order. It was argued by Mr. Herbert, of Alabama, and by other gentlemen, and at the conclusion of the argument Mr. Chairman McCreary ruled as follows, after citing the rule, which was the same then as it is now—that is, "no appropriation shall be reported on," and so on:

That is to say, if the work be a public work, or if the object is a public object and it is already in progress, then there need not be any previous legislation authorizing it.

The Chair thinks that means to authorize an appropriation. However, I proceed:

The Chair believes that the construction of a navy is a public object or public work, and the language of the bill which we have been considering and the appropriation made at the last session show that the construction of the Navy is in progress. It may be said also that the proposed amendment providing money for the construction of vessels does not change existing law and is not prohibited by law.

It is very agreeable to the present occupant of the chair to be able to refer to a precedent bearing upon the point of order now raised. In the Forty-sixth Congress (Mr. Carlisle in the chair) it was decided "that appropriations for public works and objects" already in progress could be included in general appropriation bills or could be inserted as amendments, and that the word "objects" meant something in addition to the word "works," and must be held to include the public departments of the Government and the civil, military, and naval establishments recognized by law and supported by the Government.

The Government has undertaken to maintain, and is annually maintaining, a naval establishment, and under the rule appropriations may be made for it in a general appropriation bill, and such has always been the practice until last session, when appropriations for the construction of ships for the Navy and armaments for them were made in a separate bill. Before the last session such appropriations were made in the naval appropriation bill under the rule exactly as it now is.

There is no law prescribing the number of ships that shall constitute the Navy or the number of guns they shall carry. Those matters depend entirely on the amount of money appropriated for those purposes, just as the number of clerks and other employees in the departments depend upon the appropriations made. * * * This decision allows an important amendment to be offered, but it gives to the Committee of the Whole the right to pass upon this interesting question and an opportunity to say whether it is in favor of increasing the Navy or not.

Bear in mind that that decision apparently is predicated absolutely upon "appropriations." There is another decision. I read:

On May 17, 1902, the naval appropriation bill being under consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, raised the question of order that the following paragraph involved a change of law:

That the appointment of 500 additional cadets at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., under such detailed rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe, is hereby authorized, such appointments to be made as follows:

The debate proceeded, so that the matter did not come to a decision until May 19, 1902, two days later. It was then further debated, and the Chairman, Mr. James S. Sherman, of New York, held:

The Chair does think that it is the duty of the Chairman to decide points of order as they appear and to disregard entirely his individual hopes and desires in reference to the subject matter under consideration. And the present occupant of the chair has always been so guided in deciding points of order. On more than one occasion he has been obliged to rule against his inclinations and desires. The Chair also thinks it is the duty of Members of the committee and the House to sustain the Chair when they believe he is right. The Chair thinks there have been occasions when that has not been followed.

The ruling in reference to the construction of a battleship is one which the present occupant of the chair has heretofore followed, although he did not originally make it, and is frank to say that, although he has great respect and regard for the gentleman who did make it, he doubts, if he had been in the chair when the question arose, if he would have made it. He has never been in sympathy with it. But that was a provision to increase the number of battleships when the number was not specifically defined by statute.

Likewise, so far as the Chair has been able to ascertain from a hurried reading and inspection of the statutes, there was no specific provision as to the number of seamen. Both of these questions, then, were decided upon the broader ground, whether or not it was increasing the general Naval Establishment.

In the case now presented there is a statute, section 1513, which reads:

"There shall be allowed at said academy 1 cadet midshipman for every Member and Delegate of the House of Representatives, 1 for the District of Columbia, and 10 appointed annually at large."

There is a specific, general statutory provision as to the number of cadets at the Naval Academy. The amendment to which the gentleman from Alabama has raised the point of order changes the number of cadets and changes existing law, which is clearly and unequivocally against the provision of the rule, section 2 of Rule XXI, which provides: "Nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order on any general appropriation bill." The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

There is a reason for the rule which prevents legislation upon appropriation bills, else that rule would not have been continued through all these long years. The reason is obvious. By attaching legislation to appropriation bills necessary and vital to the existence of the Government—I mean appropriations necessary and vital to the existence of the Government—gentlemen may be compelled to vote against their deliberate judgment. That is to say, they may be compelled to vote for legislation to which they are opposed or else let the Government starve. Therefore the present occupant of the chair feels that from the parliamentary standpoint it would be unwise to broaden the rule beyond the point to which it has already been broadened. In the case which was ruled upon by Mr. Chairman McCreary the authorization and appropriation went hand in hand. That which was proposed in the amendment offered by Mr. Sayers was a proposition to make the ships provided for in that amendment an immediate and tangible part of the Naval Establishment, being appropriated for in that particular bill, and hence it was held to be a continuing public work.

The proposition involved in this bill, to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has made his point of order, is to authorize a program for the future, not connected with any immediate program and not making any appropriations therefor. It seems to the Chair that that is making an extension of the rule that ought not to be made, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in lieu of the paragraph stricken out on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the paragraph stricken out insert the following:

"For the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States, the President of the United States is hereby authorized to undertake, prior to July 1, 1922, the construction of 10 first-class battleships, carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessel of their class, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action; two of these at a cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$21,000,000 each, to be begun as soon as practicable, and 10 scout cruisers, carrying suitable protection and armament suited to their size and type, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action; two to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$8,000,000 each, to be begun as soon as practicable, subject to the limitations herein; and the sum of \$5,000,000 is hereby appropriated toward the construction thereof."

Mr. MANN. I make a point of order against that.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I make the point of order against that. It has been covered by the principles just announced by the Chair.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think so. I think it complies with the principles announced by the Chair. It makes an appropriation and continues the type of ship we have.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that falls within the ruling just made.

Mr. PADGETT. In what respect?

The CHAIRMAN. It provides for further construction.

Mr. PADGETT. This has always been held in order.

The CHAIRMAN. It provides for construction that is not carried in any other part of the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. The new construction on the naval bill has always been something that was not authorized theretofore, and the amendment held in order by Mr. McCreary was for ships not authorized. It has always been held in order to include new ships.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee is confused a little, I think, by the fact that the point of order has not been made heretofore upon a good many paragraphs in naval bills.

Mr. PADGETT. But points of order have been made and ruled on a number of times.

Mr. MANN. Yes; and wherever they have been made and ruled on, on a proposition like this, the point of order has been sustained. I think there is no exception to that. Now, the gentleman proposes to try to evade the ruling of the Chair by adding an appropriation of \$5,000,000, but the provision of the amendment is legislation just as much now as it was before. It is to authorize the President to construct these ships. The gentleman can offer an amendment appropriating \$5,000,000 for the construction of these ships, and it will not be subject to a point of order. He can offer an amendment appropriating \$250,000,000 for the construction of these ships and it will not be subject to the point of order. But he does not want to do that. He does not want to make the appropriation, which is in order. He wants to make the authorization, which is a change of law and is not in order.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say just a word in connection with the point of order. I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] failed to catch the basic principle running through the ruling just made by the Chair, which was that where there was an existing authorization, and with respect to that the House chose to make appropriations for ships that could be regarded as a part of a continuing program, such appropriations would be in order. But this is a case in which there is an additional, supplementary authorization having reference to the future, and merely by offering an appropriation in connection with the appropriation the gentleman from Tennessee seems to think that he can overcome the ruling against a new authorization. The fact that the authorization is coupled with an appropriation, does not render the former any the less an authorization. If rules forbid you to begin with an authorization, and then follow the same with an appropriation, that difficulty can not be overcome by coupling the authorization and the appropriation in one paragraph. The real difficulty is in the authorization, which is new legislation. There would be no difficulty, if the amendment proposed a simple appropriation, but the gentleman has tied up an authorization with an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it would be inconsistent with the prior ruling—which ruling may have been wrong—if he did not now sustain the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ten first-class battleships, carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessels of their class, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action; two of these at a cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$21,000,000 each, to be begun as soon as practicable, subject to the limitations herein.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in lieu of the matter stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PADGETT: Before line 11, on page 53, insert:

"Toward the construction of 10 first-class battleships carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessels of their class, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action, \$2,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] desire recognition?

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask for recognition later.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph provides for the construction of 10 battleships, 2 of which are to cost \$21,000,000 each. There is no indication what the other 8 are to cost, and we propose now to appropriate \$2,000,000 toward a construction program involving the expenditure of

\$210,000,000. Does anyone believe that the gentleman from Tennessee is in earnest; that he is sincere; that he believes that we should enter upon a program involving the expenditure of \$210,000,000 with an appropriation of only \$2,000,000? It looks as if the gentleman was seeming to throw sand in the gasoline, to hoodwink the public, to pretend to increase the Navy when there is no such attempt being made. Let us be on the square with the people and take them into our confidence, and let them understand what we mean, and tell them whether we are for an increase of the Navy or whether we are not; tell them whether the proposition that we have before us is intended to influence action at another place; tell them whether we need more battleships to care for the interests of America, and if we do, let us appropriate the money to build the ships.

It looks to me as if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee was intended to deceive the public. This Congress, above all things, should not undertake to do that at this period of American history. There is no need for the construction of additional battleships. The committee has said so in its report. They did not propose to build any battleships until 1922, and now, when the House under the rule has decided that the proposal brought in by the committee was not in order, the gentleman seeks to befog the issue further by pretending to increase the size of the Navy while it only offers to appropriate \$2,000,000 to carry out the \$210,000,000 program. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will not prevail.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, it always fills me with a great deal of pleasure to hear the war horses of the Republican side of the House ask us to take the American public into our confidence. If the Republicans, who so recently went through a bitter campaign, had taken the American people into their confidence, the American people would have looked for the kind of tactics that have been adopted here to-day. Every man on that side of the House knows that the Republican Party has for more than a generation fought and clamored for an increase of the American Navy, and every man on that side of the House—

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the amendment.

Mr. CALDWELL. I am answering the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

Mr. CALDWELL. I know it is rather disquieting to the gentleman from Illinois, with his warm Republican proclivities, to have anyone tell the American people how they feel about this.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to say that it is very embarrassing to this side of the House to have the gentleman from New York reflect on the Republican Party the way he is doing. Every Republican feels chastened by what the gentleman says. [Laughter.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Under those circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I will say nothing more. [Laughter.]

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia has rightly stated that none of this so-called appropriation should be considered without considering the paragraph on page 54, which has been read. That paragraph says, practically, that this sum is appropriated for an increase of the Navy unless England agrees to reduce her Navy, and it can not be read in any other way. It says that if, before the construction has been contracted for, there has been established a tribunal to secure peaceful determination of international disputes which shall render unnecessary the maintenance of competitive armament, then the construction of these vessels may be suspended. This means nothing else than that we tell our friends, the allies, whose navy has been our protection during this war, which has aided in protecting our soldiers as they went abroad, and our people at home and at sea—it says that unless our allies agree to go into a league, which, I believe, the United States has no power to do and which, at any rate, would be a matter of treaty with which this House has nothing to do—that unless this be done, we will build ships. If this appropriation had been made in a different form, I should have supported it. If it had said that we will build these ships if England is unable to build them and that we will help her out, I might stand for it; but to say to our allies that we will build ships unless she agrees to reduce her armament is in itself a threat in which the Congress of the United States should not join, and I therefore shall support any motion to strike out that sort of an appropriation. If we had the means and it was an appropriation to build any amount of naval vessels, I would favor it. We may not be able to build them or feel ourselves able to do

so absolutely, but in its present form I will never insult our allies by voting for any such appropriation. [Applause.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I am not a jingo, and I am sure my colleagues would acquit me of the charge of being a militarist. I have no desire to involve my country in a war with Great Britain or France or Italy or Japan. And yet, Mr. Chairman, from what little reading I have done of the history of the world I know there is no such thing as permanent friendships between nations.

France furnished us with the power that enabled us to win the Revolution, and yet within a few years we were at swords' points with the land of Lafayette. We are an English-speaking people, and yet Great Britain has threatened our interests oftener and more seriously than all the other nations of the earth combined. That is merely a matter of history with which every Member of the House is familiar.

I have not had the honor of being permitted to read the President's telegram to the Secretary of the Navy. I am not in the President's confidence, but, Mr. Chairman, I have some well-defined views concerning the attitude that I believe my country should take at this time.

I believe that this war will have been fought in vain unless we secure an agreement between the great powers that have won the war, looking to military and naval disarmament. [Applause.] I believe that our representatives at the Paris conference should say to the representatives of the allies there assembled that the American people do not desire to enter into a race with the nations of the earth to see which one can construct the most powerful navy, but that the American people are determined that never again shall it be said by friend or foe that America's interest and honor must be defended by the navy of another nation. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to vote for the proposition that the United States will enter into an understanding with our friends on the other side, either through a league of nations or in some other way, by which the armaments of the earth may be reduced, and I am prepared now to frankly and fairly say to our friends that unless some such agreement can be made the United States proposes to build a Navy which will be so strong in every particular that no nation on the face of God's earth can with safety invade the waters of the Western Hemisphere with hostile intent. [Applause.]

I do not know, as I said before, what was in the President's mind when he sent the telegram to Secretary Daniels, but I hope that there was something of that kind in his mind.

The statesmen of Europe are taking care of the interests of their own people. We have in Paris to-day a delegation from Great Britain safeguarding British interests. We have a delegation from France safeguarding French interests. We have a delegation from America, and I believe that delegation is safeguarding American interests.

That delegation is headed by the President of the United States—not the Democratic President of the United States, not the Republican President of the United States. To-day Woodrow Wilson represents all of the people of the United States; and without meaning to question any man's patriotism, I firmly believe that posterity will view with surprise the spectacle of American statesmen becking and seeking to embarrass the President of the United States, who has carried democracy's message to Europe. [Applause.]

I believe that in all the essentials which he has laid down in Paris, Mr. Wilson speaks for 90 per cent of the American citizens. I believe that he speaks for Republicans as well as for Democrats. I believe that the people of this country, without regard to party, want Mr. Wilson to bring about a state of affairs which will enable us to do away with militarism for all time; and I believe that the American people want us, as their representatives here, to strengthen his hands. I hope that on both sides of the aisle we will get votes for this amendment and thus notify the world that we have wholeheartedly responded to the appeal that the President has sent to this country asking us to sustain him in the negotiations which he is carrying on on the other side. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by striking out the figures "\$2,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "\$210,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the figures "\$2,000,000" in the Padgett amendment and insert "\$210,000,000."

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that a few gentlemen exhibit smiles upon their countenances as this amendment is read from the Clerk's desk. I want to say,

to you that I have offered it in all seriousness. I am not bluffing. I mean business. I remember years ago, when the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Hobson, and myself were the only two Members of the House who voted for six battleships, the only two who voted for five battleships, and for four, and on down. We used to get a few more for three and a majority usually voted for two. We have not been carrying the program of two battleships per year for the last eight years. We have fallen materially behind in that program. If we build the 10 battleships here authorized, we would just about make up for the deficiencies in these last eight years. We will just about have the Navy that we would have had had we kept to the two-battleship program throughout that time. As a strong believer, therefore, in a big Navy, I believe in making this appropriation outright, and to build the 10 battleships.

If some one suggests that perhaps in the near future an agreement at the peace table may result in disarmament, let me answer that by the statement that that agreement will certainly come early enough so that this appropriation can be repealed if necessary before a dollar of it is expended. We are doing one of two things, either we are bluffing or we mean business. It seems to me that it is not compatible with the dignity of the Congress or the American people to bluff. If, however, it is the consensus of opinion in the hearts of mankind, as reflected at the peace table in Paris, that the nations of the world should disarm, and that sentiment receives my cordial approval, then we can stop our program, but let us say now to the world that the American people to-day mean business, that we are going to build this Navy and have started to do it, and will carry the program out unless the other nations of the world agree with us to disarm.

There is no nation in this world to-day that needs a great navy like the United States, and I have in mind the great need of the British Empire and the great need of Japan. No other nation in the world has so great a coast line. No other nation in the world has thousands of miles on both the Atlantic and the Pacific, and even touching equatorial waters. Everybody conversant with the military condition of the United States knows that with the present Navy we can not defend the Panama Canal. The one problem that remains unsolved by our military authorities up to this very hour is, with our Military and Naval Establishments how to defend the Panama Canal, and this even though the attack be from a secondary power. If we have not learned a lesson during the past four years, then we never can learn. I have no faith that general disarmament will occur. I do not believe it will take place, and I doubt that there is a Member of this House who really believes it will come now, although it undoubtedly will some day. While we are in the condition that the world now finds itself in, let us go about building a United States Navy just as Theodore Roosevelt said it should be built 20 years ago. Let us build it so that it will be a great arm for America's defense the world over. Our interests extend into the Pacific to a great distance, they extend into equatorial waters, and they extend into the Arctic area to Alaska.

If we are to reap anything like our proper share of the world's commerce our ships will sail the seven seas of the world. If they are to receive the protection which is their due and which they must have we must have a great Navy. I confess to you that \$2,000,000 does not mean business. Two million dollars is playing with a great, great principle. Let us make an appropriation adequate and commensurate with the purpose of building these 10 great battleships. I believe they will be needed in America's defense, and if perchance disarmament is agreed upon within the next six months or a year, then we can withdraw the appropriation; but until the nations of the world do that, let us keep our faces set forward and build these ships, and build them fast. We know not the hour when an adversary will appear. We know not who that adversary will be. It behooves us to be prepared for any adversary, and this requires sea power, covering both the Atlantic and Pacific. I believe the needs of our country require a large naval construction program and that every earnest and thoughtful American can support it.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota. The gentleman says that he offers his amendment in good faith, in sincerity and not as a bluff, yet the gentleman says that if arrangements are effected by the peace conference providing for a less armament than we would need otherwise, that we can then repeal this provision that he would introduce. Gentlemen, the peace conference is in session now. We will know within a reasonable time what they accomplish in regard to these great matters, and to pass this now, in view of what has come before this House, would, in my judgment, be considered by all the delegates at the peace conference as a pure, gigantic bluff, and

nothing more. The whole trouble with this proposition of offering an increase in the Navy provided by this amendment and as provided in the portion of the bill that was declared out of order has been due to the fact that the Committee on Naval Affairs have come into this House advocating this proposition not with facts and figures that justify it, not with the arguments that ought to appeal to the Members of Congress in appropriating or authorizing large appropriations of money, but they have come in here and said they are doing it for one reason, and that was because the President at the peace table had cabled here to the Secretary of the Navy, in effect, that he would be greatly embarrassed in his negotiations if we did not pass this portion of the bill. Now, Mr. Chairman, we ought not to legislate in that fashion. We ought to provide money to start the building of these battleships. We ought to authorize it if it is to the best interest of the country, regardless of any other thing. We ought not to vote here like a mere lot of puppets because the President says it will aid him in the negotiations at the peace table.

It may not mean anything else or it may mean that he wants to use it as a weapon, but I do not believe that we ought to resort to that kind of legislation. This proposition has been presented and, upon a point of order made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the able Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union said it was not in order upon this bill. Now, the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, no doubt angry at the fact it has gone out, is now trying to embarrass all of us in putting it in here in piecemeal in a slipshod fashion. I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota because I do not believe it was offered in sincerity, and I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee because I do not believe that that has been offered in sincerity.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I will.

Mr. CALDWELL. Would the gentleman vote for a rule making the provision which was ruled out on the point of order in order so as to give the House an opportunity to vote upon this question?

Mr. DYER. I am perfectly willing myself; yes, ready and willing, to go on record now on this proposition, and if I had the opportunity I would vote against it, because, in my judgment, it has not been brought into this House with sincerity and honesty of purpose. I believe it has been offered in here for one purpose only, and that was because the President cabled in answer to the Secretary of the Navy that he would need it. No facts or figures were presented here showing the necessity of it, and while I followed the President during the war and voted for a lot of things I did not think we ought to vote for, yet I did it because he was the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and I wanted to follow him as such, but now that the war is over I propose, as best I can, to use my own judgment and not be dictated to by the executive departments of the Government saying we must or should follow him without facts or figures.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel so much concerned about seeing this bill defeated, now that the distinguished chairman of the Committee of the Whole has sustained the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], provided, of course, that the provisions which were just knocked out of the bill will be kept out. I pause here to say that I desire to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, the present occupant of the Chair, upon the clearness and soundness of his ruling. It does him great credit, in view of the difficulties with which he was confronted, not only in a parliamentary sense, but otherwise.

I am against the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee [Mr. PADGETT], and it follows, of course, that I am also against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], although I apprehend that his amendment will not be taken seriously.

Now, with regard to that famous cablegram from the President, I have not been taken into the confidence of the chairman of the committee and have been groping around as best I could to find out just what it all means and how it originated. My first understanding was that the President volunteered to cable Congress that they must approve this huge naval program that is proposed by the committee. After a good many of us had expressed our indignation on that assumption, lo, and behold, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] announced to the House to-day that it originated with the Secretary of the Navy, who asked the President to send the cable that he did send. A little later in the session to-day the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CURRIE], who made

such an admirable speech against the bill, announced, much to my surprise, that he had direct information, which thoroughly satisfied him, that the movement did not even originate with the Secretary of the Navy, but that it had its origin in the fertile brain of some other member of the President's Cabinet. I expect before we get through with the consideration of the bill to hear most anything else regarding it.

There have been so many witnesses introduced on the question that it brings to my mind a story. There was a young lawyer in a small town who made a specialty of personal-injury cases. He won two or three cases and got a snug contingent fee in each, and he concluded that he would go after a larger clientele than he could get in the small town where he lived, so he moved down to the "blue grass" and opened up a rather pretentious office in the city of Lexington. After he had been there a month or so a friend of his met him on the street and asked him how he was getting along. "Well," he said, "business is not as good down here as I expected to find it. I am going to try it a little while longer, and if business does not pick up pretty soon I'll be d— if I don't intend to take my witnesses and move to Chicago." [Laughter and applause.] The only difference between this lawyer's witnesses and those that have been introduced on this cablegram question is that he had his witnesses thoroughly trained, while there is a marked lack of consistency between my colleagues who have been witnesses on this very important question. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, I don't want my attitude on this bill to be misunderstood. I would vote for a large Navy now if we needed it and had the money to pay for it, but I do not think we need it bad enough, as I have said before, to put all this additional burden upon the people. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] began his remarks by saying that he was not bluffing at all; that he meant business in offering his amendment to strike out \$2,000,000 and insert \$221,000,000, and yet a moment or two later he made the statement that if we find out later on that the peace conference is going to agree to disarmament, or reduction of armament, then we can repeal the law providing for this big naval program, which is, in effect, a confession by him that his proposition is a bluff after all; and, of course, the representatives of the other Governments at the peace table will unquestionably construe it that way in view of what he said.

I can not for the life of me see the necessity or the good sense of enacting this legislation now and alarming the taxpayers of the country still more, when we can just as well enact it when it is entirely manifest that the necessity for it exists. Mr. Chairman, I can not understand why the administration is preaching disarmament in Europe and insisting upon an increase of armament in the United States. [Applause.] It is a species of acrobatic diplomacy that passeth my comprehension. [Laughter.] Neither do I see any necessity for all of this secrecy and concealment from Congress, the body that must appropriate the money; what the real purpose behind it all is.

What has become of the open diplomacy that formed a part of the sacred 14 points?

Surely it can not be possible that the President intended this to mean that he would play an open hand with foreign countries and hide the cards from his own country. I remember we were told that there was some hidden reason why we should repeal the Panama Canal tolls act, for which repeal I am glad to say I did not vote, and that we would be enlightened a little later on; and yet we know as much now as we did then and no more, which is nothing. Now, they tell us that there is a secret reason for this big naval program, and the inference is left that it will all be made plain to us after a while. Judging the future by the past, I doubt it. At any rate, I am not going to take any chances by voting for this program until I know absolutely we have got to have it. I think we ought to give a little more consideration to the harassed and overburdened taxpayers of the country. If you are bound to make some more appropriations, then let us put the money into public buildings [laughter], which are so much needed and in the construction of which employment could be given to much of the idle labor of the country. If you feel bound to appropriate a few more hundred million dollars, let us put it into good roads. [Applause.]

Let us do something more for our soldier boys than is provided in the revenue bill which passed the House Saturday. Let us scatter the money over the country so that it will get into the hands of the masses, where it is really needed, instead of putting huge sums into vessels which, according to what the President said before we got into this war, will probably become obsolete types before they are ready for use. Let us stop creating so many additional places for these gold-braided gentlemen which the expenditure of all this money for naval construction would create and use it so it will do the common people some

good. Let us stop the expenditure of so much money in creating engines of war, after the war is over, and devote whatever funds we can spare to the development and aid of peaceful pursuits and help to get the country back on a normal peace basis.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. No; not now; wait until I finish on this point, and then I will yield, if I have the time left.

Let me repeat that we ought to consider the people's side of this question a little more than some of you seem inclined to do. We ought to be as generous toward them, at least, as was the Jew waiter toward the hen who, when his customer refused to take a fried egg after he had ordered it because the waiter charged him 10 cents for it, which he said was too much. In characteristic fashion the Jew waiter replied, "But, my dear sir, you must be reasonable and look at the other side of it. You must remember that an egg represents a whole day's work for a hen." [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, a billion dollars—and some of you gentlemen are proposing to expend a good many of them—represents a great many days, yes, a great many years' work for a great many people in this country. Mr. Chairman, I will not vote for any such bill now. Of course, I am in favor of carrying out what has already been provided for and I am in favor of carrying it out in a manner which will make it as easy as possible on the taxpayers, but that is as far as I intend to go until it is made perfectly clear to me that the honor and preservation of our country demand more. That is the way I feel about it and the way I am going to vote, and if anybody does not like my attitude, it does not matter to me. While I have the opportunity I want to add, that if a rule is brought in to make in order the provision which the chair's decision ruled out of order, I am against that, too. [Applause.]

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish the members of the committee to conclude that because I have a large volume in my hand, I intend to use it on any extensive scale.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman excuse me if I ask the chairman of the committee one question before he begins his argument?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether he proposes to press the vote on this amendment which he has offered?

Mr. PADGETT. Not to-night.

Mr. BUTLER. Some other night?

Mr. PADGETT. Not to-night.

Mr. BUTLER. I am much obliged to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] for yielding to me.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to put into the RECORD of to-day certain extracts from the naval hearings of 1915 that will abundantly sustain one or two statements which I made in the course of my oral argument a few days ago.

I stated on last Thursday that the Secretary of the Navy, and the admirals, who have heretofore testified before the Committee on Naval Affairs, had stated in the most positive fashion that this country in the determination of our naval program, had no reason to be concerned about the size of England's fleet.

In the naval hearings of 1915, Secretary Daniels testified as follows:

As Admiral Fletcher said yesterday, I do not think that there is any occasion for us to have as large a Navy as England, because, to cite one reason alone, we are so many miles away from any enemy. (See hearings 1915 testimony Secretary Daniels.)

Again in the same hearing in response to a question by Mr. BUTLER, Secretary Daniels stated:

I have clear views as to the Navy. I do not think we ought to try to have a Navy bigger than that of England, but I think we ought to have a powerful Navy.

In this connection I will state that our present Navy is a powerful one, decisively the second navy in the world, without the addition of a single ship.

Further the Secretary said:

I think the war in Europe is going to exhaust the resources of the countries engaged in it, and I think there is less likelihood of our country in the future having any trouble with those nations. We are not going to have in times of peace, what would be called a perfect war defense. So large a force would be contrary to American policies.

Again Secretary Daniels said in response to a question by Mr. GRAY:

I do not think it is necessary for us to keep up with England, but to have a regular, steady strength in our Navy.

If that was a sound statement of policy three years ago, I would like to know whether to-day we confront any more likely enemies, or greater dangers than at that time? I would like to know whether if the Secretary of the Navy was correct in

thinking three years ago that there was no occasion for this country to have a Navy as large as that of England, and that after the war there would be less danger than formerly of a collision with the countries of Europe, whether the elimination of Germany increases our danger, enhances the likelihood of war with some European country, and renders necessary the construction of a Navy as large as that of Great Britain? Will some one answer these questions?

Secretary Daniels states that we ought to have a powerful Navy. I agree that we ought to have a powerful Navy. But what is a powerful Navy? In the same testimony from which I have been quoting, Secretary Daniels referring to our Navy said:

We are ahead of all the nations now, except England. Perhaps Germany is slightly ahead of us.

A little later Secretary Daniels stated:

We have a powerful Navy, but it should be kept powerful.

If this statement was true in 1915, by how much the more is it true now? Many ships large, and small have been built in the intervening years. Moreover we adopted the program of 1916, which has been referred to as the greatest building program in all the history of naval construction. I am fully justified therefore in saying that we have a powerful Navy, an immensely powerful Navy at this time. This being so, do world conditions, and particularly the situation confronting us, justify colossal additions to our building program, in the name of national security? The yearly maintenance cost of the standing Army proposed of a strength of 500,000 men will be about \$800,000,000. The yearly maintenance cost of a Navy greater than that of Great Britain will be not less than \$800,000,000, and more likely to be nearer \$1,000,000,000. These are great sums to be laid upon the taxpayers, unless some imperious urgency requires their imposition. Whence are these prodigious amounts to be derived?

Even Capt. Hobson, who was a protagonist of a great navy always excluded England as a factor in the determination of our naval policy. In the hearings of 1915, at a time when Capt. Hobson was a member of the Naval Committee, I find this statement by him:

My suggestion is that we always have Canada here as a hostage: second England has no great standing army behind her fleet, and a fleet that has no great standing army behind it can not be a real menace to the life of a nation. England has none, and ours has none. I put England out of the category of military nations.

Mr. GRAY asked Admiral Fletcher this question:

Are any of our naval experts advocating that we increase our Navy to make it equal to that of England?

Admiral FLETCHER. No; and I do not think that anybody has advocated that.

All of this was in 1915, and, as I have stated, we have added very greatly to our fighting ships since that time. The Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Daniels, has absolutely reversed his attitude of 1915, and without assigning any reason for his change of attitude, or for his present attitude, he now insists that this country should build, and maintain a navy greater than that of Great Britain. His new attitude I will proceed to give from his testimony in the recent hearings on the pending naval bill:

Mr. KELLEY. What we really did three years ago was to establish a new policy, which you probably did not state in full at the time, but which you now have in mind, namely, that we should pass from third place to first place substantially as fast as shipbuilding facilities could do it.

Secretary DANIELS. As fast as it could be built. It is utterly indefensible that we should have any navy at all, unless we have a navy at least equal to any other navy in the world, if old conditions continue.

Mr. KELLEY. And yet you recommend to this committee on the eve of the consummation of your hopes (of naval disarmament) a program looking to the greatest navy in the world?

Secretary DANIELS. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY. That is to say, Mr. Secretary, you want the most powerful navy in the world?

Secretary DANIELS. Absolutely, unless there is an international agreement such as we hope to get; because if you have a navy at all you want one powerful enough to defend the country against any power.

I stated a few days ago that we now possess the second navy in the world, and that our present dreadnaught strength was equal to that of France, Japan, and Italy. The first statement I will establish by Secretary Daniels; the second was established by the Scientific American and has not been denied. In the same hearings already cited we find the following:

Mr. KELLEY. We are easily the second naval power to-day, are we not, with Germany wiped out?

Secretary DANIELS. Yes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these citations amply support the statements that I made, in my speech of a few days ago, that an absolutely new policy is being promulgated, one that treats Great Britain, our ally in the present war, and our peaceful neighbor since the War of 1812, over a century ago, as our next likely adversary in Europe, now that Germany has been overthrown. Surely it is a remarkable contention, that al-

though three years ago, when Germany was at the height of her power, England was disregarded in the determination of our naval policy, the overthrow of Germany has apparently increased our dangers on the high seas, and so far from affording an argument for the reduction of our naval construction, really supplies a new reason for the multiplication of our national burdens.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman think that if we embark on this ambitious plan it will cause competition among the nations to speed up their own navies?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I believe that there could not be a more inauspicious time than the present to start upon a policy of competitive naval construction. Every other nation in the world is weary of war, and yearning for relief. Nowhere, save in this country, do we note the construction of new navies in progress. The nations are turning away from war, and the preparations for war. No new ships are being laid, or ordered under any new program, either in Great Britain, France, Italy or any other country. [Applause.]

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. FARR. The Japanese have voted the largest credit in the history of Japan for shipbuilding.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Battleships?

Mr. FARR. Battleships.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have not heard of anything of the sort. It is not in your hearings.

Mr. FARR. I got that from naval circles in Washington.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Well, the naval circles in Washington, ought to have made that statement to the Naval Committee, when it was preparing the pending bill. These myserious and unsupported intimations of suggested activity by Japan do not excite me and ought not to excite anyone. But even if they were true, Japan will have to go a long way to overtake our present strength. We can take an extended naval holiday, then begin building, and easily keep ahead of Japan, or for that matter of any other country in the world save England.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman did not vote for the August, 1916, bill, did he?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No; I did not.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman did not vote for the bill passed in July, 1918?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I think not, though I am not certain that I have in mind what that bill was.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Is the gentleman in favor of the appropriations carried in this bill for the upkeep and maintenance of the Navy?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes. I am willing to go that far, if the supplemental program is stricken out.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. And the only part of the bill as reported that the gentleman is opposed to is the new construction program?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

I desire to call the attention of the committee to some further extracts from the recent testimony of Secretary Daniels showing the real extent of the naval policy involved in our action, should we adopt the supplementary program. I gathered from the report of the committee that the pending bill contained the substance of what Secretary Daniels styles the second three-year program. Such is not the case. The bill provides for only 10 first-class battleships, and 10 scout cruisers, all new construction. This is by no means all of the supplementary program.

I asked the chairman of the committee a few days ago this question: "Should we vote the supplemental program of big ships in the bill, will there be hereafter an additional number of small ships necessary to be constructed as the complement of the big ships, in order to make what the naval people call a well-rounded Navy?"

The chairman indicated that we had a disproportionate number of small ships at this time, and that the naval experts differed among themselves as to whether many more of those

smaller ships would be required to round out the new construction. Looking to the testimony of the Secretary of the Navy I find that the full program of the Secretary, and that is what will be ultimately carried out, should we adopt the program of the bill, calls for 10 dreadnaughts, 6 battle cruisers, 10 scout cruisers, and a complement of 130 other ships of various types to give us a well rounded Navy. The program in the bill is merely the head of the camel in the tent. The goal is a navy greater than Great Britain's, whatever may be the building activities of that country in the future. I wish some one speaking for the committee would give the country an approximate idea, first of the cost of construction, in billions, of a navy greater than that of England, second, when that navy is finally secured, the cost of its annual maintenance. At present though we are far short of our goal, the totals for the Naval Establishment for the years 1919 and 1920 are as follows: For the years 1919, \$1,685,379,553; for the year 1920, \$746,457,440.33.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. How can we dovetail this naval program in with our desire for disarmament?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I discussed that proposition a few days ago. It can not be done. It occurs to me that in no way could the United States inject a more alarming feature into the present situation abroad, or give greater offense to the nations, than by ordering a vast program of naval construction at this time. We are in less danger from any quarter than any other nation in the world, and therefore in a better position to wait on the outcome of the peace conference, and the action taken there, and then establish an appropriate policy. We can match building against building with any other country, or countries, should that course become necessary. For the present we can be quiescent without risk, and by a policy of repose steady the other nations.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. Supposing that the President has said that it is necessary for his negotiations in Paris that we must pass this bill, what does the gentleman think about that?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will ask the gentleman a question, before giving him an answer. Is the determination of our naval policy, in the judgment of the gentleman from Ohio, an executive, or a legislative function?

Mr. EMERSON. It is both.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Not at all. How can that be? We determine this policy. The legislative body should be ready and willing to receive suggestions from the Executive, from the Secretary, from the naval heads, from the experts, and from any other quarter. But when the legislative body has received these suggestions, whose duty is it thereafter under the Constitution to establish a naval policy? Will the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. EMERSON. Both. The President is there, sitting at the peace table, representing this country.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Suppose he is. He is negotiating a treaty, not exercising legislative functions.

Mr. EMERSON. Are we to embarrass him and humiliate him?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No. Not at all. That is the reason I do not wish to agree to the supplementary program. To vote this program at this time would be to project the most embarrassing element that could be devised, into the peace conference now sitting in Paris. [Applause.] This action on our part would be in hopeless and inescapable conflict with the declarations that have been made on our behalf that the President, speaking for this country, is seeking to replace the jealous, and selfish contentions of the Old World with the ideals of peace and justice. It is a little incongruous for the President to be the spokesman of the idealists in Paris, and for the United States in effect to flourish a great horse pistol at home by tumultuously ordering a vast program of unnecessary naval construction. [Applause.]

Permit me to read you what the Secretary of the Navy had to say heretofore with respect to the appropriate determination of a naval policy. I read:

Mr. DANIELS. I think, in the first place, the policy of national defense is not determined by the Secretaries: It is determined by the Congress, and it is a very good thing for Congress to have the varying and fluctuating views, so that they may have all the light it can get, and then for it to fix the policy.

Well if it is an aid to this body to have varying, and fluctuating views, we have been abundantly supplied in this respect during the last five years, by the Secretary of the Navy and the naval experts, as shown by the extracts which I have read from their testimony. In full possession of a generous supply of "varying and fluctuating views," this body is assuredly well

equipped to reach a wise conclusion, that is if wisdom comes that way. Further on this same line that it is the function and duty of Congress to establish a naval policy, Secretary Daniels makes this statement:

You want recommendations from the executive department, and we have given them to you. You must then determine whether you will take them up, or improve them, or otherwise.

I agree fully with these declarations of Secretary Daniels. It is our duty to establish a naval policy, after we have secured the facts, and received the suggestions of our advisers. Once in the possession of the facts, it is our solemn duty to the American people to determine under our oaths whether at this time when our country is palpably and absolutely safe, we shall take an unnecessary step, and establish a program that may be fairly treated as a threat and a menace to the rest of the world. Bear in mind that this program is not inspired by the urgency of war, and does not provide for present construction. It belongs well to the future. We are doing what no other nation is doing. Apparently we repudiate the suggestion that the overthrow of Germany has in any wise made the world a safer and a better place for the peace-loving nations of the earth. Does our safety require this step? Let Secretary Daniels answer. Two years ago the Secretary declared that we had a fleet which was sufficient to defend either the Atlantic, or the Pacific coast. Since then we have adopted the program of 1916, and in addition have materially strengthened our fighting fleet by new construction. We have not only affirmatively strengthened ourselves, by our own activities, but our position has been made materially more secure by the overthrow of the one nation that was a menace to the rights and the liberties of the world. I repeat the statement heretofore made, that we have not merely crippled, weakened, or impaired the naval power of Germany, we have absolutely eliminated that Empire from present contemplation. If that be true, this is the time to reduce, not increase the burdens of the public. [Applause.] That, at least, Mr. Chairman, is the conclusion that I draw from a survey of present world conditions.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the naval appropriation bill, H. R. 15539, had come to no resolution thereon.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported the bill (H. R. 15835) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report (No. 1048), ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 13308), and to disagree to all the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to disagree to the amendments of the Senate and to agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether it will be possible, if necessary in order to maintain the amount appropriated in the House bill for motor-truck routes, that before the conferees agree to the Senate amendment reducing that amount he will bring it back to the House for consideration by the House.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not put the conferees in that sort of a position. It may be best to do that, or it may not be best. I will say this about every provision in the bill, that if there is any desire on the part of the House to vote upon any of the questions in the bill, the conference committee, of course, desire to carry out the wishes of the House; but we ought to have a full and free conference with the Senate, and I think it is not advisable to commit ourselves on any

one proposition in this bill. There are seventy-odd amendments, and it would put the House conferees at a very great disadvantage not to have a full and free conference on all of the questions in the bill, or to be committed to any particular action on any one amendment of the Senate. I think it is the part of wisdom to let the bill go to conference and have a full and free conference, and I want to assure the House that if it manifests a desire to vote upon any question the conferees certainly will have no desire to foreclose the vote on any amendment to the bill.

Mr. DYER. Does that apply to the aero mail increased appropriation also?

Mr. MOON. Oh, yes; it applies to everything. The House has the right to control the bill. The conferees are the servants of the House. We are willing to bring anything here that you want to vote upon, but we do not want to be pledged in advance as to any of these questions, because that would cripple the conferees in conference, and in getting the measure through, as far as possible, as desired by the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I want to take advantage of this opportunity to express the hope to the gentleman from Tennessee and his fellow conferees that they will insist to the very last point possible on retaining the provision in the bill for motor-truck service, which was included in the bill when it passed the House. I hope that when it comes back it will retain that provision.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will announce the conferees.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, in order not to create a precedent, I think the present occupant of the chair ought to ask that by unanimous consent he may name the conferees. I do not think a Member temporarily occupying the chair as Speaker pro tempore is authorized under the rules to name the conferees without the consent of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the present occupant of the chair will name the conferees.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. MOON, Mr. BELL, Mr. ROUSE, Mr. STEENERSON, and Mr. MADDEN.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a decision of the Supreme Court, and also certain correspondence which I have had with my constituents on matters pending before the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an opinion of the Supreme Court and certain correspondence that he has had with his constituents. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for three minutes to place in the RECORD a copy of an order published in Fort Washington in regard to the punishment that will be given the soldier who asks for political or civilian influence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes for the purpose indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I stated the other day that in certain camps and cantonments they had posted notices that any soldier who applies for any assistance in the matter of his discharge will be court-martialed and punished. I now print as a part of my remarks, to save time, the copy of the order posted on the bulletin board at the headquarters of the coast defense of the Potomac, Fort Washington, Md., which states in substance:

First. Orders of the War Department direct that no person in the military service shall seek directly or indirectly to secure action affecting his military status by political or civilian influences.

Second. The discharge of soldiers under existing orders and instructions is being carried out by the commanding officer as impartially as possible and with due interest to the welfare of each soldier concerned. The commanding officer, and no doubt unit commanders, are receiving applications from civilian and political sources that are a source of annoyance to those who receive letters besides wasting valuable time.

Third. Every soldier of this command is forbidden to write any person whatsoever outside of the military service asking directly or indirectly for assistance affecting the soldier's status. Every case where there is reasonable ground for believing that the soldier has disobeyed these orders and instructions he will be brought to trial by court-martial for disobedience of orders.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I have only three minutes.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman understand that by "political influence" is meant the efforts of Members of Congress to have the case of the soldier considered?

Mr. MASON. Some of us think we are politicians and some of us think we are statesmen. I have ranked myself as a politician because Speaker Reed once said that a statesman is a dead politician. [Laughter.]

I called attention to this the other day and I offer it again as a reason for the passage of a resolution I have introduced. This whole act of demobilization is being dillydallied with. We have had two colleagues come from France in the last 10 days or 2 weeks, one telling of the dreadful condition of our boys there and the fact that they are not comfortable and not sheltered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. I have no objection to the gentleman incorporating that which he desires in the RECORD, but this has already been gone over many times, and I object.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, what was the objection to my proceeding?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio objected to the two additional minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that my colleague be allowed to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois moves that his colleague [Mr. MASON] be allowed to speak for five minutes.

Mr. LOBECK. I move to amend by making it 10 minutes.

Mr. MASON. I can finish in five minutes and perhaps in three.

Mr. LOBECK. I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion of the gentleman from Illinois is not in order.

Mr. MANN. It is in order; there is nothing else before the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not sure that it is in order, but he will put the question.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in the five minutes you have been kind enough to give me I am calling attention to the resolution I offered, which I have submitted to the Committee on Rules and which I hope the committee will report. The resolution simply appoints a nonpartisan committee of four Democrats and four Republicans—and I think you gentlemen on the other side ought to be willing to agree to it, for it is your last chance to get an even show on committees—to take evidence to assist the military arm of the Government in giving our boys their rights. As a matter of fact the officers, as a general rule, are fine men, but there is another fact that there is a certain class of them that want to maintain their units in order to maintain their own commissions. One of our colleagues who came back from France—and I am not using his name, for I do not see him present—said that on the vessel he came back on there was room for a thousand more soldiers; that there were state-rooms in which there were three berths and only occupied by one person.

Mr. Speaker, there ought to be some way to arrange this matter. There is no disposition to find fault. The only thing to do is to help, and if you can have a committee here in Washington with power to do that, we will reach the point where we can say to the little man with big shoulder straps, "Give these boys a chance to be heard." Under this rule, if a man wrote to his father and told him that he had to have two affidavits, he would be subject to court-martial and to punishment. If he wrote to his own mother and told her that under the rules of the War Department he had to have two affidavits showing why he was needed at home, he would violate the rule laid down here and would be subject to court-martial. The question is whether you are willing to have this committee, whether you are willing to speed taking these boys home. If they are needed, keep them; but if you intend to demobilize them, give them a chance. I say to you that some of them are being abused, and if you will give the committee, while I can not call these boys here and use their names now and have them court-martialed, I shall call them before the committee which will protect them. One Iowa Congressman told me of a case where a boy had made application because his brother had broken his leg and he wanted to

go home and help his father with his spring farming, and the officer called this boy the vilest name ever applied to a human being. He called him a coward, and said that he was trying to avoid his duty.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman know of any specific case where a soldier now in a cantonment has been placed on trial, at court-martial, because he wrote to his father or mother for these affidavits or because his case has been presented to friends or to the Representative of his district, and the commander of the cantonment had been asked to give the boy's case consideration?

Mr. MASON. I will say to the gentleman that three of my colleagues have told me of cases where they took up the case on the suggestion of the father and mother, where the boys were court-martialed.

Mr. RAKER. For this?

Mr. MASON. For the offense of asking for outside influence in presenting matters in respect to their discharge. I have another case of my own, where I simply wrote a recommendation certifying to the man's good name, to his officer, and the boy was threatened with court-martial; and it was all returned to me with an indication that I should keep off the grass. I told the Secretary of War that being a Member of Congress ought not to deprive me of my citizenship, nor should it estop me from suggesting in a respectful way anything that I could suggest for the good of the service.

Mr. Speaker, at the proper time, under the strict rules applying here in this deliberative body, I am going to ask for the discharge of the Committee on Rules, so that I may have a vote upon this question. I want to know who are willing to let these boys have some civil place to which to appeal for defense. The man who copied this for me would be court-martialed to-morrow if they knew that he had copied it; and yet he did it at my request. Here is an order printed which says to every man who dares, in time of peace, to write to anyone is subject to court-martial, and it is accompanied with an insulting remark that it is an annoyance to these distinguished officers to get letters from politicians and civilians and it is a waste of time. They have to read them to see whether it is a politician who writes them, and take some time to deposit them in the wastebasket. [Applause.]

VOTE ON REVENUE BILL—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, understanding there would be no record vote upon the adoption of the conference report upon the revenue bill, I absented myself from the Capitol on other business. I desire simply to state that had I been present I would have voted in favor of the adoption of the conference report.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. CALDWELL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reference with the bill (H. R. 15742) to regulate the collection and expenditure of money, other than by the Government of the United States or by its authority, for the use and benefit of the armed forces of the United States and of its allies, and especially of France, Great Britain, Italy, Belgium, Serbia, Greece, and Montenegro, or for any auxiliary organizations of said Governments maintained and operated for the use and benefit of such armed forces, be changed from the Committee on the Judiciary to the Committee on Military Affairs, where it properly belongs. A similar bill in the Senate has been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object. This is no time to do that.

RELEASE OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, recently there were discharged from the Leavenworth Penitentiary several hundred so-called conscientious objectors, who refused to either fight or work. The

manner of their discharge has become a matter of considerable interest out there. The Legislature of Nebraska has passed some emphatic resolutions, which I desire to present here and made a part of the RECORD. I may at a later date have something to say concerning these resolutions, but just now, as the Secretary of War is called upon for an explanation, and it may be given, I shall at this time withhold further comment. I desire to print these resolutions as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] asks unanimous consent that he may print certain indicated resolutions as a part of his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman indicate what the resolutions are?

Mr. SLOAN. The Legislature of Nebraska has seen fit to condemn the action of the Secretary of War in releasing several hundred men in a great body from the Leavenworth Penitentiary. They say these inmates refused to either fight or work during the whole period of the war. It is alleged that they were paid in full for the time they were imprisoned, given a new suit of clothes, a sum of money, \$10 or \$25 in cash, honorably discharged, and sent home.

Mr. LITTLE. Honorably discharged?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes. This has given rise to indignation on the part of the people out in our country.

Mr. GARD. This has already been expressed in the State of Nebraska in the newspapers, has it not?

Mr. SLOAN. Oh, yes; but I am inclined to think it is of such general nation-wide interest that it ought to go into the RECORD. If I can not get it in the RECORD upon this request, I think I will try to impose myself on the House for time to read and comment thereon. I do not like to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolutions referred to are as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF NEBRASKA.

I, Darius M. Amsberry, secretary of state of the State of Nebraska, do hereby certify that the resolutions hereunto attached and herewith pertaining are a true, correct, complete, and verified copy of the resolutions adopted by the senate, Legislature of Nebraska, thirty-seventh session, February 5, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Nebraska. Done at Lincoln this 7th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1919 and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-third, and of this State the fifty-second.

[SEAL.]

DARIUS M. AMSBERRY,
Secretary of State.

LINCOLN, NEBR., February 5, 1919.

HON. D. M. AMSBERRY,
Secretary of State, Lincoln, Nebr.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was adopted by the State senate under this date and is hereby transmitted to you:

[Legislature of Nebraska, thirty-seventh session. Senate file No. —. A resolution introduced by Senators Reed and Hall, Johnson, Hammond, Neal, and Cronin.]

"Whereas press reports state that several hundred men who were drafted for service in the war and refused to bear arms or work or obey orders of their superior officers, or in any manner assist in the defense of their country, or support thereof, are to be given, and are being given, honorable discharge from the Army, fitted out with a complete outfit of civilian clothing and paid the full wage, and in some instances \$15 to \$25 more than that which they would have received had they been loyal to their country and served in the trenches and borne the hardships incident thereto; and

"Whereas there are several hundred thousand loyal American soldiers still in France who have willingly offered their lives in defense of their country and who are anxious to be discharged and return to private life, loyal and unselfish men who will some day return to find their positions filled by the unpatriotic slackers and conscientious objectors wearing the clothing furnished them by the Government and with no provision made for rewarding and honoring those who have saved the country and who by their glorious achievements have preserved to posterity the honor of the Nation: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nebraska, That we earnestly protest against the action of Secretary of War Baker in rewarding the slacker and the traitor, which we stamp as a direct insult to the brave soldiers who so valiantly went forth to defend democracy and freedom against the awful blight of Kaiserism at the sacrifice of their lives, and to the Red Cross nurses who risked their lives to administer to the wounded and bleeding upon the battle fields of Europe, and every other worker who participated in the support of the war, and we call upon the Congress of the United States to condemn the said action of Secretary Baker, as it is not consistent with the principles of true Americanism, and we further call upon Congress to honor and reward the loyal and faithful men of our Army and Navy in a manner befitting their glorious deeds; be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to Secretary of War Baker and to the Members of Congress and the Senators from this State."

I, Clyde H. Barnard, secretary of the Senate of Nebraska, hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true, complete, and verified copy of resolution adopted by the senate February 5, 1919.

CLYDE H. BARNARD,
Secretary of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF NEBRASKA.

I, Darius M. Amsberry, secretary of state of the State of Nebraska, do hereby certify that the resolutions hereunto attached and herewith pertaining are a true, correct, complete, and verified copy of the resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives, Legislature of Nebraska, thirty-seventh session, February 5, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Nebraska. Done at Lincoln, this 7th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1919, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-third, and of this State the fifty-second.

[SEAL.]

Secretary of State.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF CHIEF CLERK,
Lincoln, Nebr., February 6, 1919.

[Legislature of Nebraska, thirty-seventh session. A resolution, introduced by Representatives Miller, Mears, Sandquist, Foster, Gerhart, Fries, Birdsall, and Purdy.]

Whereas press reports state that several hundred men, known as conscientious objectors, who were drafted for service in the war and refused to bear arms or work or obey orders of their superior officers, or in any manner assist in the defense of their country or support thereof, are to be given and are being given honorable discharge from the disciplinary barracks, fitted out with a complete outfit of civilian clothing, and paid the full wage, and, in some instances, \$15 to \$25 more than that which they would have received had they been loyal to their country and served in the trenches and borne the hardships incident thereto; and

Whereas there are several hundred thousand loyal American soldiers still in France who have willingly offered their lives in defense of their country and who are anxious to be discharged and return to private life—loyal and unselfish men, who will some day return to find their positions filled by the unpatriotic slackers and conscientious objectors wearing the clothing furnished them by the Government—and with no provision made for rewarding and honoring those who have saved the country and who, by their glorious achievements, have preserved to posterity the honor of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, That we earnestly protest against the action of Secretary of War Baker in rewarding the slacker and the traitor, which we stamp as a direct insult to the brave soldiers who so valiantly went forth to defend democracy and freedom against the awful blight of Kaiserism at the sacrifice of their lives, and to the Red Cross nurses who risked their lives to administer to the wounded and bleeding upon the battle fields of Europe, and every other worker who participated in the support of the war; and we call upon the Congress of the United States to condemn the said action of Secretary Baker, as it is not consistent with the principles of true Americanism; and we further call upon Congress to honor and reward the loyal and faithful men of our Army and Navy in a manner befitting their glorious deeds; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of State to Secretary of War Baker and to the Members of the Congress and the Senators from this State.

D. S. DALBEY, *Speaker.*
WILL F. HITCHCOCK,
Chief Clerk of the House.
DARIUS M. AMSBERRY,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to speak for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold for a moment? I wish to renew my request for unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to give notice that as soon as the gentleman from Michigan gets through I am going to move to adjourn.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman if the naval bill gets through before time to adjourn to-morrow what is to be taken up then?

Mr. KITCHIN. The military appropriation bill, which is reported.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, it so happens that a large number of the American troops who are in Russia came from the State of Michigan and a large part of them from the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. As expressive of the sentiment of the people of my district as to their continuance in Russia I desire to have read in my time a letter from the mayor of the city of Grand Rapids giving a resolution which was adopted at a mass meeting of the citizens of that city.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
February 6, 1919.

Hon. CARL E. MAPES, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At a meeting of the citizens of this city held Wednesday evening, February 5, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the United States Government is now maintaining an armed force in northern Russia, among whom are a number of soldiers from this city and vicinity; and

"Whereas it appears that the force there maintained is wholly inadequate to cope with the forces sent against them, and there is grave danger that their maintenance as at present will result in many if not all of the soldiers being overcome by the forces opposed to them; and

"Whereas it appears that their maintenance in northern Russia at this time is not necessary for the safety and welfare of the country, or necessary as a military measure: Therefore

Resolved, That we, the citizens of the city of Grand Rapids, most earnestly protest against the retention of our boys in Russia; and further

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, requested to withdraw said force at as early a date as practicable, to the end that their lives may not needlessly be sacrificed in maintaining an unnecessary military venture; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the Secretary of War, to the Congressman from this district, and to the Members of the Senate from this State, and ask the Congressman and Senators to cable the President to this effect."

Respectfully,

CHRISTIAN GALLMEYER, *Mayor.*

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 11, 1919, at 11 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations to enable the institution to heat and equip for exhibition purposes the metal structure erected by the War Department in the Smithsonian Grounds, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 1780); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed;

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of State submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Pan American Union for printing and binding, fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1781); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a substitute estimate of appropriation required by the Interior Department for administration of the National Park Service in lieu of estimate heretofore submitted (H. Doc. No. 1782); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Assistant Secretary of Labor submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Labor for increased cost of envelopes, fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1783); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Postmaster General submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Post Office Department and Postal Service (H. Doc. No. 1784); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15608) to incorporate the War Mothers of America, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1047), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 15815) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Bramwell, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15816) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Mullens, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BESHILIN: A bill (H. R. 15817) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Greenville, Pa., four

German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 15818) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Elsberry, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 15819) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved March 12, 1914, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 15820) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Schuylerville, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 15821) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Imlay City, Mich., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15822) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Lapeer, Mich., two German cannons or fieldpieces to mark the Victory Highway; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 15823) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mountain Grove, Mo., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15824) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the State Federal soldiers' home at St. James, Mo., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15825) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Houston, Mo., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 15826) providing for the conveyance to the State of Montana of Fort William Henry Harrison Military Reservation for educational and other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENTON: A bill (H. R. 15827) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lincoln City, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece, to be placed in Nancy Hanks Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 15828) donating two captured German cannons or field guns and carriages to the city of Montpelier, in the State of Vermont, for decoration purposes on the grounds of the State capitol; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15829) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Greensboro, Vt., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 15830) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Coopers-town, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece, to be placed in the city park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 15831) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Redfield, county of Dallas, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CONNALLY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 15832) for the purchase of a site for the erection of a post-office building at Hamilton, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15833) for the purchase of a site for the erection of a post-office building at Gatesville, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 15834) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Red Lake River, in Pennington County, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 15835) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 15836) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15837) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOULD: Resolution (H. Res. 563) directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House of Representatives with

certain information concerning prisoners confined at Fort Leavenworth, also the discharge of conscientious war objectors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 564) directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House of Representatives with certain information regarding the confinement of military prisoners; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 565) directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House of Representatives with certain information regarding court-martial cases since April 6, 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PADGETT: Resolution (H. Res. 566) making in order certain new legislation in House bill 15539, notwithstanding the rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAGUE: Resolution (H. Res. 567) for the appointment of a committee to investigate the administration of wires now under the control of the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 409) to give a war trophy to Bedford, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 410) to give a war trophy to Thompson, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 411) to give a war trophy to Middlefield, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 412) to give a war trophy to Painesville, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 413) to give a war trophy to East Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 414) to give a war trophy to Willoughby, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 415) to give a war trophy to Madison, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 416) to give a war trophy to Burton, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 417) to give a war trophy to Wickliffe, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 418) to give a war trophy to Chagrin Falls, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 419) to give a war trophy to Lakewood, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 420) to give a war trophy to Perry, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 421) to give a war trophy to Chardon, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 422) to give a war trophy to Mentor, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 423) authorizing the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to procure a metal button to be given each soldier, sailor, and marine who served in the world war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 424) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved March 12, 1914, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, urging Congress to pass an act ceding to the State of Montana certain lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging Congress to pass such laws as will permit the American shipbuilders to build ships for foreign nations; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to allow soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the war against Germany and her allies six months' pay after discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: Memorial from the Legislature of Kansas, favoring a duty of 2 cents per pound on zinc ore imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging Congress to provide means for purchasing and moving of the wheat still remaining in the hands of the farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring six months' pay for discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the early discharge of farmers from the military and

naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging Congress to appropriate \$500,000 for building highway to the Elk City mining region; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging Congress to enact such legislation as will permit the American shipbuilders to build ships for foreign nations; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. A. P. NELSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring an early discharge from the Army and the Navy all men who were engaged in agriculture at the time they entered the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring six months' pay for soldiers, sailors, and marines upon discharge from the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging Congress for an early and favorable action upon Senate bill 4922 and House bill 12880, for the relief and rehabilitation of industrial workers in the prosecution of the war with Germany; to the Committee on Education.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. BESH LIN: A bill (H. R. 15838) granting a pension to Verna Hammore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 15839) granting an increase of pension to James L. Buckler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15840) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McClure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 15841) granting a pension to Mrs. J. Franklin Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LaGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 15842) for the relief of Thomas J. O'Mara; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUNN: A bill (H. R. 15843) granting a pension to Jane H. Larkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. COOPER of West Virginia: Petition by citizens of Williamson, Ceredo, and Kenova, W. Va., urging the retention for a time by the Government of the wire systems of the country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of Will County, Ill., Teachers' Institute, requesting the President and the Congress of the United States to recognize the newly proclaimed government of Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRAGO: Petition of citizens of Uniontown, Pa., favoring the repeal of the postal zone system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of Federal Employment Service, inaugurated by Federal Government, favoring the continuance of the present system of Federal employment service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of Merchants' Association of New York, relative to discontinuance of operation by the Government of railroads, telephones, and telegraphs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of United Mine Workers of America, representing 50,000 mine workers in Ohio, asking for equal division of work to prevent closing of mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners' Union, against a State constabulary; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of Merchants' Association of New York, relative to the discontinuance of operation by the Government of railroads, telephones, and telegraphs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Northern Hemlock & Hardwood Manufacturers' Association, relating to readjustment of labor, employment of returning soldiers, and building of roads in cut-over lands of Wisconsin and Michigan, thereby opening them for settlement; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, petition of Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers' Association, against locating returned soldiers and other citizens in segregated and supervised groups upon Government-owned lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers' Association, relating to securing farms for returning soldiers and civilian employees of the Government in cut-over lands of Wisconsin and Michigan; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers' Association, recommending the immediate return of telegraph and telephone lines to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers' Association, recommending that appropriations should be continued for work of forest products laboratory at Madison, Wis.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers' Association, relating to return of railroads to their owners after Congress shall have enacted such revised, regulatory measures as will insure adequate service to the public and fair returns to owners of these properties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, for the repeal of the postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petition of sundry citizens of St. Albans, Vt., for Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of Cincinnati Planer Co., favoring bill to establish national trade schools, and requiring War Department to loan certain machine tools not in use for Government purposes to trade and technical schools; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Steubenville, Ohio, favoring the return by the Government of the telephone companies to private management and control at the earliest practicable date, the Government to make good any loss or injury sustained by governmental management and control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Resolution adopted by the supreme board of directors of the Knights of Columbus, urging that President Wilson be asked to use his great influence at the peace conference to the end that the people of Ireland be permitted to determine for themselves the form of government under which they wish to live; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petition of citizens of the sixth congressional district of Nebraska against the postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Eliza Barfoot and 86 others, of the sixth congressional district of Nebraska, protesting against the postal zone rate amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, relating to price of wheat and asking that farmers shall receive their promised price, based on the difference between Government guaranty and world's price in open markets, and that on leaving the farmers' hands the wheat should be dealt in without restriction as in prewar times; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of E. Oliver Grimes, jr., counsel relief department, Western Maryland Railway Co., relating to pensions and superannuation allowances affecting civil-service pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of board of governors' meeting, Kewanis Club, Baltimore, Md., favoring the continued Government control and operation of wire systems until Congress shall have determined upon a proper and safe procedure; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Memorial of Rotary Club of Los Angeles, Cal., urging the termination of public control of railroads within 21 months after the signing of a peace treaty; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Founders' and Employers' Association, of Los Angeles, Cal., urging prompt return of the railroads of the United States to their private owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of Society of Civil Engineers, Mechanical Engineers, Chemical Society, Electrical Engineers, Mining Engineers and Architects, and Engineers and Architects Association of Southern California, favoring \$100,000,000 appropriation for use in land reclamation and providing immediate work and subsequent homes for returning soldiers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Memorial of H. M. Bracken, M. D., State board of health, St. Paul, Minn., urging early and favorable action upon House bill 14185, known as the rural sanitation and health bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Hon. Howard B. Gorham, president of the Providence, R. I., school committee, and Isaac O.

Winslow, superintendent of public schools of Providence, R. I., favoring the passage of House bill 15625, to provide for further educational facilities by requiring the War Department to loan certain machine tools not in use to trade and technical schools; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, relative to discontinuance of operation by the Government of railroads, telephones, and telegraph; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Robert Emmett Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, asking for self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Liberty Bell Council, No. 3, Junior Order United American Mechanics of New Haven, Conn., to pass bill to prohibit immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WATSON from Pennsylvania: Petition of Board of Trade of Newton, Pa., favoring the Federal control of wire systems for the present; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Board of Trade of Quakertown, Pa., favoring the Federal control of wire systems for the present; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, February 11, 1919.

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

Almighty God, Thou hast charted the paths of peace and prosperity in Thy holy word. Thou dost deign to touch the lives of those whom Thou dost call into places of leadership with Thy holy spirit, that they may discern the path, that they may achieve the divine purpose, that they may follow the divine will. We pray that grace may be given to us this day in this high and holy office, that we may discharge the duties that are upon us with the favor and with the wisdom which God alone can give. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM OKLAHOMA.

Mr. GORE. I present the credentials of my colleague, Hon. ROBERT L. OWEN, chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oklahoma a Senator for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1919, which I ask to have read and placed on the files.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF
THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1918, ROBERT L. OWEN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oklahoma a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1919.

Witness, his excellency, our governor, J. B. A. ROBERTSON, and our seal hereto affixed at Oklahoma City, this the 4th day of February, A. D. 1919.

J. B. A. ROBERTSON, Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

JOE S. MORRIS,
Secretary of State.

ABROGATION OF TREATIES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Assistant Secretary of State in response to a Senate resolution, which will lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

The communication is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 8, 1919.

The Hon. JAMES M. BAKER,
Secretary of the Senate of the United States.

Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the following resolution adopted by the Senate of the United States December 5, 1918:

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate the following information:

"1. What countries, if any, have notified the United States of their intention to abrogate any treaties with the United States; and what treaties are to be abrogated and the reasons therefor if any are given.

"2. The countries with which the United States has treaties which prevent us from giving preference to Americans or American ships in the carrying of imports or exports, and what is necessary to be done to abrogate such treaties, and what, if any, steps our Government has taken to secure the abrogation of the same.

"Attest:

"JAMES M. BAKER, Secretary."

I also have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the following resolution adopted by the Senate February 3, 1919:

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the information called for by the Senate resolution of December 5, 1918, or inform the Senate why it can not be furnished.

"Attest:

"JAMES M. BAKER, Secretary."

In reply I beg leave to advise you, for the information of the Senate, that a compilation of the data called for in the resolution of December 5, 1918, is being prepared. The work of preparation involves a considerable amount of research, but the data will be furnished at the earliest practicable moment.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

WILLIAM PHILLIPS,
Assistant Secretary.

For the Acting Secretary of State.

RENTAL OF BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT (H. DOC. NO. 1735).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the rents received from properties located on sites of proposed public buildings purchased by the United States Government in the city of Washington, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

WHEAT GUARANTY.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to present a memorial adopted on the 20th day of January by the Legislature of Oklahoma in respect to the guaranteed price of wheat for the year 1919. I will ask the indulgence of the Senate to submit a few observations upon this subject.

The memorial requests early action by Congress to make good the guaranteed price of wheat for the harvest of 1919. I am in perfect sympathy with the purpose and object of this memorial. Anxiety has been felt and doubts have been expressed in certain quarters as to the disposition of the Government with respect to the carrying out of its guarantee. There is no foundation in fact for such anxiety or for such doubt.

On September 2, 1918, the President of the United States issued a proclamation guaranteeing the price of wheat for the season and harvest of 1919, a guaranteed price of \$2.26 a bushel for the basic grades in the city of Chicago. This proclamation was issued in pursuance of law. It was issued in pursuance of section 14 of the so-called food-control act.

This proclamation creates a valid and binding obligation upon the Government of the United States, an obligation which is as sacred and which will be held as inviolate as the obligation of the thrift stamps or the liberty bonds. This covenant will be kept both in letter and in spirit. The Government of the United States will keep faith with the American farmer to the uttermost farthing. This is not an open question. Upon this point, at least, all minds have met.

But, Mr. President, the amount which may be required to carry out this guaranty, while it in no wise affects either the character or the sanctity of the obligation, yet is a question of vital concern to the people of the United States. It is not possible at this time to ascertain the amount which will be required to redeem this obligation. The amount is contingent upon factors both present and future which are not certain at this time and which can not be made certain at this time. The amount depends primarily upon the world's harvest of wheat for the season of 1919. In the second place, it depends upon the exportable surplus carried over from the harvest of 1918 in other wheat-producing countries.

In the third place, it depends upon the purchasing power of the peoples of Europe. Their purchasing power has, of course, been materially reduced. The amount of wheat which they can purchase at our hands will not be limited so much by their needs as by their capacity to buy and pay for the required supplies. It is still true, however, that bread is the staff of life. It satisfies the elemental need, the need that is first to be supplied, and the need that is last to be denied. Others can estimate as well as I to what extent their purchasing power has been impaired.

As to the wheat harvest for 1919, considering the world at large, I may say that in ordinary times the world's production and consumption of wheat aggregates about 3,700,000,000 bushels. The United States and Russia each produce about one-fifth of this entire amount, the United States sometimes producing as much as one-fourth.

I have no means of ascertaining the acreage sown to winter wheat in other wheat-producing countries. I have no means of ascertaining the acreage which will be sown in other countries to spring wheat. It is reasonable to assume, however, that the acreage will be above rather than below the average. I say this because various countries have like ourselves held out guaranties for the coming harvest. In several countries this guaranty has been most generous. It will be interesting to state a few of