Congressional Record.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *July 1, 1919.*

(Legislative day of Monday, June 30, 1919.)

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ball	Keyes	Nugent	Trammell
Calder	King	Overman	Underwood
Capper	Kirby	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Knox	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Dillingham	La Follette	Sheppard	Warren
Fernald	Lenroot	Smoot	Watson
Frelinghuysen	McLean	Spencer	Wolcott
Harding	Nelson	Stanley	
Kellogg	Norris	Thomas	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. FRANCE, Mr. GRONNA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. NEW, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. SMITH of Georgia answered to their names.

Mr. KIRBY. I wish to announce the absence of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL], who is detained on public business.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] are detained on official business.

Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. KENYON, Mr. BECKHAM, Mr. COLT, Mr. SMITH of Arizona, Mr. ELKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. STERLING, Mr. MCCUMBER, Mr. PHELAN, Mr. RANSDELL, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. GAY, and Mr. SUTHERLAND entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

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

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 amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1706) authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River, about 3 miles above its confluence with the Columbia River, near Pasco, Wash.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4630. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River, near the Texas & Pacific Railroad bridge, in said county and State; and

H. R. 4631. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River, at or near Blackmans Point, in said county and State.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 1213) to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Millville, Malden, Everett, Somerville, Methuen, and Lawrence, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the prompt enactment of legislation for the enforcement of national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry employees of the Fairbanks-Morse Co.; the George Frost Co.; the Boston & Lockport Block Co.; the Wright & Potter Printing Co.; the E. B. Badger & Sons Co.; the Franklin Machine & Tool Co.; the Clinton E. Hobbs Co.; the Brown Engine & Machine Co.; the New England Maple Syrup Co.; Monks & Johnson; the Brown-Wales Co.; the Columbian Rope Co.; the Cronkhite Co. (Inc.); the Thomas D. Gotshell Shoe Co.; the Lamson Co.; the Prince Macaroni Manufacturing Co.; D. E. Eddy & Sons Co.; H. C. Whitcomb & Co.; Ginn & Co.; Pratt & Forrest Co.; Richardson & Boynton Co.; the Barrett Co.; H. W. Johns-Manville Co.; Carter, Rice & Co. (Corp.); Edgar T. Ward's Sons Co.; Universal Winding Co.; Tolman, Dow & Co.; and the National Casket Co., all of Boston; of the Worcester Wind Motor Co.; the Reed & Prince Manufacturing Co.; White & Bagley Co.; the Whitcomb, Blaisdell Machine Co.; the Osgood Bradley Car Co.; the United States Envelope Co.; Browns' Beach Jacket Co.; Walden-Worcester (Inc.); O. S. Walker Co.; the Arcade Malleable Iron Co.; the Worcester Bleach & Dyeworks Co.; the Stockbridge Machine Co.; the Coates Clipper Manufacturing Co., all of Worcester; of the Wright & Ditson Co., of Springfield; the Ross Manufacturing Co., of Leominster; Greenfield Tap & Die Corporation, of Greenfield; R. A. Wood Co. (Inc.), of Lowell; the Waltham Machine Works, of Waltham; the Perfect Safety Paper Co., of Holyoke; Blake Pump & Condenser Co., of Fitchburg; the Agawam Co., of Agawam; the Bishop Co., of North Attleboro; the Southbridge Printing Co., of Southbridge; Merriam, Hall & Co., of North Leominster; the Holyoke Braiding Co., of Holyoke; Potter Confectionery Co., of Cambridge; O. S. Hawes & Bros., of Fall River; the Fitchburg, Foundry Co., of Fitchburg; the National Equipment Co., of Springfield; Clements Associates, of Southbridge; the Plymouth Mills, of Plymouth; the Whitin Machine Works, of Whitinsville; the Standard Worcester Co., of Plymouth; and the Coates Clipper Manufacturing Co., of Worcester, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Cambridge, Belmont, Waverly, Arlington, Medford, Gloucester, Fitchburg, Fall River, Worcester, Millville, Springfield, Whitman, Boston, Whitinsville, Uxbridge, Enfield, Malden, Hyannis, Taunton, North Wilbraham, Westfield, Lawrence, Great Barrington, Marshfield, Waltham, Lowell, Quincy, Sandwich, Framingham, Ashby, Salem, Manchester, Plymouth, Pittsfield, New Bedford, Clinton, Middleboro, and Adams, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Iowa City, Iowa, and a petition of sundry citizens of Webster County, Iowa, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented a petition of Local Branch No. 6029, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of Springfield, Mass., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. PHELAN presented petitions of the Outlook Club, of Oakland; the Plymouth Congregational Church, of Paso Robles; the Board of Supervisors of San Luis Obispo County; the Methodist Episcopal Church of Watsonville; the Willow Glen Methodist Episcopal Church, of San Jose; the League of Peace Club of Sebastopol; the Woman's Club of Walnut Creek;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the Congregational Church of Ferndale; the Woman's Improvement Association of South Pasadena; the Maywood Woman's Club, of Corning; the Ashbury Methodist Episcopal Church, of Livermore; the Village Club of Ferndale; the Faculty Woman's Club of Stanford University; the Richmond Club, of Richmond; the Woman's Club of Palo Alto; the California Federation of Women's Clubs, of San Francisco; the Stockton School Women's Club, of Stockton; the Women's Christian Union of Southern California, of Los Angeles; the Lincoln Park Woman's Club, of San Francisco; the San Diego Business and Professional Women's Club; the Modern Language Association of Los Angeles; the High School of Owensmouth; the Woman's Improvement Club of Vallejo; the Wednesday Club of San Diego; the Wednesday Morning Club of Altadena; the American Federation of Musicians of San Francisco; the May View Camp, No. 7255, Modern Woodmen of America, of San Diego; the Woman's Club of Colusa; the Chamber of Commerce of Concord; the Bellevue Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Santa Rosa; the Chamber of Commerce of Santa Ana; the Fortnightly Club of Redlands; the Dames of the Loyal Legion Society of San Francisco; the Kings County Chamber of Commerce of Hanford; the Richmond Club of Richmond; the Chamber of Commerce of Madera; the Fairmead Farm Center, of Madera County; the Woman's Improvement Club of Martinez; the First Presbyterian Church of Eureka; the Church Federation of Sacramento; the Rebekah Lodge, of San Luis Obispo; the Selma Lodge, No. 277, Free and Accepted Masons, of Selma; the Hemet Lodge, Knights of Pythias, of Hemet; the Campbell Improvement Club; the Woman's Club of Carlotta; the Monterey Lodge, No. 180, Knights of Pythias, of Monterey; the Chamber of Commerce of Monterey; the Alpha Literary Improvement Club, of Lompoc; the University Book Club, of Los Angeles; the Woman's Club of Carpinteria; the Woman's Club of Hollister; the California Badger Club, of Los Angeles; the Federated Commercial Bodies of Fortuna; and of Local Branch, International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Shipbuilders, and Helpers of America, of Vallejo, all in the State of California, praying for the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5032) to extend the franchise in the parishes and separate congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 60) thereon.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably without amendment Senate resolution 98.

Mr. CURTIS. 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 Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth 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 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 recesses of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate resolution 97, and I ask for its present consideration.

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

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to employ such counsel and expert assistants as may be necessary; 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 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 recesses of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SENATE PAGES.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate resolution 69, submitted by Mr. HARDING on the 5th instant, and I ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to employ five additional pages for the Senate Chamber at $3 per day each for a period lasting until the end of the present session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, to be paid from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire whether we need five more pages?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that these pages are already appointed. The Senator will remember that at the last session of Congress, when the telephone booths were installed in the cloakrooms——

Mr. THOMAS. This confirms what we already have?

Mr. SMOOT. We had three at that time. We have taken the telephone girl away from the booth and appointed one of the pages in her place.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 2341) granting a pension to Matilda T. Lyman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 2342) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Madison, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 2343) for the relief of Capt. Frederick B. Shaw; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 2344) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to lend unused or obsolete machinery to educational institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 2345) for the relief of Laban H. Davies (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 2346) granting an increase of pension to Uriah Ruch; and

A bill (S. 2347) granting a pension to George W. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 2348) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Herrald;

A bill (S. 2349) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Mitchell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2350) granting an increase of pension to William P. Wilson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2351) granting an increase of pension to George F. Chambers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2352) granting a pension to Joseph W. Wolf;

A bill (S. 2353) granting a pension to Charles M. Kuhn;

A bill (S. 2354) granting an increase of pension to William H. Carter;

A bill (S. 2355) granting an increase of pension to Asa L. Bushnell;

A bill (S. 2356) granting an increase of pension to Ellen L. Billings;

A bill (S. 2357) granting an increase of pension to George R. Frazier;

A bill (S. 2358) granting an increase of pension to Rubin J. Huston;

A bill (S. 2359) granting a pension to William H. Johnson;

A bill (S. 2360) granting an increase of pension to John V. Kearns;

A bill (S. 2361) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Newton Primm;

A bill (S. 2362) granting an increase of pension to Channing Smith;

A bill (S. 2363) granting an increase of pension to Perry Strayer;

A bill (S. 2364) granting a pension to Annie Tullis; and

A bill (S. 2365) granting an increase of pension to John R. Winter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 2366) for the relief of Daniel M. Whitaker; and

A bill (S. 2367) for the relief of Mary Whitaker Moffatt (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STANLEY:

A bill (S. 2368) granting an increase of pension to Rev. Horace Kennedy (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2369) granting an increase of pension to John B. Tucker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FALL:

A bill (S. 2370) granting a pension to George F. Ludi (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2371) for the relief of Katheryn Walker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KEYES:

A bill (S. 2372) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Dearborn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico:

A bill (S. 2373) to amend the act making an appropriation for a public building at East Las Vegas, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 2374) creating the Pajarito National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 2375) for the relief of Kate A. Wallace (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 2376) to establish a station for the investigation of mentally handicapped children in schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

AFFAIRS IN COSTA RICA.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a resolution for reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The situation to which this resolution relates is a most grave and serious one, which I trust will receive prompt and favorable consideration at the hands of the committee and that it will then be reported to the Senate for action.

The resolution (S. Res. 105) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the Senate why Nicaragua, a country over which the United States is maintaining a protectorate, has been and is now permitted, with armed forces, to invade and to threaten with invasion the territory of Costa Rica, a nation which has been and now is a friend of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the Senate for what reason Costa Rica, a belligerent with the Allies in the war just ended, was not permitted to sign the treaty of peace at Versailles, in view of the fact that the present Government of Costa Rica had been formally recognized as a cobelligerent by all the Allies in the war against Germany except by the United States, and recognized by the neutral nations of the earth as a constitutional government.

TREATMENT OF AMERICAN CITIZENS IN MEXICO.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 106), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas American citizens residing in and having property in the Republic of Mexico have suffered damages amounting to several hundred million dollars by reason of the unlawful destruction and larceny of property, and in addition thereto have been subjected to gross personal outrages, and in hundreds of cases have suffered murder and assassination; and

Whereas no progress has apparently been made toward the liquidation, settlement, and payment of claims against the Mexican Government, on account of whose delinquency such damages and outrages have been suffered: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to investigate the matter of damages and outrages suffered by citizens of the United States in the Republic of Mexico, including the number of citizens of the United States who have been killed or have suffered personal outrages in Mexico, and the amount of proper indemnities for such murders and outrages; the quantity of damages suffered on account of the destruction, confiscation, and larceny of personal property, and the confiscation and deprivation of the use of lands and the destruction of improvements thereon; the number of citizens of the United States residing in Mexico at the time Porfirio Diaz retired from the presidency of Mexico, and the number of citizens of the United States at present residing in Mexico, and the nature and amount of their present holdings and properties in said country; and for this purpose to subpœna such witnesses and documents as may be necessary and to make a report of the findings in the premises to the Senate.

CONTRACTS FOR GASOLINE.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 107), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, directed to report at the earliest practicable moment the amount of gasoline the War Department has on storage or under contract, at what prices it was obtained, and what amount it is estimated, if any, that the War Department now has to sell or release, and when, and in what manner, and upon what terms and quantities and conditions does it propose to sell or dispose of same; and if any contracts for gasoline have heretofore been entered into, state the terms of same and whether such contracts have been or are to be terminated or canceled; upon what conditions have the same been canceled or upon what terms is it proposed to cancel such contracts.

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT (S. RES. 108).

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and is hereby, directed to report to the Senate the quantity and description of war material, equipment, and supplies, particularly the number and description of cars, trucks, and tractors which will be required for the use and improvement of highways and which were authorized to be distributed among the highway departments of the several States to be used on the roads constructed in whole or in part by Federal aid, as provided by section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1919.

SURPLUS WAR DEPARTMENT EQUIPMENT.

Mr. KING. I offer another resolution, which is a complement to the one which has just been agreed to, and which I have submitted to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, and of which he approves.

The resolution (S. Res. 109) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is directed to report to the Senate the number and description of cars, trucks, tractors, and other war material, equipment, and supplies on hand and which are not needed by the War Department, and what steps have been taken to make an inventory and classification of such equipment and to sell and dispose of the same.

SULPHUR RIVER BRIDGE.

H. R. 4630. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River, near the Texas & Pacific Railroad bridge, in said county and State, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 4630) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River, near the Texas & Pacific Railroad bridge, in said county and State, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

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

H. R. 4631. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River, at or near Blackmans Point, in said county and State, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 4631) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River, at or near Blackmans Point, in said county and State, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration.

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

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

JOINT STOCK LAND BANKS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to make a short statement to the Senate this morning in relation to the joint stock land banks established in different parts of the country and some of the results that have come from the establishment of these banks under existing law. I call the attention of the Senate to the conditions existing with the hope that there will be no more of these joint stock land banks authorized, and I hope also that the Federal Farm Loan Bureau will take this as a notice that Congress intends to amend the act so that there shall be no more joint stock land banks authorized in this country.

I was fearful at the time they were authorized that the result would be just as it has turned out to be. When the revenue bill was before the Committee on Finance your committee struck the provision from that bill exempting their obligations from taxation. It went into conference, and the House insisted upon it, and to-day, as has been the case from the beginning, they are exempt from all forms of Federal taxation.

Mr. President, I asked the Federal Farm Loan Bureau to give me a concise statement of the first Joint Stock Land Bank of Chicago, Ill., and this is but a sample of all of the others, with the exception of some that were located unfavorably. I wish the Senate would listen to the result.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator how many of these joint stock land banks have been formed?

Mr. SMOOT. Twenty-one joint stock land banks have been formed up to date, but I am told now that as the result of the large profits of these joint stock land banks throughout the country the Federal Farm Loan Bureau to-day is swamped with applications, and unless we take some action and the law is

amended I do not see how the Federal Farm Loan Bureau is going to withstand much longer the demands that are made upon it.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator does not refer to the Federal farm associations, but simply to the joint stock land banks.

Mr. SMOOT. Just to the joint stock land bank. There are 3,708 associations, and the number ought to be increased. No one is objecting to them, but it is the joint stock land bank; and now, Senators, listen to the report up to date of the first one at Chicago, Ill., and see what the results show.

The charter was granted for the operation of this bank July 25, 1917. It operates in the States of Illinois and Iowa. Capital stock has been authorized at $1,000,000. Capital stock has been paid in as follows:

July 25, 1917	$125,000
Jan. 15, 1918	125,000
Oct. 21, 1918	125,000
Jan. 28, 1919	125,000
Feb. 27, 1919	100,000
May 7, 1919	100,000

Or a total paid in of capital stock of $700,000 to the close of May 31, 1919. This represents an average investment of $299,148.15 for the period from the organization to the close of May 31, 1919.

As shown by their report for the month of May, 1919, the net earnings amount to $47,304.60. In addition to this amount, dividends have been declared amounting to $13,904, and salaries were paid to officers and directors for the first five months of the current calendar year amounting to $16,500—two salaried directors.

The statement also shows $3,022,800 of bonds on hand unsold. These bonds at 5 per cent, if sold at 102 as advertised, should net the bank 101, which would mean an additional profit of $30,228 from this source. Assuming that this profit is realized on bonds on hand, the total profits would amount to $91,436.60, or 30½ per cent, on the average investment over and above the amounts paid for officers' and directors' salaries. Without the profits on bond sales actual earnings have been $61,208.60, or 20½ per cent on average investment over and above the amounts paid for officers and directors' salaries.

If the bank is maintained at present size the net income of 1 per cent, the difference between interest rate received from borrower and that paid on bonds, would amount to $100,000 per annum, while if increased to maximum permitted under authorized capital of $1,000,000 the income would amount to $150,000 per annum.

If this bank should take no more loans or should liquidate and should continue to operate only to such extent as would be necessary to make collections on amortization payments and make interest payments on outstanding bonds, the annual fixed income for the next 18 years, without any further effort, would amount to $100,000, which would permit the payment of salaries of $15,000 each per annum to the two salaried directors, allow $10,000 per annum for such clerical assistance as would then be needed, and leave a profit of $60,000 per annum for the 18 years' period. This would represent an income of over 8½ per cent on the investment for the period. The $10,000 clerical assistance estimate would be sufficient to not only cover all necessary clerical assistance, but to pay such incidental expenses, as rent, heat, light, postage, etc., as might be necessary to maintain the institution until complete liquidation could be made. The present annual pay roll for clerical assistance amounts to approximately $20,000.

The profits made by this institution would seem to be fairly indicative of those that could be made in any carefully operated joint stock land bank doing this volume of business. Other joint stock land banks do not show profits nearly so large as this institution, but in a number of instances these joint stock land banks are operated in connection with a trust company—mark this—which, it seems, ofttimes derives the benefits from premiums received on sales of bonds, thus greatly reducing the margin of profits shown by them, since these bonds are sold to the trust companies at par.

Mr. President, the owners in some cases of the stock of the joint stock land banks are the owners of a trust company, and in some cases profits are divided between them. In such cases I am told by one of the bank examiners of these joint stock land banks, that an application will be made sometimes to one of these banks, and they say, "Well, to-day we are not in a position to grant your request, but we suggest to you that you go to such and such a trust company." The applicant goes to the trust company, and the trust company will say, "We can make the loan at 7 per cent, but we should like to have you submit your application and securities." When the borrower returns they will, if the security is satisfactory, make the loan at 7 per cent. Then, Mr. President, the trust company takes 1 per cent, the joint stock land bank takes 1 per cent; and there is where the double profits are made. The bank and trust company are owned by the same people. I want to say that if the Chicago bank continues a few years longer it could close its doors, and each of the directors of the bank draw $20,000 per annum, do nothing, seek no further business, and wait for 18 years before the payments are fully made, when they will have received all of the profits named and capital invested during that time.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. POMERENE. I am very greatly surprised at the statement of these profits. I have kept somewhat in touch with the farm-loan associations that are being organized, and I am very proud of the work they are doing.

Mr. SMOOT. So am I.

Mr. POMERENE. They are doing a wonderful work everywhere the merits of the system have become known; but my attention has never been called to the earnings of the banks to which the Senator from Utah refers.

Mr. SMOOT. The joint stock land banks.

Mr. POMERENE. I am wondering what additional legislation the Senator from Utah has in mind.

Mr. SMOOT. I have in mind to offer an amendment to the Federal farm-loan act preventing the creation of any more joint stock land banks. There are 21 of them to-day in the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. These banks deal in bonds which are issued under the Federal farm-loan banking law.

Mr. SMOOT. They do; that is, they take the obligations of the farmer and then they issue bonds on them, just the same as the Federal farm-loan banks do.

Mr. THOMAS. The interest which these bonds bear is fixed by the Federal Farm Loan Board, is it not?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; the interest the bonds shall bear; but under the law there is 1 per cent increase allowed on the interest which the bonds bear. The plan for an additional increase, I am informed by the Federal Farm Loan Bureau, is through a trust company.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that, but there is no added burden because of this profit upon the farm borrower?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes; there is, Mr. President.

Mr. THOMAS. What burden?

Mr. SMOOT. The 1 per cent increase charged by the trust company over and above the 6 per cent allowed the bank to charge.

Mr. THOMAS. Suppose the bonds are handled by the Farm Loan Board directly, have they not the same authority to add this ½ per cent for the negotiation?

Mr. SMOOT. That is quite a different proposition. In the other case the money goes directly to the joint stock land banks, which are situated in different parts of the country and which are organized with a capital stock.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand perfectly.

Mr. SMOOT. And they virtually do a banking business.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand perfectly how they are run; but the associations which the Senator thinks should be encouraged have a similar right with regard to this added 1 per cent, have they not?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but they make direct loans—not through a trust company.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand. The bank, however, whatever its profits may be, makes a profit; and that is perfectly legitimate under the statute.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. THOMAS. I apprehended that there might be some practice which these banks were able to carry on that was very profitable to them but that the same time burdensome to the borrower.

Mr. SMOOT. Not so far as the 1 per cent is concerned; but I am told that in some cases the banks will say, "We are not in a position to make this loan, but we recommend that you go to the trust company"; and the trust company makes the loan, charging an additional 1 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS. But that is not an added 1 per cent, is it?

Mr. SMOOT. It is an added 1 per cent to the farmer.

Mr. THOMAS. If that is the case, then I quite agree with the Senator that it is not right. The fact, however, that the profit made is without an added burden to the farmer would appear to be not objectionable; but if, as the Senator says, there is an added 1 per cent, then by all means let us suppress it.

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what we want to do; and I believe, when I say that, I express the opinion of the members of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau. Why should these joint-

stock land banks be exempt from all forms of taxation? Nobody can justly defend that exemption, and your committee of the Senate struck it out of the revenue bill in the Senate; but, as I have said, it was put back in conference.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator why should the bonds of the Federal farm-loan banks be exempt from all taxation?

Mr. SMOOT. I really believe that they ought to be taxed, but the Congress thought otherwise.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am quite in favor of abolishing the joint-stock land banks; but it is unjust and unfair to accumulate any considerable capital in this country that is free from all taxation, and we will not be able to endure that practice very long, for the large income-tax payers of the country will gradually accumulate these bonds, and a very large portion of our capital will not contribute anything to the expenses of the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Iowa is absolutely right, and what I want to undertake first is to stop the creation of any more joint-stock land banks. Let us get at that at once; and I hope that the Federal Farm Loan Bureau from this day on will positively refuse to issue any kind of a charter or permit for the organization of such banks.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if part of the evil does not arise from the exemption the joint-stock land banks have from the powers of the Federal Farm Loan Board? Subdivision b of section 17 of the Federal farm-loan act, relating to the general powers of the Federal Farm Loan Board, provides that they shall have the power—

To review and alter at its discretion the rate of interest to be charged by Federal land banks for loans made by them under the provisions of this act, said rates to be uniform so far as practicable.

But now joint-stock land banks are exempt from that provision under a paragraph of section 16, which prescribes:

Joint-stock land banks shall not be subject to the provisions of subsection b of section 17 of this act as to interest rates on mortgage loans or farm-loan bonds.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is perfectly right; there is no doubt about it; and they are even given a greater power for speculative purposes than the farm-loan banks themselves. I think it is unjust; nobody can defend it; and the law ought to be amended. I have a bill prepared for that purpose which I am going to offer in a few days, and I express the hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will take action upon it as quickly as possible.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, is it a bill for the repeal of that part of the law?

Mr. SMOOT. It will not in any way affect the joint-stock land banks that have been granted a charter; they may go on; but——

Mr. NELSON. It has relation to the future?

Mr. SMOOT. It will prevent in the future the organization of joint-stock land banks.

Mr. NELSON. I think the Senator is right. That feature of the law never ought to have been enacted.

Mr. SMOOT. Never.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the history of this matter is that in framing the Federal farm-loan act—and I had the privilege of introducing the first bill on the subject—joint-stock land banks were never contemplated at all. That idea originated in another part of the Capitol; it finally came to us here and, by way of arriving at an adjustment of differences, it was finally incorporated in the law. The argument for these joint-stock land banks, however, presents very considerable merit, though it may be possible that the law is not strict enough in its terms to prevent speculation and to avoid difficulties such as have been indicated by the Senator from Utah. I never did favor the idea, I confess, but, as I have said, there are arguments for it which are quite convincing in a way. For instance, the Federal farm-loan act limits the loans made by a farm-loan bank to $10,000.

Under the system no loan can be made by any Federal land bank exceeding $10,000. It was argued that there are a good many people engaged in farming operations in the country, purely agricultural enterprises, whose requirements would not be met by $10,000, and the question was how to afford some facilities for those large enterprises, where property of the value of $100,000, perhaps, was involved, perhaps a farm operated by a corporation or an individual. That class of borrowers will be deprived of any advantage under this system if the limit of the loans is made $10,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I presume the Senator knows that the law has been construed so that a loan of $10,000 can be made to individuals, but not to a corporation. Individuals can get such loans, not one individual, but individuals who are indirectly, I may say, or directly interested in the property. Under those circumstances a loan of more than $10,000 can be made.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not understand how they manage that, because the law specifically provides that $10,000 is the maximum loan which may be made.

Mr. SMOOT. I will assure the Senator that loans of more than $10,000 are made. I do not wish, however, to go into a discussion of that now.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will not take up time with that. I do not quite approve of it, if it is done; but it ought not to be done, in my judgment. The primary purpose of the act was to meet the necessities of the small home builder who is struggling to acquire a home and develop that home and improve it and to enjoy some of the conveniences of life in the country. That was the primary object; it was to assist such people. The reason for exempting the bonds from taxation was to enable the bonds to be sold at as low a rate as possible.

The law provides that the banks shall not charge above 1 per cent in excess of the rate of interest paid on the bonds; so that the borrower, the farmer, the actual producer of foodstuffs, is to get the benefit of a low rate of interest. As a matter of fact, 1 per cent was the maximum amount supposed to be allowed for purposes of administration, but it has been possible to administer the law at an expense of one-half of 1 per cent, and as the business grows it will probably fall below that; so that when the bonds are sold for 5 per cent the farmer gets his money for 5½ per cent, or if the bonds are sold at 4½ per cent, the farmer pays 5 per cent; that is what the loan costs him. He pays that for 35 years, or he pays it for 5 years, and any time after 5 years he can pay up the entire indebtedness or any portion of it.

It is a wonderful system and is producing wonderful results. A great many of the farmers in the Northwest were actually saved from ruin by reason of this system because mortgages upon their farms held by foreigners could not be renewed. So the farmers came to these banks to secure the money with which to liquidate past indebtedness. That is one of the objects of the system, namely, to pay off existing liens. Two hundred million dollars and more have been loaned to farmers at the rate of 5½ per cent per annum under this system.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I agree with the Senator as to the beneficial results and possibilities of the Federal land banks. I wish to ask the Senator, however, what ground, if any, there is for the charge which has been made that some of these banks are evading the spirit at least, if not the letter of the law, which limits the amount that can be loaned to one farmer, by having the farmer deed portions of his farm to various members of his family, and then each member of the family borrowing the maximum amount which they can borrow under the law, thereby in effect loaning at the same time as much as $25,000 practically to one man, although nominally to different individuals?

In connection with the inquiry of the Senator as to what grounds exist for this charge that has been made, I should like to say that my understanding of the purpose of this law at the time it was passed was that it was to help the poor man; that it was to enable the farmer of small land holdings and meager resources to borrow a modest amount of money at a low rate of interest with ample time in which to repay it. Furthermore, this charge is made; I do not know whether it is well-grounded or not. I should like to hear from the Senator from Florida in regard to it. While the purpose of this law was to enable farmers who had raw lands, comparatively unimproved lands, comparatively poor lands, which would not furnish very good commercial security, lands on which they would have difficulty in borrowing money from commercial banks, even at high rates of interest, to borrow money in order to enable them to improve the unimproved lands, it is charged that in the administration of the law farmers of that kind, farmers who are undertaking to improve land under those conditions, have not been able to borrow money from the Federal land banks. In other words, it is stated that the Federal farm land banks have confined their loans to improved lands, to valuable lands, to lands which were good commercial security, and upon which money could be borrowed, although at a higher rate of interest, through commercial agencies.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, one of the very purposes of the act was to afford facilities for those farmers in the situation the Senator mentions. They were unable to get loans from financial institutions, from banking institutions. It was not a commercial proposition. It was to enable those people who could not get loans anywhere else to obtain money for the development of their property and the improvement of their farms.

I can not understand why a loan should be refused in those circumstances. The act does not say that the farm, or the land, or the real estate upon which the mortgage is taken, must be improved. It says simply that—

No such loan shall exceed 50 per cent of the value of the land mortgaged and 20 per cent of the value of the permanent, insured improvement thereon.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is true; and I think the Senator has the same idea as to the spirit and purpose of the act that I had; but what I was inquiring about was whether or not the administration of the law had been in accordance with the purpose of the act when it was passed by Congress.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, I can not answer as to that specifically. I feel in a general way that the board has endeavored to carry out the spirit of the law. Of course, there is this to be said: In the first place, there are local farm loan associations formed. Those local associations have their officers, directors, and a committee on appraisal. That committee reports on the value of the land offered as security. Then that report is checked up by appraisers selected by the land bank, and the final determination as to the value of the land offered has to be reached through that system. Now, the bank appraiser may make a mistake in judgment as to the value of the land. He may consider the land offered, being unimproved land and all of that sort of thing, as not having sufficient actual value to warrant a loan upon it, and there may be a mistake in judgment as to that; and, of course, there are opportunities for the administration rather to fail to measure up to the merits of the situation in particular instances in that way. They have to depend upon the judgment of their appraisers, and those appraisers have to act independently of the local appraisers in order to protect the bank as far as possible; and yet I think there is a sympathetic interest upon the part of the board and a desire, as far as possible, to meet the situation upon its merits.

I do not know about this question of exceeding the amount of the loan. In the seventh subdivision of section 12 of the act it is specifically provided:

The amount of loans to any one borrower shall in no case exceed a maximum of $10,000, nor shall any loan be for a less sum than $100.

That is the express provision of the law, and I am inclined to think it is a good provision. It may be possible that it is advisable to increase that somewhat, but I doubt it very much, because the original purpose was to take care of the needs of the man who did not have the capital to develop his farm and improve it sufficiently—the small man, as the Senator has said. They may avoid that in some way by subdividing the farm, but that is an evasion. I certainly think the practice ought not to be continued, or certainly ought not to be encouraged. There may be, of course, instances where a farm is worth many times more than $20,000, and it may be possible to subdivide it so as to get additional accommodation, but that is an evasion of the law, in my judgment; and it was for that reason that these joint-stock land banks were provided for in that act, to take care of these larger enterprises that could not be accommodated under this act.

I do not know what has been done in the formation of those joint-stock land banks. I was a little surprised to know from the Senator from Utah that they now number 21.

Mr. SMOOT. They number 21.

Mr. FLETCHER. In my part of the country there have been none formed at all, and I did not suppose they were being operated.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, let me say at that point that if you draw a line in the center of the United States north and south, out of these 21 banks there is but one west of the center line, and 20 of them are east of that line.

Mr. FLETCHER. The center of the United States, beginning where?

Mr. SMOOT. Running just a little west of the Mississippi River.

Mr. FLETCHER. At any rate, there are none in the district in which Florida is located.

Mr. SMOOT. There is not one in Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. There are none in Florida, Georgia, North or South Carolina.

Mr. SMOOT. Most of them are in the large cities.

Mr. FLETCHER. I knew there were none in that district, and I did not know they were being formed to any extent.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator also that I understand this morning that there are applications for almost 100 more of them. Of course there will be applications after they find out the results of the ones that have already been formed. Who would not like to go into a business and run it two years and draw $20,000 salary as a director, and do nothing for 18 years, and be assured of over 8½ per cent on his money besides the $20,000 that he draws by way of salary as director?

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, we tried as far as possible to separate these joint-stock land banks from the system. We went so far as to provide that—

Farm-loan bonds issued by joint-stock land banks shall be so engraved as to be readily distinguished in form and color from farm-loan bonds issued by Federal land banks, and shall otherwise bear such distinguishing marks as the Federal Farm Loan Board shall direct.

That is so that the public would not be deceived as to these bonds. Now, the act further provides:

Shareholders of every joint-stock land bank organized under this act shall be held individually responsible, equally and ratably, and not one for another, for all contracts, debts, and engagements of such bank to the extent of the amount of stock owned by them at the par value thereof in addition to the amount paid in and represented by their shares.

So that there is back of the obligation of these joint-stock land banks not only the farm, which the law says shall be taken as security not exceeding 50 per cent of its value, and then the obligation of the borrower, but the obligation of this joint-stock land bank itself and the liability of every stockholder of that bank to double the amount of his stock.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the same as the national banking law.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; that is the same as the national banking law.

Mr. SMOOT. And, Mr. President, there is no idea that there is going to be any loss as far as the stockholders are concerned, because they are absolutely insured. I do not see how it is possible to make a loss in these joint-stock land banks. There is a chance, however, of the others making a loss, because they make loans directly from here upon farms generally all over the United States. As I say, there are 3,708 of these associations at the present time.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of the farm-loan associations?

Mr. SMOOT. Of the farm-loan associations.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is quite distinct from this joint-stock land bank provision altogether.

Mr. SMOOT. Entirely so.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then the law further provides that—

No joint-stock land bank shall have power to issue or obligate itself for outstanding farm-loan bonds in excess of fifteen times the amount of its capital and surplus—

That was thought to make a fair safety margin—

or to receive deposits or to transact any banking or other business not expressly authorized by the provisions of this act.

Now, those are restrictions upon their operation, and in addition:

No joint-stock land bank shall be authorized to do business until capital stock to the amount of at least $250,000 has been subscribed, one-half thereof paid in cash and the balance subject to call by the board of directors, and a charter has been issued to it by the Federal Farm Loan Board.

No joint-stock land bank shall issue any bonds until after the capital stock is entirely paid up.

The object was to protect the public as far as possible and at the same time afford facilities for accommodating those engaged in agriculture on a large scale. That was the purpose. It may be that there is some abuse about it. At any rate, it is a matter worth considering, and when the Senator introduced the bill and the committee takes it up we can get at the real merits of it. It may be possible to meet the situation by an amendment. I do not quite like the idea of continuing the 21 and saying that nobody else shall get into this business hereafter, because that looks as if we were rather giving them a monopoly of it. It may be that there ought to be some restrictions somewhere in addition to what we have, but I am unalterably opposed to changing the law which exempts these farm-loan bonds from State, county, municipal, and Federal taxation. That benefits the farmers of the country, who produce the food of the Nation, and they get the direct benefit of the exemption. It ought to be continued.

REFUND OF TAXES.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if there is nothing else before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to take up for consideration Senate bill 1694. It is a private bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1694) providing for the refund of taxes collected for stamp tax on certain policies under the emergency tax act of October 22, 1914, under the proviso to which act such policies were exempt. It authorizes and directs—

The Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Central Manufacturers' Mutual Insurance Co. of Van Wert, Ohio, the sum of $2,888.77, being the amount paid for stamp taxes under the emergency revenue act of October 22, 1914, on policies of such company, which policies were exempt from such tax under a proviso to said act as determined

by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit in the case of Niles, collector of internal revenue, against Central Manufacturers' Mutual Insurance Co., decided June 10, 1918, and reported in volume 252 of the Federal Reporter, page 564.

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

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], while I was addressing the Senate on the subject of public opinion in the United States on the league of nations, asked me the question as to whether I had any information as to the state of opinion among the returning soldiers. In reply I advised him that I had made no effort to ascertain that opinion and knew of no method by which it could be very accurately ascertained. Since that time there have been placed in my hand copies of The Stars and Stripes, the publication authorized by the War Department, which was organized on a business basis in France, and which circulated there among the soldiers of the American Expeditionary Forces in competition with the London Mail, the Chicago Tribune, and the New York Herald, which, so far as I know, were the only other newspapers published in English and circulated among the men.

This newspaper, upon its merits as a newspaper, selling for 50 centimes, attained a circulation of something like 400,000, and became, perhaps, the most widely circulated newspaper of all those patronized by members of the Expeditionary Forces. During its career, which has only just now come to an end, it secured a considerable amount of advertising because of its large circulation, and the result of the publication of this newspaper and its circulation among the American soldiers in France has been to earn a profit of something in the neighborhood of $500,000.

I desire to add this newspaper to the list of those which I published yesterday in my remarks as being a strong supporter of the league of nations, and in doing so I wish to read a few editorial extracts from various copies of the paper.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I inquire if the paper was edited by soldiers or by the War Department?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was edited by soldiers and officers. The War Department authorized Gen. Pershing to organize a newspaper of this sort, or to permit its organization with the backing of the War Department, and directed him to select experienced newspaper men from privates and officers.

Mr. KENYON. Who were the officers?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I happen to know but one of the editors, Mr. Guy Viskniski, who was the managing editor of the Philadelphia Press at one time and later the manager of the McClure Newspaper Syndicate in the United States.

Mr. KENYON. Was he a soldier?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. He was; I think he was an officer. The members of the staff consisted impartially of officers and privates, those having experience in the particular newspaper department to which they were assigned upon this paper; and the success of the paper demonstrates the fact that the men selected were experienced and competent newspaper men. The character of the articles, so far as I have read them, indicates that the management of the paper and the membership of the staff were selected in such a way as to make a successful newspaper upon its merits.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am told by the War Department authorities that the editorial utterances of the paper were absolutely unfettered, and that the control of the paper was placed by Gen. Pershing in the hands of these men simply because they would be able to give to the men the news that they were interested in receiving from home, and the news that, as members of the Expeditionary Force, they were anxious to get. The wide circulation of the paper, being entirely voluntary and costing money, 50 centimes being charged for each copy, indicates that it met with favor among the men.

I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have no doubt that it is a very excellent paper, and, as the Senator says, its wide circulation is an indication of that; but that would not necessarily indicate that it was a paper of independent views. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that this newspaper was subject to military censorship as to its contents.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There was no military censorship exercised upon it, as I am informed, except that there was no criticism permitted of military officers.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Was there any criticism permitted of the administration?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The only censorship that I have been informed of was that they were not permitted to criticize the military management of the war.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have been informed they were also not permitted to discuss controversial political subjects involving the conduct of the administration. If the Senator can point out in any copy of the paper even any independent to say nothing of any critical views as to the administration of the Government, I should like to have him do so.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not familiar with it. I have not been a reader of it. I have seen occasionally a copy that some soldier sent me, but I have here three copies from which I desire to read.

I am aware of and I appreciate the fact that an attack will be made upon it, just as an attack will be made upon every supporter of the league of nations. If a banker supports it, he is denounced as an international banker; if a big business man supports the league of nations, he is denounced as a big business man; and I suppose this will be criticized; but I will put it in the RECORD in connection with other things I have already put in the RECORD to show that the overwhelming sentiment of this country, as indicated by the newspapers of all classes, supports the league of nations.

I am only doing this because the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] in a very proper way asked me to indicate if I could what the sentiment was among the returning soldiers upon this question. Naturally, that is not an easy matter to ascertain. I assume that the men who go back to Iowa from their service in the war will reflect to a large extent the opinion of Iowa, and I know what the opinion of Iowa is, because practically every Republican newspaper in the State is supporting the league of nations. I assume those who go back to the State of Nebraska will reflect the sentiment of the people of Nebraska, and I know that every Republican paper, stand-pat and progressive, as well as every Democratic paper of Statewide circulation in my State is supporting the league of nations.

Mr. LODGE. Every newspaper in New York supported Mr. Mitchel for mayor.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the Senator from Massachusetts very well knows, if he knows anything about the newspaper world, that when newspapers come to speak about local candidates they have no influence over the individual voter. The man in New York City knows as much about the candidates for mayor as the editor of a newspaper, and he always exercises his individual right to express his opinion at the polls. In every municipal campaign newspapers are comparatively impotent. But when newspapers come to argue great principles and national questions, they not only influence public opinion, but they reflect the public opinion of the community in which they are published.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to read from these copies of the Stars and Stripes without further interruption.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I merely wish to ask one further question of the Senator.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator will make it brief, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Some time ago I noticed a dispatch in a newspaper stating that the Secretary of War had sent a commission composed largely of college professors to Europe to instruct the soldiers in the American Army in Europe on the question of the league of nations. Does the Senator know whether that statement was correct or not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; I do not know anything about it. It has nothing to do with this case.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It has something to do with it for this reason. The Senator has already stated that this paper was published under the protection of the War Department.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was published by permission of the War Department, and with the authority of the War Department, and under the direct supervision of Gen. Pershing, because it filled a great want. The men were over there without literature; they were over there without news, and the paper was published for the purpose of filling a want, and it is that paper supported by these men from which I now read.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. I wish to state to the Senator from Nebraska that the publication of this paper was suspended on the 13th of June.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am aware of that fact. I have the last issue in my hand.

Mr. NELSON. I received the last copy of it bearing that date, stating that that was the end of it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was the end of it, because the demobilization had progressed to such an extent over there that on or about the 13th or 15th of June, I think it was, the paper having

fulfilled its purpose was suspended. It represents the most successful publication ever attempted, because in the period of its existence it not only supplied the men with greatly needed news and gave them the moral support which came from having the news of the Army and the news of America, but it also earned a handsome profit, because it was managed legitimately, independently, and was unfettered in the expression of its opinions.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GERRY. I was informed when in Europe that the editors of the newspaper were allowed practically entire independence in the handling of it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am so informed by the Secretary of War.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Subject to the usual military censorship.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The only censorship to which they were subjected was that they should not attack their military superiors nor attack the military management.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It could not give information about the movements of the Army. It was subject to the usual military censorship.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes. I have stated that the managing editor for the greatest period of the time was Mr. Guy Viskniski, who has an established reputation in this country as managing editor of the Philadelphia Press for a number of years, has held responsible newspaper positions since that time, and held a newspaper position at the time he entered the Army. I am not familiar with the names of the other editors and have not had time to secure them. I repeat that they were both officers and privates.

The first editorial to which my attention has been called appeared on the 31st of January. I will only read the first paragraph, because it shows the character of it:

The plan of a league of nations, laid this week at the door of the world, is the greatest gift that has been offered to humanity since Cain spilled the first blood outside the fields of Eden.

They were high words which were written on the banners of America's citizen Army that sent the khaki legion into battle. No boastful talk of planting a flag on foreign soil, no threat of far-flung frontiers, no promise of booty in new Provinces or spoil from the strong boxes of defeated kings.

Then I read the next reference in the number appearing February 21. This is more news almost than it is editorial. "In Black and White," it is entitled:

IN BLACK AND WHITE.

Standing among the dignitaries of the foreign offices, the sovereigns of States, the members of cabinets, the diplomatists and the writers who heard President Wilson read the draft of the league of nations last Friday were some men in khaki whose "rank and title" in the registration book reads simply, "Private, U. S. A."—some of the men whose presence in France during the months just past made possible the league of nations.

They heard the President say that the plan was made for the "men who go to bed tired at night and wake up without hope"; they heard the words of the covenant itself that is proposed to end all wars spoken clearly and emphatically by their Commander in Chief, and they saw the printed copies in the hands of the delegates. They knew then that the thing that their comrades had fought and died for through a winter and around the seasons until one November morning was real—it was there on paper for all the world to read.

There was little ceremony, there was no debate, there was nothing to show of the days of earnest discussion, of claim and counterclaim, of doubt and faith, and the power that drove out the doubt and downed the opposition. The draft was read and explained, and that was all.

It is not yet accepted. It was not even submitted without reservation on the part of some members of the commission that helped to draw it up. But it is there surely "a living thing," as the President himself called it, with as fair a chance for success among the united States of civilization as had the Constitution of the United States of America when it came before the skeptic and fearful councilors, the doubters and cynics in the legislatures of the original States, who very likely sneered at the "idealistic document," far too impractical to be worthy of their support.

The privates who heard the draft of the covenant of the league of nations believe that their comrades did not die in vain.

The next mention I find in the files of The Stars and Stripes is in the publication of February 28, and is in an editorial entitled "The League of Nations," as follows:

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Why is it that the matchless cathedrals of France, built hundreds of years ago, still stand to receive the hushed and wondering Yankee pilgrims, shaming by their strength and stately beauty the weaker and more tawdry structures of our own day and generation? Is it because the care and toil and love, not of a few years but of centuries, went into their building?

The men who laid the first stones of the shell-torn marvel at Rheims, the hill-top cathedral at Bourges, the imperishable Notre Dame at Paris, did not live to see those temples completed, knew that it would never be their lot to see them completed. Preposterously idealistic and impractical, they worked with their eyes on the future. Their work was good because it was not done for themselves. They builded for the Lord.

Now, before the peoples of the world are laid the architects' plans for a great mansion and soon work will begin on the foundations. If, indifferent to the needs of future generations, the builders plan it only for the convenience and short-sighted comfort of their own immediate occupancy, that mansion will not be good to look upon, nor will it withstand the tempests of the waiting centuries. But it will still be standing, beautiful, strong, spacious, a thousand years from now, if those who lay its foundations to-day build it for the Lord—for posterity.

Finally, in what I think was the last issue of the paper, as indicated by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], June 13, an editorial entitled "War as we know it" concludes as follows:

We know but we can not give that knowledge to others. But upon it we can act. We can help build a league of nations with such sinews of war and such conscience for peace that no one will dare oppose it.

If we don't, the blood will be on our own foolish heads, which, by the grace of God, chance, or some Prussian guardsman's poor aim, are still on our foolish shoulders.

Mr. President, I submit this as a conclusive showing of what I have made of the state of public opinion. I had no idea in the time I might have when I put into the RECORD yesterday a list of Republican and Independent newspapers and gave a list of test votes and straw votes and national conventions and State organizations that I could produce any evidence of the state of public opinion in the Army, but I believe this newspaper, supported as it was by many of the men who fought in the war, probably expressed to a large extent the judgment of those men who supported that newspaper, and I submit it as a final showing in what I made yesterday.

Before I conclude I ask to have published in the RECORD an article by William Howard Taft, published in the Washington Post yesterday, in reply or in criticism of the resolution introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL].

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

TAFT SAYS CONGRESS CAN NOT DECLARE PEACE WITH GERMANY—HOLDS FALL RESOLUTION SHOULD "BE ALLOWED TO DIE THE NATURAL DEATH APPARENTLY SUFFERED BY KNOX RESOLUTION"—CITES DANGER IN SEPARATE PACT WITH HUNS.

[By William Howard Taft.]

Senator FALL'S joint resolution to declare peace with Germany has been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. Senator LODGE has said that Congress, having the power to declare war, has, therefore, the power to declare peace. This argument is faulty in that it assumes that in their making war and peace are of the same nature. Each is a legal status, but the status of war may be created by the declaration of one nation. The status of peace after a war may be created only by an agreement of the belligerents to end the war. If only one of them declares peace, war continues. Congress declares war, makes war, and can cease making war on its side, but that does not make peace. The nation with which we have been at war must agree that war is ended and signify its agreement.

Now, agreements with other nations are made, under our Constitution, by what is called the treaty-making power, the President and the Senate. Therefore permanent peace after a war can only be properly made by a treaty. It is true that we have sometimes effected arrangements with other nations through an act of Congress; but they were in their nature mere enactments of law to prevail in our country on condition that certain corresponding laws were enacted in another country.

CITES CANADIAN RECIPROCITY.

Thus Canadian reciprocity in 1911 was provided for by act of Congress as to duties on imports from Canada on condition that certain duties were imposed by Canada on imports from the United States. Either party might end the operation of the arrangement by repeal of its law. So here, perhaps, Congress could declare peace with Germany on condition that Germany made a similar declaration.

But that is not the Fall resolution. It merely declares peace. Without Germany's accord, it can not create peace. The armistice continues. The effect of the signing of the final treaty before ratification will continue the armistice till ratification of the treaty.

END OF WAR WITH NO CONCLUSION.

But suppose Germany were, by legislative act, to make a corresponding declaration of peace. The result would be an end of the war without any conclusion. We went to war specifically to maintain as neutrals the rights of our own ships and our citizens on commercial vessels of the enemies of Germany to be free from injury upon the high seas by submarines. Germany denied us those rights.

If the war is to be ended by congressional resolution, as suggested, we shall have not settled in any way the rights we sought to maintain. Under our alien enemy property act we have sold millions of dollars of the private property of German nationals. Germany will be in a position to dispute the validity of every one of these sales. She may dispute our title to the German commercial vessels we interned and then took over for our use. Such a peace would, indeed, be a lame and impotent conclusion of a great war and our great sacrifices.

MUST RELY ON SIGNED TREATY.

It would be a separate peace with Germany, ignoring our Allies. Those who propose it must really rely on the provisions of the treaty already signed in Paris by the Germans, the advantages of which it is thus intended to secure without assuming its burdens.

But it is said we can make a subsequent treaty with Germany with specific terms. Yes; we can; but then she will be in a much more unrestrained position to assert and demand conditions which she was unable to secure against the Allies.

But why discuss such an impossible resolution as the Fall resolution? It can not pass save with the Executive signature. Of course that will be withheld. The President could not, and would not, approve the resolution, and the country would sustain him in his veto. It would then take two-thirds of the Senate and two-thirds of the House to pass it. Does anybody suppose that two-thirds of either House would pass it?

WOULD SHIFT BURDEN OF DELAY.

Why then attempt to pass it in the Senate? The only possible reason is that in some way it will transfer to the President the burden of delaying a return to normal peace conditions with Germany and a resumption of business intercourse. It is hoped that the Senate, in amending the German treaty so as to send it back for further negotia-

tion, or that a minority of the Senate, in refusing to ratify the unamended treaty, may avoid responsibility for the delay by manifesting a desire for immediate peace by such a resolution. In other words, its only object would seem to be playing for position.

URGES CONSTITUTIONAL PROCEDURE.

Let us hope the constitutional procedure will be followed, and that the Senate will not act until it has the treaty before it for its constitutional action. The Fall resolution should be allowed to die the same natural death apparently suffered by the Knox resolution.

When the treaty is before the Senate, then no consideration of expediency should prevent a Senator from voting to amend or reject the treaty if he believes it to be really dangerous to our country's interest. If he hesitates to assume responsibility for delay, it must be that he has not confidence in his reasons for opposing the treaty on its merits.

AMHERST W. BARBER.

Mr. NELSON. The bill (S. 1377) for the relief of Amherst W. Barber was passed over when reached on the calendar. I think there is no objection to it, and I ask unanimous consent that it be put on its passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to Amherst W. Barber, the sum of $263.37 for the resurvey of 23 miles, 75 chains, and 42 links of township lines on public lands in the State of Colorado, executed by him and necessary to complete the lines of survey embraced in his contract No. 710, dated April 2, 1885.

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

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

Mr. PHELAN. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1358) providing for an additional judge for the northern district of California. The bill has been favorably reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, and a similar bill was passed by the Senate at the last session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. ASHURST. I have no objection, but 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	Gronna	McKellar	Smith, Md.
Ball	Harding	McLean	Smoot
Bankhead	Harris	McNary	Spencer
Beckham	Henderson	Nelson	Stanley
Borah	Hitchcock	Norris	Sterling
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Sutherland
Capper	Kellogg	Overman	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Phelan	Trammell
Culberson	Kenyon	Phipps	Underwood
Cummins	Keyes	Pittman	Wadsworth
Curtis	King	Poindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Kirby	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	Knox	Ransdell	Warren
Fall	La Follette	Robinson	Watson
Fletcher	Lenroot	Sheppard	Williams
Gay	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Gerry	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call; there is a quorum present. The Senator from California asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1358. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I shall ask that the bill go over to-day, and I wish to call the attention of the Senator from California to the fact that the bill will have to be amended, it seems to me, as it is an amendment to section 1 of the Judicial Code, which provides that there shall be two district judges in that district.

The bill provides for the appointment of an additional judge for the northern district of California, with the same qualifications, jurisdiction, and salary as the present district judge. There are two judges in that district, and I should like to have the bill go over in order to ascertain whether there is any real reason for three judges in that district; and if there is, then to have the bill amended so as to conform with section 1 of the Judicial Code.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I think this is one of the most meritorious bills of this character that have ever come before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I merely wish to have it amended.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is the only bill that the Attorney General says he has made an exception of by recommending its passage. He says in his letter that San Francisco is the New York of the West, that they have business coming before the court from all over the country and in connection with Australia and other parts of the eastern world, and that the judges assigned there now can not perform the work. If the Senator will read the letter of the Attorney General in reference to the bill he will notice that he says that they have been compelled to assign judges there from other jurisdictions for as many as 250 days in a year.

Mr. SMOOT. What I am referring to more particularly is this: The bill says, in line 6, that this additional judge "shall possess the same qualifications and have the same powers and jurisdiction and receive the same salary now prescribed by law in respect to the present district judge therein"——

Mr. PHELAN. The bill says "judges." The Senator is in error.

Mr. SMOOT. I now see that it does; I thought that it said "judge therein."

Mr. PHELAN. No; the bill says "judges therein."

Mr. SMOOT. Then I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that of all the bills for the appointment of additional judges this is the only one that the Department of Justice has strenuously recommended. It ought to pass, for it is urgently needed.

Mr. SMOOT. The Legislative Reference Service, in their digest of this bill, make this statement:

This bill, which provides for the appointment of an additional judge for the northern district of California, with same qualifications, jurisdiction, and salary as the present district judge, is in effect an amendment of section 1 of the Judicial Code, which provides that there shall be two district judges in this district.

I read that as I did not have the bill before me; there was not a copy of it on my files; and as I understood the Secretary to read "judge," I wished to have an amendment adopted to make the bill conform to the Judicial Code. I have no objection, however, to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. A brief executive session is necessary, and 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 seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR ARIZONA.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 282, providing for an additional judge for the district of Arizona.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 282) providing for an additional judge for the district of Arizona, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional judge for the district of Arizona, who shall reside in said district and shall possess the same qualifications and have the same powers and jurisdiction and receive the same salary now prescribed by law in respect of the present district judge therein.

SEC. 2. That the clerk of the district court for the district of Arizona and the marshal and district attorney for said district shall perform the duties appertaining to their offices, respectively, for said court.

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

RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senate can not expect any conference reports from the House until half past 2 o'clock. Therefore I move that the Senate take a recess until 2.30 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 2.30 o'clock p. m., at which hour the Senate reassembled.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue permits for the diversion of water from the Niagara River, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES HOUSING CORPORATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, ordered to be printed, and, with accompanying paper, ordered to lie on the table:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918, I transmit herewith reports covering all of the transactions with relation to the subject matter of that act up to and including February 28, 1919, and of all of the divisions other than the Fiscal Division up to and including April 30, 1919.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 1, 1919.*

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WARREN. I present the conference report on House bill 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and move its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will be read.

The Secretary read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 6, 8, 11, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 24, 29, 30, 31, 35, 40, 44, 51, 52, 56, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 68, 72, 74, 88, 96, and 112.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 12, 17, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 48, 57, 64, 66, 67, 70, 75, 77, 80, 92, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 114, and 115, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$2,375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$48,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Assistant Surgeons General at large, not exceeding three in number"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The heads of the several executive departments and other Government establishments are authorized and directed to submit to Congress not later than the first Monday in December, 1919, a statement showing for the fiscal year 1919 the activities of their respective departments or establishments pertaining to the public health, and the amounts expended on account of each of the said activities."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $2,500 per annum except the following: One at $7,500, 1 at $5,000, 10 at $3,600 each, and 40 from $2,500 to $3,000 each, inclusive"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$356,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out, amended to read as follows:

"For commencing the construction of a reflecting pool in West Potomac Park, $175,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,461,353.50"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,201,897"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: " : *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to adjust the compensation of officers and employees at St. Elizabeths Hospital"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "offices" in line 11; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The appropriation herein made for the enforcement of the immigration laws shall be available for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes,' approved October 16, 1918, and acts amendatory thereof."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "To," strike out the word "equip"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"HOUSES.

"Aberdeen, Md., $5,000;
"Alliance, Ohio, $6,500;
"Bath, Me., $7,500;
"Bremerton, Wash., $24,000;
"Bridgeport, Conn. (site 4—Crane tract), $19,000;
"Bridgeport, Conn. (site 5—Mill green), $19,000;
"Bridgeport, Conn. (site 12—Grassmere), $8,000;
"Charleston, W. Va., $8,000;
"Erie, Pa. (east tract), $4,500;
"Erie, Pa. (west tract), $18,500;
"Hammond, Ind., $13,000;
"Indianhead, Md., $8,000;
"New Brunswick, N. J., $17,000;
"New London, Conn., $8,000;
"Groton, Conn., $1,750;
"Newport, R. I., $3,750;
"Niagara Falls, N. Y., $13,000;
"Niles, Ohio, $5,750;
"Philadelphia, Pa., $44,000;
"Portsmouth (Va.) district: Cradock, $47,000; Truxton, $12,500;
"Pompton Lakes, N. J., $1,000;
"Quincy, Mass., $36,000;
"Rock Island district: Davenport, Iowa, $15,000; Moline, Ill., $9,000; East Moline, Ill., $8,000; Rock Island, Ill., $16,500;
"Vallejo, Calif. (Mare Island), $21,000;
"Washington (D. C.) Navy Yard, $1,000;
"Waterbury, Conn., $4,000;
"Watertown, N. Y., $7,000;
"In all, houses, $412,250."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Amend the matter inserted by said amendment as follows: In line 2 strike out "$220,000" and insert "$165,000"; in line 3 strike out "$99,000" and insert "$74,000"; in line 5 strike out the word "equip"; in line 14 strike out "$925,940" and insert "$700,000"; in line 14 strike out "$1,244,940" and insert "$939,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"RESTAURANTS.

"Quincy, Mass., $2,500;
"Vallejo, Calif. (Mare Island), $110,000;
"In all, restaurants, $112,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"APARTMENTS.

"Bremerton, Wash., $6,000;
"Bridgeport, Conn. (site 1, Black Rock), $33,000;
"Bridgeport, Conn. (site 14, Connecticut Avenue), $15,000;
"Erie, Pa. (west tract), $1,000;
"Porthmouth, Va., District: Cradock, $6,000;
"Washington, D. C.: Navy yard, $600;
"In all, apartments, $61,600."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"DORMITORIES.

"Indianhead, Md., $6,000;
"Quincy, Mass., $74,000;
"Vallejo, Calif. (Mare Island), $28,000;
"Washington, D. C.: Navy yard, $4,000;
"In all, dormitories, $112,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"In all, $2,068,970: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriations heretofore made and available for expenditure by the United States Housing Corporation shall be expended for the purposes for which appropriations are made herein."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 16 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the words "after the" and in line 17 strike out the words "conclusion of the war" and the word "it," and strike out all of line 39, after the word "away" down to and including the word "President" in line 42, and in line 55, strike out the word "commission" and insert in lieu thereof the word "corporation," and in line 57, after the word "therefrom," insert the following: "together with a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures on account of the other activities authorized by law"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"To enable the Secretary of Labor to maintain in the District of Columbia an organization to coordinate the public employment offices throughout the country by furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment and by maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States, including a director at $5,000 per annum; an assistant, at $4,000 per annum; four chiefs of division, at $3,000 each per annum; and such other personal services at rates of compensation not exceeding $1,800 each per annum as may be necessary; supplies and equipment, telegraph and telephone service, and printing and binding, $200,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment and transpose the remainder of said amendment to follow line 7 of page 2 of the bill; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For additional amount for driving the automobiles of the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, $240 each, $480."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Renumber the section to read, "Sec. 6"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the numeral "8" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Renumber the section to read "8" and strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment after line 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "And with jurisdiction also to hear, consider, and adjudicate any and all other claims or demands by or against either party to said litigation, to the end that a complete and final adjustment may be had between said parties as to outstanding matters of controversy or account between them: *Provided*, That nothing in this amendment shall be construed to include claims by J. F. McMurray or Mansfield, McMurray & Cornish relating to the sale of the Choctaw-Chickasaw coal lands or claims relating to the leased district, or claims relating to proceeds arising from the sale of timber lands, unallotted or other lands, or any other claim where the services were not actually rendered and finished and resulted to the benefit of said people: *Provided further*, That the said J. F. McMurray shall be limited in presenting such additional claims to such matters as may have or shall hereafter be set up by way of set-off or counterclaim by the defendants"; and the Senate agree to the same.

F. E. WARREN,
REED SMOOT,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JAMES W. GOOD,
WILLIAM S. VARE,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Managers on the part of the House.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Kenyon	Nugent	Smith, Md.
Ball	Keyes	Overman	Smoot
Bankhead	King	Phelan	Spencer
Capper	Kirby	Phipps	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Knox	Pittman	Thomas
Cummins	La Follette	Poindexter	Warren
Curtis	Lenroot	Pomerene	Watson
Dillingham	McKellar	Ransdell	Williams
Fall	McLean	Robinson	Wolcott
Gerry	McNary	Sheppard	
Harrison	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	
Kendrick	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] on public business.

Mr. McKELLAR. The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] is absent on important business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BECKHAM, Mr. CALDER, Mr. COLT, Mr. FRANCE, Mr. GAY, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRONNA, Mr. LODGE, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. WADSWORTH answered to their names when called.

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

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I rise to address myself to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] that the Senate adopt the conference report on the so-called sundry civil appropriation bill.

There has been on the part of the conferees a matter omitted, and the matter is so vital that notwithstanding the great respect and esteem in which I personally hold the conferees, and notwithstanding the fact that we are all anxious to take a recess, I must be pardoned if I premise my remarks by the observation that if the Senate should adopt the conference report by omitting and excluding the so-called Robinson amendment, you must pardon me when I say it will be the most flagrant disregard of official duty that could possibly come to a body of this kind.

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator state just what has been done with reference to the Robinson amendment?

Mr. ASHURST. It has been submarined, torpedoed, sunk without a trace.

Mr. President, there had been prepared an amendment which provided that $950,000 should be appropriated to continue the exercise of the agencies and energies of the Employment Service in the Department of Labor. After numerous conferences among Senators on this floor, after the chairman of the committee had been consulted, after a large number of Senators, leaders on both sides, had been consulted, it was agreed that while we could appropriate billions for war purposes, and I voted for them gladly, it would be better not to be too prodigal in expending money to secure positions and jobs for returning soldiers, and it was the unanimous consensus of opinion on both sides of the Chamber that $950,000 could not possibly be appropriated, because, of course, that would get somebody a job, it would bring a returning soldier a job. So the Robinson amendment was agreed to. There are sitting on this floor many Senators who were approached, among them conferees on the bill, who said they had no objection, and the Robinson amendment was agreed to; and there was a pretty lively, thick attendance of Senators. It was no thin attendance when the Robinson amendment was agreed to. The amendment is as follows, numbered 91, page 187:

To enable the Secretary of Labor, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor," to continue to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, to advance their opportunities for profitable employment by maintaining a national system of employment offices in the several States and political subdivisions thereof and to coordinate the public employment offices throughout the country by furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment and by maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and for their actual necessary traveling expenses while absent from their official station, together with their per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, supplies and equipment, telegraph and telephone service, and printing and binding, $400,000.

So, Mr. President, those among the Senators who saw the necessity to continue these employment offices agreed to reduce the amount from $950,000 to $400,000. Now, what do we find when the honorable chairman and the conferees return the bill? We find that the $400,000 has been reduced to $200,000 and that each and every dollar of that must be spent in the city of Washington—not a center of industrial activity. Beautiful and restful as this city is, it is not a center of industry, activity, and enterprise.

I can not assume—it would be offensive to assume—that Senators are oblivious to what the Employment Service is and what it has done. At the risk of being tedious, it will become my duty to state, as briefly and succinctly as I may, just what the activities of that bureau are and just what they have been.

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

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly; I yield for a question.

Mr. WARREN. I was not about to ask a question, but to make an observation.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to my friend the Senator from Wyoming for any purpose so long as I do not lose the floor.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator knows, of course, that we had to meet the House in conference. The House insisted upon a sort of clearing-house measure between the United States and the States, as many of the States have organized their bureau heads. We met with them and protected the appropriation of $400,000 to the limit.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield to me to make an inquiry?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Wyoming has just stated that most of the States have an adequate employment service.

Mr. WARREN. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not state that. I said nothing about adequate or inadequate. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has just stated that most of the States have an employment service.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; I said many of them.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator state how many?

Mr. WARREN. I could not state how many, but I think perhaps two-thirds of them.

Mr. ROBINSON. Information on my desk is to the effect that only 14 States have any employment service as State organizations, and if the Senate conferees in promptly receding from this amendment proceeded upon the theory that the existing local organizations, State and municipal, are adequate to meet the requirements of conditions in the country now in connection with unemployment they were laboring under such a lack of information as is totally incomprehensible to me.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not care to have words put into my mouth. I did not say that it was the language or the thought of the conferees upon the part of the Senate, and when the Senator says the conferees yielded quickly he is very much mistaken. I wish to state now before the Senate that the conferees did the best they could in this case, and the Senate has the result. If it is unsatisfactory, of course the Senate has its remedy. The conferees, however, did the best they could.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming state when the conference report on the sundry civil appropriation was agreed to by the conferees?

Mr. WARREN. It was agreed to yesterday.

Mr. ROBINSON. This bill passed the Senate about 1 o'clock on Saturday night.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. And the conferees, therefore, could not have had more than 36 hours in which to consider the numerous amendments in conference on this bill.

Mr. WARREN. The conferees went into conference on Sunday and worked until after midnight on Sunday. Immediately on Monday morning they went into conference again and were in conference up to the time of the meeting of the Senate. That was about all the time we had, as yesterday was the last day of the fiscal year.

Mr. ROBINSON. I understand that, but the Senator has stated that the conferees proceeded with deliberation——

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. And that they took ample time. I take the position that, considering the importance of the controversies involved in the amendments which the Senate put on the bill, the conferees could not have considered one-half of them. They could hardly have read them.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not know what the knowledge of the Senator is about conferees, but I want to say to him that the conferees on the part of the Senate did have plenty of time to consider every subject, and did consider every subject, involved in the bill. We might have been in conference for a month and we might or might not have had any differences, but it is not for the Senator from Arkansas or any other Senator to say that conferees, when they come in here, having

worked night and day, with the limited time at their command, have not considered all the items of the bill.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President——

Mr. KENYON. Let me ask a question.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask when the House sent this bill to conference. I understood that was done yesterday.

Mr. WARREN. That is true, but the conferees were known, and we went into conference immediately after the Senate passed the bill and hardly slept until we had finished it.

Mr. KENYON. The conferees met and determined the matter before the House appointed conferees?

Mr. WARREN. We did not, but we went through the bill, and without a final determination, of course, upon all these points. It went to the House on Monday morning, and the conferees were then appointed, and we again went into conference.

I wish to say in that connection, what it is unnecessary for me to say, that here is a bill which failed entirely at the last session and which, if not passed before the 1st of this month, leaves these institutions without authority to proceed further. There seemed to be haste, making it necessary for me to ask the Senate to remain in session from early in the morning until very late on Saturday night. It seemed to us that that was the right way for us to handle it. It then became the duty of the conferees to put all the time they could get into the consideration of these items. Therefore they took time by the forelock in having the conferees on the part of the House go into service even before they were appointed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I merely want to say, with the permission of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], that the last statement of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] discloses the fact that this bill did not go to conference until after the House met on yesterday.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have been long enough here to know that it is improper for me to refer to what has taken place in another branch of Congress, so I say that in another body a motion was made by the man who for months has—I say he had the right to—been the persistent enemy and antagonist of the Employment Service. He moved to instruct the conferees, and every man who indulges in the luxury of reflection knows that that meant that the conferees should eliminate the Robinson amendment. His motion was defeated by a vote of 189 to 1. Then my friend from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] says that the sentiment of the House was indicated by the conferees to be overwhelmingly opposed to this amendment, when the only expression had was of a vote of 189 to 1; and yet he regards that to be an expression on the part of the House in oppugnacy to the present amendment.

Mr. President, this is a fundamental question, and let me say to the conferees that I mean nothing personal; I do not intend to be offensive; and, if I strike hard blows, they are going to be fair ones. The time has come for some plain speaking.

We have been holding out promises of various kinds in speeches at banquets and functions of other kinds that when the soldier returns he would at least get his job back and perhaps a farm. The farm-homestead bill is in a very precarious condition. There was an agency established, however, under and by virtue of which the returning soldier could step into a Government employment agency in New York or in Brooklyn or in any other part of this country and say to the local director, "I am a returning soldier; I desire a position in order that I may again resume my activity in civil life and earn my bread."

Under that agency positions were secured at the rate of 70,000 per week for returning soldiers. Think of that, Senators! Under these Government agencies the soldiers were put into positions at the rate, on the average, of 70,000 per week. One week it was 81,000 and another week 69,000, but the average was 70,000 men a week put to work. To use a phrase which I did not coin, but which I heard to-day, it was the agency of our Government which brought the "manless job and the jobless man" together. A brass worker or a wagon maker could step into this office in New York and ascertain whether there was a position for him in Toledo, Ohio. The man and the job were brought together, yet we find that the conferees have come back, having paralyzed and rendered nugatory the only agency set up by the Government for the purpose of bringing the man and the job together.

I have no especial eulogy for the soldier; he did his duty; he did what he ought to have done; to have done less would have proven that he was not an American; but we owe the soldier at least the opportunity to get a position if he wants to work.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question without interrupting the course of his argument?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. How many weeks does this average of 70,000 employment extend over?

Mr. ASHURST. The employment agency has been active since January, 1918, but the average of 70,000 per week extends back for many weeks; I should say at least 12 or 15 weeks and possibly longer. I have not the data right at hand.

But now to give to the country and to the Senate some idea in what esteem this Employment Service is held and how it is regarded by big business, little business, laboring men, farmers, industrial men, and capitalists, I hold in my hand a telegram, which is only two days old, which is signed by the Du Pont Co., of Wilmington, Del. It is addressed to the Director General of the Employment Service, and reads:

> We are recruiting for large construction works near Detroit through your office and understand a general reduction in practically all of your offices occurs July 1. Very important we know Monday what employment offices will operate after July 1 in the followings States: Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, and Wisconsin. Will appreciate prompt reply.

Mr. President, I could tire the Senate and load the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD down with scores upon scores of letters and telegrams from various industrial enterprises in our country, all testifying to the fact that for months past they have utilized the splendid service of the employment offices of the Government in recruiting their factories and their farms with laborers.

What, then, is the sentiment of the country upon this subject? When my party failed to do its duty last March—and I am going to tell the truth about my own party as quickly as I shall about any party—when it failed to do its duty last March to make an appropriation for this service, hundreds of men who asked for nothing from their Government came forward and contributed from their private funds in order that these employment agencies might go forward; and a large number of offices, six or seven hundred, have been maintained partly through the small amount of money that was on hand and partly by reenforcement from private sources. So I say—and I measure my words—that this employment agency has averted one of the most perilous things that could come to our country. What is the sentiment of the country upon it? It is the one question upon which all our countrymen are united. We may be in opposition upon other questions, but I challenge Senators to give me the name of one question upon which the Nation is more nearly unanimous than it is upon this question.

Has it been a perfect service? No. The only perfect thing is what we think we can do; that is the only perfect thing in the world; but I assert here that, notwithstanding possibly there have been one or two places where it did not function just the way it should, it has functioned well; it has done a splendid work.

The charge is made that it has been too friendly to union labor, and that in many instances it has employed only union labor. I respectfully state that that is not true.

The Employment Service has not attempted to employ union labor only. I know that hundreds of laborers were brought from the West by the Employment Service to work on the nitrate plants at Nitro, W. Va., and to work in the shipyards at Norfolk. Out of the 500 who were brought here not 200 belong to labor unions and 300 were not members of labor unions. So I say if it be an offense to have employed a large number of union laborers they have in securing men positions paid no attention to whether they belonged to labor unions or whether they did not. It may be true that in some one State the charge might be made with a due regard to plausibility that union labor was taken care of, and that the man who did not belong to the union was not allowed to have a position; but I assert that, taking it by and large, all kinds of men, whether they were unionized or not, were given an opportunity to work. I further assert here that the laboring men, whether union or nonunion, are in favor of the continuance of this employment agency.

I repeat, what is the sentiment of the country, Mr. President, on this subject? The President of the United States in his message to Congress said on May 20, 1919:

> I am sure that it is not necessary for me to remind you that there is one immediate and very practical question of labor that we should meet in the most liberal spirit. We must see to it that our returning soldiers are assisted in every practicable way to find the places for which they are fitted in the daily work of the country.
>
> This can be done by developing and maintaining upon an adequate scale the admirable organization created by the Department of Labor (the United States Employment Service) for placing men seeking work; and it can also be done, in at least one very great field, by creating new opportunities for individual enterprise.

I will not read the editorials, but I crave permission, Mr. President, to include in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a few out of the many hundreds of editorials that I have here. If I can secure that permission, I will only read extracts from them and include the remainder in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and permission is granted.

Mr. ASHURST. Take the Des Moines News, published in Des Moines, Iowa. The first three lines of the editorial read:

One of the most urgent and patriotic duties now before Congress is the passage of an act appropriating money for the continuation of the United States Employment Bureaus.

I will include the remainder of that editorial in the RECORD without reading.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD HELP SOLDIERS GET JOBS.

One of the most urgent and patriotic duties now before Congress is the passage of an act appropriating money for the continuation of the United States Employment Bureaus.

Unless such an appropriation is made at once, these bureaus must be discontinued July 1 for lack of funds.

Since January 1, 1918, Government employment bureaus have placed 5,000,000 workers in jobs.

At a low average wage of $2 per day, this means that $10,000,000 is paid out daily to Government-placed workers and that the same amount of new wealth is being created daily in some form of constructive work.

In Iowa the Federal bureaus, working in conjunction with the State bureaus, sent out to jobs in one year 94,072 workers. During this period, April 1, 1918, to April 1, 1919, the office records show that at least 73,252 workers were successfully placed.

Owing to the failure of the thirty-eighth assembly to make any appropriation for the continuation of the State bureaus after July 1, Iowa will be on that date without any official organization, State or Federal, to which returning soldiers can turn for assistance in finding work.

Shall the Iowa boys of the Eighty-eighth Division and other returning units be left to the tender mercies of the private employment agencies in their search for a job?

Parades and receptions are well enough in their way, and no honor due Iowa's soldiers should be omitted, but what will it profit the man who sacrificed all to serve his country if he be met with a brass band on the first day of his return and then be turned out to shift for himself on the second?

The Government which took men away from industry to fight for our country can in honor do nothing less than to put them back into industry.

Since Iowa's Legislature shirked its part of the duty, Congressman JAMES W. GOOD, chairman of the House Appropriation Committee, should make doubly sure that an immediate appropriation is made for continuation of the Federal employment bureaus.

Other Members of the Iowa delegation should use their influence to the same end.

Returning soldiers must be given jobs—without money and without price.

Mr. ASHURST. The Washington Post of June 20 published an editorial entitled "Neglect of soldiers," the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

In reducing the appropriation in the sundry civil bill for the United States Employment Service for the next fiscal year from $4,600,000 to $200,000 and in limiting the expenditure of the latter sum to the maintenance of a mere "clearing house in the District of Columbia," the House Appropriations Committee has acted obviously without regard to the real situation.

I will include in the RECORD the remainder of that editorial. The entire editorial is as follows:

NEGLECT OF SOLDIERS.

In reducing the appropriation in the sundry civil bill for the United States Employment Service for the next fiscal year from $4,600,000 to $200,000 and in limiting the expenditure of the latter sum to the maintenance of a mere "clearing house in the District of Columbia," the House Appropriations Committee has obviously acted without regard to the real situation.

How misunderstood the true conditions are is indicated in the remark by the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee when he stated that the field organization of the Federal Employment Service is not needed for the placement of soldiers and sailors, since the War Department has developed a soldiers' employment service.

The facts are, however, that the War Department has not the semblance of placement machinery to assist returning soldiers to employment. Not more than 12 of the States have employment systems. If the placement facilities maintained by the Federal Employment Service in the States are not continued through adequate appropriation, the United States on July 1 will find itself without any comprehensive organization to assist the soldiers and workers to employment and to prevent the conditions that contribute most to industrial and social unrest.

The War Department recently advised the House and Senate Appropriations Committees that the work of placing soldiers and sailors was being conducted through the medium of the United States Employment Service and that if the service were not continued next year "the interests of the soldiers and sailors needing assistance in reestablishing themselves in civil life would be injured to an extent which it is impossible to exaggerate."

If the States are to be relied upon to solve the employment problem, it will not be solved. The larger industrial States, with but two or three exceptions, are not equipped successfully to handle the employment problem within their borders, while the agricultural States, now crying for harvest labor, have no facilities of their own for recruiting and distributing workers. The comprehensive machinery of the Federal Employment Service throughout the country should be continued, at least during the readjustment period. The granting of funds for a bare administrative skeleton in Washington, with nothing to administer, would be a waste of money. If the returning soldiers are entitled to jobs, let the Government find the jobs and not shift the duty to the States.

Mr. ASHURST. The Washington Star had a long editorial recently, temperate and moderate, the headline being "Continue the service," referring to the Employment Service. I will include that editorial in the RECORD without reading.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

CONTINUE THE SERVICE!

An emergency deficiency appropriation of $275,000 is asked to continue the United States Employment Service during the present fiscal year, to prevent the scrapping of the machinery that has been assembled and put into effective working order to insure a distribution of labor and prevent congestion of unemployment. A bill is pending in each House to provide for a permanent Employment Service, with the Federal and State Governments cooperating. If the deficiency appropriation is granted and is supplemented by additional funds for the coming fiscal year, the service can be maintained until some such permanent plan can be put into execution.

No doubt can be felt as to the value of this service to the country. It has amply proved its worth by its works. Through it, since the armistice was signed, 2,136,717 men have been placed in sustaining positions. At present nearly 60,000 men are weekly being guided to jobs. Each week the service is clearing between 2,000 and 3,000 men between States, thus preventing congestion.

Opposition is manifested to the continuance of the service from two sources, the fee-charging employment agencies and the manufacturers who want congestion of labor in their localities in order to have long lines of applicants at their gates and thus to bring down wages. The interest of the fee agencies is obvious. The Employment Service is now saving approximately $22,000 a day to the men whom it places in fees they would otherwise have to pay. The short-sighted manufacturers who want labor congestion for their own convenience and profit can not appreciate, apparently, that such conditions lead to certain future trouble.

Congress is now asked for these appropriations to maintain a service that has been effective and that is greatly needed for months to come, until the last man has been demobilized and all men who can work, and want to work, are brought into relation with jobs. And after the present emergency conditions have passed, there should be a systematic method of labor placement, similar to the system in vogue in England, where the Government aims through agencies to promote "fluidity" and to prevent congestion through distribution.

To dismantle the Employment Service for lack of a comparatively small sum would throw out of gear a mechanism for social safety and industrial rehabilitation that has been worth many times its cost during the trying months of labor derangement incident to the war. It would be the falsest sort of economy to deny the appropriation sought.

Mr. ASHURST. The Washington Times had an editorial only a week ago urging the continuance of the Employment Service entitled, "Shall we fail our fighting men?"

From the Boston Post—and there is the city of Boston, the center of culture and estheticism of our country, talking to you—I quote the following:

The work of the United States Employment Service should be maintained. The proposition for its continuance now before Congress carries with it an appropriation to meet the cost of such service which, while moderate in comparison with other authorized expenditures, is essential and should be granted.

The editorial is a very strong one, and I shall print the remainder of it in the RECORD.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

PLACES FOR OUR BOYS.

The work of the United States Employment Service should be maintained. The proposition for its continuance, now before Congress, carries with it an appropriation to meet the cost of such service which, while moderate in comparison with other authorized expenditures, is essential and should be granted.

What has already been done in the line of placing our returning soldiers and sailors in industrial work is notable and showing the efficiency of the scheme. The Federal bureau has been finding places for the unemployed at the rate of about 300,000 a month; of these some 20 per cent are returned soldiers and sailors. Now they are coming home from the other side in larger companies than ever, and of those arriving during the week of May 24—the latest date of official figuring available—12,654 were satisfactorily located, with returns from six States yet to come in.

It is a large work in which the Employment Service is engaged and it is conducted with energy and skill.

Mr. ASHURST. I now quote from an Associated Press dispatch. Who is this talking? Gen. Wood is talking now. Listen to this:

Discharged men "potential reds," says Gen. Wood.

New York, June 14: To combat "Bolshevism" employment should be provided by the Federal Government for discharged soldiers, sailors, marines, and war workers—"potential Bolshevists"—according to a statement by Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood made public here to-night by Dr. George W. Kirchwey, State director of the United States Employment Service.

Asserting that men who engaged in the war feel they are entitled "to as much consideration as the chaps who stayed at home," Gen. Wood declared it was natural they should feel discontented on their return to find their positions occupied by "stay at homes."

I ask permission to include the remainder of Gen. Wood's interview without reading.

The dispatch referred to entire is as follows:

DISCHARGED MEN "POTENTIAL REDS," SAYS GEN. WOOD.

(Associated Press dispatch, June 15, 1919.)

NEW YORK, *June 14, 1919.*

To combat Bolshevism employment should be provided by the Federal Government for discharged soldiers, sailors, marines, and war workers—"potential Bolshevists"—according to a statement by Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood made public here to-night by Dr. George W. Kirchwey, State director of the United States Employment Service

Asserting that men who engaged in the war feel they are entitled "to as much consideration as the chaps who stayed at home," Gen. Wood declared it was natural they should feel discontented on their return to find their positions occupied by "stay at homes."

"Many of the men who have returned are sick, both physically and mentally, and waiting with nothing to do and finding on every hand radical orators only too willing to sow the seed of discontent, their minds are open to such propaganda," said the general.

"I consider it absolutely essential for the Federal Government to continue its efforts to place discharged military men and civilian war workers in profitable peace-time jobs, and for this purpose funds should be immediately made available to continue the United States Employment Service, which has proved a potent factor in helping to solve this problem from a national standpoint."

Mr. ASHURST. Now, I will ask Senators to remember the names of the newspapers I am about to read. I will not read all the editorials printed in these newspapers—and they are only a part of all of them—that have urged this Congress, and urged the Senate especially, to continue the Employment Service.

The New York Commercial; the Springfield (Ohio) Sun; the Musical Courier; the Chicago Daily News; the New York World; the New York Tribune—and let me read a part of what the Tribune says:

A work that should go on—

Referring to the Employment Service—

To-day there are many special exigencies which make the continuance of the United States Employment Service activities a public necessity.

The New Orleans Item—and I have, bear in mind, secured permission to include these editorials in the RECORD—the Atlantic City (N. J.) Gazette; the New York Evening Post; the Cleveland (Ohio) Topics; the Los Angeles Herald; the Savannah (Ga.) News; the San Francisco Bulletin; the New York Herald; the Poughkeepsie (N. Y.) Star; Forbes Magazine; another long and powerful editorial from the New York Tribune; the Cotton Seed Oil Magazine; J. P. Morgan & Co.—J. P. Morgan & Co. join hands with the American Federation of Labor and with the laboring men who belong to no federation of labor, and say this Employment Service should be continued; the Sioux Falls Press; the Fresno (Calif.) Republican; the Detroit News; the Springfield (Mass.) Republican; the Boston Traveler; the Atlanta Journal—a metropolitan newspaper, published in the home of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], one of the greatest Senators that State or any other State has ever sent to this body. It is his duty also, and ought to be, and I know it will be, to sustain this service on this occasion. The Chicago Journal; the Savannah (Ga.) News; Collier's Weekly—I do not always agree with Collier's, but when it writes I always read; the Paterson (N. J.) Call; the Wilmington (Del.) Every Evening; the New York World; the Cleveland (Ohio) Press; the New York Telegraph; the Iron Age; the Wisconsin State Journal; the La Crosse Tribune; the Newark (N. J.) Star Eagle; the Birmingham (Ala.) Ledger; the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee—a paper which is one of the leaders of thought and expression on the Pacific coast; the New York Commercial; the New York Mail. I wish that I could be forgiven for standing here and reading all of these editorials.

Senators, if I were to read the powerful arguments contained in these editorials from Democratic papers and Republican papers, wet papers and dry papers, union-labor papers and anti-union-labor papers, papers of all kinds, you would be utterly amazed at the unanimity of expression; you would find that the thinkers of America see that the workers of America must have an opportunity to work. To continue the list, the Memphis (Tenn.) Press; the Claremont (N. H.) Daily Eagle; another editorial from the New Orleans Daily Item; Baltimore (Md.) News; New Orleans State; San Francisco Call and Post; Winston-Salem (N. C.) Sentinel—North Carolina calls upon her learned Senator, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], to go back into conference and see that the workingmen at least have a chance to get jobs, and I know he will do it, as he has never failed to respond to a proper call made by the true, expressed voice of the American people; the Farm Journal. What is this list of editorials? Who is this talking? Some popular orator talking to the people, arousing their prejudices in order to get their votes? No; it is the thoughtful, conservative expression of the press of America. The Denver (Colo.) Bulletin—and its editorial has the caption "Ten reasons why the United States Employment Service should be continued"; the Chicago Herald-Examiner; the Survey—and let me read the first few lines of the brief Survey editorial:

Though born of the war and tested by it, it may be that in years to come the United States Employment Service, which was left without resources by the failure to pass the general deficiency bill, will be remembered for its contributions to the theory, science, and practical development of a permanent national system rather than for its spectacular success in mobilizing man power.

It would defy Milton himself to put it more luminously or more correctly than it is put by that sentence.

The Yonkers (N. Y.) Statesman; the Evening State Journal of Nebraska; the Omaha Bee; the Toledo Blade; the Newark News; the Analyst (New York Times Co.); the Des Moines (Iowa) Capital; the Washington Times again; the San Francisco Examiner; Public Opinion; the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser; the Tampa (Fla.) Times; the World's Work; the American Contractor; the Ithaca Journal; the Farrell (Pa.) News; the Schenectady (N. Y.) Gazette; the Marietta Times; the American City, New York; the Freeport (Ill.) Journal; again, the Washington Times; the New York Journal of Commerce; again, the Washington Star; the Washington Post; the Philadelphia Evening Ledger; the Hackensack Record; the Literary Digest; the Trench and Camp.

That name falls with a cadence upon my ear. Soldiers appealing to you not for charity, not for a gift, not for money out of the Treasury, but appealing to you to assist them when they set foot again on American soil to get positions in order that they may work.

The Pittsburgh Press, the Charleston (S. C.) American, the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, the Come-Back. The Come-Back is published at Walter Reed Hospital. The contributions to that paper, by their optimism, liveliness, spirit, energy, and cheerfulness are remarkable. What shall be our answer to those boys who publish the Come-Back in behalf of the wounded soldiers? Shall it be that we will let them take such chances as they may find; that they have got to ascertain for themselves whether there is a position in Toledo or in Pittsburgh for them? Shall we cast them off when they come back, and say, "We took you out of a good job, now you hunt a job yourself"? That does not appeal to the soldier and does not appeal to the statesman.

The Stars and Stripes, Printers' Ink, Advertising and Selling, and the Fourth Estate.

I will ask permission, Mr. President, to include in the RECORD, without further reading, a few expressions from typical letters from soldiers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

TYPICAL LETTERS FROM SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

"I was discharged from the Army, and upon my return home tried to find employment, but without success. By chance I heard of the United States Employment Service office and filed my application with it. Within 24 hours I was referred to an opening, where I am now employed. A private agency would have charged me $40 to $60 for the kind of a position I secured, free of cost, from the Employment Service." (Ex-Soldier.)

"Regarding the Government's plan of placing men under the new employment scheme, too much can not be said for it, for the policy seems to be that of fitting the men to the job instead of the old way. Furthermore, men leaving the military service do not have to be overburdened with private employment fees in obtaining work." (Navy Ensign.)

"After trying two weeks to secure a suitable position, I had about made up my mind that I could not find what I wanted here, so was planning to go to another city. At this time I conferred with the superintendent of the local office of the United States Employment Service, and he at once referred me to the S. Manufacturing Co., from whom I secured exactly the kind of a position I desired, with a good salary to start and good chances for advancement." (Army Lieutenant.)

"The United States Employment Service is certainly doing a fine work, and I am sure it is highly appreciated by all who take advantage of it. The fact that it was successful in placing me in just the sort of position I desired within two hours from the time I arrived in the city speaks well for the systematic and efficient management." (E. G. C.)

"The United States Employment Service not only places ex-soldiers and ex-sailors in fair jobs, but locates them with the best firms in our city and in permanent positions with a future." (T. C. McH.)

"It seems that the United States Employment Service should be better known to the soldiers who are returning to their homes. If the soldiers were told of this service throughout the country, it would save them much trouble and delay in securing positions." (Ex-Soldier.)

"In answer to your letter received at my Kansas City address, I find that you are in receipt of information to the effect that I have recently been discharged and am now seeking employment and that you offer every assistance possible in getting the kind of work desired.

"For this I very much thank you; but you will find from your latest records that I have already been given employment through the United States Employment Service as a salesman." (B. E. W.)

WELFARE ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORT THIS CAMPAIGN.

The War Camp Community Service, Red Cross, Knights of Columbus, Y. M. C. A., Jewish Welfare Board, and similar organizations, which are conducting their soldiers' placement activities through the medium of the United States Employment Service, are giving valuable assistance to the advertising campaign through their local units. As part of their work on behalf of soldiers, they are inserting the standard or special advertisements in local newspapers, in order to inform employers where to list their employment openings and the necessity for doing so.

The New York City branch of the War Camp Community Service, for instance, placed a special advertisement along this line in the papers of that city which has been repeated by other branches of that organization and other welfare bodies in other cities of the country. The copy for this "ad," which has proven so popular, is included in the first edition of this bulletin.

Mr. ASHURST. I also ask permission to insert in the RECORD expressions from a large number of advertising agencies and business, trade, and agricultural papers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ADVERTISING AGENCIES.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE,
220 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

GENTLEMEN: The advertising campaign of the United States Employment Service designed to sell "jobs for soldiers" commends itself to this association, particularly because of its practical and economic character.

Now that the Victory loan campaign is over, there is no more urgently needed campaign than one to assist the millions of returning soldiers, sailors, marines, and war workers to suitable employment. It should appeal especially to the business and advertising men of this country because it is universally realized that stable labor and employment conditions are essential to industrial progress, increased production, and markets for every kind of commodity. We believe that it will appeal fully as much to advertising men, sales managers, and advertisers as much as a sound business proposition as it does as a patriotic service.

We assure you that we will do everything possible to make the campaign a success.

Sincerely, yours, WILLIAM H. RANKIN,
Chairman Newspaper Division of the American Association of Advertising Agencies, Chicago, Ill.

—

ADVERTISING CLUBS.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE,
Room 2001, 220 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

GENTLEMEN: We have given very careful attention to your letter of the 16th, asking us to cooperate with you in procuring advertising for the United States Employment Service to aid in securing jobs for returning soldiers and sailors.

We feel that this is a very worthy cause, and I know that our clubs all over the country are active in helping this work right now and I am sure that they would be very much interested in the suggestions you have made. * * * I will be glad to send the suggested advertisements to our clubs promptly, and I think we can depend on good cooperation.

Yours, very truly,
ASSOCIATED ADVERTISING CLUBS OF THE WORLD,
P. S. FLOREA, *Executive Manager.*

—

NEW YORK CITY.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE,
220 Fifth Avenue, New York City:

The stimulation of normal business conditions with the consequent employment of men is the most immediate and vital problem affecting American business; and it has the added importance of recognition by all of the very great debt which we owe to our Army and the obligation which is upon us to see that suitable employment is promptly provided for returning men. Any effort to that end can not but have the immediate indorsement of all business interests.

The members of the Association of National Advertisers, Inc., are demonstrating their faith in business conditions by promoting business to the fullest possible extent, by aggressive advertising campaigns which it seems certain can not fail to result in an increase in business activity. This will automatically open channels of employment.

The members of the association will, I feel certain, be very glad to know the true facts about the present status of the United States Employment Service, and to cooperate through its agencies in offering employment to men.

Sincerely, yours,
WALTER A. MCDERMID, *President.*
ASSOCIATION OF NATIONAL ADVERTISERS.

—

BUSINESS AND TRADE PAPERS.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE,
220 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

GENTLEMEN: During the war the business press enlisted for service without condition or reservation, and we are proud of the achievements of our papers in promoting every conceivable form of activity to do with the winning of the war.

In the work of reconstruction our publications are showing the same degree of intelligent zeal that they did during the war; and I know that I bespeak the sentiment of every business paper publisher and editor in the country when I say that you may count upon our hearty support in your work of finding jobs for the returning soldiers.

This is a duty as well as an economic necessity; and we trust that you will not hesitate to call upon the business press for the assistance it is so peculiarly qualified to render in connection with this work.

Sincerely, yours,
THE ASSOCIATED BUSINESS PAPERS (INC.),
New York City,
JESSE H. NEAL, *Executive Secretary.*

—

AGRICULTURE PRESS.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE,
220 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

GENTLEMEN: I received your request to give consideration of this important matter of assisting the returning soldiers to employment, and I assure you that it will be most cheerfully acquiesced in because of the worthiness of the cause.

Very truly, yours,
AGRICULTURAL PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill.,
FRANK B. WHITE, *Managing Director.*

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I forbear to load the RECORD down with a larger number of similar communications, but I assert that this is only a small portion of editorials from respectable papers that I could produce here urging the Senate not to abolish the Employment Service.

Now I will read a short statement as to the energies and activities of the Employment Service:

The United States Employment Service desires sufficient funds to operate the service over the present emergency and until the Senate and House can decide whether or not a permanent service is desirable.

It is at present operating 500 offices and some 2,500 bureaus for returning soldiers. Since the appropriation was not reached in the last Congress, a great many of the offices have been maintained by voluntary contributions, amounting to $110,000 per month. This is an evidence of the desire of the great mass of people, through their organizations, for an employment service. More than 50 organizations are contributing to the operation of the service. The voluntary contributions extend generally only to June 30, for the reason that it was supposed that the Employment Service would be provided for by Congress. If no funds are provided in the sundry civil bill, the employment offices will close their doors thereby.

Bear in mind that under the amendment as it is returned by the conferees, instead of $400,000 being appropriated, so that the 500 offices and 2,500 bureaus in all parts of the United States may be operated, the amendment as returned by the conferees limits the expenditure simply to Washington, and reduces it to $200,000. As I construe the amendment, all the money to be appropriated must be spent here in the home of officialdom and of bureaucracy. It would be well to have a few dollars spent here, but I conceive it would be better if only $200,000 is to be granted, to spend it out in the States, in New York City, in Philadelphia, in Boston, and in other places where the returning soldiers are landing, so that the offices there can be maintained and the soldiers know where to go to secure a position.

The following will be the results if the amendment should be defeated:

1. It will seriously hamper the recruiting of labor in the great wheat belt, which will imperil the crops of that region.

2. An entirely different machine will have to be set in operation for the returning soldiers and sailors, and the representatives in Europe who are obtaining the soldiers' applications for work will be withdrawn. The service is placing between 10,000 and 15,000 soldiers per week, and, including civilian workers, from 60,000 to 70,000 per week. I was in error when I said it was procuring positions for 70,000 soldiers per week. It is 15,000 soldiers per week and about 55,000 civilians per week. If the appropriation should fail, the investment of about $1,000,000 in equipment will have to be sold to the highest bidder.

Charges against the service:

(a) The charge that has been made that the Employment Service has been extravagant is unjust, for the reason that it has cost, including overhead, investments, and equipment, only $1.37 per worker placed in employment. In other words, Mr. President, it requires only $1.37 to secure a position for a man.

"Placement" means that either the workman or the employer reports that he has been placed in a position. Now, bear in mind that "placement" means only when the workman reports that he has secured employment.

From the signing of the armistice to June 1 there have been more than 2,000,000 workers placed—2,000,000 workers placed!.

(b) The charge that it is a prounion organization is successfully refuted by the personnel of the State directors, the majority of whom are in the employer class. How could you charge successfully that this is simply an instrument or an agency of union labor when a majority of the directors throughout the States are employers of labor?

In addition, the directors in Washington are made up as follows:

Director General, a lawyer.

Assistant Director General, in private life the head of a large insurance company.

Acting Assistant Director General, president of a number of manufacturing corporations and a large employer of labor.

Director of operations, director of a railroad and a director in several corporations.

Director of organization, a lawyer.

Not more than 12 instances can be cited of improper actions having a tendency toward favoring organized labor. Out of the vast energies of this service, stretching its fingers into almost every hamlet, town, city, and village in our country, we discover that only in 12 instances can there be laid charges of improper action in securing a position for a union man as against a nonunion man.

This is remarkable in an organization operating 500 offices and which has had during the war a large personnel.

Secretary Wilson said in a speech in Washington on April 5, 1919:

Of course, any employment service that is a union-labor employment service and that gives special preference to union labor as against nonunion labor would not meet the employment situation of the United States.

It has been charged that this is a political machine. The charge that it is a political machine is refuted by the personnel of the State directors, the majority of whom are Republicans. The politics of the employees is not known, but it is safe to estimate that the majority of them are Republicans.

Question: Are the employers against the service?

The fact that it is estimated that 10,000 employers are using the service weekly would seem to justify the belief that many employers favor the service. I think that is a fair assumption. When 10,000 employers each week utilize this service, it is at least a fair and reasonable presumption that it is necessary and popular with the employers.

The propaganda which has been carried on against the service by various employers' organizations is the same sort of propaganda which has been carried on against any progressive movement of any kind having to do with employers. The same propaganda was carried on against the workmen's compensation law, against the factory-inspection laws, against the pure-food law, against the child-labor law, and against all these other laws of a similar character.

Now, having, as I think I have, demonstrated, or at least tried to demonstrate, that the employers of labor are for the service, the question arises, Are the workers for the service?

The workers are for the Employment Service for the reason that they believe that they should have some means of finding out opportunities for employment whether in their own State or in an adjoining State without paying for the privilege to a fee-charging agency. It is unfortunate that the great body of workmen can not voice their support of the service.

The farmers are for it strongly for the reason that they need some agency to recruit farm labor, especially seasonal labor. The National Grange and the National Farmers' Council have both officially indorsed the service.

Practically all of the far-sighted employers are for the service—those who can see that business is benefited by having men continuously employed without periods of idleness necessary in looking for work under the old system. Only about one-third of the States have employment-service systems, and if no appropriation is provided it means that two-thirds of the States will be without adequate public employment offices. This would mean an aid to unrest.

What have other countries done?

Our wealth towers above that of other nations, even as the Washington Monument towers above a toadstool, when compared to the wealth of other countries. Why, our wealth—the material, potential wealth of our country—far transcends that of any other country or of any other three countries combined. Now, let us see what is being done in those countries that have not the wealth that we have.

Free employment service, Great Britain and Canada: R. C. Davison, an official of the British ministry of labor, and an expert on employment, has just completed a tour of the United States, studying our system of employment offices. Now, listen, Senators:

The British free-labor exchanges now number 400 main offices and 1,200 branch offices, with a personnel of 20,000 men. Great Britain, staggering under the reiterated blows of her enemy in the late war, bounds forward with a resiliency that is admirable. Conservative Britain maintains, although loaded with debt, 400 main offices and 1,200 branch offices and 20,000 men to secure jobs—if you will pardon that expression—for her returning soldiers; and our debt, as compared to hers, is as but a silken thread in the scales.

Let us take Canada—Canada, whose sons rushed forward, who left their farms and left their fields, and who were assured that when they returned they would have positions, or, at least, an opportunity to secure positions. Canada, with about 8,000,000 of people—I think I have overstated the number—has recently established a system providing 10 offices for every million workers. Seventy-eight such offices are already in operation. This Mr. Davison, an official of the British ministry of labor, says:

When one considers the fact that your national employment system had to be installed suddenly and throughout the country at the same time and function while it was building, America has done a remarkably good job.

Here is a man free from partisan bias, free from partisan prejudice, who is familiar with the same agency in his own country. He says:

When you consider that you had to build the house and live in it at the same time, you had to set up your agency and maintain it and operate it at the same time, America has done remarkably well. England can learn something from the United States—

I am glad to hear that—

particularly in the physical layout and in the methods of interviewing applicants.

Yet these methods of laying out the work, interviewing applicants, and sending them to where the positions are are powerless and rendered useless if this conference report should be adopted.

Now, who are these Federal directors? I have said, or at least I have been advised by those who ought to know, that a majority of them are Republicans. Who are they—these directors in the various States?

Maine: Charles S. Hichborn, president First Granite National Bank, Augusta.

Vermont: Robert W. Simonds, lawyer and commissioner of labor.

New Hampshire: E. K. Sawyer, merchant, department store.

Massachusetts: Everett W. Lord, dean, school business administration, Boston University.

Rhode Island: George H. Webb, formerly secretary chamber of commerce, commissioner of industrial statistics, director workingmen's compensation, superintendent State employment office, director of draft in Rhode Island, Army commission of captain, colonel on governor's staff.

Connecticut: Charles E. Julin, manufacturer.

New York: George W. Kirchwey, acting director, formerly dean Columbia Law School.

New Jersey: Lewis T. Bryant, real estate business, State commissioner of labor.

Pennsylvania: E. C. Felton, former director, president Pennsylvania Steel Co.

Maryland: John K. Shaw, coal operator.

Virginia: James B. Botts, formerly member firm of Darris & Stephenson (Inc.), insurance.

West Virginia: Lemuel B. Spaun, immigrant inspector, Immigration Service.

Ohio: Fred. C. Croxton, food administrator.

Michigan: James V. Cunningham, former State labor commissioner (member organized labor).

Wisconsin: George P. Hambrecht, lawyer and employer, chairman Wisconsin Industrial Commission.

Indiana: Louis C. Huesmann, manufacturer of hardware.

Illinois: Mark L. Crawford, commissioner of conciliation, immigrant inspector at Chicago.

Minnesota: Hugo Koch, deputy labor commissioner, Minnesota, Department of Labor from civil-service list.

Kentucky: W. Pratt Dale, lawyer (formerly counsel for chamber of commerce).

Missouri: W. W. Brown, lawyer (formerly member Brown & Steward).

Tennessee: Joseph T. Ware, physician.

North Carolina: George J. Ramsey, president Pease Institute, Raleigh, N. C.

South Carolina—John L. Davis, secretary-treasurer—why, mirabile dictu! I have found that there is a man who is identified with union labor who is one of these directors. I have read the names of the directors in about 15 States. I see that South Carolina, Mr. President, has a member of union labor for the director of the employment service. Why, what has swept that conservative State from her moorings? What vision or visions has she seen that she has failed to go out into the great world of commerce and get a great big business man and make him director? She has made the president of the State Federation of Labor director, if I have not misread this.

South Carolina: John L. Davis, secretary-treasurer South Carolina Federation of Labor, secretary-treasurer City Federation of Trades, member South Carolina Board of Conciliation and Mediation, employee of newspaper.

Georgia: H. M. Stanley, State commissioner industry and labor.

Florida: Gideon B. Travis, civil-service appointee.

Alabama: George B. Tarrant, real estate dealer.

Mississippi: H. H. Weir, president State Federation of Labor, newspaper, creamery, and farm-products business employee.

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

Mr. ASHURST. I yield, certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. I might state that I know Mr. Weir. He is the president of the State Federation of Labor, but he is a man of most excellent qualities and has the respect of the business people of the State.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I read on with considerable trepidation:

Louisiana: H. A. M. Jacobsen, civil-service appointee.

Arkansas: R. B. Keating, Immigration Service, Conciliation Service.

Iowa: A. L. Urick, State commissioner of labor.

North Dakota: Lindley H. Patten, cashier and lease clerk of State land department.

South Dakota: Charles McCaffree, five years immigration and industrial department, newspaper and advertising, directing farm-labor work four years.

Texas: H. W. Lewis, railway official, formerly State labor commissioner.

Nebraska: George J. Kleffner, formerly with Post Office Department (member organized labor).

Look here, Senators—a member of organized labor—a member of organized labor! Why, Nebraska is in strange company when she appointed or allowed to be appointed as director of the Federal Employment Service a member of organized labor.

Kansas: J. Will Kelley, formerly secretary chamber of commerce, Topeka.

Oklahoma: Claude E. Connally, assistant commissioner of labor, six years State forestry inspector.

Montana: Scott Leavitt, formerly official of Forestry Service.

Wyoming: Edward P. Taylor, fire chief, commissioner of labor statistics.

Colorado: Roady Kenehan, formerly State treasurer and State auditor, secretary district exemption board.

New Mexico: D. A. MacPherson, business manager newspaper.

Arizona: Thomas J. Croaff, president State Federation of Labor, member executive council, State council of defense.

Now, just a word about Arizona. It has been asserted, not on this floor, that these directors were supple and supine agencies of the American Federation of Labor, and that in reaching out their energies to secure positions for men they always took care to secure jobs for a man who belonged to union labor. I know Mr. Croaff very well. He was born in Virginia; is an excellent lawyer. He was asked to resign, because, the Department of Labor said, "Your work has been efficient. I commend your work, but I feel that so long as you are president of the State Federation of Labor you ought to give undivided attention to one particular work. We want your entire time, and you must resign either one post or the other." So he resigned as director. I do not know who has been appointed in his stead. That is the history of the matter.

Utah: P. J. Moran, president Utah Portland Cement Co.

Idaho: M. J. Kerr, rancher and contractor.

Washington: Lawrence Wood, Immigration Service.

Oregon: Wilfred F. Smith, Immigration Service.

Nevada: J. C. Coniff, business man.

California: William T. Boyce, Immigration Service.

Delaware: Simon P. Doherty, secretary police commission, Delaware, secretary State senate, inspector Dupont Co., employer in laundry business.

District of Columbia: E. M. Kline, civil-service employee.

Now, Senators, I have trespassed long on your patience, but I have felt that it was necessary.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I just want to add to what the Senator has said in reference to Dr. Ware, of Tennessee, that there is not a better man in the State, and he is doing a splendid work.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator.

Now, I submit in all candor, what has become of the argument that has been made about the corridors, whispered about here and there, that this Employment Service was simply a device in the hands of the American Federation of Labor? In all candor and in all good faith, what becomes of that charge when it is shown to you that not only a majority, but a very large majority, of these State directors of the employment offices have no identification whatever with labor, organized or unorganized? I think in two or three instances—in my own State, the State of South Carolina, and one or two others—men have been appointed as directors who had some connection with union labor; but should that strike down the Employment Service? Not at all. If they were all members of union labor, that alone should not condemn them. It is what they are, not what they belong to. It is whether they are men who are doing their duty. I do not know whom the Secretary is going to appoint in Arizona; and, if you will pardon me, I care less, so long as he gets a man who will do his full duty.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to say to the Senator that in the hearings that are now taking place before a joint commission of the Senate and the House with reference to the permanent Federal Employment Bureau it was stated, as I remember it—I can not be exactly accurate about it, but I am confident that the evidence shows—that the majority of the employees were not members of unions, a rather amazing circumstance.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator pardon me, and let me get that? Do I understand the Senator to say that it has been developed before his committee—he is chairman of the Education and Labor Committee—that a majority of those persons for whom positions have been secured are not members of labor unions?

Mr. KENYON. That was the testimony before us, as I remember it. It was very surprising to me, as I supposed the majority of them were members of unions, and I would have seen nothing wrong about it if they had been.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; I would have assumed the same status of affairs, and I would not have considered it a violent assumption.

So what becomes in all candor, now, of the argument that these directors in the 48 States are simply union-labor agitators seeking to protect the unions? Why, the charge falls as a house of cards. Only three or four are identified with union labor, at the most—half a dozen out of 48. But assume that they were all identified with union labor, you must then show that they have improperly exercised these powers and energies that have been confided to them.

Why, Mr. President, it may be improper for me to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; I fear some Senator will make a point of order at once; but I am going to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that great religious daily in whose columns we love to see our names:

Mr. MONDELL—

And who is Mr. MONDELL? Leader, if you please, of a great political party, now in the majority in the House.

June 21 Mr. MONDELL said:

[Mr. MONDELL on the United States Employment Service. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 1526 and 1527, June 21, 1919.]

Mr. Chairman, while I was temporarily and unavoidably out of the Chamber the item at the bottom of page 155 and top of page 156, relative to the United States Employment Service, went out on a point of order made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. Of course, that would have occurred had I been here just the same, so that my absence has made no difference in the procedure. I simply refer to the fact that I was absent because I had intended to make a very brief statement in regard to that item when it was reached. I avail myself of the opportunity to do so now. My opinion is that it is not only very important that the item be in the bill when it becomes a law but my personal opinion is that the appropriation should be larger than that recommended by the committee. There has been a very great deal of criticism of the Federal Employment Service. I do not know just how much of that criticism has been justified by the facts. There has certainly been some basis for it or there would not have been such a volume of criticism. Nevertheless the service has undoubtedly done some good—a very considerable amount of good, in my opinion—and I think it would be very unfortunate to have it discontinued at this time. I do not approve the plans and purposes of some of creating a great governmental employment service costing many millions of dollars annually. I do not believe that would be wise; but I am convinced the Federal Government ought to undertake a work which goes as far, at least, as is contemplated under the language that went out of the bill. I think that we should go further than that and at least do that character of employment work that is interstate in its nature. The State employment agencies necessarily busy themselves with matters of State employment, or employment within the State, and we all know that in our country the demand for labor, the demand for mechanics, comes from widely separated districts. The field for supplying the demand for labor and mechanics is not bounded by State lines. There is a certain amount and class of work that should be done by the Federal Government. I am not prepared to say how much we should spend on an employment service, but I am very certain that we should not only do what is contemplated by the provision that went out on a point of order but that we should extend the work further in order to at least cooperate fully and completely with the States and in that connection do a class of interstate work which the States can not or will not do. *I trust* that when this bill becomes a law it will carry a sum sufficient for the Employment Service, at least along the lines I have suggested.

He trusted. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] was one whom he trusted; the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] was one whom he trusted; the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] was one whom he trusted. I know when they go back in conference after having learned the sentiments that trust will not be betrayed and that he will not have trusted in vain.

I now ask permission at this point to include in the RECORD an extended interview of Gen. Leonard Wood. I read an extract from it a moment ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Extract from interview Gen. Leonard Wood, New York Times, June 15.]

It will be a mistake for any agency now contributing to the great work of getting jobs for these men to slacken its efforts in the slightest degree. I consider it absolutely essential for the Federal Government to continue its efforts to place discharged military men and civilian war workers in profitable peace-time jobs, and for this purpose funds should be immediately made available to continue the United States

Employment Service, which has proved a potent factor in helping to solve this problem from a national standpoint.

We must not lose sight of these boys, and the Government owes them a debt of gratitude as well, which can in a slight measure be repaid by an intelligent effort to secure for them profitable peace-time employment. The Federal Government first of all must assume the major responsibility for this work, and this is why I consider it so essential for the Federal Employment Service to be continued and for all other agencies to continue their efforts to solve this problem as long as a single soldier or civilian war worker remains jobless. We can not lay too much stress upon our responsibility in this matter.

—

[Extract from interview Gen. Leonard Wood, June 19, Washington Evening Star.]

It is very essential, and I sincerely hope that the Federal Employment Service will be kept up until every returning soldier and sailor and discharged war worker is given a chance to be relocated in a peace-time job. The army of occupation has not been demobilized. We must afford those boys the same facilities for returning to civil life as we did to their fellow soldiers who were fortunate to return to their homes earlier.

Mr. ASHURST. I do not know whether I would be violating the proprieties or not; if I do I hope I will be promptly called to order; but there have lately come into the Chamber two recruits. From the great grain fields of Kansas comes a Senator, learned, modest in his demeanor, to reinforce the other Senator from Kansas, with whose party I am not at all in sympathy but who does good work in the Senate. The junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] stated as follows—and I clipped this out of a newspaper:

At this particular moment the army of 200,000 extra harvest hands, recruited, mobilized, and being placed by the Employment Service in the great wheat belt, in view of the existing shortage of food, is equally as important as the Army of occupation on the River Rhine.

That is pretty strong language, that it is just as important to harvest our grain fields as it is to have an Army of occupation on the Rhine. Strong as that language is, Mr. President, I agree with it.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the extract from the interview with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]; also from interviews with Col. Arthur Woods, Assistant to the Secretary of War; Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood; and Mr. John Joy Edson, chairman of the board of directors of the Washington Loan & Trust Co.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted. The matter referred to is as follows:

CONCRETE REASONS FOR CONTINUING THE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE.

Senator CAPPER, of Kansas, says that "at this particular moment the army of 200,000 extra harvest hands, recruited, mobilized, and being placed by the Employment Service in the great wheat belt, in view of the existing shortage of food, is equally as important as the Army of occupation on the River Rhine." He declares that "it is unthinkable that the Federal Government would withdraw its support from the Employment Service at this time."

Col. Arthur Woods, Assistant to the Secretary of War, in charge of the problem of relocating discharged soldiers in peace-time jobs, says that "for the United States Employment Service to go out of business on the 1st of July would cause the interests of the returning soldiers and sailors to suffer to an extent which it is difficult to overestimate." He further says "that the United States Employment Service has the only comprehensive replacement machinery throughout the country for the placement of soldiers and sailors, and he is absolutely dependent on it to carry on his work."

Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood calls attention to the fact that the Army of occupation has not yet been demobilized. "We must afford those boys the same facilities for returning to civilian life as we did to their more fortunate fellow soldiers who were able to return to their homes earlier. The Federal Government first of all must assume the major responsibility for finding jobs for these boys and for the discharged war workers, and is in position to continue to prove a potent factor in helping to solve the unemployment problem from a national viewpoint."

Mr. John Joy Edson, chairman of the board of directors Washington Loan & Trust Co., also the contributor to the support of the Employment Service office in Washington, D. C., says that "to discontinue the service at this time would be practically fatal to the interests of the returning soldiers and sailors who need, deserve, and must have assistance in trying to reestablish themselves in civil life."

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have, in conclusion, this further to say: The expenses of the Great War before we are finally through with the payment of all demands will doubtless be $80,000,000,000 or more. That is a vast sum. It was worth it to win the war. We are secure and safe to-day. Within a very short time we will again be pursuing our daily course, and the Great War will be history. A gorgeous, a brilliant, book in history it will be wonderfully penciled. The valor of our troops and the troops of our Allies will be recounted for decades to come, and will furnish sufficient raw material for all the poets, orators, historians, and lecturers for a century to come.

But to whom do we owe the safety we now enjoy? To whom should we turn with our thanks for this safety? Surely we must not forget that the soldier in the trench had some part in this victory. It may be that we can not give him a farm when he returns and finds his former position occupied by some one else. We are unable to pay him a bonus of $1,000 or $500. It may be that he will not want that. In fact, I think the soldier would resent the idea of seeing gifts ladled out to him. The soldier is not an object of charity. He is a man; he has proved himself to be a man. So when the soldier of the Great War comes home and proceeds to the place where there was an employment office when he left and finds that in his absence Congress has stricken out the only agency to which he could go and through which he could obtain a situation, he will get a sample of the proverbial ingratitude of republics.

I want this Republic to be a grateful Republic, not a patronizing Republic; not grateful in words alone, but one that will say, "We can not feed you; you do not want to be fed; all you can ask and all you do ask is a free field and a fair fight; all you want is an opportunity with your brawn and your muscle and your tools to earn a living. You had a right to ask that the Government give you the information as to where work may be secured." The soldier will be satisfied with no less than that. More than that, in my judgment, the soldier will not ask.

I have spoken upon this subject, it must be obvious to Senators, with considerable feeling, but I assure the conferees with no personal feeling, because I have for them a profound regard. They are experienced legislators; they have been in the Senate many years; but they have entirely misconceived the sentiment of public opinion. They have had visions instead of a vision when they strike down such an agency, the only agency known where men can secure positions. I appeal to them to ask leave to sit again, to go back into conference, and insist upon what I am pleased to term the Robinson amendment. All day Saturday I sat here to offer an amendment providing for $950,000, but conference after conference was had, Senator after Senator was consulted, and finally we all agreed "it is reasonable, moderate, and prudent to agree to $400,000 only in order that these agencies throughout the country may be maintained." While I believe the friends of the amendment could have secured a majority vote, and possibly a two-thirds vote, they felt that at least to be reasonable, and thinking it was expedient and was true wisdom we agreed to $400,000. I do not say it was agreed as a contract, because we can not make a contract in the Senate, but it was agreed as far as men can agree in the United States Senate, that the amendment would go in and stay in at $400,000, and when the midnight hour approached the Senate adjourned. We all went to our homes confident that the Robinson amendment would be a part and parcel of the sundry civil appropriation law. We believed that our conferees would stand firmly in behalf of the Robinson amendment, and we had a right to believe it. But we find that in their haste to get through, and I know it is a task to be on a conference committee, they have cut the amount of money in two and have provided that it all must be spent in Washington.

So, Mr. President, I urge the conferees, I appeal to the Senators on both sides, to sustain this Employment Service and to vote to reject the conference report or to disagree to the conference report and let the conferees sit again.

I ask that the letters which I send to the desk may be appended to my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

[Des Moines (Iowa) Capital, May 31, 1919.]

KEEP THE FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ALIVE.

Reconstruction problems, vast and complicated, which now loom before the Nation's lawmakers at Washington, make the responsibilities of the present Congress doubly heavy.

Urgent matters of immediate concern are pressing themselves upon the Senators and Representatives. Conditions incident to the immediate postwar readjustment period are clamoring for attention. Delay in such cases must be measured only by the time needed to develop a wise solution.

One of the most important matters confronting Congress to-day is that involving the returning soldiers and sailors and war workers. Slightly more than half of the 4,000,000 of men under arms have been demobilized and turned back into civilian life. The machinery of the United States Employment Service—a governmental agency—has been directed largely toward finding jobs for these returning soldiers and sailors, but unless the present Congress provides funds without delay this Employment Service must be discontinued July 1 next. This means that the remaining hundreds of thousands of boys in service will be turned loose to shift for themselves in the matter of finding work. Among them are several thousand Iowa boys, who are still in service.

The Government has as distinct a duty to these boys as it had to the boys already discharged. The boys themselves expect the same consideration that their comrades received. It is, therefore, inconceivable that the present Congress would fail to preserve the organization that has been built to care for the boys in this emergency.

Iowa, for the moment, is most fortunate. Thanks to the efforts of this Employment Service, reports show that of the thousands who have been demobilized only about 500 are without work at the present time. As fast as they are discharged the men have been sent back to their home communities, and even to their old jobs in perhaps 50 per cent of the cases. For the others opportunities were found. In addition, the industrial, commercial, and agricultural interests of the State have likewise been served and their labor needs supplied promptly. Farm labor in particular is being placed rapidly.

The State legislature, in recent session, defeated a bill to appropriate $25,000 for public employment bureaus to be located in Davenport, Waterloo, Sioux City, Council Bluffs, and Des Moines. The bill would

have provided State offices to take the place of the cooperative State and Federal offices existent until July 1.

Congress should take steps to make permanent the Employment Service now a part of the Federal Department of Labor. The principle behind an efficiently conducted public employment service is sound, whether viewed from the standpoint of the welfare of the Nation at large, the employer or the employee, and should be encouraged accordingly.

—

[From the Washington Times, June 27, 1919.]

SHALL WE FAIL OUR FIGHTING MEN?—A MATTER FOR THE SENATE TO DECIDE.

"Since the signing of the armistice Great Britain has increased her national employment service 300 per cent in placement facilities and personnel to assist her soldiers and war workers to employment," said a representative of the British labor ministry the other day in this city.

Since the signing of the armistice the United States Employment Service, with the exception of the first three months, has been decreased 50 per cent, and unless the Senate acts this week to save it, the national machinery for placing our soldiers, sailors, and civilian workers will close down entirely next Monday.

The average citizen can understand, though he may condemn, the efforts on the part of certain private interests to force the discontinuance of the Federal Employment Service. But it is incomprehensible to the average citizen why Congress, professing an interest in the returning soldier and a desire to prevent the growth of radicalism in America, should evince a disposition to throw overboard the organization that will give the soldier the most practical aid—help to a job—and is the best weapon against the conditions that breed Bolshevism.

The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee recently explained on the floor of the lower Chamber that there was no need for more than a "clearing house" in the Department of Labor, limited to supplying information and to the boundaries of the District of Columbia.

He stated that the War Department had an organization for placing soldiers and the States were equipped to place civilian workers.

But the War Department, through Col. Arthur Woods, assistant to the Secretary of War, has repeatedly advised Congress that it has no placement machinery and that discontinuance of the Federal Employment Service will injure the interests of returning fighters.

Only 13 States, in which none of the great agricultural States is included, have anything that might be called a public employment service.

—

Industrial Management says: "Should the manufacturers of this country be asked whether or not they wish to see the United States Employment Service kept without doubt the almost unanimous answer would be 'yes.' This reply would be given with no thought of bowing before the inevitable, but because employers honestly believe that this service once developed will be of tremendous value to them. In fact it is perhaps not overstating the situation to say that employment managers, such as have said more harsh things about the United States employment agencies than their superiors in the industry.

"To face a few facts:

"The United States Employment Service is here to stay. It has been a helpful agency during the months of the war. It promises great good for American industry once it is developed and brought to a condition of maximum usefulness. Perhaps the four major needs in its upbuilding and immediate future are:

"Administration that will not even allow seeming discrimination or special privileges.

"Adoption of a standard classification so that the man and woman sent in response to a request will be fitted for the position open.

"Adapting the service to the needs of skilled men.

"Making the office routine of interview and placement uniform throughout the entire country."

New York Commercial: "The United States Department of Labor has drafted a bill to be presented to the next Congress legalizing the establishment of a permanent Federal Employment Bureau. This bill should have the support of all thinking business men, for it will do much to remove prevailing abuses and will tend to distribute labor where it is needed."

Springfield (Ohio) Sun: "* * * Springfield's Federal Employment Bureau has been of inestimable value and the city can not well afford to be without it, at least not until the readjustment shall have taken place."

The Musical Courier: "It is the Government agency of reconstruction, the United States Employment Service, that has most adequately coped with present industrial conditions, and its continuance is essential, not only for the benefit of the men who are being demobilized but for industry in general, including our own piano industry, which to be prosperous must have a prosperous country to purchase its products."

Chicago Daily News: "There are soldiers and sailors looking for jobs and every agency that can help to find them must be maintained."

New York World: "Maintain the United States Employment Service at all costs. No private employment can as much as begin to do, even locally, what the Unittd States Employment Service is enabled to accomplish."

New York Tribune: "A work that should go on. To-day there are many special exigencies which make the continuance of the United States Employment Service activities a public necessity."

New Orleans Item: "The country needs it. The United States Employment Service, with its 4,000 offices in every part of the country, is the only agency, national, municipal, or private, that can meet this problem of industrial equalization."

Atlantic (N. J.) Gazette: "Uncle Sam now tries to lead the right man to the right job. The Federal Employment Service idea was always a good one."

The New York Evening Post: "The United States Employment Service is doing such valuable work and is so indispensable to reconstruction that it should be made as nearly proof against criticism as is possible."

Cleveland (Ohio) Topics: "During the war the long-desired Federal Employment Service has been created, and the National Government has assumed responsibility for connecting employers and workers in the only right and efficient way. This service should be continued, generously financed by Congress."

Los Angeles (Calif.) Herald: "Work of assisting soldiers and sailors and other war workers to obtain suitable employment is properly a function of the General Government, and it ought not to have to depend on private charities and volunteer contributions."

Savannah (Ga.) News: "It seems that if the United States Employment Service ever has been worth while it certainly should be now. The service should be continued, and it should have the cooperation of employers; its work will be easier if employers will let it know their needs."

San Francisco Bulletin: "At the time the question of unemployment is one meriting prompt attention. The United States Employment Service is needed more and more. Hence we repeat that one of the first duties of the new Congress is to correct the almost criminal neglect of the old and provide funds for carrying on this important work."

New York Herald: "The United States Employment Service is the only large free agency for this purpose. It would be the eternal shame of this country if our soldiers and sailors returning from abroad should find no means of employment and be forced to beg for bread."

Poughkeepsie (N. Y.) Star: "The coming of spring, with the resumption of farm work, would make the United States Employment Service essential to securing farm labor."

Forbes Magazine: "* * * These bureaus (United States Employment Service) have succeeded in placing many thousands of ex-soldiers and others. The need for them has not passed. Their cost is trifling compared with the value of the services they are rendering in alleviating unemployment."

New York Tribune: "There is no reason for disbanding an agency like the United States Employment Service, which is needed to help place returning soldiers in old or new jobs.

"While the war lasted this service was busy enrolling workers for war industries. There is an even broader field for it now in shifting labor back to nonwar industries and in distributing the new labor supply created by the release of the fighting men. Such a distribution is an essential feature of any official reconstruction program. Why should the Government stand aside and leave it to the lumbering operations of the law of labor supply and demand, imperfectly accelerated by private employment agencies? * * *

"This is wrong-headed economy. Unemployment means suffering. It also means economic waste. In a broad sense the facilitation of a maximum degree of employment is a proper governmental function. And to-day there are many special exigencies which make the continuance of the Federal service's activities a public necessity."

Cotton Seed Oil Magazine: "As a means of avoiding strikes, labor disputes, and the like, the Cotton Seed Oil Magazine believes that this Employment Service, organized for the period of the war, is the best solution of the ever-increasing menace to labor when it does not thoroughly understand the manufacturers' viewpoint.

"Take, for example, a supposed case in the field of oil milling. The superintendent wishes to employ some one who understands the work to be done around his plant. If it was not for this Employment Service, he most likely would have to employ help which is unaccustomed and wholly unsuited to his needs, and the work therefore becomes a grind for the one employed. Soon there might be dissatisfaction and unrest. But now he can go to this bureau, state his wants, and from the large list of registrants find just the man he wants, because they are classified and in most cases trained for just certain work. Here the Employment Service is created for the specific purpose of bringing employer and employee together so that the two may work in harmony for the country's good.

"We believe that labor disputes and strikes in the main are entirely unnecessary if there be an understanding between the parties concerned."

J. P. Morgan & Co.: "We are impressed with the importance of the United States Employment Service and quite agree that it would be most unfortunate that that service should now be cut down, owing to the failure of the deficiency bill in the last Congress."

Sioux Falls Press: "Without the aid of the United States Employment Service farmers are going to have a very difficult time this year. This is the testimony of men who are in close touch with the situation."

Fresno (Calif.) Republican: "Other nations are increasing their national employment service to unprecedented dimensions. It has become one of the principal departments of all the other governments in the world * * * America alone * * * has cut off the support or even the little national organization we had."

Detroit News: "* * * Of all the unjustifiable omissions, one stands out preeminent—the neglect to provide for the continuance of the United States Employment Service. * * *"

Springfield (Mass.) Republican: "As a war measure this service (the United States Employment Service) is imperatively needed. As a peace measure it will be needed still more. Its foundations are well laid, and to root them up would be highly folly."

Boston Traveler: "To do away with existing means for the relief of unemployment is to court grave danger from the forces of anarchy that are lying in wait for just such an occasion. The interests of the entire Nation, as well as those of the unemployed, demand that no useful part of our machinery for connecting men with jobs shall be discarded or suffered to lie idle. And the United States Employment Service is performing a decidedly useful part in this readjustment process."

Atlanta Journal: "Those conducting this branch of Government service have been so absorbed in solving economic problems and rendering human aid that they have had no time to exploit their achievements or play the game of personal politics. But a glance into what they have done and are doing each day will convince any fair-minded observer that this work, far from being discontinued, ought to be amplified. And it behooves the far-sighted business man, as well as every friend of the masses of the people, to exert his influence to that end. * * *"

Chicago Journal: "As an insurance against Bolshevism alone, the National Employment Service is worth all it cost—and it has not cost much. It found jobs for 3,000,000 workers during 1918, prior to the armistice. * * * Surely, at a time when every effort is being made to turn the wage earner against law and order, a service like this should be continued."

Savannah (Ga.) News: "It seems that if the United States Employment Service ever has been worth while, it certainly should be so now. However, its functions have changed; while they are not the least bit less important than before, if anything they are more important now.

"While mobilization and fighting were going on its principal work was to find men for jobs; its principal work now, of course, is to find jobs for men. Certainly there is need of a clearing house of this sort on account of the large number of men set free from the Army and war factory work, and the Government alone can attend to it without cost to the men. The service evidently should be continued, and it should have the cooperation of employers. Its work will be easier if employers will let it know their needs.

"* * * The United States Employment Service is the only large free agency for this purpose. Its work is regarded as vital in the reconstruction which must necessarily follow the war. It would be to

the eternal shame of this country if our soldiers and sailors returning from abroad should find no means of employment and be forced to beg for bread."

Colliers: "If the returning Army and Navy men need any special aid it is in the matter of getting hold of the sort of job that they are now best able to start toward giving this help by setting up a nation-wide United States Employment Service which is qualified to introduce work and workers with the minimum of wasted time."

Paterson (N. J.) Call: "The Federal employment bureaus have done good work in finding employment for returning soldiers and idle war workers, and their work should be continued by all means."

Wilmington (Del.) Every Evening: "It would seem rather foolish to abolish a branch of public service found so useful during the war, and which probably will be needed far more in the days of reconstruction."

New York World: "The Employment Service was never needed so much as it will be during the reconstruction period. The time has arrived for its most effective work. There are critical conditions all over the world and the unrest of the labor element is the chief factor in the disturbance. The surest preventative, as well as cure, for trouble of that kind is universal employment."

Cleveland (Ohio) Press: "It is not hard to see why private employment agencies are opposed to Uncle Sam's going into (employment) business. * * * Naturally a service run by the Government, run on the level, and charging no fee of any kind, would put them out of business."

New York Telegraph: "We can not understand why intelligent men would dispense with the aid of this powerful auxiliary during the period of social unrest brought about by the rapid demobilization of the Army and war plants, unless, as has been charged, the influence of the fee-charging employment agencies and blacklisting employers' associations is very great."

The Iron Age: "The Employment Service has found it difficult to make much headway against this increase in workers looking for jobs. * * * To help complicate the situation a fight has arisen * * * to cut off the appropriation for the Employment Service on the plea that it was only a war-time institution. In this connection charges have been made that the service has been responsible for alarming reports concerning labor conditions in the hope of impressing Congress with the need of its work. The service, however, has limped along very considerably behind other reports of the real shortages, and its figures still are considerably below the actual seriousness of the situation."

Wisconsin State Journal: "One of the biggest improvements the war has brought about was the total revolution of the employment agency system. We have tolerated long enough the private employment agency institution, with its graft on one side and deception on the other. Every worker in America, unskilled or skilled, from purely manual labor to highly trained scientific efficiency, is entitled at all times to the help and cooperation of the National Government."

La Crosse Tribune: "Opposition to the Department of Labor's employment bureau has become a matter of serious concern to those who are impressed by the need of orderly transition to a peace basis of industry. Industrial unrest is the product of unemployment * * * and the United States Employment Service is the only agency we have evolved for meeting the issue of unemployment. * * * It is only a minimum of decent gratitude to collect a list of possible jobs for the soldier to pick from, and that is just what the bureau does."

Newark (N. J.) Star-Eagle: "* * * Unrest feeds on unemployment. Mischief soon pushes itself into idle hands and heads. Give a man a reasonable amount of work to do, pay him a living wage, and he will not readily follow at the heels of agitators. These are critical times. Employment is the surest remedy at hand to keep America sane."

Birmingham (Ala.) Ledger: "We should hesitate to leave our young men to the haphazard of individual job seeking. Private employment agencies will have special axes to grind and serve special masters. A Federal employment agency, with coordinated branches in all parts of the country and reporting to a common center, ought to serve the demobilized soldier and industry also with more efficiency. The greatest menace which any country can face is idleness of returned soldiery."

Sacramento (Calif.) Bee: "Employers of labor, equally with those hunting employment, are concerned in the matter of keeping open the efficient United States Employment Service office. Idleness breeds discontent and discontent is the menace of the governments of the world to-day. Let this community do what it can to point the way to work to those who desire work, and we know of no better medium than that of the United States Employment Service."

New York Commercial: "Hitherto the furnishing of jobs for unemployed has been done by private agencies, which charged extortionate commissions or swindled the unwary by exacting registration fees. Then, too, at one place there was a surplus of labor, while at another there was a scarcity—with no means of equalizing the difference."

New York Mail: "All over America great enterprises of road building, construction, or reclamation are under way or are contemplated. All these enterprises will involve a widespread readjustment of the supply of labor to the new demand. The machinery for effecting this adjustment is second in importance only to the launching and development of the enterprises themselves.

"Such machinery we possess in the United States Employment Service, which was established to provide workers for the industries of war, met that need in a highly satisfactory way, and is now turning its attention to the work of placing the war worker in peace industries.

"The United States Employment Service is an essential need of the hour. It will continue to be an essential need during the entire period of readjustment. America can not afford to put out of commission a vital part of its machinery of readjustment at the moment when it is putting the work of readjustment under way."

Memphis (Tenn.) Press: "One of the biggest improvements the war brought was the total revolution of the employment-agency system. The country needs the Employment Service—needs it worse now than ever before, because the soldiers are coming back in search of jobs. It would be a mistake to discontinue it. True, the Government must economize, but there are other economies which can be effected without injury."

Claremont (N. H.) Daily Eagle: "Probably at no time in the history of the country has labor unrest been so marked as now. * * * In the last few months it has been the duty of the United States Employment Service to look after those idle men and find work for them. * * * The United States Employment Service is fully organized and ready to go on with its work. Never was it needed more. This would seem a poor time to disrupt it."

New Orleans (La.) Item: "With millons of soldiers and sailors being demobilized and multiplied millions of war workers being discharged, liberal surpluses of labor are developing in certain parts of the country, while in other parts there are shortages.

"The United States Employment Service is the only agency—national, municipal, or private—that can meet this problem of industrial equalization."

Baltimore (Md.) News: "In this disinterested and neutral agency between employment and labor, each served free of cost and with discriminating selection of the right man for the right job, the whole question of placement and distribution of the country's man power was of established order, flexibility, and competency; it is universally known to workingman and employer alike and has won their confidence. With the passing of the Federal agency the whole question reverts to the relatively chaotic and haphazard conditions which prevailed before the war.

"On its face, such a step seems of reaction and backward, a loss of a valuable thing gained in the hard experience of war and of a great and proved use."

New Orleans (La.) State: "If a United States Bureau of Employment was needful last year while the war was on, the necessity for it is infinitely greater now. Last year the bureau put 3,000,000 men to work, its function being to distribute the labor so that there might not be congestion here and famine there.

"This year it has been putting 15,000 men to work daily, but the task is a much more difficult and perplexing one, with hundreds of thousands of soldiers and other war workers thrown suddenly on the labor market and industry working very slowly toward readjustment from war to peace conditions, and, hence, unprepared to take back immediately those who rallied to the colors in field or camp or entered the vast plants where munitions and other supplies were manufactured."

San Francisco Call and Post: "The principal opponents of the United States Employment Service are the fee-charging agencies which have grown rich by exploiting the unfortunates in search of employment—which is a strong argument in favor of the Federal service, which is free to everybody."

Winston-Salem (N. C.) Sentinel: "This has been a most valuable work."

The Farm Journal: "The United States Employment Service is establishing offices all over the country to help move labor from one place to another as the need arises. County agents are in close touch with farmers and can find out how much labor is needed."

Denver (Colo.) Bulletin (under the caption "Ten Reasons Why United States Employment Service Should Be Continued"):

"1. It is the only Nation-wide governmental agency dealing constructively with demobilized soldiers, sailors, and war workers in the finding of employment.

"2. It is the only service witbin the Department of Labor capable of carrying out the provisions of the organic act of Congress of March 4, 1913, creating the department, which charges it with the responsibility of advancing the opportunities for profitable employment of the wage earners of the United States.

"3. It is the only existing medium for the currant study of the labor market.

"4. It is the only existing public method for the clearance of job opportunities and labor supply, thus providing for intelligent guidance of shifting workers.

"5. It is the only adequate means for conserving the social and economic waste inherent in the process of workers seeking employment from plant to plant.

"6. It is the only method of distributing labor to the sections where employment is plentiful, thereby increasing national production and removing one great cause of social unrest.

"7. It is the only nationally extended arm of the Department of Labor directly and continuously cooperating with the States in dealing with the problems of unemployment.

"8. It is the only arm of the Government capable, through careful adaptation of the trade tests used by the Army during the war, of developing scientific methods for the vocational guidance of the workers, thus selecting the right man for the right job, and thereby making for industrial efficiency and content.

"9. It is the sole agency that is capable of rendering competent service, both to the workers and the employers, on a community basis without bias. This impartiality is secured by the existence of supervisory community labor boards and State advisory boards comprising representatives of labor and management and presided over by a representative of the public partisan to neither but acceptable to both.

"10. The plan of a nationally supervised locally administered chain of labor exchanges is common to most European countries and has been recognized by 26 of our State legislatures. It is an imperative necessity in the period of reconstruction and a factor always in our national life."

Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser: "If there ever was need for the work of the Employment Bureau of the Department of Labor, that time is now. * * * A distribution of surplus labor in the cities will make for quiet and good order in America. As a matter of fact, the need for the bureau is greater than it was during the war. * * *"

New York Herald: "After every war in which this country has been engaged there has been a period of reaction. * * * Many laborers are thrown out of work and the return of soldiers seeking employment presents a serious problem.

"To meet this situation the Government at Washington established a United States Employment Service Board with the object of finding places for the men without jobs, and especially of seeing that the men who served the country so nobly abroad do not have to beg for lack of employment. * * * There was no charge to the persons benefited, so the board from the start has had the enmity of employment agencies that charged a fee and of blacklisting employers' organizations."

Sheboygan (Wis.) Press: "The recently organized United States Employment Service has found work for millions of men. This greatly increased the fighting power of the United States. But it also has succeeded in carrying the country through a big part of the readjustment period without disaster. There have been suggestions that this * * * national employment service might be discontinued. It would be a very serious mistake. It will prevent industrial depressions from starting. It should be made a permanent bureau."

Janesville (Wis.) Gazette: "Why is such a determined attempt being made to eliminate * * * the Government labor bureaus? One of the greatest aids to the man in uniform who has been discharged from the Army or Navy has been these employment bureaus. Thousands have been given jobs who would not have known where to find them. Thousands have been aided free of cost where otherwise they would have had to go to private employment agencies and put up a fee and then take a chance on being swindled out of it. Right here in Janesville hundreds of soldiers who came from Camp Grant almost broke

have been given lifts to jobs which would at least tide them over till they got on their feet again. Manufacturers in all parts of the country are loud in their praise of the cooperation the service has given in placing workers at a time when the labor problem loomed biggest. Let it finish a work well started."

San Francisco Examiner: "There must be no question about the continuance of the United States Employment Service. Its work is vital."

Miami (Fla.) Herald: "It will be remembered that the United States Employment Service supplied nearly 3,000,000 war workers. Since the armistice was signed it has reversed the process and is now finding employment for men at the rate of 100,000 a month. The service so far has supplied 27 or 28 out of every 30, but the big problem will come when an additional 2,000,000 men are released from war service."

Chicago Herald-Examiner: "Union labor wants the bureau. Women's organizations wants it. The Chicago Chamber of Commerce wants it. The whole American people, if it could only see the situation, would rise and demand it."

The Survey: "Though born of the war and tested by it, it may be that in the years to come the United States Employment Service, which was left without resources by the failure to pass the general deficiency bill, will be remembered for its contributions to the theory, science, and practical development of a permanent national system rather than for its spectacular success in mobilizing man power for war industries during a few months or in coordinating the resources of the country in the interest of returning soldiers and sailors. In the brief period since January, 1918, when the service was reorganized as a separate unit of the Department of Labor, and especially in the fraction of that period—only four months—between the signing of the armistice and the news that its appropriation had failed, a phenomenal progress has been made. Under the stimulus of the emergency and with the fervor of patriotic enthusiasm, it has been possible to accomplish in 14 months what might have required 20 years or more in ordinary times."

Yonkers (N. Y.) Statesman: "The Employment Service in this city has been doing splendid work, and the results of its efforts in procuring employment for both men and women have been most satisfactory."

Evening State (Nebr.) Journal: "* * * There are eight Government labor offices in Nebraska. These have placed 56,000 men during the last nine months. From May 1 to January 1, the cost to the Government of maintaining these eight offices was approximately $48,000. On a per capita basis this figures down to 83 cents per man. Less than $1 expense for every man placed. According to figures compiled by the department, if this same number of men had been placed through private employment agencies, the cost would have been $560,000. * * * It is pointed out that in this respect alone the Government labor bureau saved to Nebraska citizens or rather diverted to so-called legitimate channels, $512,000. * * *"

Omaha Bee: "* * * Not one of the innumerable extraordinary activities of the Government in war time more thoroughly and completely justified its existence than did the employment bureau. * * * It has interfered with the operation of private employment agencies only, and from these comes the chief opposition to its continuance. In a recent report the statement was made that the free Federal employment agency had within the last year secured jobs for men and women to an extent that fees collected for the service by private agencies would have amounted to $10,000,000. This sum was saved to the workers. * * *"

Letter in Toledo (Ohio) Blade: "At this time when unemployment is so general the need for this service is very great, and it would be a keen disappointment to the working people to have it closed. By all means its efficiency should be maintained at the highest point."

Newark (N. J.) News: "The War Labor Board and the United States Employment Service are the only constructive agencies set up here for stabilizing man power. Both are threatened and there is nothing to take their places."

The Annalist (New York Times Co.): "The United States Employment Service, which has devoted much time to solving the problem of finding employment for the returned soldiers, was the agency that kept up the most persistent appeal after Congress had expired without appropriating funds to continue its efforts. It is true that a number of its offices may close, but the main machinery of the system has not been broken down * * *."

Des Moines (Iowa) Capital: "President Wilson has made an appeal to the churches of America to assist the United States Employment Service in finding work for returning soldiers and sailors and war workers. * * * The tribute which can be paid to our fighting men is hollow and soundless if we allow them to tramp the streets looking for work."

Washington (D. C.) Times: "The Federal Employment Service has been so successful and of so much benefit to employers and employees that the private agencies are hollering for their old graft back again."

San Francisco Examiner: "* * * It is self-evident that there is a pressing need for the work of this bureau (United States Employment Service) of the Labor Department. It has done and is doing a work of tremendous importance. * * * In the past year alone, the California offices have supplied the connection between 325,000 unemployed persons and jobs. A most respectable showing."

Public Opinion: "The Federal Employment Service has been an invaluable institution since America was hurled into the war. A Federal employment service can be made invaluable in the time of peace. Organized along the proper lines with the cooperation of State and municipal branches it would strike a telling blow at unemployment and its many attendant evils."

Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser: "The governmental agency for finding jobs for men represented in the United States Employment Service should be permitted to do its work at this particular crisis."

Tampa (Fla.) Times: "There is one Government organization the work of which is more necessary now than at any previous period. We refer to the United States Employment Service of the Department of Labor."

World's Work: "The United States Employment Service has already done much work in finding men for jobs and jobs for men in war industries, and it is now planning a much larger campaign in behalf of our disbanding armies."

American Contractor: "It is to be hoped that some means can be found to put the United States Employment Service on a permanent basis. There must be no drifting back to prewar methods of handling unemployment—a well-organized, unified, national system of labor exchanges is vitally necessary as a permanent part of our national program."

Ithaca (N. Y.) Journal: "One of the most powerful agencies at work toward putting the country on a peace basis with the least disturbance possible is the United States Employment Service of the Department of Labor."

Farrell (Pa.) News: "One of the powerful agencies at work toward putting the country on a peace basis with the least disturbance possible is the United States Employment Service of the Department of Labor. Distribution of labor has been one of the most chaotic matters in our haphazard economic fabric. Men have traveled from San Francisco to Pittsburgh for a special job, only to find that all jobs of that nature had been filled and had a waiting list. Food has rotted in orchard and field for lack of labor and transportation facilities, while jobless men walked city streets and their families were hungry partly because of the unemployment, partly because of the waste of food. * * *

"The United States Employment Service is not in any sense a charity organization. It is a Federal agency for placing labor. If it keeps on as it has started it will do much to bring order into the national economic life."

Schenectady (N. Y.) Gazette: "* * * As a man from the War Department has expressed it, the Government took a large number of men from their jobs and put them in the Army. The Government will not consider its work done until it puts these men back at work."

Let us all get together and put this most necessary work over. Truly, as Col. Arthur Woods, assistant to the Secretary of War, says:

"The most practical way in which to assist the returning soldiers is to help them to employment. Brass bands, free meals, and receptions are right and proper, but there must be with the welcome the offer of a suitable job to every man in uniform who needs one.

"And we must not forget that these men, to whom the country owes so much, will do far more for us than we can do for them. They are bringing back noble standards of loyalty, of service, of steadiness, which will be potent factors in the new times we are entering into."

The American City (N. Y.): "It is imperative that the United States Employment Service be provided with sufficient funds to carry on its work of finding employment for demobilized soldiers, sailors, and war workers. The United States Employment Service undoubtedly is rendering a much-needed service. Opposition to it has been largely based on self-interest or on remedial mistakes of local operation rather than on general policy. Those communities which know it best have borne ample testimony to its usefulness by their support of it before the Sixty-fifth Congress and by their willingness to help financially during the present emergency. * * *"

"If it is not all that it should be in some cities, the municipal officials should take steps to demand its improvement. The possibilities of the service as an aid in city development are greater than have generally been realized. Before the war we had begun to develop State and city employment agencies, but even with their agreements for the interchange of information they lacked the completeness of the Federal system. * * * Let us make certain that the progress made during the war in developing a national system of labor exchanges which has proved its ability to render real service is not lost through a failure of the cities to impress upon the Sixty-sixth Congress the imperative need for the unimpaired continuation of the service."

Freeport (Ill.) Journal: "An adequate supply of well-trained farm labor is vital. During the past year the United States Employment Service has done much; there should be an employment organization in every county to see that the farmer gets the help he needs."

Washington (D. C.) Times: "An idea of the great value of this service (United States Employment Service) may be had from a study of figures showing what has been accomplished. * * * There should be no thought of discontinuing the National Employment Service now so well established and which has clearly proved its great worth."

New York Journal of Commerce: "* * * This United States Employment Service organization and others of a State or local character are doing a good work, worth much more than it costs, and having a patriotic as well as generous quality."

Washington (D. C.) Star: "Continue the Employment Service! While it is inevitable that some of the war-time agencies should be eliminated and demobilized in the process of necessary economies, it is surprising to find a proposal to abolish the United States Employment Service. If there ever was a time when such a service was necessary it is now, with the labor market overstocked in consequence of industrial transformation and Army demobilization.

"This service was established for the purpose of distributing labor effectively at a time when it was necessary to use every available man for munition making, shipbuilding, and other works incident to the prosecution of the war. It was a distributing agency, to get the maximum results from the available labor supply. Now, with a surplus of labor, it has become a distributing service in another sense—that of finding jobs for men instead of finding men for jobs.

"Unless the States can be reliably depended upon to meet the requirements, the abolition of the Employment Service will leave the country in a bad way for labor distribution. Dependence on the State agencies is unsafe, for there is no fixed standard, and no assurance can be had of efficiency and continuity. A Federal Employment Service is virtually a necessity at this time.

"During the next year the labor question will be one of the greatest difficulties. There is no assurance as to the stabilizing of industry. Capital is hesitant in view of the uncertainty regarding prices and markets. Labor is hesitant respecting wages. The Government is doing perhaps its best in the way of reassurance on both lines, but at best there can be no real fixity and but little development.

"If the workingmen of this country are not aided in finding places there will be much congestion in some quarters, with consequent poverty and resultant suffering. The true function of a labor exchange or service is to prevent this congestion, and there is no agency of doing that short of a Federal bureau, which can cover the whole country. The money necessary to maintain the service should not be considered in this connection. It will be a rich investment in industrial stability and national welfare."

Washington (D. C.) Post: "Steps were taken at the conference held here during the past week by State representatives and officials of the Federal Employment Service looking to the establishment by the next Congress of a permanent cooperative arrangement between the Federal, State, and municipal governments for placing unemployed persons in useful and satisfactory positions. A tentative bill has been drafted which provides for a bureau of employment in the Department of Labor, to be in charge of a director general appointed by the President. The function of this bureau is to establish and maintain a system of public employment offices in the States which do not have public employment service, to aid in the development of existing State services, and to coordinate all the public employment offices in the country by furnishing information as to labor conditions, maintaining a system for clearing labor between States, and by establishing and maintaining a uniform policy and procedure.

"It is proposed to extend Federal aid to public employment offices operated as a State system, and where States appropriate a fixed sum the General Government may contribute a like sum, dollar for dollar. This money would be turned over to the State treasurers, to be expended

by the States upon compliance by them with the uniform rules and regulations issued by the Federal bureau of employment. In this way the Federal Government would not be encroaching upon the prerogatives of the States or interfering with their well-defined police powers, but would establish cooperation in such a manner as to make a complete working machine for carrying out a definite object.

"The bill as thus drafted will serve as a foundation upon which to build a comprehensive and efficient public employment service. Objections may be found to this particular plan, and it may be discovered that some other device will prove more effective; but it may be assumed that the general project of establishing the machinery which will be helpful in distributing labor where the needs of industry are greatest and where the opportunities for the worker are best will meet with widespread approval. The Department of Agriculture looks after the interests of the farmers in great detail, even to the extent of distributing millions of dollars' worth of free seeds. The Department of Commerce assists materially the business men of the Nation in the extension of trade and the multiplication of opportunities. The financial interests are conserved by the Treasury Department. Thus it appears entirely consistent that the Federal Government should exert itself to look after the particular interests of the millions of workers, especially when such action at the same time is of great benefit to the Nation as a whole by providing a more adequate and better adjusted labor supply.

"A permanent Federal employment service will prove beneficial only if it commands the approval and confidence of both workers and employers. It must be above suspicion of favoritism or prejudice; it must be neutral, as between unionism and nonunionism, and in labor disputes. Founded upon this principle and maintained thus, it will prove a real and lasting benefit to the workers of the Nation and to the Nation itself.

"Congress will have this tentative draft before it immediately upon convening a few weeks hence, and it should proceed at once with the perfecting of a bill which will command general support. Time should be given for all interests to be heard, and the bill should be drawn with the sole object of making it as effective and helpful as possible. There is an opportunity here for real service."

Philadelphia Evening Public Ledger: "Criticism like that aimed at the Federal Employment Service * * * is to be regretted, since it is of a sort likely to prejudice general opinion against a principle that should be more broadly applied in the future rather than hindered. * * * The Federal Employment Service can not be judged finally by its success or failure in placing men in given localities, though its record of achievements in Pennsylvania is admirable enough. The essential purpose of the service is to relieve congestion of the unemployed in various parts of the country, to offer such supervision and suggestions as would make it unnecessary for jobless men to crowd in discouraged groups in one community while there was shortage of labor elsewhere In a general way, it was intended to help men and to study the labor problem from a national viewpoint. * * *

"It is interesting to observe that the bitterest opposition to the Federal Employment Service was organized by employment agents, who formerly were able to fatten on the misfortunes of men out of work. * * * Failure of funds would be grievous disregard for the welfare of returning soldiers and a lamentable ignorance of one of the basic economic needs of the country."

Hackensack (N. J.) Record: "Private corporations and individuals, chambers of commerce, welfare organizations, and civic governments are responding nobly to the call of the Federal Employment Service. The promptness of the response all over the country will go far toward stabilizing conditions full of menace."

Literary Digest: "A warning and plea are sounded in a letter received by the Literary Digest from an American Army officer: 'Surely it does not require argument to support the contention that the country is under a moral obligation to give its discharged soldiers an opportunity to return to civil life in a manner that will not cause them to sacrifice their self-respect by becoming objects of charity, however willingly donated, for even the briefest time. * * * The Bureau of Labor (United States Employment Service) is performing a splendid service in endeavoring to secure employment for former enlisted men.'"

Trench and Camp (Soldiers' newspaper in 30 camps): "The United States Employment Service, the official agency for assisting soldiers to employment, is already placing in suitable jobs more than 75 per cent of the returning men who must find new work and is daily increasing its facilities for bringing the man and the job together."

Pittsburgh Press: "The authorities of the United States Employment Bureau offer you a valuable 'tip,' Mr. Employer. * * * The wise employer will take time by the forelock and solve the labor problem while the solving is good."

Charleston (S. C.) American: "It may be that the United States Employment Service will be continued for at least one more year; at the end of that time the great work it has done and will do for the unemployed in every part of the country will be so generally understood as to assure its continuance as a permanent branch of the Government."

Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram: "We are convinced that the Federal Employment Service not only has demonstrated its usefulness but any reconstruction program which does not provide for its continuance will be badly handicapped in meeting some of the problems which bid fair to be the most difficult of solution * * *."

Coming Back (soldiers' newspaper on transports): "Harold Stone, national superintendent of the bureaus for returning soldiers and sailors of the United States Employment Service, has arrived in France to bring the job-finding facilities of the Federal Employment Service to the soldiers and sailors overseas. He and his staff are now developing a system whereby returning men can make out their applications while on transports homeward bound, each card to be sent to the bureau for returning soldiers and sailors in the town to which a man is going after discharge. In this way men in need of assistance in job finding will be greatly helped and the United States Employment Service and the folks and organizations at home will have a chance to find a job before a man arrives."

Stars and Stripes (official newspaper of the American Expeditionary Forces): "That every man who really wants a job and goes after it toot sweet upon returning to the United States will get it is the promise held out by the United States Employment Service, which got into operation on behalf of the soldiers and sailors about a year ago and which now has three representatives in France looking after their interests.

"Until now the real facts concerning employment and lack of employment back home for ex-service men have been pretty well hidden and the reports thereon in the home papers have been pretty well diversified, according largely to the shades of political opinion. Some had it that jobs were running about loose; others that there wasn't work in sight for the best man who ever drew a pay envelope on Saturday night. The Employment Bureau steers a middle course. There will be work if the men only follow regulations. * * *

"Just now there are some 2,000 bureaus for returning soldiers and sailors back home, with headquarters in one of the principal cities of every State. They do not create jobs, nor do they promise to find job for everyone; but they do agree to help find jobs for all. * * *

"So much for what the Employment Service will do. Now, a little about what it has done. During 1918 it placed about 3,000,000 workers in the important war industries, and when the armistice was signed it was officially designated as the central agency to help discharged soldiers secure work. Through it Army auxiliary organizations, as well as the civic and fraternal bodies, are all working together for the same cause. The national office is informed weekly by telegraph of the labor conditions in every State in the Union. In February it was finding work for about 100,000 persons a week, of whom 20,000 were discharged soldiers and sailors."

Printers' Ink: "Attacking General Confusion, General Hesitation, and General Timidity from an angle somewhat different from that along which the National Prosperity campaign is training its guns, but with a common purpose in mind, the United States Employment Service is also engaging in an intensive advertising campaign.

"This campaign is to place the returning soldiers and sailors in the jobs for which they are best fitted and by this means to help American industry and commerce more soundly on its feet and to enter it with a flying start in our race for nation-wide prosperity.

"The success of the United States Employment Service is evidenced by the fact that while approximately 35 per cent of the discharged soldiers leave the Army without prospect of positions, it has been able, with the cooperation of welfare organizations, churches, and chambers of commerce, to place 80 per cent of these discharged men in the positions they are best fitted to fill.

"The purpose of its campaign is, first, to secure the unreserved cooperation of the employer, and, secondly, to stimulate the creation of jobs * * *."

Advertising and Selling: "While the United States Employment Service has been able to place 80 per cent of the returning soldiers who need new jobs, its task is growing more difficult each day because of the fact that public and private operations are naturally not keeping pace and affording employment openings at a rate equal to the demobilization of the Army and war plants.

"Furthermore, the service has the task of inducing through advertising the farm boys who are staying in industrial centers to return to their former occupation in order to relieve the farm labor shortage.

"Despite their heavy contributions of advertising space to the Government during the war, advertisers and newspapers are taking kindly to the copy supplied by the United States Employment Service. This is attributed to the general realization of the necessity for keeping unemployment at a minimum in this country, since widespread unemployment will hold back the resumption of peace business and industry and will encourage Bolshevism and social unrest."

The Fourth Estate: "The United States Employment Service is sponsoring an intensive national publicity campaign to assist soldiers, sailors, and war workers to employment. Advertising plays a prominent part in the drive and the service has just issued a portfolio of advertisements. The copy of the advertisements, 24 in number, is intended to stimulate business and buying and at the same time cause employers to keep their labor requirements listed with offices of the service and its bureaus for returning soldiers and sailors, which are automatically receiving the applications of the soldiers who must find new jobs * * *.

"The American Association of Advertising Agencies has indorsed the campaign and through its secretary is transmitting the portfolio of advertisements to the advertising agencies and advertising clubs, requesting their cooperation. As a matter of fact, advertising clubs in many cities for months have been giving the fullest support."

—

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1919.

Hon. JAMES W. GOOD,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am told that your committee is now considering in connection with the sundry civil appropriation bill the item to provide for the continuance of the United States Employment Service after July 1, 1919. I want to urge favorable consideration of this.

In my work as assistant to the Secretary of War, representing him in matters having to do with finding employment for discharged soldiers, I have been working with the United States Employment Service from the beginning, and with their bureaus for returning soldiers, which were formed under the leadership of the Employment Service, with the cooperation of various welfare societies and local agencies. If the United States Employment Service were to go out of business on the 1st of July, the interests of the returning soldiers and sailors who need assistance in trying to reestablish themselves in civil life would suffer to an extent which it is difficult to overestimate. This Employment Service extends all over the country, and except for the various welfare associations, which in most cases cooperate closely with the Employment Service, is, of course, the only comprehensive placement machinery for soldiers and sailors.

I have no wish and am not qualified to take up the question as to whether this particular form of organization is the best as a permanent form of United States Employment Service, but my work to date in trying to help the soldiers back into worthy positions in civil life has convinced me that, as a practical matter, there is no proper alternative but to continue the service at the present time.

Very truly, yours,

ARTHUR WOODS.
Assistant to the Secretary.

—

DISCHARGED MEN "POTENTIAL REDS," SAYS GEN. WOOD.

[From Times, Buffalo, N. Y., June 15, 1919.]

NEW YORK, *June 14, 1919.*

To combat "Bolshevism" employment should be provided by the Federal Government for discharged soldiers, sailors, marines, and war workers—"potential Bolshevists"—according to a statement by Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood made public here to-night by Dr. George W. Kirchwey, State director of the United States Employment Service.

Asserting that men who engaged in the war feel they are entitled "to as much consideration as the chaps who stayed at home," Gen.

Wood declared it was natural they should feel discontented on their return to find their positions occupied by "stay at homes."

"Many of the men who have returned are sick, both physically and mentally, and waiting with nothing to do and finding on every hand radical orators only too willing to sow the seed of discontent, their minds are open to such propaganda," said the general.

"I consider it absolutely essential for the Federal Government to continue its efforts to place discharged military men and civilian war workers in profitable peace-time jobs, and for this purpose funds should be immediately made available to continue the United States Employment Service, which has proved a potent factor in helping to solve this problem from a national standpoint."

—

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., June 16, 1919.

Hon. W. B. WILSON,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have observed with sincere regret the persistent propaganda which seeks to destroy the United States Employment Service, the only arm of the Federal Government in position to cope with the dislocation of labor during the present period of readjustment.

The farmers throughout the "great wheat belt" and particularly in Kansas, my own State, are greatly dependent upon the Federal Employment Service for the proper distribution of harvest labor. I have before me letters and resolutions from numerous farmers' organizations expressing in unmistakable terms that the successful harvesting of 48,000,000 acres of wheat, the greatest crop in history, is largely dependent upon the maintenance of the machinery of the employment service for the recruiting and proper distribution of harvest hands.

I have before me a letter from the editor of the Kansas City Star predicting a shortage of labor for harvesting the enormous wheat crop in Kansas and reciting the fact that wages are from five to seven dollars a day including board and lodging and that the working force will move north with the harvest to Nebraska, Minnesota, and the Dakotas and can find employment afterwards in thrashing so that there will be steady employment at least until the ground freezes. He estimates that no less than an army of 200,000 extra harvest hands are needed this year.

At this particular moment, in view of the existing world shortage of food, in my opinion this army of harvest hands is equally important as the army of occupation on the River Rhine.

Considering the unemployment that exists, right now, in localities where population is thickly congested, it is unthinkable that the Federal Government would withdraw its support from the United States Employment Service which has the machinery capable of preventing disaster during the emergency of the next few months.

Surely those who seek to destroy the effectiveness of the Employment Service would not contribute toward the destruction of one single bushel of wheat, and in the light of these facts I can not help but predict that Congress will include an ample appropriation in the sundry civil bill for continuing an effective service during the next fiscal year.

I am presenting you with these facts in the hope that they will help correct some of the misapprehensions concerning the wisdom in continuing the Employment Service which, although, like many emergency organizations, suffers from some isolated imperfections, still has its task clearly ahead in wrestling with the problem of relocation of labor, not only for economic reasons but also in the interest of conserving the visible supply of food.

Very respectfully,

ARTHUR CAPPER.

—

[Telegram.]

DUPONT, WILMINGTON, DEL., *June 27, 1919.*

DIRECTOR GENERAL,
United States Employment Service,
Washington, D. C.

We are recruiting for large construction work near Detroit through your offices and understand general reduction in number of your offices occurs July 1. Very important we know Monday what employment offices will operate after July 1 in following States: Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, and Wisconsin. Will appreciate prompt reply.

E. DUPONT & CO.
WHITLOCK.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

LANDING OF THE PILGRIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the concurrent resolution adopted on yesterday providing for the appointment of a joint committee to consider the observance of the three-hundredths anniversary of the Landing of the Pilgrims, the Chair appoints on that committee in behalf of the Senate the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask the Senator in charge of the pending conference report if he will yield to me for a few minutes to submit the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill. There were only two matters in difference, it is very short, and there will be no controversy over it.

Mr. WARREN. I would like to get this conference report through.

Mr. ROBINSON. What is the request of the Senator from Kansas? I did not hear his statement.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to submit the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill. There will be no controversy over it.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection.

Mr. WARREN. Very well, provided the conference report on the sundry civil bill does not lose its place, and that the conference report on the District bill will not lead to any debate.

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 45 to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 45.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1; and agree to the same.

CHARLES CURTIS,
LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,
JOHN WALTER SMITH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

C. R. DAVIS,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, under the circumstances I feel justified in asking the Senate to recommit this conference report to the conferees, and if such a motion shall be held in order the Senate will be afforded an opportunity to vote upon it. In the event that motion should be held out of order, the only way I know in which the Congress may have an opportunity of determining whether it desires to continue or to kill by making or refusing to make the appropriation for the Employment Service in the Department of Labor is to reject the conference report.

It must be remembered that the other and coordinate branch of Congress has had no opportunity to consider this controversy. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate [Mr. WARREN] stated to the Senate when this conference report was first submitted an hour or more ago that the conferees found themselves unable to agree concerning this provision, that the opposition in the other body to the same was overwhelming, or words to that effect. I want to invite the attention of the Senator from Wyoming as also the attention of other Senators to evidence contradicting that statement beyond a reasonable doubt.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator will remember that I begged to interrupt the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] merely to state what was the view of the House conferees, but the Senator from Arkansas intervened and questioned me, and I assume from what followed that he misunderstood what I undertook to say. What I undertook to say was that the House in the consideration of the bill and the conferees in the conference took the ground not that this $200,000, which they had claimed would be their limit, would be spent in the District of Columbia in the ordinary way of simply providing a line of salaries, but that it was the intention to establish a sort of clearing house where they could work through the States as the soldiers came here. That was the view there held.

Now, if the Senator will pardon me a moment more, I want to remind him, first, that the sundry civil bill of the last session, sent to us by the House of the preceding Congress, came to the Senate containing nothing upon this subject. No provision at all was made therein for the employment service. When the deficiency bill came to us there had been put in on the other side $272,000, I think, and it went out in the House on a point of order. Of course, that debate, which is probably as familiar to the Senator as it is to me, developed both sides of the question to some extent. That bill also came to us with nothing in it. The Senate committee put back the $272,000 in that bill which had gone out on a point of order in the House, and, of course, it became a law.

The sundry civil bill again came to us with nothing whatever in it for labor. It had been before the House, $200,000 had been put in, and again had been lost on a point of order. That brought it up to this stage. We had but a short time to consider the bill here on the floor, as the Senator knows. We had a great deal more time in conference than we had on the floor. But I think the Senator must allow that, with one hundred and odd differences in conference, one can hardly expect every point in the bill to be maintained by the Senate. If that were so, why have a conference at all? The conferees must, after doing the best they can, either come back with a disagreement or get the best terms they can.

So far as the arguments for labor are concerned, I grant them all. It is simply a matter not of theory but of circumstances. We had to meet the House, and if we were to legislate at all, we, of course, had to have an agreement. The House has had its opportunity. I am sorry that it did not give us something to go on.

The Senator from Arizona read, with a good deal of pleasure to himself and to me, what Mr. MONDELL said, and I thanked him this morning for saying it. I was one of those who contributed to the support of the various labor headquarters in my State when they found themselves short of funds, and others have done the same.

Here is what Mr. GOOD said, following Mr. MONDELL, and when he was protecting it against the attempt to throw it out over there——

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator can later read his statements of Members of the House if he chooses to do so, but not now.

Mr. WARREN. It covers the one point, and it is only half a dozen lines.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. GOOD says:

> I want to say to the Members of this House that we have 1,000,000 men to-day in the military service of the United States, and on every ship that comes from abroad carrying American soldiers there is an officer taking the names of the soldiers, finding out the former employment of each one, what he was employed at before entering the service, what he desires to do, and so forth. In order to find a place for these boys we must have a clearing house in Washington. By that organization the job and the man will be brought nearer together. I think the amount here is too much. I think the provision of the Senate bill should place a limitation upon the salaries that are provided for. I do think, however, there should be a clearing house in Washington in order that we may find a place for the discharged soldiers and sailors, and I sincerely hope that the motion of the gentleman from Texas will be voted down.

I am simply giving to the Senator the view of Mr. GOOD in defending not the $400,000 but the $200,000.

Mr. ROBINSON. I will state to the Senator from Wyoming that I have not only read the statement which he has just put into the RECORD, but the entire proceedings of the other body had in the previous session of Congress, and I think I am quite as familiar with the matter as he is. The sum and substance of the statement which the Senator from Wyoming has just made is that the Senate conferees exhausted their energies and their resources and fully discharged their duty to the Senate in an effort to retain this provision in the bill, but on account of the unwillingness of another body to acquiesce in the provision it must go out. That brings me back to the identical point I was discussing when the Senator from Wyoming interrupted me.

I had already said that the other body has never been afforded an opportunity to vote upon this proposition. During the last session of Congress, when it was pending before the House, the entire matter was determined upon a point of order. Amendment after amendment was introduced, to the number of 8 or 10, and the whole subject was suppressed under the rules of the other branch of Congress. No vote was ever taken in that session on any amendment akin to the proposition now under consideration. So the other branch of Congress during the last session did not determine this question upon its merits, but determined it upon a technical point of order.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is absolutely right.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well. I think I will show the Senator he is wrong before I get through, if he will permit in my own time to discuss it.

Mr. WARREN. I do not know what the Senator attributes to me as wrong. I wish to say to him now that the House did have an opportunity to reject or affirm this report of the conferees.

Mr. ROBINSON. All right; I am coming to that, if the Senator will permit me. I have at last arrived at the present issue, and I propose to show the Senator from Wyoming that not only has the other branch of Congress had no opportunity to vote up this question, but in so far as any evidence concerning the viewpoint of that body exists it is conclusive in favor of the amendment.

Before the conference report was under consideration in the House of Representatives, a Member who had been quite active for a number of months in opposing any legislation in behalf of the Employment Service, a Member who availed himself of every opportunity to denounce that service, made a motion to instruct the House conferees not to agree to amendment 91, the Federal employment amendment, which the Senate by a unanimous vote inserted in this bill.

After a debate upon the subject, a part of which the Senator from Wyoming has quoted here, the other branch of Congress took a vote; and, amazing beyond expression, the vote registered was 1 in favor of the motion to instruct the conferees against this amendment and 187 in opposition to it; and yet, after considering more than 100 important amendments in conference for a few hours, the Senate conferees come in here and excuse themselves, or seek to excuse themselves, for abandoning the position unanimously taken by the Senate, on the theory that the other body is so determinedly opposed to this provision that it is hopeless to insist upon it, when the only vote the other body has taken upon the subject indicates that it is 187 to 1 in favor of it!

Mr. KENYON. I desire to ask the Senator when that vote was taken?

Mr. ROBINSON. The vote was taken on Saturday.

Let me give the Senator from Wyoming and the other Senators who bear the commission of this body in the conference with the other House of Congress another evidence that if the conferees will let the Congress express its opinion on this subject this amendment will carry, and the Employment Service will be continued until Congress may determine whether or not it wishes to perpetuate or to abolish it. If Senators will turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 30, page 2087, they will find that the gentleman who made the motion to instruct the conferees not to agree to this amendment admitted that he was in a hopeless minority in the House of Representatives; admitted that if the House had an opportunity to express itself on the subject it would vote in favor of the amendment overwhelmingly. That is the statement of the Member who has led the opposition to the Employment Service and to legislation to promote it and to maintain it.

Mr. President, here is what occurred: While that motion was under debate, the RECORD shows the following—I make the reference respectfully, for it was within the province of the Member to make the statement, and I am not criticizing him for it; I am producing this as an evidence that the chairman of the committee does not know what he is talking about when he runs away from the position that the Senate instructed him to take and comes back here as quickly as he can, with a recession on this and other important amendments that the Senate inserted in the bill——

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. Let me read this statement, and then I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. I will not again interrupt the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator may interrupt me whenever he wants to do so, except that I want to read this statement of the Member of the House who made the motion to instruct the conferees not to agree to this amendment, and whose motion was voted down 1 yea to 187 nays. This is the statement:

> Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, on account of my time being limited I ask not to be interrupted.
>
> I realize that I shall not be able to prevent the appropriation of this $400,000. I know that on this item I will vote in a hopeless minority.

A frank, open admission that the other body favors the amendment.

Mr. President, in view of that fact and in view of the way this amendment has been submarined, I am going to recite its history. The bill was reported to the Senate without any provision affecting the Employment Service. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. NUGENT], and I introduced amendments relating to the subject. The opponents of the amendment, so far as I know, were the first to advance a compromise. The chairman of the committee knows whether or not this declaration is true. If it is incorrect, let him correct it now.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. I do not desire the Senator to yield, but I wish simply to say that the Senator is entitled to lambaste me and the other conferees, and I suppose the conferees must accept it as they always do.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming will not again interrupt me with a statement like that. I know, and the Senator from Wyoming knows, the course this matter has taken. I know, and he knows, that legislation like this can not be put on a personal basis. When the

proposition was made that a compromise be effected, I went to every Senator who had introduced an amendment in reference to this subject, and I went to every Senator who I had heard proposed opposition to the item. I had information that the other body wanted or would stand for at least $300,000. An agreement among Senators was reached. At the request of other Senators interested in the subject the duty devolved upon me to present the amendment. I offered it here, and the amendment was promptly agreed to without a word of debate. The chairman of the committee, in consonance with the agreement already made with him, accepted the amendment.

Then, in another place, advantage was taken of the history of the amendment to criticize and to condemn the Senate. In this connection let me remark that if Senators will look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday they will find that in relation to another amendment placed in this bill by the Senate the Senate was by several speakers ridiculed, one gentleman announcing, when he took the floor, that it was his purpose to reflect on the Senate.

With one hundred and some odd amendments in conference, with the bill committed by the other body to conference some time yesterday, the conferees hastened back here last night with an agreement to this conference report settling the fate of 100 or more Senate amendments.

The statement made by the Senator from Wyoming a few moments ago confirms the position which I took during the remarks of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and that is that in their haste to get the bill passed the Senate conferees abandoned without serious contest the position they had been instructed to take by the Senate.

It is time now to inform Senators who are fortunate enough by long service to control through conference committees the legislation of this Nation that they have a higher duty than to respond to their personal will and inclination, and that duty is in good faith to abide by the judgment of the Senate. That does not mean that every amendment that the Senate adopts must be agreed to; everyone knows what that language means; it simply means that if a Senator is on a conference committee and takes a contrary view to that expressed or reflected by the Senate in its legislation, he ought to yield his personal convictions and stand upon the higher plane which he is instructed to occupy as a representative of the Senate. If there had been one friend of the Employment Service amongst the Senate conferees, this conference report, destroying the Employment Service or abolishing it because of lack of appropriation, would not have been agreed to in advance of the appointment in the other body of the conferees to consider it.

Mr. OVERMAN and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom?

Mr. ROBINSON. To either Senator or both.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator does me an injustice. I was on the conference committee and was one of the Senators who succeeded in securing the original appropriation. I was heartily in favor of the provision, and in conference supported it heartily and at some length. So I was not antagonistic to it. I had seen, however, the head of the bureau, who told me that they were going before a regular committee to try to get permanent legislation, and were asking for $1,000,000 before the committee presided over by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and all the appropriation they wanted was enough to tide them over. So I was not antagonistic to the amendment, and agreed with the other conferees only upon the statement of the fact that this amount was sufficient to tide them over. I was a friend of the provision and helped them get the money in the first instance.

Mr. ROBINSON. I accept, without qualification, the explanation and statement of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Arkansas why it was, if the conferees were going to abolish the operations of this bureau within the States, they did not abolish them here in the city of Washington?

Mr. ROBINSON. I shall be glad to answer that question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And why, if they were going merely to bridge it over, they did not bridge it over by letting it continue to work where it was doing its real work and abolishing the part of it here in Washington?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, that brings me to the consideration of a comparison of the Senate provision and the conference provision. The Senate provision is understood by all Senators. In order to meet objections of the chairman of the committee and others, expressed to me in conversation, I struck out the last paragraph of the amendment as offered by the Senator from Arizona, and substantially, I think, as offered by other Senators, and reduced the amount to $400,000, reflecting the compromise agreed upon. That amendment went into the bill and went to conference. In conference this provision was inserted:

To enable the Secretary of Labor to maintain in the District of Columbia an organization to coordinate the public employment offices throughout the country—

From about the words "public employment offices" the language of this amendment is identical with a portion of the language used in the Senate amendment, and is as follows:

by furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment and by maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States, including—

And so forth.

The effect of this amendment is to limit the Federal Employment Service to the District of Columbia, whereas now it has from three to four branches in every State. I wish to place in the RECORD at this point a list of the employment offices, together with the number of the same in each State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Under an appropriation of $950,000 for a six months' period offices can be maintained in field as follows ($800,000 being allotted for this purpose):

Alabama: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
Arizona: Federal director's office, two placement offices.
Arkansas: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
California: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
Colorado: Federal director's office, two placement offices.
Connecticut: Federal director's office, four placement offices.
District of Columbia: Federal director and placement office.
Delaware: Federal director's office, one placement office.
Florida: Federal director's office, two placement offices.
Georgia: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
Idaho: Federal director's office, one placement office.
Illinois: Federal director's office, 11 placement offices.
Indiana: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
Iowa: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
Kansas: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
Kentucky: Federal director's office, four placement offices.
Louisiana: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
Maine: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
Maryland: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
Massachusetts: Federal director's office, seven placement offices
Michigan: Federal director's office, six placement offices.
Minnesota: Federal director's office, four placement offices.
Mississippi: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
Missouri: Federal director's office, four placement offices.
Montana: Federal director's office, four placement offices.
Nebraska: Federal director's office, two placement offices.
Nevada: Federal director's office, one placement office.
New Hampshire: Federal director's office, four placement offices.
New Jersey: Federal director's office, six placement offices.
New Mexico: Federal director's office, two placement offices.
New York: Federal director's office, 14 placement offices.
North Carolina: Federal director's office, four placement offices.
North Dakota: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
Ohio: Federal director's office, eight placement offices.
Oklahoma: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
Oregon: Federal director's office, four placement offices.
Pennsylvania: Federal director's office, eight placement offices.
Rhode Island: Federal director's office, two placement offices.
South Carolina: Federal director's office, two placement offices.
South Dakota: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
Tennessee: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
Texas: Federal director's office, six placement offices.
Utah: Federal director's office, two placement offices.
Vermont: Federal director's office, two placement offices.
Virginia: Federal director's office, four placement offices.
Washington: Federal director's office, four placement offices.
West Virginia: Federal director's office, three placement offices.
Wisconsin: Federal director's office, nine placement offices.
Wyoming: Federal director's office, one placement office.

Mr. ROBINSON. Under the amendment inserted in conference no part of this fund can be expended for services outside of the District of Columbia; no organization can be maintained anywhere save in the District of Columbia. This amendment abolishes all of the employment organizations heretofore effected by the Department of Labor in every State in the Union, and leaves the bureau in the District of Columbia to look after unemployment throughout the Union. The mere statement of that fact discloses the impossibility of an organization in the District of Columbia performing service successfully as an employment bureau for the various States of the Union. There is great need for a Federal agency to coordinate the various activities of State and municipal bureaus. The best service has been rendered by directing unemployed labor in one State to employment in other States.

The Department of Labor has found it imperative to establish in the various States from three to four of these offices, as I have already said, and now to limit the organization to the District of Columbia is so minimizing the service, so yielding to the

opposition that has manifested itself through private employment agencies, and through manufacturers who want a surplus of labor at their own doors from which to draw in case of demand for their own necessities, and through other influences not consistent with the general welfare, either of the employers or the employees of the United States, that this splendid service is to be emasculated in the name of economy.

Is there a Senator who believes that under present conditions, with millions of men returning from military pursuits to civilian life, with millions of civilians quitting war industries and seeking employment in the normal activities of our people—is there a Senator who think that an organization in the District of Columbia can perform with fair efficiency the business of a labor-employment bureau for the people of the United States? If there is, no argument at my command will be addressed to him. The opposition to the Federal Employment Service has torpedoed the service at the time when it can be least afforded.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] went into that subject fully. Let me supplement just briefly some of the things that apply to the general proposition, whether you want to kill the Labor Service nationally or whether you want to maintain it until the committee referred to, I think, by the Senator from North Carolina has had an opportunity to act.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations brought in a provision eliminating appropriations for the Tariff Commission. That was justified by the committee in the name of economy. The subject was discussed in the Senate, and when the vote was taken the vote was 2 to sustain the committee's action, and 57 against it; and I should like to know what became of the members of the committee who voted to report the amendment.

Mr. President, although the Senate almost unanimously sustained the Tariff Commission in spite of the action of its committee, which, in so far as I now recall, was almost unanimous in reporting the amendment, there is more reason, stronger justification, sounding in the interest of all men and all things that the United States Senate is charged with protecting—there is more reason why this Government should maintain this Employment Service than the Tariff Commission. At the close of the greatest war that has ever occurred, at a time when 4,000,000 people—many of whom, more than half of whom, quit profitable employment at home and went to the front and risked their lives in the Nation's cause—are returning and asking for an opportunity to secure profitable employment, when they are finding the places which they occupied before the war filled, are they to be told that the Government feels no interest in them, that they must rely on private agencies to bring them to a position where they can be as well off as when the Government took them out of civil life and put them in the Army?

In the city of Boston on this good day, within 24 hours after the intelligence had flashed across the continent that the conferees had killed the labor service, a powerful private fee-charging labor employment bureau is being organized to take the very offices heretofore used by the Government service.

You may sing as you will the praises of our gallant soldiers, for in all of the history of the world there is nothing to compare with their courage and their daring. What is the least that statesmen duly regardful of the public interest will do in a case like this? Will you say to the American soldier who is seeking employment that the Government maintained this agency during the war for the benefit of the men who wanted to employ others, and that now, since the principal duties of the service have become representative of the interests of the men to be employed, you yield to the selfish demand that this service shall be abolished?

Great as is the need for continuing, for the present at least, this Employment Service in behalf of returning sailors and soldiers, it is equally important to civilian employees. During the war we built up enormous Government factories that employed millions of men, and now, as the world beholds a vision of returning peace, those factories are stopping their operations or reducing them; and as a result millions of civilians are going out of employment, and they go to the Federal agency, a general and an unselfish agency, asking assistance in finding work.

You can not justify destroying the labor service on the theory that private employment agencies, municipal and State bureaus, will adequately take care of the service. The ignorance prevailing on this subject is reflected in the declaration recently made that practically all the States have employment services. According to the information furnished me, there are only 14 States that make any pretense of maintaining employment bureaus. There are in addition a large number of municipal bureaus and a large number of private fee-charging agencies. All of these, State and municipal particularly, have been cooperating with the Federal Employment Service.

You can not think, if you study the question for a minute, that a mere local agent can deal successfully with this condition, which is national; and when you contemplate the enormous sums of money expended by this Government in anticipation of necessities which might have arisen, but which never did arise, how will you explain to the thousands who are dependent upon the daily labor of the men who fought the battles and won the victories of this Nation in the war, how are you going to answer them when they ask you to give aid in securing employment? They ask you for bread; will you give them a stone?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I am extremely anxious, without criticism of anybody in either House or Senate, to have a vote on this question before the House of Representatives. I appreciate the magnitude of the service that has been given, and no man can adequately appreciate the service which can be given under a perfect or as nearly as possible a perfect administration of this particular bureau. No State can do it. No municipality can do it.

I am extremely anxious, as I said in starting, to see a vote by the House of Representatives. The matter never has come to them. As has already been stated by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] in his address, the only side vote, if you can call it such, was on a premature motion made by a Member of the House to vote in advance that this $400,000 amendment should not be considered or placed on the bill in conference. That was voted down by the majority he suggests, 187 to 1. The same one who is leading the fight there also admits that he would be in a hopeless minority if the House had ever had an opportunity to vote on the measure. The House, in its vote in adopting this conference report, did nothing more than to say that the House was satisfied with the action of the House conferees, in that the House conferees maintained the House bill. It is no disrespect to the committee of conference for the Senate to ask that a separate vote be had on this particular phase of the conference report by the House of Representatives.

I for one deprecate the storm that has been brewing between the two Houses, and I hope to see on the part of both a rapid approach to the proprieties of legislation in both Houses. Now, let us see if without prejudice, without stirring up animosities, we can not receive a fair vote of the House of Representatives on the Senate amendment.

Being so impressed with the belief that the House will maintain the proposition of the Senate in this particular matter, I shall vote, though a member of the committee, to send this particular report back to the committee of conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it is, I hope, a well-known fact that I never desire the Government to undertake to do anything which private enterprise can attend to as well, or even nearly as well. This, however, is not a case of that sort. It is exactly of the opposite sort. The private employment bureaus can attend to local questions of unemployment just as well as a Government bureau, I have no doubt; but this is a broader proposition and requires a broader method of dealing with it.

There may be at one time a superabundance of labor in Illinois and at the same time a lack of labor in Missouri. There may be a dearth of labor in California and a surplus of labor just across the mountain in some other State, like Colorado.

Mr. President, I thought this was one of the things growing out of the war that ought to become permanent, so that we who had just learned to mobilize our man power and our money power for war purposes might learn to mobilize our working forces for peace purposes in industry. To abolish that very part of it which is doing the work best in the localities, it seems to me is wrong in every respect.

You can not, here at Washington, tell a man in California that there is work up in the State of Washington or in Oregon if he will just go there; but if you will furnish him with a bureau there, and somebody working at it, he himself will make inquiry, and he will be told. But even if he could learn by mail, the time is too long, and he perhaps gets either inferior work or in the meanwhile he half starves.

This is one of the things growing out of the war that I had hoped would be in some form perpetuated, because it is for the good of everybody, employer and employee both, and is one of the things that would harmonize these two classes, instead of increasing the unfortunately constant clash which seems to exist between them.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the motion made by the Senator from Arkansas, or, if that motion is declared out of order, for the motion which he shall make.

Another matter, Mr. President, totally irrelevant to this.

On June 24 Dr. Charles W. Eliot, emeritus president of Harvard College, one of the most intelligent, well-educated men and one of the most honest and patriotic and unselfish men that this country has ever produced, wrote a letter, which was published in the New York Times, which is entitled "Ratify the Treaty Forthwith. It Confers Great Benefits on the World and Provides for its Own Perfecting." I shall not take up the time of the Senate to read it, unless the request is refused, but shall make request that it be inserted in the RECORD.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1919.]

RATIFY THE TREATY FORTHWITH—IT CONFERS GREAT BENEFITS ON THE WORLD AND PROVIDES FOR ITS OWN PERFECTING.

(By Dr. Charles W. Eliot.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The treaty which the peace conference at Paris has prepared with conscientious labor, patient discussion, and many inevitable compromises will soon be before the American people in its final form. It aims at justice, liberty, and peace for Europe and America, and at the promotion of all national and international righteousness and well-being. It is by far the most promising agreement among the freer and more progressive nations that has ever been worked out.

In intention or purpose its merits are manifold and extraordinary. It rights great wrongs committed by autocratic European governments in the past. It suggests and will promote the organization of several new republics. These will make free and secure populations that have suffered for generations severe oppression from alien autocratic governments, accustomed to compel submission by cruel use of military and police forces. It provides for the creation of the first international legislative body, the first executive council with adequate powers, and the first international court with a sanction behind its decrees.

This unprecedented treaty also makes the first international provision for the reduction of competitive national armaments, a remarkable provision considering the continuing dread of armed aggression under which France and Italy labor.

The treaty contains many provisions for the gradual improvement of the various institutions it establishes, and is in important respects elastic rather than rigid.

The league of nations which the treaty will establish is indispensable to the gradual bringing into execution of the new policies the treaty embodies. It is the league which must procure, through its assembly, council, and legal tribunal, order and peace throughout the civilized world, while the new republics set up in Europe and Asia are becoming stable and orderly and are gaining experience in self-government. It is the league which is gradually to provide an intelligent and righteous way of giving aid to the backward peoples of the earth, and of protecting them from exploitation by any stronger power. It is the league which is to determine when Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey have become admissible to the league. It is the league which offers the only available means of getting put into execution the ideals for which the American people went to war. Without it the sacrifices America made for the war will be in vain. With it the treasurer spent and the young lives sacrificed will have earned an immense gain for mankind. It is the league which will find the way to the suppression of militarism among the civilized nations; that is, to the annihilation of a military class of professional soldiers who have no occupation except war and preparation for war, and who are always at the service of any despotic government—purporting to represent the divine right of kings or to be the socialistic superstate—ambitious of territorial or commercial extension. The treaty in its present form is by no means perfect from the American point of view; but it contains within itself the means of its own perfecting.

A minority of the American Senate is threatening to prevent or delay the ratification of this invaluable treaty. Some of the reasons given for such delay or defeat can only be described as ignominious and dastardly. They represent the American people as tired of their disinterested crusade for justice and liberty throughout the world and desirous of returning to their former belief in their own prosperity and safety through isolation. Let the American people make known to the Senate that they hold firmly to the ideals with which they went to war in April, 1917, and that they are not so stupid as to believe that the United States can avoid sharing in any political and industrial calamities which may afflict the rest of the world. Other arguments used against the treaty suggest that the American people should be careful about assuming new responsibilities for the welfare of other nations and should keep its breath to cool its own hot porridge. These, too, are arguments which appeal to the less generous and idealistic side of the American character. Hence, they will be unsuccessful. One great lesson of the war is that the American people will support their Government in doing everything possible to promote public liberty, health, and happiness not only at home but in any part of the world to which its influence can extend, and will pledge to that cause "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor," as the signers of the Declaration of Independence said to each other on July 4, 1776.

The covenant and treaty—they are inseparable—will go down in history as the most memorable international agreement ever made. It will probably be many years before the details of the struggle at Paris will become known to the world; but one thing is now known—America contributed a great hope and a noble inspiration.

CHARLES W. ELIOT.

Asticou, Me., June 28, 1919.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he proposes to go ahead with this report now or what is his plan? Is there to be a recess or adjournment?

Mr. WARREN. Replying to the question of the Senator from Iowa, it seems to me that on this question of adopting or not adopting the report we ought to remain in session until we can obtain a vote. However, I am only wishing to do what is the pleasure of the Senate.

Mr. KENYON. I have no objection to that at all; but I do not want to be hurried in my remarks, and I think there will be a good deal of conversation on this subject before it is disposed of.

Mr. WARREN. Under ordinary circumstances I should say, of course, we had better adjourn and let it go over; but the Senator understands what day of the month it is of the year and what bill it is, and, of course, he knows as well as I what is behind it.

Mr. KENYON. The bill can not be signed until the President returns.

Mr. WARREN. That is true.

Mr. KENYON. And the President will not return until a week from yesterday.

Mr. WARREN. I do not know when the President will return; and, furthermore, these departments, or some of them, are between wind and water, and can not either spend a cent or contract a cent; but with the bill voted on and passed, showing what the amounts are, they probably would bridge over.

Mr. KENYON. I was not asking for its delay; but I know there are a number of Senators who want to speak on this subject, and if we are to go ahead, well and good. It is rather late in the day, but it is, of course, desirable to finish these bills.

Mr. President, I think the action of the conferees on this matter illustrates the abundant capacity of Republican leadership to make mistakes, for this is certainly a serious mistake from every standpoint. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] have said that this was a submarining of the bill. I have observed, Mr. President, that a number of bills at this session have had a very difficult time passing through the submarine zone of the conferees, and this is one of them. I think it is about time to find out whether the Senate has anything to say about these bills or whether they are to be determined by two or three conferees, now two conferees from the Republican side and one from the Democratic side.

We had the vocational-training bill here for soldiers injured in the war. It was not torpedoed in conference, but I think, and the more I think about it the more it seems clear to me, it has been torpedoed in the Senate. When the time comes to inquire why certain of these soldiers can not receive vocational training, they can put the responsibility squarely on the Congress, and there is one party responsible for legislation in Congress now and that party can not avoid responsibility.

The appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission had a mild case of submarining. The Federal Trade Commission had gone into the packers' question; it had produced a report more thorough and searching and conclusive than any investigation that ever had been made of the packers. The people of this country were coming to wonder, as they do now, I think, whether this is a Government of the packers, for the packers, and by the packers, or a Government of the American people. That appropriation was subjected to torpedoing—we may wonder why—but the Senate would not stand for that.

The Tariff Commission suffered the same way in its journeying. The labor legislation that was put on this bill suffered likewise. That, as the Senator from Arkansas has stated, and I refer to this particular appropriation for the Employment Service, is torpedoed in conference.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, of course the Senator knows it is entirely with the Senate whether the Senate accepts the report of the conferees or not.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; and I think the Senate by its vote is going to let the conferees know that the Senate is doing the legislating and not the conferees. The conferees are not yet masters of the Senate. Sometimes power exalts men's ideas of their own importance.

Mr. SMOOT. It will let the House of Representatives know.

Mr. KENYON. It will let the House of Representatives know, too.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that Congress wanted these bills to pass before the close of the 30th day of the month, or the end of the fiscal year, and I say now to the Senate that it never could have been done unless the Senate yielded on a number of points criticized to-day. The House conferees took the position that they were compelled to yield on almost everything that the Senate put in.

Mr. KENYON. It seems to me the yielding has been mostly the other way.

Mr. SMOOT. No. I will say to the Senator if he will read the report he will see that the yielding has been mostly on the House side.

Mr. KENYON. The bills were not passed. There was not enough yielding done to pass them by the 1st day of July.

Mr. SMOOT. It was intended that they should be passed, I will say to the Senator, and the Senator knows that that was the program.

Mr. KENYON. It was the program, and I hoped it could be carried out.

Mr. SMOOT. So did we.

Mr. KENYON. So we have not only these different instances of submarining, but the conferees have also submarined a mild provision in this bill for a commission to report to Congress on a budget plan. Of course, it may be that Congress knows all about a budget system and does not need any report. I do not believe it does. I have been in favor of some action on that question instead of investigation. We do not appear to be able to get action. The investigation would not have delayed any action, because a report was to be made by the 1st day of December. I do not believe that the Senate claims to have all the information necessary for a budget bill, even if the conferees may, and thinks that a commission is entirely unessential.

So we have had not all submarining in conference, but we have had these different instances that I have referred to of the difficult voyage of bills that are for humanity, bills for the curbing of packers, bills for economy, and Republican standpat leadership can take the responsibility for the situation.

What about a mild little provision here for a budget? What have the political parties said about it? I was so confident that it would be torpedoed, even before the premature meeting of Sunday, that I looked up the resolutions adopted in the Republican and Democratic national conventions with relation thereto.

The Democratic national convention declared in 1916:

> We demand careful economy in all expenditures for the support of the Government, and to that end favor a return by the House of Representatives to its former practice of initiating and preparing all appropriation bills through a single committee chosen from its membership, in order that responsibility may be centered, expenditures standardized and made uniform, and waste and duplication in the public service avoided. We favor this as a practicable first step toward a budget system.

And on that committee on resolutions were Senator Thompson from Kansas, Gov. Stanley, now Senator from Kentucky, Senator Ransdell of Louisiana, Senator Williams of Mississippi, Senator Stone of Missouri, Senator Walsh of Montana, Senator Pittman of Nevada, Senator Hollis of New Hampshire, Senator Pomerene of Ohio, Senator Martin of Virginia, and Senator Kendrick of Wyoming.

The Republicans, not to be outdone by any Democratic claim for economy, inserted in their platform the following—indeed this was prior to the Democratic convention:

> The increasing cost of the National Government and the need for the greatest economy of its resources in order to meet the growing demands of the people for Government service call for the severest condemnation of the wasteful appropriations of this Democratic administration, of its shameless raids on the Treasury, and of its opposition to a rejection of President Taft's oft-repeated proposal and earnest effort to secure economy and efficiency through the establishment of a simple businesslike budget system, to which we pledge our support and which we hold to be necessary to effect any real reform in the administration of national finances.

On that committee on resolutions were Senators Borah, Lodge, Moses of New Hampshire, Fall, Wadsworth, Sterling, former Senator Oliver, former Senator Lippitt, former Senator Sutherland, a colleague of one of the conferees in the present submarining process.

Did we mean it or not? There is a bill pending in the House for a budget system; there is a bill pending here——

Mr. WARREN. I think there are two or three in the House.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; two or three. I have not any pride of opinion in anything simply because I may suggest it. I am going to support any real budget plan and any budget system that will do the work, and I hope never to reach the point where I will oppose one of them because I did not have something to do with it.

When these platforms were drawn up by the representatives of these parties did they mean it? Go and tell the people if you did not mean it; tell them that it was a little camouflage; that you are not going to have any budget system. Tell them that in a simple little thing to get some information for Congress you would not even stand for that, and it was only carrying an appropriation of $20,000. Tell them that platforms of parties are like platforms of railroad cars, and that no one is expected to stand on the platform that would be honest, anyway.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator whether both parties did not in these platforms pledge themselves to a system of rigid economy in the administration of the Treasury and of the affairs of the public?

Mr. KENYON. They did in these very platforms from which I have read. Possibly the Senator means that a person is inconsistent in arguing for a liberal appropriation for a labor bureau in view of that. Everybody has got to settle for himself the question of economy. That is the trouble. The Senator from Colorado may feel that an appropriation of $400,000 for this service is waste. I do not think so.

Mr. THOMAS. I asked the question, not in connection with this appropriation but in connection with the Senator's suggestion that having adopted a certain plank in the platform we should be held to it, and my inquiry therefore was designed to remind the Senator that our pledges of economy have thus far been waste paper. This is a very moderate appropriation.

Mr. KENYON. I notice the appropriations have been cut something like one and a half billion dollars by this Republican Congress, which is a most commendable thing.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; it is commendable, if true; but I am afraid it is not true.

Mr. KENYON. I only take that from statements I have seen that it has been done. I hope they may be cut more; but the difficulty we are in is that we can not stop all appropriations. A judicious investment of money is not waste.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to the Senator that if the analysis by Mr. KITCHIN in the House the other day of the imputed saving of $1,500,000,000 is correct, I am afraid it is more apparent than actual.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not correct.

Mr. THOMAS. I think it is correct.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator from Colorado thinks it is correct and the Senator from Utah thinks it is not correct. Both are great financial experts and I will not get into that discussion. I am going to agree with the Senator from Utah. That is all I care to say about the other item. On this particular appropriation I personally understood, when we, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and myself, were talking with the chairman of the committee, that this amount would be satisfactory. I think the chairman agreed to that.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; entirely satisfactory.

Mr. KENYON. Here is the situation: We are having joint meetings now, the Labor Committee of the House and the Labor Committee of the Senate, considering the question of a permanent employment bureau. We have gone into the charges that have been made against Mr. Densmore. I have not any question that there has been a reckless waste of money, as there has been, perhaps, in every other bureau or department of the Government. I do not believe that any fair-minded man can listen to that testimony and believe that Mr. Densmore has done any intentional wrong thing. I do not like the long list of employees. I do not like some of the salaries that appear to have been paid. They ought to be scaled down to the closest point of economy that we possibly can consistent with efficiency.

Now, that committee is considering the question whether we shall have any permanent employment agency or bureau connected with the Government. That is a mooted question.

When the war is over, when the soldiers are placed, when the country gets back to its normal status, we may not need this. I think we do. I think it is one of the things that the Government owes to the man who seeks employment; that he does not have to go to some private agency and pay out a percentage of his salary, for a whole year sometimes, in order to be put in connection with the job. Be that as it may, that is an unsettled question. There is a hiatus to bridge over between this moment and the time when our committee and the House committee acting together can report out a bill to Congress and Congress can act upon it. Now, query: During that time do we want to strike down and destroy this employment agency? That is the question. The $400,000 was merely to bridge over this hiatus, and it will take that much to do it by the practice of the strictest economy, I am informed by the Labor Department.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am going, as a matter of fairness, to inform the Senator why. I have always found him to be fair. I want to tell the Senator from Iowa just what position the committee was in on this amendment.

In a bill that passed at the last session of Congress and failed of passing the Senate in the closing days of the last session there was a provision similar to this provision with the exception of the addition of the words found in the Senate print beginning on line 9, page 187, down to and including the word "Columbia" in line 12. I will call the attention of the

Senate to the words that were added to the provision, which was in the last sundry civil bill referred to, as follows:

By furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment and by maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States, including personal services in the District of Columbia.

That part of the Senate amendment was added to the provision that was in the bill as it passed the House at the last session of Congress. The $200,000 appropriation was exactly the same as it was in that bill. The House conferees refused to yield on this item, and that was the compromise that was made, taking the provision found in the bill of the last session and adding a part of this amendment agreed to by the Senate, and giving the same amount that was appropriated for this purpose to them.

Mr. KENYON. Has the Senator from Utah any idea that this amount will carry on this work for a period of two or three months?

Mr. SMOOT. We provide $200,000 for maintaining the central organization in the District of Columbia. Every employee in the District, I understand, can be employed with this amount of money. The appropriation will do the printing that is done here in the District, and it will maintain that organization until legislation is enacted. They can work in cooperaton with any State in the Union which desires the information that is collected here by the central agency, and they will have a perfect right—and they have money sufficient in this appropriation—to send the information to the States, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. That will depend entirely upon how long it takes to pass the legislation.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, this will provide for the salaries for a full year and for the expenses of printing what may go from here by way of information; but it will not pay for the transportation of men to go into each one of the States, nor will it pay for the organizations within the States, which is the main expense attached to the present plan.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator knows that there will be thousands of soldiers just at this time to be placed in employment. Does he not think it is rather a bad time to save a couple of hundred thousand dollars on this proposition?

Mr. SMOOT. It is not what the Senator thinks, but it is what the conferees could get. I desire to say to the Senator that if this bill had been in conference in ordinary times the conferees would have been in session, I have no doubt, more than a week; but we thought that Congress wanted to get through with its labors and to get these appropriation bills passed, as I previously stated, by June 30.

Mr. KENYON. Does not the Senator from Utah now realize that there is no hurry; that the bill can not be signed until the President arrives here? What more pleasant work could there be than going on and discussing these matters?

Mr. SMOOT. There is a reason why the bill should be passed, I will say to the Senator, and that is, because every department of the Government must know before they assume any responsibility or make contracts of any kind how much they are going to have; and until the bill is passed there is no department of the Government that can know that.

Mr. KENYON. I realize that there is some force to that suggestion, but this is a broken week, with the Fourth of July coming on, and even though a day or two might be lost by sending this back to conference, it would not work any very serious injury, would it?

Mr. SMOOT. After 12 o'clock last night, Mr. President, no department that has appropriations in this bill had any legal right whatever to make a contract or to pay out one dollar.

Mr. KENYON. No; no legal right. I am inclined to think that if the bill were sent back to conference it could get back here before 12 o'clock to-night.

Mr. SMOOT. In relation to the budget system, I will say to the Senator from Iowa that I think, so far as the investigation is concerned, it would not delay the action of Congress, just as he has said, but I really believe that it will hasten it.

Mr. KENYON. We will wait and see how far along by the 1st of December—the time this commission would have to report—Congress has gone toward establishing a budget system.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I think this bill ought to be sent back on the item of $356,000,000 for the merchant marine. I do not think the merchant marine ought to be torpedoed any more than should these other projects for which we have provided.

Mr. KENYON. There are so many things that the bill ought to be sent back on that it ought to go back by unanimous consent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so myself.

Mr. KENYON. And possibly we may come to a vote on that. If we can, I am not going to pursue the matter further; and in the hope of reaching an immediate vote I will yield the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in relation to the Shipping Board, to which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has referred, I will say that I have not any doubt that the amount the conferees have agreed upon will carry the Shipping Board on. The appropriation that is now provided is not going to interfere with the completion, the maintenance, or the running of one single boat.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will merely mean the cancellation of contracts to the extent of $135,000,000, to the very great loss of the Government and to the failure of the building of the merchant marine. That is what it does.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that there will not be the cancellation of one ton of shipping if the provision passes in its present shape.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator feels that he is correct, but I am quite sure that the Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure that I am not mistaken about it, but I do not want to take up the time of the Senator from Iowa further.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I hope we may have a vote.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, to amend the title of the bill, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

H. R. 1706. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River, about 3 miles above its confluence with the Columbia River, near Pasco, Wash.; and

H. R. 5608. An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I wish to submit the conference report on the Army appropriation bill, but I am informed that the submission of the report at this time will result in its going to the calendar. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. I should like to know if that will be the case?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not necessarily so.

Mr. SMOOT. We had better have an understanding about it, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then I understand that the report of the conference committee on the Army bill does not go to the calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It may lie on the table.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 18, 44, 51, 53, 58, 81, 83, 90, 91, 93, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, and 110.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 10, 12, 16, 17, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 45, 47, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 63,

64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 95, and 99, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert: ": *Provided*, That the restrictions herein above recited concerning personal services and the amount allowable for per diem allowance shall not apply to so much of the funds herein appropriated as may be required to carry out the purpose of existing laws relating to the sale of war supplies: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or made available under this act shall be used for the payment of any salary in excess of $12,000 per annum to any civilian employee in the War Department: *Provided further*, That in addition to the delivery of the property heretofore authorized to be delivered to the Public Health Service, the Department of Agriculture and the Post Office Department of the Government, the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to sell any surplus supplies including motor trucks and automobiles now owned by and in the possession of the Government for the use of the War Department to any State or municipal subdivision thereof, or to any corporation or individual upon such terms as may be deemed best"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"Appropriations, Air Service: Creating, maintaining, and operating at established flying schools, courses of instruction for aviation students and enlisted men, including cost of equipment, and supplies necessary for instruction and subsistence of students, purchase of tools, equipment, materials, machines, textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, and instruments and material for theoretical and practical instruction at aviation schools; purchase of supplies for securing, developing, printing, and reproducing photographs made by aerial observers; to maintain and replace the equipment of organizations already in service; improvement, equipment, maintenance, lease, and operation of aviation stations, balloon schools, plants for testing and experimental work, including the acquisition of land, or any interest in land by purchase, lease, or condemnation, where necessary to procure helium gas; procuring and introducing water, electric light and power, telephones, telegraphs, and sewerage, including maintenance, operation, and repair of such utilities; salaries and wages of civilian employees in the District of Columbia or elsewhere as may be necessary, and payment of their traveling and other necessary expenses as authorized by existing law; experimental investigation and purchase and development of new types of aircraft, accessories thereto, including helium gas rights, and aviation engines, including patents and other rights thereto, and plans, drawings, and specifications thereof; purchase, manufacture, construction, maintenance, repair, storage, and operation of airships, war balloons, and other aerial machines, including instruments, gas plants, hangars, and repair shops, and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction, or equipment of all types of aircraft, and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith, and also for the purchase or manufacture and the issue of special clothing, wearing apparel, and similar equipment for aviation purposes; for all necessary expenses connected with the sale or disposal of surplus or obsolete aeronautical equipment, including the hire of civilian employees, and the rental of buildings, and other facilities for the handling or storage of such equipment; for the services of such consulting engineers at experimental stations of the Air Service as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, including necessary traveling expenses: *Provided*, That the entire expenditure for the services of consulting engineers for the fiscal year 1920 shall not exceed $100,000; purchase of special apparatus and appliances, repairs, and replacements of same used in connection with special scientific medical research in the Air Service; for the establishment of aviation stations in the Philippine Islands, including the lease of land or any interest in land for landing fields only and the preparation of land now owned by the Government necessary to make the same suitable for the purpose intended, buildings, heating, lighting, plumbing, water, sewer, roads, and walks, at a total cost not to exceed $350,000, in all, $25,000,000: *Provided*, That claims not exceeding $250 in amount for damages to persons and private property resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad, may be settled out of the funds appropriated hereunder, when each claim is substantiated by a survey report of a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer of the nearest aviation post, and approved by the Director of Air Service: *Provided further*, That claims so settled and paid from the sum hereby appropriated shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of $150,000: *Provided further*, That hereafter actual and necessary expenses only, not to exceed $8 per day, shall be paid to officers of the Army and contract surgeons when traveling by air on duty without troops, under competent orders: *And provided further*, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to subscriptions for foreign and professional newspapers and periodicals to be paid for from this appropriation.

"The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to establish and maintain at one or more established flying schools courses of instruction for aviation students.

"Aviation students shall be enlisted in or appointed to the grade of flying cadet, Air Service, which grade is hereby established: *Provided*, That the total number of flying cadets shall not at any time exceed 1,300. The base pay of a flying cadet shall be $75 per month, including extra pay for flying risk as provided by law. The ration allowance of a flying cadet shall not exceed $1 per day, and his other allowances shall be those of a private, first class, Air Service.

"Upon completion of a course prescribed for flying cadets, each flying cadet, if he so desire, may be discharged and commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Officers' Reserve Corps: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is authorized to discharge at any time any flying cadet whose discharge shall have been recommended by a board of not less than three officers."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For pay of officers of the line, $20,300,000.

"For pay of the officers of staff corps and departments, $19,429,367.

"Pay of officers, National Guard, $100.

"For pay of the officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, $2,325,000.

"For pay of warrant officers, Mine Planter Service, $83,700.

"For pay of the officers, Bureau of Insular Affairs, $15,000.

"Aviation increase, to officers of the Signal Corps, $775,000.

"For pay of the officers, Philippine Scouts, $483,600.

"Additional pay to officers for length of service, $2,892,925.

"PAY OF ENLISTED MEN.

"For pay of enlisted men of the line, $92,728,230: *Provided*, That the pay due enlisted men of the Army shall not be withheld from them by reason of the fact that their service records or other official papers showing the status of their accounts with respect to pay have been lost or not returned from overseas, and, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, these men may be paid upon their personal affidavit as to date of last payment and condition of their accounts: *Provided further*, That payments made in accordance with such regulations (or which have already been made upon the affidavit of the soldier) shall be passed by the accounting officers of the Treasury to the credit of the disbursing officers making them.

"For pay of enlisted men of National Guard, $100.

"For pay of enlisted men of the Staff Corps and departments, $48,162,500.

"For pay of enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserves, $224,750.

"For pay of enlisted men of the enlisted Reserve Corps, $77,500.

"Aviation increase, to enlisted men of the Signal Corps, $7,750.

"For pay of the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts, $1,007,500.

"Additional pay for length of service to enlisted men, $3,875,000: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 10 of an act entitled 'An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States, approved May 18, 1917, in so far as it increases the pay of the enlisted men of the Army, be, and the same hereby are, continued in force and effect from and after the date and approval of this act.'

"PAY OF PERSONS WITH RETIRED STATUS.

"For pay of the officers on the retired list, $2,500,000.

"For increased pay to retired officers on active duty, $200,000.

"For pay of retired enlisted men, $3,000,000.

"For pay and allowances of retired enlisted men on active duty, $20,000.

"For pay and allowances of Regular Army reservists on active duty, $40,000.

"For pay of retired Philippine Scout officers, $45,000.

"For pay of retired pay clerks, $18,000.

"For pay of retired veterinarians, $3,500.

"CLERKS, MESSENGERS, AND LABORERS, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF.

"One chief clerk, at $2,500 per annum, $2,500.

"One clerk, at $2,250 per annum, $2,250.

"Six clerks, at $2,000 each per annum, $12,000.

"Eight clerks, at $1,800 each per annum, $14,400.

"Thirteen clerks, at $1,600 each per annum, $20,800.

"Twenty-one clerks, at $1,400 each per annum, $29,400.

"Twenty-four clerks, at $1,200 each per annum, $28,800.

"Twenty-six clerks, at $1,000 each per annum, $26,000.

"One captain of the watch, at $900 per annum, $900.

"Six watchmen, at $720 each per annum, $4,320.

"One gardener, at $720 per annum, $720.

"One packer, at $840 per annum, $840.

"One chief messenger, at $1,000 per annum, $1,000.

"Three messengers, at $840 each per annum, $2,520.

"Fifteen messengers, at $720 each per annum, $10,800.

"Two laborers, at $720 each per annum, $1,440.

"One laborer, at $600 per annum, $600.

"Five charwomen, at $240 each per annum, $1,200.

"PAY OF ARMY FIELD CLERKS AND CIVIL-SERVICE MESSENGERS AT HEADQUARTERS OF THE SEVERAL TERRITORIAL DEPARTMENTS, ARMY AND CORPS HEADQUARTERS, TERRITORIAL DISTRICTS, TACTICAL DIVISIONS AND BRIGADES, SERVICE SCHOOLS, CAMPS, AND PORTS OF EMBARKATION AND DEBARKATION.

"Eighty clerks, at $1,800 each per annum, $144,000.

"Seven clerks, at $2,000 each per annum, $14,000.

"One hundred and seventy-two clerks, at $1,600 each per annum, $275,200.

"Eleven clerks, at $1,800 each per annum, $19,800.

"Two hundred and twenty-two clerks, at $1,400 each per annum, $310,800.

"Fourteen clerks, at $1,600 each per annum, $22,400.

"Five hundred and twenty-six clerks, at $1,200 each per annum, $631,200.

"Thirty-two clerks, at $1,400 each per annum, $44,800.

"One hundred and nineteen messengers, at $720 each per annum, $85,680.

"Fifty-seven clerks, at $1,200 each per annum, $68,400.

"Forty-nine clerks, at $1,200 each per annum, $58,800.

"Thirty-nine messengers, at $720 each per annum, $28,080.

"Additional pay while on foreign service, $8,000.

"For commutation of quarters and of heat and light, $23,040: *Provided*, That Army field clerks shall have the same allowances and benefits as heretofore allowed by law to pay clerks, Quartermaster Corps, not including retirement: *Provided, however*, That the minimum or entrance pay exclusive of said allowances of said Army field clerks shall be $1,200 per annum: *Provided further*, That Army field clerks shall receive the same increase of pay for service beyond the continental limits of the United States as is allowed by law to commissioned officers of the Army: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of War is authorized to employ, during the present emergency and for a period not exceeding four months thereafter, such additional Army field clerks as may be necessary, not exceeding 4,272.

"For commutation of quarters and of heat and light for field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, $76,800: *Provided*, That said clerks, messengers, and laborers shall be employed and assigned by the Secretary of War to the offices and positions in which they are to serve: *Provided further*, That no clerk, messenger, or laborer at headquarters of tactical divisions, military departments, brigades, service schools, and office of the Chief of Staff shall be assigned to duty in any bureau of the War Department.

"MISCELLANEOUS.

"For pay of contract surgeons, $90,000.

"For pay of nurses, $800,000.

"For pay of hospital matrons, $3,600.

"For pay of reserve veterinarians, $350,000.

"For expenses of courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, retiring boards, and compensation of reporters and witnesses attending same, and expenses of taking depositions and securing other evidence for use before the same, $200,000.

"For additional pay to officer in charge of public buildings and grounds at Washington, D. C., $500.

"For commutation of quarters and heat and light to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Nurse Corps, and enlisted men on duty at places where no public quarters are available, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, $4,821,150.

"For interest on soldiers' deposits, $145,000.

"For pay of expert accountant for the Inspector General's Department, $2,500.

"For extra pay to enlisted men employed on extra duty for periods of not less than 10 days in the offices of Coast Defense Artillery Engineers and Coast Defense Ordnance officers, and as switchboard operators at seacoast fortifications, $25,000.

"For extra pay to enlisted men employed on extra duty as switchboard operators at each interior post of the Army, $19,215.

"For extra pay to enlisted men of the line of the Army and to enlisted men of the Quartermaster Corps, Medical Department, and of the Signal Corps employed in the Territory of Alaska on the Washington-Alaska cable and telegraph system for periods of not less than 10 days at the rate of 35 cents per day, $38,430.

"For mileage to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, when ordered to active duty, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks, and field clerks of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, $2,500,000.

"For additional 10 per cent increase of pay of officers on foreign service, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That hereafter warrant officers shall receive the same increase of pay for service beyond the continental limits of the United States as is allowed to commissioned officers of the Army.

"For additional 20 per cent increase of pay of enlisted men on foreign service, $4,000,000.

"For pay of one computer for Artillery Board, $2,500.

"For payment of exchange by acting quartermasters serving in foreign countries and when specially authorized by the Secretary of War by officers disbursing funds pertaining to the Quartermaster Corps when serving in Alaska, and all foreign money received shall be charged to and paid out by disbursing officers of the Quartermaster Corps at the legal valuation fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, $1,000.

"For additional pay to officers below the grade of major required to be mounted and who furnish their own mounts, $240,000.

"For amount required to make monthly payment to Jennie Carroll, widow of James Carroll, late major, United States Army, $1,500.

"For amount required to make monthly payments to Mabel H. Lazear, widow of Jesse W. Lazear, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, $1,500.

"For amount required to make monthly payments of $100 to John R. Kissinger, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-seventh Indiana Volunteer Infantry, also late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, $1,200.

"All the money hereinbefore appropriated for pay of the Army and miscellaneous, except the appropriation for mileage to commissioned officers, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks, and field clerks of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, shall be disbursed and accounted for as pay of the Army, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$62,526,466.50: *Provided*, That not to exceed $22,500 of this sum be made available for the care of the peach orchard on Poole Island, Aberdeen Proving Ground, and the grain now growing at this and other reservations and the harvest and disposal of the crops; and such disposal by sale or otherwise shall be made pursuant to such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That all moneys received by the United States as the proceeds of such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as 'Miscellaneous receipts'"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$10"; and on page 25, line 19, of the engrossed bill, strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$30,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$7,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$675,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$30,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"Land for hospital and other purposes: For the purchase of land contiguous to the Walter Reed General Hospital, District of Columbia, 26.9 acres, more or less, for the final location of the Army Medical Museum, the Surgeon General's Library, and the Army Medical School, and for the improvements now on the land to be purchased, $350,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert: "$300,000: *Provided*, That the services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, and such other services as the Secretary of War may deem necessary may be employed only in the office of the Chief of Engineers to carry into effect the various appropriations for 'Engineer equipment of troops,' 'Engineer operations in the field,' and other military appropriations, to be paid from such appropriations: *Provided further*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1920 shall not exceed $225,000. The Secretary of War shall each year, in the annual estimates, report to Congress the number of persons who are employed, their duties, and amount paid to each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert: "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$5,000,000: *Provided*, That all they moneys hereinbefore appropriated for the arming, equipping, and training of the National Guard shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "cantonments except in such cases at National Army or National Guard camps or cantonments which were in use prior to November 11, 1918, where it has been or may be found more economical to the Government for the purpose of salvaging such camps or cantonments to buy real estate than to continue to pay rentals or claims for damages thereon, and except where industrial plants have been constructed or taken over by the Government for war purposes and the purchase of land is necessary in order to protect the interest of the Government"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"That the several organizations of the Army, to wit: The Chemical Warfare Service, the Air Service, the Construction Division, the Tank Corps, and the Motor Transport Corps, with their powers and duties as defined in orders and regulations in force and effect on November 11, 1918, shall be continued to and until June 30, 1920.

"That officers of the emergency Army appointed to the Officers' Reserve Corps may be appointed therein to the grade held by them in the emergency Army or next higher grade, as the Secretary of War may direct."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "Sec. 2," in line 1 of the second paragraph of the amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"Exchange of Army cold-storage plant, Chicago, Ill.: That the President is hereby authorized, through the Secretary of War, upon terms and conditions considered advisable by the Secretary of War, to dispose of the United States Army cold-storage plant in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, with machinery and equipment therein contained and appurtenances thereunto belonging, and to accept in part payment therefor a warehouse adjacent to the Army general supply depot in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, containing approximately 650,000 square feet of storage space, together with the land comprising the site of same: *Provided*, That such exchange shall be effected without expenditure for this purpose by the United States, except necessary costs of conveyancing, not exceeding $500, hereby appropriated for this purpose. The President, through the Secretary of War, is hereby authorized to execute and deliver in the name of the United States of America and in its behalf any and all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments necessary to effect such sale or exchange.

"That all moneys received by the United States as the proceeds of such sale or exchange shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of 'Miscellaneous receipts,' and a full report of the same shall be submitted to Congress."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Insert at the beginning of the amendment a side title as follows: "Boughton Memorial Association"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"Medical supplies for the American Red Cross: The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to place at the disposal of the American Red Cross such medical and surgical

supplies and supplementary and dietary foodstuffs used in the treatment of the sick and injured now in Europe and designed for but which are not now essential to the needs of the American Expeditionary Forces, or needed for use in military hospitals in the United States, or as military or hospital stores for the Army of the United States, to be used by said American Red Cross as it shall determine, to relieve and supply the pressing needs of the peoples of countries involved in the late war. The Secretary of War shall prescribe regulations and conditions for the selection and delivery of said supplies and foodstuffs to the American Red Cross for the purposes aforesaid."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"Prosecution of claims by former Government employees: That it shall be unlawful for any person who, as a commissioned officer of the Army, or officer or employee of the United States, has at any time since April 6, 1917, been employed in any bureau of the Government and in such employment been engaged on behalf of the United States, in procuring or assisting to procure supplies for the Military Establishment, or who has been engaged in the settlement or adjustment of contracts or agreements for the procurement of supplies for the Military Establishment, within two years next after his discharge or other separation from the service of the Government, to solicit employment in the presentation or to aid or assist for compensation in the prosecution of claims against the United States arising out of any contracts or agreements for the procurement of supplies for said bureau, which were pending or entered into while the said officer or employee were associated therewith. A violation of this provision of this chapter shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both: *Provided*, That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with any of the provisions of this act are hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
HOWARD SUTHERLAND,
GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
JULIUS KAHN,
D. R. ANTHONY,
S. H. DENT, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I assume that the report of the conference committee on the Army bill will give rise to some little discussion, one Senator having already notified me that he desires to be heard on it. In that event, of course, I shall wait until the conference report on the sundry civil bill shall have been disposed of.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, in view of what has been said respecting the sundry civil appropriation bill it would be wiser for the Senator to do that.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, before this amendment was offered it was shown to me at rather an advanced hour of the evening, and I consented to let it be incorporated in the bill without objection. Had the hour been a different one and the amount of time remaining for action on the bill been more extended, I should probably have had something to say about it.

I have not been inclined to regard the perpetuation of this board with favor, largely because of information which I consider to be of a reliable character regarding some aspects of its activities during the war period. I shall say nothing about them, however, at this time, because the whole subject is now one of inquiry before a joint committee composed of members of the Committees on Labor of both Houses, and it would be therefore inappropriate for me to do so.

Mr. President, this board was created as a temporary one and to meet a "pressing emergency." It was one of the transient bureaus called into being by the exigencies of the war, and was designed, must have been designed, to cease with the emergency which made it necessary.

I have several times taken occasion to venture the prediction that nearly all of the transient boards springing into life during the war and designed to end with peace would, if possible, find some pretext for becoming permanent, for fixing themselves upon the Treasury, with their constantly increasing retinue of employees. This is only one of several now making that attempt, and all such efforts are very naturally based upon the contention that the board or agency is essential to serve the returning soldiers.

Mr. President, my friend the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] took occasion just now to eulogize the marvelous wealth of the United States, the extent of its resources, and the enviable position which it occupies in the commercial and industrial world of to-day. Everything that he said upon that subject is true, but whether it will remain the richest nation in the world, whether its resources will remain adequate to its requirements, must depend very largely upon the appropriations which are made, upon the bureaus which are increasing, upon the departments we are about to consider, if not to create, and similar enterprises of various sorts and descriptions, constantly increasing in number and all having in view new employees and the Treasury of the United States.

This bureau sent an estimate for the fiscal year ending 1920 of something like $14,000,000. The Senator from Arizona looks incredulous, but that is my information; that while Congress and the people of the country were last January thinking and talking economy and while Congress is making an effort to reduce taxes and relieve the people from some of the tax burdens, the Department of Labor asked $14,801,382 to continue the work of the employment service and the activities of an estimated number of assistants of 5,341.

The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses of last Congress did not see fit to grant that request. I can not state what they did, for, of course, the failure of the bill put an end at the time to the agitation. Now it is proposed again at this session of Congress to transform an emergency bureau into a permanent one, to give it certain activities national in character and scope, which will inevitably lead to an additional annual expenditure of millions upon millions of dollars.

The purpose is said to be a commendable one, and with that I have no quarrel; but I am unable to believe, Mr. President, that the people of the United States differ in their characteristics and in their energy before and since the war. I believe that the returning soldiers are able to find and will find employment in a country whose expanding energies on the one hand, and the decreasing foreign population by emigration back to their own countries on the other, will give every man of self-reliance and enterprise, depending upon his own resources, every opportunity that he may have to work if he wants to work, and as he worked prior to his enlistment. Bureaus like this, however, designed to serve a good purpose, tend constantly and inevitably to weaken the reliance of the individual upon himself, and cause him to look to the Government for everything from the cradle to the grave, happy if he receives it, discontented and helpless if it is refused. We are reversing the policies, Mr. President, of 100 years. I believe that if my friend, the Senator from Arizona, at the commencement of his career had been confronted with bureaus and employment agencies, and had looked to them for assistance and comfort, he never would have found the seat which he honors in the Senate of the United States. The American is what he is and will only continue to be what he is by the exercise of that self-reliance and resourcefulness which are characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon race.

Mr. President, I confess, even at the risk of being accused of being unfriendly to the soldier, at the risk of being suspected of a lack of patriotism, that I am appalled by the vast number of bills and resolutions and amendments that are pouring into both Houses of Congress for the benefit, for the relief, and for the material advancement and welfare of the soldiers of the Army of the United States, forgetting that the man who stayed at home, who worked upon his job, whether upon the farm or in the factory, who kept the home fires burning, is just as much of a soldier, just as much entitled to the gratitude and confidence of his fellow citizens and to the appreciation of the American Congress; and, let me remind my brethren, just as capable of casting a vote as the man who carried a bayonet and risked his life for his country at the front. God bless them all, and a grateful nation will say amen; but we can not adhere to our doctrine of the equality of all men and continue to legislate for classes in America. That is what we are doing; that is what we have been doing for a great many years, and what, I fear, we shall continue to do, because an example of that sort once made and becoming effectual proves the prolific parent of a brood that will at some time in the future confront us with their undesirable consequences.

Of course, this bureau will be established; I predict that; it will be established by the unanimous recommendation of the

subcommittee and of the joint committees to both Houses, and for the reasons and the arguments which we have listened to here. It will probably be endowed with $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 the first year, ten millions the next year, fifteen or twenty millions the next year, and, like all the other agencies, its appropriations will expand, whether its usefulness and the need of it be good or otherwise.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that we have any right to continue for one moment after the war any of the transient and temporary agencies, save the War Risk Board, which the emergency then thrust upon this country made absolutely necessary. If we do, then may God help this country if it ever should be confronted with another war, because the precedents thus made will be utilized for the creation in permanent form, probably in a progressive ratio, of similar agencies.

Mr. President, the number of bureaus, divisions, commissions, and other administrative agencies now conducting or pretending to conduct the business of the United States is not only enormously expensive, but is making the simplest business affair so complicated as sometimes to discourage men from attempting to transact it. If a man comes to Washington with a claim, or with a case, if you please, in the departments, or with any affair of considerable magnitude, requiring the consideration of one of the bureaus in Washington, the chances are ten to one that before he gets very far he will have to consult a dozen of them, and in all probability he will go away unsatisfied and disconsolate. Washington is becoming the center of the Government of the United States in almost every particular; and if we persist, as now seems probable, the appointment of a policeman in Denver or a water carrier in the city of Jacksonville will be made from the city of Washington, and after being O. K'd by half a dozen departments and viséed by half a dozen more the appointee will be commissioned and at once furnished with a private stenographer and an assistant. The policy is growing all the time; and unless we begin reforming somewhere—which is always a delicate point; I think this is a good place to begin—unless we begin somewhere, and relegate this matter of employment and similar activities back to the States, where it belongs, our boasted local self-government will be nothing but a reminiscence.

Mr. President, under the circumstances I shall content myself with voting to sustain the report of the committee.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have been somewhat disappointed that the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] was not permitted to remain in the bill as it passed the Senate.

I think this employment problem is a serious one; and I have in mind not only the soldiers, but the hundreds of thousands of men who went from one section of the country to another for temporary war work, who must be restored to their homes or other places of employment. But, at the same time, while I speak thus in favor of the principle of this employment agency, I do not think that the country can give its indorsement to all of the work that has been done by it.

I have in mind at the present time a statement which was issued by this bureau in January when they were seeking some ten or twelve or fourteen million dollars for the continuance of this work. During that month it was published to the world that there were 70,000 unemployed in the city of Cleveland, Ohio. The figures staggered me, and I sought to make some investigation in a very general way.

The population of the city of Cleveland is probably 750,000 to 850,000. If there were 70,000 unemployed, it meant one out of every ten or eleven or twelve men, women, and children; or, to state the fact in another way, it meant perhaps one out of every five or six working men and women in the city. The statement was ridiculously absurd. No one who investigated it believed it, and I have been advised that since that time—and I have not inquired at the department—they have admitted that it was a mistake.

After the figures were published, I made it my business to inquire of every Ohio man who came to this city touching industrial and labor conditions in the State; and I am going to give you the benefit of the information I got from a man who has made a special study of this subject. He is connected with one of the great rubber plants in Akron. My conference with him was about the middle of February. He told me that at that time the three largest rubber plants in Akron were employing 10,000 more men than they had on the day that the armistice was signed, and they wanted men, men, and more men; they were taking labor from every community where it was to be had; and when he saw this statement, he immediately inserted advertisements in every paper printed in the city of Cleveland, and he expected that the labor wants of the rubber industries would be supplied immediately. Strange to say, the responses to his advertisements were purely negligible; and Cleveland is only 30 or 35 miles from Akron, with plenty of means of transportation for anybody who wanted a job.

I refer to this to point out some of the reckless statements that are being made from time to time when it becomes necessary to secure appropriations.

Let me give you another illustration: I was waited upon here the other day by a gentleman who wanted an appropriation for the investigation and inspection service; and immediately I was confronted with the statement that there were 1,300,000 men, aliens, who were about to leave this country, and that each one of these men was going to carry with him, on an average, $3,000. That means $3,900,000,000. The total resources of all the mutual banks and savings banks in the country, plus the postal savings, is, in round numbers, about five billions; so that 1,300,000 men, who were going to leave these shores, were going to carry with them nearly four-fifths of the entire savings of the country.

As a legislator I want facts; but I am heartily tired of being fed on fiction of that kind. I refer to this with the hope that the heads of some of these bureaus, when they want legislation, will have a little respect for the intelligence of Senators.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. I meant, when I had the floor, to direct the attention of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] to the fact that 70,000 men finding employment per week for 15 weeks would aggregate 1,050,000 men furnished with jobs, or a very considerable proportion more than half, I think, of the soldiers that have been demobilized in America.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator will let me answer that. I will take only a moment. Now, it must be remembered first that of that number of 70,000 that have secured situations, only 15,000 per week are soldiers. I corrected myself on that. Fifty-five thousand are civilians and 15,000 are soldiers.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not hear the Senator's correction.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator for letting me correct this matter. Then let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that in our country for many years the total unemployed has generally been about 1,000,000, caused by losing positions through illness, general indisposition, or a desire to change positions.

Mr. THOMAS. Strikes, and so on.

Mr. ASHURST. And that floating number of 1,000,000 is served by this labor service in getting positions.

Now, the distinguished Senator from Ohio calls attention to the fact that there is no shortage of labor in Akron and in Cleveland. I believe the Senator. The Senator has made a very fine point, and he tells us that there are positions open for men there.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am not opposing this amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. I know that.

Mr. POMERENE. I hope it will be inserted.

Mr. ASHURST. I know that.

Mr. POMERENE. But I am protesting against some of the work that is being done by this very bureau.

Mr. ASHURST. But on the very point the Senator makes, that positions may be secured in Cleveland, a man out of work in Utica, or Leadville, or Charleston, S. C., or a soldier who lands, does not know where work can be obtained.

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, I recognize that, and I was going to say a word in that behalf. I feel that an employment agency is a Federal function. I feel that if there is a job in Ohio and a man in Pennsylvania, we ought to get them together; and it is to that end that I am hoping that the admisistration of this department can be so reformed or improved that the laboring men can have the benefit of it.

Now, let me give a concrete case that came to my notice just the other day, as showing the importance of this work.

I have a friend, a college-bred friend, who is engaged in welfare work, and he is studying this question at first hand. He goes to a factory where he thinks there is employment, and he will do the most menial labor in order that he can get in touch with the men and find out what they are thinking about and what their grievances are, with a view to helping remedy the situation if he can; and he gave this experience:

He went to Pittsburgh. He went to one of the shops where labor was advertised for. He was the fiftieth man that lined up at the door, waiting for the employment agent to come out. Pretty soon he came out. He sized up all the men. They straightened themselves up, to make their shoulders look as strong as possible, and so forth; and the labor agent took three

of the men, all he needed. The other 47 went adrift. I do not know where they went; neither did he know; but he, bent on getting a job, went to another plant not 5 miles away. Immediately he was taken. The company wanted men and more men at that factory. They were taking even the lame and the halt. Doubtless every one of the other 47 men who lined up at the first plant could have had a job if they had known that men were wanted at the second plant.

It is just such situations as this that demonstrate to my mind the necessity for this kind of work; and if there had been a legitimate employment agency in that vicinity, alive to its job and doing its work, there is no reason why the other 47 men might not have had these jobs, and at once, instead of going away discouraged. It is just such situations as this that come to my mind and appeal to me in favor of the necessity of this legislation; and even though a part of this money may be squandered, at this crucial time, when the Army is being demobilized—and when I say "the Army" I mean not only the fighting Army, but that vast army of employees that was in the war plants of the country—I want to help them, if I can, to the uttermost. I therefore hope the conference report may be recommitted and the appropriation be made in the sum originally approved by the Senate.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I am very anxious, as I presume all of the Senators are, that a vote should be taken on this matter, and I do not propose to delay the Senate.

In reference to this particular matter, I believe the Secretary of Labor and the Employment Bureau have given very thorough study to the subject, and that they have evolved a very practical and a very beneficial scheme. These purposes have been highly conceived and in general they have carried out the work in a splendid way. Undoubtedly mistakes have been made. I presume they would hardly claim to the contrary, but they have done splendid work and there is yet a great amount of important and beneficial service for them to render.

I was glad to see this amendment adopted, and I hope if the bill goes back to conference the Senate conferees will insist upon retaining it. It looks as if the bill may go back to conference. In this connection I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether I am correctly advised that the conferees reduced the amount appropriated for the completion of the shipbuilding program by some $135,000,000?

Mr. WARREN. The agreement of the conferees was that where there was $220,000,000 in the bill as passed by the House, and where we in the Senate put in $491,000,000, the amount was reduced to $356,000,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. I can not understand how the conferees figure that the Shipping Board will be able to complete contracts actually made, with the keels laid of those ships and material on hand to build them. They have got to be paid for, of course, and it will be a tremendous loss just to junk and scrap all that.

Mr. WARREN. Let me say to the Senator that we brought that to the attention of the House. I do not like to say too much about what happened in conference with the House, but I think they are not as afraid of deficiencies as we are. I think in many of these cases they feel that there is a chance to sell more of the ships for cash and less on time, on account of some earlier information they had, without an intention on their part to cripple the work. They felt this would carry it along, and, if the worst happened, they are sure it will have to come up for further consideration.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, they may have later information than I have about the prospects for the sale of ships, but I can not see that they will be able to count on over $75,000,000 from that source, at the outside, within the year.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that we got every dollar we could on it, and if the Senator feels that we could get any more, of course it is matter——

Mr. FLETCHER. I wanted to call that to the attention of the conferees, and see if it would be possible to consider that in case the bill goes back for further conference.

Mr. WARREN. The conferees on the part of the Senate felt that they wanted enough in to avoid deficiencies and go on and complete this work and not take any chance whatever about the thing. There is where the difference came, and, as I said, we did the best we could.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator if he will state the fact—if it be a fact—that this reduction was made with any thought of reducing the present program?

Mr. WARREN. Oh, none whatever.

Mr. LENROOT. I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. WARREN. It was a mere matter of their wanting to "breathe."

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, that is the important thing. If you can devise some other way of completing it than by appropriating the money for it, I am perfectly willing you should do it. I did not know there was any other way. I am certainly sincere in feeling that we ought not to make any further cancellations and that we ought to go on and complete this program.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that the program as agreed to will be carried out. There is no question about it at all.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is satisfactory so far as that item is concerned.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want to go into detail, but I say now that the program agreed to will be carried out under the provisions of the bill as agreed to in conference.

Mr. OVERMAN. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Senate will reject this conference report by such a decisive vote that it will amount to an instruction to the conferees to retain this $400,000 appropriation and save the Employment Service from practical annihilation.

I have been a good deal surprised, as the debate has progressed, to learn that the action of the conferees in striking out the Senate amendment is in opposition to the expressed will of both Houses. This amendment putting $400,000 on the bill for the purpose of maintaining the Federal Employment Service was adopted unanimously by the Senate. The RECORD of the House proceedings has been read here in the course of the debate, showing apparently that the House is in overwhelming agreement with the Senate that this appropriation should be made. At least the one Member of the House who made the fight against it conceded that his opposition to it was practically without support in that body.

In the face of this record the Senate and House conferees agree upon a report as to this appropriation which would deprive each House of the opportunity to legislate in accordance with its manifest desire. In other words, the conferees would obviously defeat the legislative will of both Houses. Is not that what the RECORD discloses?

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield for a statement in that connection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly. I may be in error, and if I am, I want to be corrected.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator is correct. I merely wanted to add that during the progress of this debate I have received assurance from what I believe to be reasonably authoritative sources that if the bill goes back to conference the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, we have quite recently adopted an amendment to the Senate rules limiting the power of our conferees. That amendment was adopted because the conferees were habitually writing into bills committed to them for conference new legislation upon which neither House had passed. It now appears that our rules will require further amendment to the end that conferees are made to understand that they are not the masters of legislation, but that it is their business to represent the legislative will of the two Houses and to secure some fair approximation to that will as expressed in the action of the body they represent.

Mr. President, I know the difficulties conferees encounter in their endeavors to reconcile the disagreeing views of the two Houses. That is one thing. But it is quite another thing for conferees to agree to report against legislation upon which their respective Houses are substantially agreed. I trust there will be such a decisive vote in sending this report back to conference that it will instruct our conferees and the conferees of the House that the Senate means to stand by this proposition.

Just one word about the proposition itself. It has been suggested that it is the business of the State and the municipality to conduct these employment agencies and that it is not properly the concern of the Federal Government.

The fact is that there is most important work to be done in providing work for the unemployed that the Federal Government alone can do. We have at all times, it may be said, a scarcity of labor in one State or section of our country and an oversupply in another State or section. The Federal Government can coordinate the work of State agencies and can make the whole service vastly more efficient.

I have before me here the record of the fact that this Federal agency has transferred from one State, where the men could not find employment, to other States in which they could find employment, an average of 8,000 men a week for several months. These officers of the Federal Government ought to be maintained in the different States, and there ought to be cooperation between these offices on the ground and the various State employment agencies.

The Federal Employment Service within the last year has placed nearly two and a half million workers in positions, and

it is at the present time finding employment for an average of 60,000 a week. Put that into money at, say, $2.50 a day for each man, and it means something like $3,000,000 a month, as I run it over in my head standing here on my feet.

This appropriation should be much larger than the Senate provided. Certainly it ought not to be reduced. I hope the conference report will be rejected.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, just a word. I did not think the very severe strictures that have been cast upon the Senate conferees this afternoon with reference to this item have been altogether warranted. I happen to know that some of the House conferees at least were very insistent upon the proposition as agreed upon, and they have at least a portion of the responsibility for the agreement.

But it has come to me, as it has come to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], and I am convinced that if the conference report is rejected there will be an agreement very quickly upon this proposition by the conference. If they should not agree it will be entirely within the province of the conferees to come to a full agreement upon every other item but this item and enable the House to vote separately upon it. I feel very sure that if the conference report is rejected we will have a full agreement or the House will concur in the Senate amendment within the next two hours.

But may I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that he would very much simplify the procedure if he would withdraw his motion to recommit and ask the Senate to reject the report.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. Inasmuch as the House has already discharged its managers and I have not made any motion as yet, but merely announced my purpose to make a motion to recommit, I concur in the conclusion expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin that the vote should be taken on the pending question, which is to agree to the report; and therefore I ask all friends of the amendment to vote "nay."

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to ask for a quorum, but I will not do it. I will be perfectly content for the Senate to act by a viva voce vote and decide the question now, so that if the report is not agreed to we can go into conference at once.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.] The noes have it, and the conference report is rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask for a division. I want the House informed of something of the weight of opinion here on this matter.

Mr. SMOOT. We can not get a quorum.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We do not have to have a quorum on a division.

Mr. WARREN. If we are going into that procedure let us have a quorum.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for a division.

Mr. ROBINSON. In view of the lateness of the hour, I think it may delay proceedings unduly. It is perfectly manifest from the vote already taken that the Senate, with the exception of the conferees, is practically agreed on this subject. The vote was almost unanimous. I will ask the Senator from Wisconsin——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I just asked for a division. I have not asked for a quorum.

Mr. ROBINSON. Inasmuch as I have already stated the vote shows an almost unanimous vote, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will not withdraw his request?

Mr. WARREN. I will say that as far as I know the conferees have not voted at all, and as far as I know there has been no opposition. My only suggestion is on the ground that there seems to be a disposition to want a record vote, and I thought it would be unfair to have a division in the present state of the body when we could have the other.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There was a vote from at least one of the conferees, and I wanted the RECORD to show that it was either unanimous or that it was overwhelming.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the RECORD may show, as far as I am concerned, that two Senators voted to sustain the report. They were the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and myself.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let us have a division. It will only take a moment.

Mr. SMOOT. As far as I am concerned, I voted on yesterday to sustain the report of the conference committee, of which I was a member, and I will vote the same way to-day. The vote was almost unanimous, and that is all there is to it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I believe that makes a sufficient record on the proposition. Let it go at that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report has been rejected.

Mr. WARREN. In view of the action taken, I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments, ask the House for a further conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. OVERMAN conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on House bill 5227, the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I think it due the Senate that I make a very brief statement in explaining the changes which have been made in the Army appropriation bill in conference.

The bill when it passed the Senate carried an aggregate of $885,000,000. I am not reading the thousands or hundreds. Eight hundred and eighty-five million was appropriated by the bill when it passed the Senate, and to that should have been added $100,000,000 of reappropriation from the unexpended balances of the pay appropriations for the Army for the fiscal year 1919. The bill as now agreed upon in conference carries $775,000,000 and eliminates the provision for the reappropriation of $100,000,000 of the unexpended pay appropriations for the fiscal year 1919.

The bill as it originally passed the Senate appropriated for an Army of an average strength for the 12 months of 400,000 men. As agreed upon in conference, it proposes to appropriate for an Army of the average strength of 325,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York tell us, then, what the size of the Army will be at the close of the year?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It will be in the neighborhood of 240,000 men on October 1, and will remain at that figure for the succeeding nine months of the fiscal year. I may say to the Senator that the House conferees were exceedingly strenuous in their opposition to an Army of 400,000 men and exceedingly tenacious for an Army of 300,000. The temper of the House of Representatives was such that it was entirely apparent that the legislation would be endangered did not the Senate conferees agree to some compromise to the bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from New York just there? The Senator will remember we disagreed in reference to the size of the Army; reported a disagreement; the matter went back to the House; and the House insisted upon their number.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Oregon is correct. In the first part of our conference with the House conferees, the Senate conferees offered to compromise on an average Army of 350,000 men. The House conferees took that proposal back to the House of Representatives, and the House by a rising vote, by a division, refused to accept it. The vote opposed to that was unanimous. They then came back and announced that result to the Senate conferees. Of course, so far as that item was concerned, it no longer was in conference; in other words, the House conferees appeared before the Senate conferees in the capacity of ambassadors with an ultimatum. We thereafter pursuaded the House conferees to accept 325,000 men as the average strength of the Army for the next 12 months.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate to one thing in connection with that very matter. This bill carries an appropriation of $215,000,000 for the pay of the Army, supposedly an army of 325,000 men. It will not pay an army of 325,000 men for 12 months. That is conceded by the House conferees; it is conceded by the Senate conferees; and we have our information from the head of the finance division of the War Department, who states that with an appropriation of $215,000,000 they will manage to get along for a portion of this fiscal year, but that eventually they must come to Congress and ask for a deficiency appropriation; that they will either have to get such an appropriation from the Appropriations Committees of the House and of the Senate, or else in the preparation of the next annual Army appropriation bill, which will be brought up next winter before, of course, this fiscal year is over, a provision will have to be put in making the appropriation for the pay of the Army immediately available. I do not want the Senate to be fooled or the public to be fooled by this proposal that $215,-

000,000 will pay an army of 325,000 men for 12 months, for it will not.

However, the House had instructed its conferees, and the House insisted upon its attitude with respect to this pay item. The House had originally appropriated $198,000,000 for the pay of an army of 300,000 men, and that would not have paid an army of 300,000 men. Unfortunately the House made that amendment upon the floor, and when it made it it forgot the $50 bonus which is to be given to every soldier when he is discharged.

Mr. STERLING. A $60 bonus.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I should have said a $60 bonus.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. Can the Senator inform the Senate what the amount of the deficiency will be between the appropriation and what is necessary for an army of 325,000 men?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I estimate it to be between twenty and thirty-five million dollars.

Let me say to the Senator—and I do not want to take up too much time, for I know it is getting late—that when the first conference reported for an army of 325,000 men it carried scientifically worked out pay figures and the total was $257,000,000. If we support an army of 325,000 men for 12 months it will cost approximately that amount; but this bill, instead of carrying $257,000,000, carries $214,000,000. However, we could not persuade the House to yield one inch upon that matter; but the House conferees are thoroughly aware that a deficiency item must be inserted in some bill next winter.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to have some information as to what the Senator has in mind and what the conferees have in mind by an average army of 325,000 men. There are a great many more than that in the Army now, of course.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly. That was thoroughly discussed when the Senate considered the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It means the number we shall have for the last nine months of the year; that is the only Army that will be left.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will tell the Senator as nearly as I can, but I can not be very accurate, and I hope the Senator will not be very severe if I miss it by a few thousand. The matter was discussed when the bill was in the Senate.

We start in on July 1, which is to-day, with 1,039,000 men in the Army of the United States; approximately half of them abroad and half in this country. On August 1 the Army will be down to 748,000 men; on September 1 it will be down to four hundred and thirty odd thousand men; on October 1, under this proposal for an average army through 12 months of 325,000, it will come down to the neighborhood of 240,000 men. There it will remain for the next nine months, to the end of this fiscal year. The average for the 12 months, starting at a million and down to 240,000, will be 325,000 men.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then, the conferees have practically agreed that the Regular Army shall be reduced to 240,000 men?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not agree with the phrase "Regular Army." This is not the Regular Army; it is a temporary army for this year only, but it will constitute the entire armed force of the United States——

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is what I supposed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. With the exception of those units of the National Guard which are slowly being reconstituted.

Mr. President, there is one other important amendment. Senators will remember that as the Senate passed the bill it carried $55,000,000 for aviation. In the first portion of the conference the conferees agreed upon $40,000,000 for aviation. They took that back to the House of Representatives, and the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote instructed their conferees to stand for an appropriation of only $15,000,000 and sent their conferees back to us again, more as ambassadors with an ultimatum than as conferees. We finally persuaded the House conferees to go back to the House to-day and to consult the membership and, if possible, consent to an appropriation for aviation of $25,000,000 instead of the $15,000,000 which they were insisting upon. We called their attention to the fact that the House of Representatives, without the slightest objection whatever, had appropriated $25,000,000 for naval aviation, and yet was insisting on only $15,000,000 for Army aviation, and Army aviation is three or four times greater than naval aviation. After much conference and much consideration the House conferees finally persuaded the House to accept the appropriation of $25,000,000 for aviation.

I make no concealment of my great disappointment in the great reduction from $55,000,000 to $25,000,000, but the House could not be persuaded to accept any higher figure, and it, in fact, retracted its own instructions for $15,000,000 when it finally agreed to $25,000,000.

Those are the principal changes in the appropriations. The House insisted that all of the so-called private claims items at the end of the bill should go out; their conferees were instructed to insist that they go out, or there would be no bill, and the Senate conferees, although we were fully justified in contending for them—we had gone into them and examined them and they were just cases, each and every one—finally reached the conclusion that a matter like a private claim should not hold up a great military appropriation bill, and we consented to take them out.

In addition to that, all of the land purchases were taken out with the exception of the land purchased in connection with the Walter Reed Hospital. That remains in the bill, although the House conferees had been instructed by the House to put that out of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has labored very hard and very earnestly to secure the acceptance of the Senate amendments, and I deeply sympathize with his partial failure to accomplish that much desired object. I would not detain the Senate for a moment longer were it not for the fact that I feel impelled to refer to one of the Senate amendments which was unanimously accepted here, and which the House conferees declined to consider. It is a comparatively insignificant amendment, Mr. President, and yet one which affects a gallant soldier who can ill-afford to remain, as he has remained for some years, deprived of a perfectly legitimate item of expenditure.

The amendment to which I refer appropriated for Maj. Gen. Jesse McI. Carter, of the United States Army, the sum of $352.23—of course, I do not give the exact phraseology; but its substance was to provide a return to Gen. Carter of this small sum of money for expenditures which it represented. I can state the facts to the Senate in the most concise way, perhaps, by reading a memorandum which I asked the general to supply me with some time ago. He says:

In 1912 I was ordered to proceed to Europe as member of a board of officers for the purpose of studying the organization, training, and equipment of the cavalry of various States in Europe, and was appointed disbursing officer and quartermaster for the board, which was composed of myself and three other officers.

Before leaving I was supplied with $1,000 from the fund "Contingencies of the Army, 1913," which fund, in the language of the appropriation act, was "to be expended under the immediate orders of the Secretary of War," "for all contingent expenses of the Army not otherwise provided for, and embracing all branches of the military service." I was instructed by the Secretary of War to expend this fund for the procurement of information, in payment for passports and viséing same, in tips to orderlies and horse holders, and in payment for entertainment of foreign officers in return for like courtesies extended by them. I limited expenditures of this sum to the items above named. I found that it was usual and customary and was expected that when orderlies and horse holders were detailed to attend the board at maneuvers or exercises a monetary remuneration should be made to the men so detailed. I ascertained in each case what the customary fee was and paid that and no more. I paid the State Department of the United States for passports for members of the board, and when it was necessary had these passports viséed in Europe and paid the authorized fee therefor. We were entertained as guests of foreign officers a number of times and returned such entertainment at our own expense. On one occasion we entertained several officers of the French Army at dinner in return for a like courtesy on their part, and I paid from the contingency fund the cost of the dinner for the French officers, not including the cost of the dinner for members of the board. To the best of my recollection, this amounted to approximately $21.

The board was in Europe more than three months and visited Russia, Germany, Austria, Italy, France, and England, and made an exhaustive study of the subject which it was ordered to study, and on its return submitted a report, accompanied by a system of drill regulations, which has revolutionized the training of cavalry in the United States.

I expended but $352.23 of the $1,000 "Contingencies of the Army" allotted to the board, and turned in the remainder to the United States Treasury. The note accompanying the estimate of the Quartermaster General, which states that the disallowance arose as a result of expenditure for transportation of excess baggage of officers, cab and carriage hire, tips, and gratuities to hotel servants, etc., is in error, as an examination of my accounts in the office of the Auditor for the War Department will show. No part of the funds allotted to me from "Contingencies of the Army" were expended for any of these purposes. No reimbursement to the members of the board for "tips and gratuities to hotel servants" was asked for and none was made.

I expended the amount ($352.23) in the manner directed and for the procurement of information of value to the Government, and for which the board had been sent to Europe.

Mr. President, while the amount involved here is small, the circumstances show that this gallant officer has been subjected to a treatment that is both contemptible and dishonorable in

an affair in which he acted under orders and saved money to the Government. He was detailed to go to Europe, was provided with a thousand dollars out of the contingent fund of the Army, and was directed to expend it in a certain way. He expended $352.23 as instructed, returned the remainder to the United States Treasury, and his account has been from that day to this disallowed upon a false statement of facts.

Since that time Col. Carter has been advanced until he now occupies the position of a major general in the United States Army. The department has declined, through the advice of its law officer, I presume, to allow this amount, and he has been relegated to the Court of Claims, which means that his great grandchildren will not live to see the amount refunded. The item was placed in the bill, the conferees of the House in their wisdom saw fit to reject it, and the general is not only deprived of his money, but labors under an imputation that he improperly expended it.

Mr. POMERENE. What is the sum?

Mr. THOMAS. The amount is very small—$352.23—but that means a good deal to an officer living in these times upon a very small salary.

Mr. President, I shall not, of course, interrupt the progress of this bill, but, if I live, shall offer this amendment to the next Army supply bill and, notwithstanding the comparatively small amount, I shall insist upon its allowance to the best of my ability.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.] The report is agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I was speaking to another Senator for a moment and did not understand the question was being put on agreeing to the report. I desire to say a word upon the report, and I ask unanimous consent that the vote whereby the report was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote whereby the Senate agreed to the conference report will be reconsidered. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time,

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Georgia assures me that if we will take a recess now until 8 o'clock, he will undertake to close in half an hour.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection to any arrangement the Senator from Massachusetts makes, but I have no assurance that there will not be other debate.

Mr. LODGE. That might happen in any event.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think we could possibly get a quorum if there were a suggestion for a quorum at this time, and I do wish to make a few statements that I think will allay prejudice relative to the camp at Benning, and to have a few more Senators to hear me. I will not take over half an hour more and will be able to get through within that time this evening.

RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate take a recess until 8.15 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 8.15 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at 8 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on the proposed league of nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE WESTPHALIAN PEACE TREATY (1648) AND THE PROPOSED LEAGUE OF NATIONS (1919) IN CONNECTION WITH INTERNATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AND REVOLUTIONS.

[By Arthur MacDonald, anthropologist, Washington, D. C., and honorary president of the International Congress of Criminal Anthropology of Europe.]

INTRODUCTION.

The proposed league of nations may only be a first step in the direction of permanent peace, yet not a few persons seem doubtful of its utility. However, the league may be the lesser evil as compared with the old régime, which appears to have resulted in total failure after very long and fair trial.

Whatever be the ultimate outcome of the league and of the problems to be solved, the one encouraging thing is that all the people are thinking seriously on the subject and longing for some way to stop war. It may be true that lasting peace can only be secured when both people and leaders (sometimes the people lead the leaders) realize the necessity of peace and the senselessness of war. But to reach such a happy realization of the truth what are we, the people, to do now? Already the discussions of the league (pro and con) have fertilized the soil; the minds of the people are open as never before; and now is the supreme moment to sow peace seeds. The sooner, more thoroughly, and wider they are scattered, the better. In this way we may be able to so impress peace ideas upon everyone, as to avoid the terrible necessity of a future war, in which both sides become exhausted, as in the Thirty Years' War, which would be a much more horrible war than the present war.

To escape such a catastrophe and make a league of nations or any kind of peace arrangements endure is preeminently an educational problem, and consists mainly in repeatedly filling the minds of the people, old and young, everywhere with fundamental peace conceptions. Shall we not begin at once and persist in doing this until political wars become as impossible in the future as religious wars are now?

SUGGESTIONS OF THE PEACE TREATY OF WESTPHALIA FOR THE PEACE CONFERENCE IN PARIS.

[Article (by writer) in Central Law Journal, St. Louis, Apr. 25, 1919, and in open court Apr., 1919, Chicago, Ill.]

The conference of nations that is now taking place around the peace table at Paris is doubtless the most important of any in history. One reason is the fact that whatever plan the conference may decide to carry out will necessarily concern most all countries of the world. For railroads, steamships, aeroplanes, telegraphs, telephones, and wireless telegraphy, as never before, have made communication between nations so easy, quick, and direct that distance is almost eliminated, enabling the whole world to think, reason, and act at the same time, and to be influenced as one human solidarity.

There seems to be a strong desire in all lands that the peace conference will make future wars not only improbable but practically impossible. But how can this be done? For years countless peace plans and theories have been proposed filling volumes of books, but they are mainly of a speculative nature. Since theoretical grounds have proved inadequate, is there then any experience in the history of the world which can be made a basis for permanent peace? Is there, for instance, any kind of war that has resulted in doing away with itself permanently? The answer would point to the Thirty Years' War, closing with the peace of Westphalia (1648), which seems to have put an end to all religious wars.

How, then, does it happen that the peace treaty of Westphalia, of all the treaties in the world, is the only one that has succeeded in stopping all religious wars? We are certainly dealing here with a phenomenal fact in history. The writer has been unable to find any discussion of this phase of the matter. See a study of the United States Senate by the writer (published in Spanish) under the title: "Estudio del Senado de los Estados Unidos de America," in Revista Argentina de Ciencias Politicas, 12 de Enero de 1918. (Buenos Aires, 1918.) It would therefore seem of interest and importance, especially at the present time, to make a brief anthropological study of the Thirty Years' War which led to such an exceptional and successful treaty.

NEW FIELD FOR ANTHROPOLOGY.

From the anthropological point of view, history can be looked upon as a vast laboratory for the purpose of studying humanity and assisting in its progress. In the past anthropology has concerned itself mainly with savage and prehistoric man, but it is due time that it take up the more important and much more difficult subject of civilized man, not only as an individual but as an organization, or nation, or group of nations. It is true that other departments of knowledge, such as history and political science, have pursued these fields, but unfortunately not always in the scientific sense; to use an ancient pun, it is *his* story, rather than all the facts. Anthropology in this new field should seek to establish only those truths which can be based upon facts. There are doubtless many very important truths which can not be established by scientific methods, but perhaps they can be better treated in political science, psychology, ethics, philosophy, and theology.

In the present inquiry the anthropological problem is this: As religious wars are admitted to be the most intense, most idealistic, and most sacrificial of all wars, and therefore most difficult to stop, can it be ascertained just how the Thirty Years' War, culminating in the peace of Westphalia, brought about the end of all religious wars? This might suggest how all political wars may be made to cease. If the seventeenth century accomplished the more difficult task, the peace conference at Paris ought to succeed in the less difficult one. If the twentieth century prides itself on being superior in diplomacy, practical statesmanship, and general mental caliber, it will now have an opportunity to show such superiority by formulating a treaty which will make all future political wars not only improbable but impossible.

PRINCIPLES OF A PEACE CONFERENCE.

In following the present peace conference and comparing it with the peace congress of Westphalia, it may be well to mention a few of the principles of such congresses in general. In a treaty of peace there are first of all the usual articles, as, e. g., a declaration that peace is restored and amnesty clauses, including restitution of such conquests as are not intended to be retained, and of rights suspended by the war. Also there are provisions to remove the causes out of which the war arose, redress grievances, and prevent their recurrence. This is the most essential thing for the congress to do. Then there is the indemnity article to make satisfactory reparation for injury sustained and cost of war. But great prudence should be exercised here, otherwise the conquered power may feel deep resentment which is liable to sow seeds for a future war.

As to personal attendance at the congress, one great advantage is that difficulties thought insurmountable in correspondence often disappear in an interview. Half the work is done when members have come to know what each really wants. But in long discussions there is danger of becoming fatigued and making ill-advised concessions. There is also temptation for some members to interfere where they have no substantial interests nor rights, and to contract engagements in which they have no special concern. When strong enough, every nation will insist on the right to manage its own internal affairs. Sometimes there are a few particularly able men, speaking several languages fluently (a very practical advantage), but representing only small countries, who may exercise undue influence and cause the congress to authorize things which may not prove of equal justice to all. Members of congresses have been known to vote for things that they did not understand, to the great disadvantage of their own country, due mainly to inexperience and lack of familiarity with the language spoken in the congress.

THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA.

As early as 1636 Pope Urban VIII extorted from the powers engaged in the Thirty Years' War their unwilling consent to treat. In 1637 a discussion of safe conducts was begun, which lasted nearly five years, and it was not until 1641 that preliminaries as to time and place of the congress were signed, and these were not ratified, nor safe conducts exchanged, until 1643, making six years for controversies as to mere formalities. One of the causes of this dilatoriness was that neither side really desired peace. Captiousness and punctiliousness were doubtless emphasized in order to obtain delay. The labor of concluding peace was colossal; there were endless obstacles to surmount, contending interests to reconcile, a labyrinth of circumstances to cope with, difficulties to overcome besetting the congress from the very outset of the negotiations, not only of arranging the conditions of peace but still more of carrying them through the proceedings.

It is therefore fair to assume that the difficulties in establishing the Peace of Westphalia were as great as, and probably greater than, those now confronting the peace conference at Paris. For in the Westphalian congress nobody desired peace, and it was not possible to agree to an armistice, so that war continued while the congress was in session, materially affecting the deliberations; this may be one reason why the congress lasted as long as four years.

To avoid questions of precedence and to lessen further opportunities for disagreement, two cities in Westphalia, Munster for the Catholics and Osnabruck for the Protestants, were selected. These places were a short day's ride apart. The treaty was signed at Munster October 24, 1648, and was called "The Peace of Westphalia." In addition to the disposition for delay, there was a tendency to criticize things generally. Thus certain plenipotentiaries complained of their accommodations, saying that the houses assigned to them, though high and handsome externally, were in fact rat holes. The streets also were pronounced very narrow, so much so that when a certain very polite diplomat, who wore a very large hat, made from his coach an extremely low bow, his hat hit a very expensive vase in an open window, which fell and broke, causing great embarrassment.

First, questions of etiquette were taken up. For instance, did the precedence belong to Spain, and what marks of honor were due to the representatives of the neutral powers? Then came contests for the ecclesiastical seats. The Nuncio, the representative of the Pope, wished to sit not only at the head of the table but wanted a canopy over him to distinguish him. The way in which the minor powers should be received was in doubt. It was finally decided to go halfway down the stairs with guests when departing. Also the question of titles arose. The word "excellency" was chosen for addressing the envoys of the great powers, but it had to be extended to the lesser powers. The Venetian envoy obtained the honor (to his joy) of being conducted, when he visited the French plenipotentiary, to the door of his coach, instead of to the staircase. These few of the many incidents during the congress will illustrate the human side of official matters. Such disputes as to precedence and etiquette were to be expected in a proud and ceremonious age among representatives of numerous States, especially when many of them were of doubtful rank. There was also much display. A train of 18 coaches conveyed the French envoys in their visits of ceremony. It appeared that France desired to show that she had not been impoverished by the war like Germany.

The papal nuncio and the Venetian envoy were mediators as well as members of the congress. France and Sweden were opposed to each other in religion, but in accord on political matters. The treaty was drawn up with such fullness and precision of language as is rarely found in documents of this nature, due to a large body of trained lawyers among the members. As indicating a desire for fairness in little things as well as in larger questions, the treaty contained these words: "No one of any party shall look askance at anyone on account of his creed." As an example of wise provisions, the following may be noted: The Protestants demanded the year 1618 as annus normalis for the restitution of ecclesiastical estates, the Catholics insisted on the year 1630, which was much more favorable to them. The congress split the difference and made it 1624. The medius terminus is often the wisest course in acute controversies. As to temporal affairs, all hostilities of whatever kind were to be forgotten, neither party being allowed to molest or injure the other for any purpose. In regard to spiritual affairs, complete equality was to exist (aequalitas exacta mutuaque), and every kind of violence was forever forbidden between the parties.

The peace of Westphalia was the first effort to reconstruct the European states' system, and it became the common law of Europe. Few treaties have had such influence, and Europe is said for the first time to have formed a kind of commonwealth watching with anxiety over the preservation of the general peace.

THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR.

To have called to mind some of the principal points in the peace of Westphalia is not sufficient for understanding the real significance of the treaty without some consideration of the war which it closed. As already suggested, this war, looked at from a scientific point of view, is an unconscious experiment of nations, an attempt to solve a problem in abnormal international psychology. In order to comprehend this experiment and its resultant treaty, just how it brought about permanent religious peace, some of the main events of the war must be recalled as a basis upon which to work.

The Protestant Reformation had great influence upon almost everything political in Europe until the peace of Westphalia. The religious peace of Augsburg (1555) furnished no settlement to questions stirred up by the Reformation. It was inevitable that such fundamental disagreements should lead to a general war. The Thirty Years' War marked the end of the Reformation, which changed the idea of Christian unity and altered the theory of a holy Roman empire, replacing it by the idea of autonomy for individual states.

On May 23, 1618, a body of Protestants entered the royal palace at Prague and threw two detested representatives of the Crown from the window. This act started a struggle that for 30 years involved Europe in a war which spread gradually from Bohemia over southern Germany, then slowly to northern Germany and Denmark, until country after country began to take part and the fighting became general. The war might have ended in 1623, making it a five years' war, had it not been for the outrageous treatment of the Protestant states of northern Germany, resulting in a political disintegration in which Germany lost half of her population and two-thirds of her wealth. Her religion and morality sank low, and the intellectual damage required generations to restore.

The Roman Catholic Church, having guided Christianity for centuries without a rival, naturally felt greatly wronged by Protestant secession. This explains the uncompromising enmities of the Thirty Years' War. Various parties claimed the control of the religious doctrines to be taught the people, as well as control of worship; they were fighting each other for this power, ready to sacrifice their lives for it. The Lutherans were as intolerant toward the Calvanists as they were toward the Catholics. The Catholic Church, convinced of the absolute truth of its doctrines based upon 13 centuries of growth, naturally could not tolerate some young reformers to arise and challenge its divine right, especially not since these reformers seized old monastic and ecclesiastic foundations with domains and edifices and administered them in their own interest. The resistance of the Catholic hierarchy, to the last drop of blood, was a normal reaction. As so often happens, the conditions were abnormal, not the human beings.

Had the war stopped in 1623 the Catholics would have been left with decided advantages. Their own ambitions, however, prevented it. Gustavus Adolphus appeared, and by his efforts Protestantism is said to have been saved from extinction. During 13 of the 30 years the lands of the Protestants had been devastated; during the next 17 years an equalization of the exhaustion of the parties developed before a lasting religious peace was made. It became clear in the end that neither Catholics nor Protestants could crush their opponents without perishing likewise.

TERRIBLE RESULTS OF THE WAR.

The terrible results of the Thirty Years' War may be summed up by saying that Germany was the carcass, and the hosts which invaded the German soil were the vultures. The Protestant invaders were Swedes, Finns, Hollanders, Frenchmen, Englishmen, and Scotchmen; on the Catholic side there came in Spaniards, Italians, Walloons, Poles, Cossacks, Croats, and representatives of nearly all other Slavonic tribes. There was an army never larger than 40,000 men, but the camp followers were 140,000, consisting of gangs of gypsies, Jewish camp traders, marauders, and plunderers. The soldiers robbed and tortured all alike, both friend and foe. The inhabitants would flee to the woods, taking with them or hiding everything they could. But the invaders were experts in discovering secret treasures; they would pour water on the ground, and where it sank quickly there they knew something had been recently buried.

To retaliate, the peasants would watch for stragglers, for the sick and wounded who had dropped behind, putting them to death with every device of insult and cruelty known. Much of the cruelty is too hideous to mention. In many districts the desolation was so great that persons were found dead with grass in their mouths. Men climbed up the scaffolds and tore down the bodies of those hanged and devoured them. The supply was large. Newly buried corpses were dug up for food. Children were enticed away that they might be slain and eaten. The population, when plundered, would become plunderers in turn, forming into bands, and inflict on others the horrors that they themselves had suffered. Men became wholly indifferent to the sufferings of others. Whole countries were destroyed, towns and villages reduced to ashes, and civilization was pushed back into barbarism for half a century. The Thirty Years' War is said to have been so unspeakably cruel and calamitous that the like has never been known in Europe.

CAUSES OF THE LENGTH OF THE WAR.

Gustavus Adolphus writes in a letter that the war would be long drawn out and stop from exhaustion. The original purpose of the war was the suppression of the Protestant faith, but the victories of Gustavus Adolphus made the Catholics hopeless. Also other interests of a political nature rose up, the war passed from a German to a European question. Though there were times when peace might have been made, the side who had the best of it for the moment deemed it folly to stop when victory was in reach. The other side thought it base and cowardly not to continue, as some turn of fortune might repair the losses. Many a war has dragged on after the purpose for which it began had become unattainable, because those who began it were too vain to admit that the objects of the war were impossible from its outset.

In a long war also individuals rise up to whom fighting becomes a second nature, who know nothing else but violence and murder. Thus many soldiers were indignant when the Westphalian peace was signed, for they felt they had a vested right to plunder and murder, looking upon a wretched, helpless population as their just prey.

A further reason for the long continuation of the war was the very exhaustion of both sides; there was not enough strength on either side to strike a decisive blow, nor sufficient energy left to make a vigorous effort for peace, making it seem useless to try. In the earlier and middle period of the war there were many cries for peace, but in the last eight years there was a terrible silence of death and such utter desperation that no one dared to speak of peace, so great was the exhaustion. The soldiers decreased as it became more and more difficult to recruit and feed them; the military operations grew feebler and more desultory, the fighting more inconclusive, though the misery did not diminish. But while the people and soldiers had become tired of the interminable struggle and wanted peace, many of the diplomats did not appear to desire it.

CAUSES OF THE WAR.

The great length of the war gradually revealed its very hopelessness and uselessness, creating a general desire for rest and peace, transforming and weakening the religious movements out of which the war had arisen. The principle of private judgment, coming from the Reformation, had had time to develop and undermine the ideas of temporal rights and duties common to both parties, while many ideas first conceived by the Reformation but suppressed at the time had at last commenced to grow through the long-continued turbulations.

Another cause of the war was the inherent incompatibility of religious views among the people. Religious discord exists to-day, but it is not decided by bloody contests, because of breadth of religious insight, general indifference, and increasing skepticism. The convictions of the people of the seventeenth century, as to the truth of their own opinions and the errors of their opponents, were of such an absolute character as can not be found nowadays even among people with the most rigid beliefs. They did not know then that it was possible to live together and yet have the most varied and contradictory religious convictions. To suppose that these people were stupid is an error. The chances are that they were less stupid than the people of to-day. How many at the present time can look at their country, its ideals, ideas, and customs justly and without prejudice? Naturally very few. But to place ourselves outside of not only our country but our generation is much more difficult. How could we then expect the people of the seventeenth century to do this?

IGNORANCE THE FUNDAMENTAL CAUSE OF WAR.

The fundamental cause that brought the Thirty Years' War to a close was mental insight into the uselessness and hopelessness of further struggle, caused by the feeling of exhaustion due to the long continuance of the war. The reason why this war put an end to all religious wars

was that this intellectual insight became general in Europe, inculcating more liberal religious views. This psychological attitude, with increasing indifference to religion and resultant skepticism, caused religious questions to be regarded less seriously, making further wars for such purposes impossible. The basal reason, therefore, was the intellectual realization of the foolishness of bloodshed on account of difference of religious convictions; that is, lack of knowledge of this fact in the past—in short, ignorance—was at the bottom of it all, as of most evils in the world.

COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR AND THE EUROPEAN WAR.

In order to learn what suggestions from the Thirty Years' War may be of use around the peace table at Paris, it will be well to mention the general similarities and differences between this war and the recent European war.

The similarities are as follows:

1. The Thirty Years' War began with the throwing out of a window (defenstration) of detested persons; the European war started from an assassination.

2. The Thirty Years' War had been expected for some time; a general European war had been predicted for many years.

3. The Thirty Years' War, beginning with a local incident, spread from country to country, just like the European war did.

4. The Thirty Years' War was exceedingly brutal for its generation, just as the European war has been for our time.

5. The Thirty Years' War was a very long one for its generation; the European war has been a relatively long one for recent times.

As to the differences between the two wars, it may be said that—

1. In the Thirty Years' War both belligerents finally proved to be nearly equal in strength. In the European war one of the belligerents, though at first meeting with reverses, in the end completely overcame the other.

2. The Thirty Years' War ended in the exhaustion of both belligerents; the European war closed with the exhaustion of only one belligerent.

3. The Thirty Years' War was waged for religious convictions rather than for gain; the European war was not so ideal in its purposes.

Taking a general view of the similarities and differences between the two wars, the one great question arises: Is the experience of the present European war strong enough for victors and vanquished alike to be willing to yield sufficient of their natural rights and sovereignty to submit all questions of war to some superior international court from which there is no appeal?

In the Thirty Years' War nothing further was necessary; the exhaustion of both belligerents was sufficient to end religious wars.

As the victorious party in war is much less inclined (if inclined at all) than the conquered foe to yield anything, will the Allies, without the experience of defeat and exhaustion, be willing to yield enough of their sovereignty to make the future peace of the world permanent? Will they be magnanimous and give up some national advantages of the present for future international benefits to all mankind? In short, are they unselfish enough to so temper their justice with mercy as to establish a world peace, the greatest boon to humanity ever known?

Here is a supreme opportunity. Will the victorious Allies arise to the occasion and make future wars improbable, if not impossible? We say "impossible," because if a nation is recalcitrant it can be punished by a general boycott, leading toward its economic ruin. As the instinct of self-preservation is the most powerful influence in nations as well as in individuals, it is a moral certainty that no nation could or would submit very long to such punishment. Just after a war is ended, when the belligerents feel more keenly its effect than later on, they are much more disposed to make mutual concessions. Will the victors of the European War strike at once while the iron is hot, and insist at the outset on the one paramount issue, the absolute prohibition of all wars? Such a decision would radiate through all further proceedings of the peace conference and greatly facilitate its work. By thus making a certainty of the most important question of all history, no matter how difficult and delicate matters of greater or less importance may be, the conference of Paris will have assured its success in advance as the greatest and most beneficent influence that the world has ever experienced, just as the peace of Westphalia was in its generation.

In the peace treaty of Westphalia were these words: "The hostilities that have taken place from the beginning of the late disturbances, in any place of whatsoever kind, by one side or the other, shall be forgotten and forgiven, so that neither party shall cherish enmity or hatred against nor molest nor injure the other for any cause whatsoever." Will the peace treaty of Paris contain as generous and noble words and stop all political wars forever, just as the peace of Westphalia put an end to all religious wars?

Will the twentieth century Christianity, with its supposed greater liberality and enlightenment, be as far-seeing, unselfish, and effective as the Christianity of the seventeenth century?

Let the conference at Paris answer yes.

Just as the spread of education and knowledge has gradually liberated the intellect so as to undermine the ideas upon which religious wars were based, so a similar process of enlightenment may be necessary to cause political wars to cease.

REFERENCES.

The following references are only a few of those easily accessible in libraries. The Cambridge Modern History (vol. 4) has a bibliography of some 3,000 works and brochures on the Thirty Years' War.

Bougeant. Histoire des Guerres et des Négociations qui précéderent le Traité de Westphalie. Paris, 1751.

Bernard, Mountague. Four lectures in subjects connected with diplomacy. London, 1868, 8°. Lecture 1 is entitled "The Congress of Westphalia" (60 pp.); comparison with other congresses is made.

The Cambridge Modern History. The Thirty Years' War, Volume IV. Cambridge, 1906, III, 1,003 pages. It contains a most extensive classified bibliography of the war, filling 150 pages.

Freytag, Gustav. Bilder aus der Deutschen Vergangenheit. Includes chapters on Thirty Years' War.

Gindely, Anton. History of the Thirty Years' War. 2 volumes, New York, 1884.

Hausser, Ludwig. The period of the Reformation, 1517 to 1648 (translation). London, 1873, 8°, 456 pages.

Cust, Edward. Lives of the warriors of the Thirty Years' War. 2 volumes, 12°. London, 1865. The author is a military man.

Leclerc. Négociations sécrètes touchant la Paix de Muenster et d'Osnabrug.

Puetter. Geist des Westphalischen Friedens.

INTERNATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AND PEACE.

(Article (by writer) in Chicago Legal News for May 3, 1919.)

The history of the world would seem to indicate that international psychology is almost synonymous with international anarchy. For the last 30 or more years, as is well known, a general European war was expected, predicted, and feared. This was the abnormal psychological condition of diplomatic and military Europe until the present war caused its realization. The world appears always to have existed in a pathological condition of possible, probable, or actual war. The question is, "Shall the world continue in this old way of international anarchism and political pathology or shall it make a supreme effort to shake off this monstrous incubus of war?"

It is a peculiar circumstance that while anarchism within a nation is generally detested, anarchism between nations has been palatable so long. Cannibalism existed for thousands of years, slavery also, yet both have been practically abandoned, and now there seems to be a chance to do away with the last and greatest enemy of humanity—war. To stop an evil that has existed so long and whose roots reach back into the beginning of history will necessarily require colossal effort and great sacrifice. Such an effort has been successful only once in the history of the world. That was when the Westphalian peace treaty was signed, in 1648, after the Thirty Years' War. (See article (by author) entitled "Suggestions from the Westphalian Peace Treaty for the Peace Conference in France," published in the Journal of Education, Boston, Mar. 27, 1919, and Central Law Journal, St. Louis, Mo., April, 1919; also in Open Court for April, 1919, Chicago.) This resulted in abolishing the most difficult kind of wars—religious wars. If the seventeenth century could accomplish this greater task, certainly the twentieth century should take courage and likewise put an end to political wars, the lesser task. It may not be possible to make war impossible, but this is no reason it should not be tried. It may be possible, however, to make war most improbable.

SCIENTIFIC METHOD IN HISTORY NECESSARY.

In the writing of history a common illusion is to exaggerate the future importance of contemporary events. Both sides in the French Revolution thought that the end of the world had come, as no doubt it had for some. Comparatively few men can get outside of their country and look at things as they are, but very few or none can separate themselves from their generation and look without prejudice into the future. The importance of every great event is usually exaggerated by those immediately interested. From the historical point of view, the degree of importance of current events can not be determined until some time afterwards when the sources are more accessible and it is possible to consider them calmly and from the point of view of strict truth, which is one of the main principles of scientific inquiry. History is continuous and not broken up by what the present generation may think to be a finality or cataclysm; there may be progress or retrogression, but neither is so great as they appear at the time of the events which cause enthusiasm and optimism in the victorious and despair and pessimism in the vanquished. These are temporary phenomena, being only links in the historical chain. The changes after this war back to normal conditions may be much greater and faster than in previous wars. In this connection it must be remembered that the humane spirit is now much more diffused in the world than in the past, which is indicated by the enormous extent of protests against the horrows of war. (See article (by author) in Pacific Medical Journal, San Francisco, Calif., April, 1916, entitled, "Atrocities and Outrages of War," also pamphlet (by author) entitled, "War and Criminal Anthropology," reprinted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Feb. 17 and Mar. 15, 1917, Washington, D. C.). These horrors are common to all wars and were relative as frequent in the past, if not more so. It is true that the absolute number of outrages may have been much greater in the present war than in previous wars, but this is probably due mainly to the enormous number of individuals engaged in the war.

INTERDEPENDENCE OF NATIONS A DEMOGRAPHIC LAW.

The world has become so closely connected through modern means of communication that any war might result in a world war. The prevalent political tendencies are in the direction of combination and resultant consolidation. The question soon arises, Shall combination and regulation go beyond national limits? The old-fashioned ideas of national limits do not seem to be adapted to present conditions. Commercially such limits are impracticable and appear to be so in other ways. (Woolf, L. S., International Government, Fabian Research Department, London.) The Constitution of the United States has 18 amendments. This demographic law of interdependence of nations necessarily results in combination, which eventually may lead to international solidarity.

Whether we will or no, this demographic law of interdependence of nations can not be escaped. Just as the States of the Union are now closer together than their counties were many years ago, through the enormous development of physical means of communication, so governments are now brought more closely in contact than were the States at the time of the formation of the Union. This demographic law of increasing interdependence when carefully examined appears to be almost as necessary as the law of gravity. It has been at work ever since history began and, though little noticed perhaps, it has been manifesting itself more and more as history advanced. The individual is subordinate to the community and must yield some of his sovereignty to it, the community in turn must yield to the county, the county to the State, the State to the Nation, and finally the Nation to the world. This last step is the one now pending in Europe, and eventually, if not presently, may result in international solidarity, which will practically put an end to political wars just as the Westphalian peace did with religious wars.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND DEMOGRAPHIC LAW OF INTERDEPENDENCE OF STATES.

The tendency toward this demographic law of interdependence of States is shown by the large number of international organizations such as congresses or conferences which are held from time to time in different countries of the world. From the Conference of Vienna (1815) to the present time there have been some two hundred or more international congresses, the majority of which had to do with regulation of economic and sociologic affairs. Thus manufacturers, merchants, and capitalists of different countries have met and made agreements to control and regulate production and distribution of merchandise.

There is also the Universal Postal Union, which is an illustration of international control or government. Objections are sometimes made against international government, which were made years ago against the International Postal Union. It now has a constitution obeyed by all nations. Refusal to obey would deprive a country of the benefits of the union. As a matter of fact, no country has done this.

POWER OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

If there were an international organization for war as well as for postage, and one or two nations should refuse to obey the decisions of a majority, or three-fourths of the organization, each of these recalcitrant nations could be boycotted economically and in many other ways by the remaining member nations. It is very doubtful if any nation would take such chances.

Any international organization helps toward peace by making action less precipitate, for if it were known in advance that a conference were to take place, this would tend to make nations less disposed to go to war. In fact, all international conferences, like the International Congress of Criminal Anthropology, tend to intellectual, moral, and sociological solidarity between nations, in accordance with our demographic law of interdependence. (See Equation of law later on.) This International Congress of Criminal Anthropology, for instance, consists of some four hundred university specialists in anthropology, medicine, psychology, and sociology, who come from almost all countries of the world.

In the eighteenth century international relations consisted of diplomatic conversations and were regulated by an occasional treaty, but, owing to the very inadequate means of communication, few international relations were required. In the nineteenth century the change in international conditions was very great. When international organizations represent some actual phase of life, whether educational, commercial, or scientific, they really regulate their relations between nations and are often organs of international government. In short, international conferences and congresses act like legislatures between nations.

If conferences had been in vogue and one had been held concerning the dispute between Austria and Serbia, very probably there would not have been any war, because, if for no other reason, the diplomats would have seen that it might lead to a general war in Europe, and as no nation cared to take that responsibility the diplomatic procedure would doubtless have been modified. Thus the conference over the Morocco question killed it as a cause of war.

This and other practical examples of government between nations show that the great success, convenience, and benefit to all nations encourage the further development of international organizations. The difficulties and dangers predicted have not come to pass. International administration has come in the cases of railroads, ships, and automobiles. An elaborate international government has come (through treaties) in public health and epidemics, and international notification of the presence of disease has been made obligatory.

SOVEREIGNTY DECREASES ACCORDING TO THE DEMOGRAPHIC LAW OF INTERDEPENDENCE OF NATIONS.

The old idea of the independence of the State, mingled with that of sovereignty, prestige, and honor, and exaggerated by false patriotism, although limited more and more by conditions of civilization, is one of the main obstacles to the development of international organization and government.

The habit of holding conferences or congresses would get the people to expect international government and insist on it, and any country would hesitate long before refusing to agree to a conference.

The idea that sovereignty is destroyed because a nation is not absolutely independent belongs to the old régime, when many modern means of communication did not exist. In those days of comparative isolation there was reason for much independence, but now countries are so closely connected, as we have seen, that their independence and sovereignty are necessarily limited, while their interdependence has increased to such an extent that what benefits or injures one benefits or injures the other. Thus it is to the advantage of each State to give up some of its sovereignty, just as it is for the individual to give up some of his freedom to the community for privileges much greater than the loss of his so-called independence. It is well known how the States of our Union have gradually yielded more and more of their sovereignty to the Federal Government. Thus sovereignty decreases according to our law of the interdependence of States.

CAUSE OF WAR NOT NECESSARILY ECONOMIC.

It is frequently asserted that after all the main cause of most wars is rivalry in trade and commercial friction; in short, it is economic. But it is a curious fact that commerce and industry are the most insistent on international rules or law to reduce all friction to a minimum, for peaceful trading is a general benefit to all concerned.

It might be stated in this connection that in historical and political as well as physical science there is no one cause of anything, but a chain of causes; for the more we study the world the closer we find it related; nothing is nor can be really alone. When we single out a cause we mean the predominant one, and which is the strongest link in the chain of causes becomes a matter of opinion, owing to our limited knowledge of international psychology.

Commercial systems of the world have brought nations closer together, but political relations have remained much the same; that is, the advances in diplomacy have been very few in comparison with the growth of economic relations which makes for peace rather than war.

NO INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENT; NO LASTING PEACE.

That the lack of international government means international anarchy may be illustrated by some recent events. Owing to the struggle of Serbia for expansion, Austria feared the seizure of its own territory and loss of some of its population, and so refused to accept mediation, because the Hapsburg monarchy being reported declining, she must counteract this impression by showing vigorous action. The success of Austria would be regarded by Russia as a threat to herself, but a defeat of Austria by Russia would be a defeat for Germany, and a German defeat for Russia and France would be regarded as a defeat for England. Thus the lack of any international government or organization made cooperation for peace almost, if not quite, impossible. England might have said to herself, among other reasons, "If I stay out of the war, Germany may overrun France and Belgium, resulting in a union of the French and German Navies, but we are an island, and it would not do to risk the danger of such a combination."

Frontier questions have perhaps been the main cause of more wars in history than anything else. But in the course of events such questions have come to be settled without resort to force, which is a change from national to international government.

NATIONALISM MAY CONFLICT WITH THE PEOPLES' INTEREST.

Another nationalistic anachronism is the geographical standard in governmental matters. But intercommunications are so many and so close that geographical relations have few reasons to be considered. Individual and racial interests are less geographical and more sociological. But governmental matters have not developed near so fast as sociological conditions.

Nationalism more often represents the interests of the few rather than the many. Unfortunately it is easy to bolster up a narrow and selfish nationalism by appeal to the patriotism of the masses who fail to understand the conditions and support the interests of a few against their own vital interests. While anarchy between nations (nationalism) makes future wars probable, anarchy within nations can be easily stopped by doing justice to the masses.

WAR WORST METHOD OF SETTLING DIFFICULTIES.

An egotistical, selfish, and narrow nationalism, the basis of international anarchy, has been demonstrated a partial, if not complete, failure by the condition in which Europe is to-day. War, though only one of many methods for settling difficulties between nations, has, nevertheless, been the main one. There is a strong desire among the people to substitute some other method.

Generally a nation has two things to consider—one is what it wants; the other whether it can enforce its wants. This is the usual nationalistic dilemma, but our demographic law of the interdependence of nations assumes that each country will respect the other countries and be willing to consider their wishes at least in vital matters.

Where the differences between two nations have threatened the peace of Europe it has been felt that such a matter was more than a national question; in fact, passed over into the international realm, and so conferences have been called which to a certain extent recognized the principle of interdependence and have enforced its decisions by blockade if not by more warlike means. If a nation adopt the methods of force, it is appealing to international anarchy, which causes nations to break international law much more readily than otherwise. In fact, military necessity knows no law.

It may seem odd that conferences are so often called for war instead of for peace. But it is necessity that often rules; the wheel in the machine is not examined until it is out of order, human beings were never studied scientifically until they became lunatics or criminals. So peace seems to have been little thought of until danger of war appeared. Peace is like good health, we do not know its value until we lose it.

SECRET DIPLOMACY INSIDIOUS.

All treaties between nations should be published in order to make the diplomacy of intrigue and deception impossible or at least most difficult to carry into effect. Secret diplomacy enables those who want war to bring something to light suddenly and cause excitement and fear among the people and thus drive them into war before they understand what they are doing. The psychology of fear shows its power in producing apprehension by catch phrases, such as "the crisis is acute," or "there is panic on the stock exchange," or "negotiations may come to an end," or "an ultimatum has been sent." Patriotic as well as fear inspiring phrases are published broadcast leading the people into war, but they must always be made to believe that it is in defense of their country, whether it is or not.

But open diplomacy and international conferences prevent insidious methods of producing excitement; they also give the people time to think and avoid precipitate action; also facts are brought to light that otherwise might have been concealed by those desiring war.

COMPETITIVE ARMAMENTS LEAD TO WAR.

Competitive armaments, for which the masses are compelled to pay and by which they are killed, hasten the probability of future wars. Great armaments lead to competitive armament, which experience shows to be no guaranty of peace, for it makes a nation feel so well prepared for war that when a dispute arises, and it is thought a few days' delay may give the enemy an advantage that might never be regained, the enemy must be attacked at once. Thus Austria refused to extend time to Serbia nor would she take part in a conference of ambassadors nor respond to the Serbian note to refer the dispute to The Hague. So Germany refused a similar proposal to the Czar on July 29 and allowed Russia but 12 hours to answer the ultimatum. Russia had begun to mobilize and Germany's fear, if the proposal for pacific settlement were accepted, Russia would get the start and gain a military advantage probably caused Germany to strike at once. Thus such preparedness actually prevented any chance for even discussion of a peaceful settlement. Also the knowledge that Russia's Army and Navy were to be increased and strategic railroads built and that France was about to reintroduce three years' military service may have caused Germany to think it imprudent to delay an inevitable war any longer.

PERMANENT PEACE HINDERED BY SPIRIT OF HATE.

There can be no permanent peace so long as the idea of crushing this or that nation prevails. The question is not national, but international. The nationalistic spirit of hate may be temporarily useful in stirring up a country to fight better, but it does not tend toward a lasting peace. In the study of war we should seek the causes, be impersonal, and neither condone nor accuse. The scientific investigation of war comes under the head of criminal anthropology, one of the purposes of which is by knowledge gained to lessen or stop war permanently rather than discuss the ethics of war involving the spirit of hate and vengeance.

NO PERMANENT PEACE WITH NATIONALISM ALONE.

The existing conditions between nations are somewhat like as if a State had rules and laws as to what to do when murder and riot occur, but no laws to prevent murder and riot, or, if there were laws, no power to execute them.

From the theoretical point of view these irrational and abnormal conditions are evident, and yet they have been considered normal conditions for ages. This is indicated by the remark of a diplomat, who said: "Things are getting back to a wholesome state again, every nation for itself and God for us all." As long as such an extreme and pathological form of nationalism exists no permanent peace is probable, if not impossible. Nationalism has had a long trial with comparative freedom, and one of its grand finales is the present European war.

A FEW SUGGESTIONS FOR PERMANENT PEACE.

It would go far beyond the purpose of this article to discuss the many methods proposed for establishing permanent peace, yet one may be allowed merely to note a few points. There might be established an international high court to decide judicial issues between independent sovereign nations and an international council to secure international legislation and to settle nonjudicial issues. Also, an international secretariat should be established. Some fundamental principles of such international control might be to disclaim all desire or intention of aggression, to pursue no claim against any other independent state; not to send any ultimatum or threat of military or naval operations or do any act of aggression, and never to declare war or order any general mobilization or violate the territory or attack the ships of another state,

except in way of repelling an attack actually made; not to do any of these until the matter in dispute has been submitted to the international high court or to the international council, and not until a year after the date of such submission.

PROHIBITIONS FOR RECALCITRANT STATES.

In order to enforce the decrees of the international high court against any recalcitrant State an embargo on her ships and forbidding her landing at any capital might be initiated. Also there might be instituted prohibition of postal and telegraph communication, of payment of debts due to citizens, prohibition of all imports and exports and of all passenger traffic; to level special duties on goods to such State and blockade her ports. In short, an effort should be made to enforce complete nonintercourse with any recalcitrant State.

Should a State proceed to use force to go to war rather than obey the decree of the international high court all the other constituent States should make common cause against such State and enforce the order of the international high court.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL MOMENT FOR PREVENTING WAR IS SOON AFTER WAR.

If an absolute agreement among leading nations of the world never to resort to war could be obtained at the outset all other questions could be settled more justly and with fewer difficulties, for the consciousness that the supreme question was out of the way would relieve the psychological tension and afford opportunity for a more calm and careful consideration and adjudication of all other matters in dispute. It would be like the consciousness of the lawyer, when having lost his case in all other courts is content to let the United States Supreme Court settle it forever. This is due to the psychological power of the radiation of justice from the top downward.

Such an absolute and final agreement never to resort to war can be best accomplished right after the war, when all are sick of war and the very thought of it causes the suffering, wounded, and bleeding people to turn their heads significantly away with a profound instinctive feeling, crying out that anything is better than to go back to the old régime. In such a state of mind mutual concessions are much easier to make than later on.

The psychological moment to prevent such suffering of the masses from ever occurring again is soon after the war. It is a sad comment that the number and untold suffering of millions of human beings seem to have been required for the nationalistic spirit of Europe to be willing to follow international humanitarian ideas toward establishing permanent peace in the world.

THE HAGUE RULES ONLY SUGGESTIONS.

The diplomats who wrote the rules at The Hague Convention knew well that they might be more or less disregarded; they were only suggestions. As war assumes the right to kill human beings, what rights, then, have the victims left over that are worth mentioning? As to what way they are killed there is little use of considering, probably the quicker the better, for there is less suffering. If prisoners must starve, it is a mercy to shoot them. To regulate murder of human beings is more or less humbug. The thing to do is to try to abolish international anarchy and slaughter forever, and to accomplish this the egotism, selfishness, and narrowness of nations must be so modified that they are willing to make the necessary sacrifice.

EQUATION OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC LAW OF INTERDEPENDENCE OF NATIONS.

As already noted, our demographic law of the interdependence of nations is, that increase in the means of communication between States causes increase of their interdependence but decrease in their sovereignty. Just as a physical body consists of molecules of various kinds, so the State may be regarded as a psychological entity with citizens of various characteristics, and just as the density of a body is equal to its mass divided by its volume, so the density of citizenship is equal to the population divided by the land area.

If, therefore, we consider the States' adult population, as its mass (m) and the resultant aggregate increase of its means of communication as its velocity (v), and (t) as the time, then the psychological force (F) or interdependence of the State can be expressed by the familiar equation in physics F=mv/t; that is to say, the interdependence of a State is equal to its adult population (mass) multiplied by the resultant aggregate increase of its means of communication (velocity) and the product divided by the time (t).

The poundal unit of physical force is such a force as will move 1 pound (mass unit) at a velocity of 1 foot per second in one second of time.

Now, assuming the unit of citizenship of a State to be one citizen and the unit of the resultant aggregate increase of means of communication per annum in one year of time to be K, then

The statal unit of psychological force is such a force as will give one citizen (mass unit) one K unit (for convenience the K unit of annual aggregate increase of means of communication can be expressed in per cents. Taking some of the principal means of communication, and working out their annual average per cents of increase, we have for the United States during the census periods (1900–1910); annual average increase of passengers on railroads, 7 per cent; on street and electric railways, 3 per cent (1907–1912); of telegraph messages sent, 6 per cent; of telephone stations, 10 per cent. Combining these, the per cent of annual average aggregate increase will be 6.5 per cent, as value of K, assuming the percentages are equally weighted) of resultant aggregate increase of means of communication per annum in one year of time.

As yet there is no exact way to measure the sovereignty and means of communication of the State, but the psychological side of this physical equation may suggest a working hypothesis for our demographic law of the interdependence of States which may some time be useful in the realm of international psychology.

To measure the aggregate influence upon citizens of the many means of communication in a State (also, for illustration merely, let us take one of the principal means of communication, as steam railroads, and we find that the annual average increase in passenger-train-car miles for one citizen of the United States, from 1908 to 1914, to be 4.45, which is the value of K for steam railroads alone for period mentioned. In a later article the author will consider in detail the practical application of the equation) as steam, street and electric railways, telegraph and telephones, will require exact detailed knowledge of the mental, moral, and physical power of the individual citizen, the unit of the social organism. Such measurements might be made when psychology and sociology become sciences in the rigid sense. The underlying hypothesis in this equation is that both the psychological and physical mechanism of the world are under one fundamental law. (See article (by author) entitled "Anthropology of Modern Civilized Man" in Medical Fortnightly and Laboratory News, St. Louis, Mo., April, 1919; also chapter on "Emil Zola" in Senate Document (by author) No. 532, 60th Cong., 1st sess.)

If the reader believes the general ideas set forth in this study, let him or her aid the writer in a practical way and send a contribution to help circulate these ideas, not only in English and other languages but in other countries as well as the United States.

The address of the author is: The Congressional, 100 East Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.

—

LAWS OF REVOLUTIONS.

(Article (by writer) in Journal of Education, Boston, Mass., for Dec. 26, 1918.)

Scientific history teaches that without war many revolutions could never have taken place. One of the greatest problems of future government is to reconcile democratic equality with hereditary inequality among the people. Governments differ much more in form than in substance, and make progress when the resultant activities of the citizens direct and control them.

With this in mind, a few principles of revolutions may be instructive in connection with the present European situation.

1. The causes of revolutions are summed up in the word "discontent," which must be general and accompanied with hope in order to produce results.

2. Modern revolutions appear to be more abrupt than ancient. Contrary to expectation, conservative people may have the most violent revolutions, because of not being able to adapt themselves to changes of environment.

3. Revolution owes its power to the unchaining of the people, and does not take place without the aid of an important fraction of the army, which usually becomes disaffected by power of suggestion.

4. The triumphant party will organize according to whether the revolution is effected by soldiers, radicals, or conservatives.

5. The violence is liable to be great if a belief as well as material interests are being defended.

6. For ideas which cause violent contradictions are matters of faith, rather than of knowledge.

7. If the triumphant party go to extremes, bordering upon absurdities, they are liable to be turned down by the people.

8. Most revolutions aim to put a new person in power, who usually tries to establish an equilibrium between the struggling factions, and not be too much dominated by any one class.

9. The rapidity of modern revolutions is explained by quick methods of publicity, and the slight resistance and ease with which some governments have been overturned is surprising, indicating blind confidence and inability to foresee.

10. Governments sometimes have fallen so easily that they are said to have committed suicide.

11. Revolutionary organizations are impulsive, though often timid, and are influenced by a few leaders, who may cause them to act contrary to the wishes of the majority. Thus royal assemblies have destroyed empires and humanitarian legislatures have permitted massacres.

12. When all social restraints are abandoned, and instinctive impulses are allowed full sway, there is danger of return to barbarianism. For the ancestral ego (inherent in everyone) is let loose.

13. A country will prosper in proportion that the really superior persons rule, and this superiority is both moral and mental.

14. If certain social tendencies appear to lower the power of mind, they, nevertheless, may lessen injustice to the weaker classes; and if it be a choice between mentality and morality, morality should be preferred.

15. A financial aristocracy does not promote much jealousy in those who hope to form a part of it in the future.

16. Science has caused many things once held to be historical to be now considered doubtful. Thus it is asked—

17. Would not the results of the French Revolution, which cost so much bloodshed, have been obtained without violence later, through gradual evolution? And were the results of the French Revolution worth the cost of the terrible barbarism and suffering that took place?

18. To understand the people in a revolution we must know their history.

19. The accumulated thought, feeling, and tradition of a nation constitute its strength, which is its national spirit. This must not be too rigid, nor too malleable. For, in the first place, revolution means anarchy, and, in the second place, it results in successive revolutions.

—

WAR AND PEACE STUDIES.

By the Author.

Peace, War, and Humanity. Printed by Judd & Detweiler, Washington, D. C., 26 pages, 1915, 8°.

Comparative Militarism. Reprint from publications of the American Statistical Association, Boston, December, 1915, 3 pages, 8°.

Atrocities and Outrages of War. Reprint from the Pacific Medical Journal, San Francisco, April, 1916, 16 pages, 8°. Gives data for Civil War, Boer War, Bulgaria, and Russia and Germany, 16 pages, 8°.

Some Moral Evils of War. Reprint from Pacific Medical Journal, San Francisco, August, 1916, 8 pages, 8°. Refers especially to Boer War.

Reasons for Peace. Machinists' Monthly Journal, Washington, D. C., July, 1916, pages 708–710, 8°.

Choosing Between War and Peace. Reprint from Western Medical Times, Denver, Colo., 6 pages, 8°.

Statement of European War. Reprint from Pacific Medical Journal, San Francisco, Calif., February, 1917, 8 pages, 8°.

Prevention of War. Reprint from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Washington, D. C., February 27, 1917, 8 pages, 8°; also, reprint 7 pages, 8°.

Military Training in the Public Schools. Educational Exchange, Birmingham, Ala., February and March, 1917.

War and Criminal Anthropology. Published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 27 and March 15, 1917.

Our National Defense. Testimony of American officers as to difficulties of invasion, and our coast defenses. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 15, 1917; also, reprint, 10 pages, 8°.

Identification of Soldiers After Death and Head Measurements. Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, June 13, 1918; also, reprint 8 pages, 8°.

Revolutions. Journal of Education, Boston, Mass., December 26, 1918, 4°.

Anthropometry of Soldiers. Medical Record, New York City, December 14, 1918; also, reprint 17 pages, 12°; also, in Our State Army and Navy, Philadelphia, April, 1919.

Psychology of Swiss Soldiers. Arms and the Man, Washington, D. C., 1918; also, in Journal of Medicine and Surgery, Nashville, Tenn., March, 1919.

International Psychology and Peace. Chicago Legal News, May 1, 1919.
Suggestions of the Peace Treaty of Westphalia for the Peace Conference in France. Journal of Education, Boston, Mass., March 27, 1919; also, in Open Court, April, 1919; also (in German) Milwaukee Herold. April, 1919; also (in Norwegian) in Amerika, May 16, Madison, Wis.; in "La Prenso" (Spanish), San Antonio, Tex., Lunes 19 de Mayo de 1919; "Nardoni List" (Croatian), June 8, 1919; also in "Rivista d'Ialia," Milano, April, 1919.
Disequilibrium of Mind and Nerves in War. Medical Record, New York City, May 3, 1919; also, reprint, 12 pages, 12°.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] is entitled to the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	France	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Ball	Gerry	Phelan	Stanley
Calder	Henderson	Phipps	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Pomerene	Thomas
Curtis	King	Ransdell	Trammell
Dillingham	Kirby	Robinson	Wadsworth
Fall	La Follette	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	McKellar	Smith, Ariz	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-one Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CAPPER, Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. STERLING, Mr. WALSH of Montana, and Mr. WARREN answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON, Mr. HARDING, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. KNOX, Mr. ELKINS, and Mr. FERNALD entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After some delay, Mr. KELLOGG, Mr. LODGE, Mr. SMOOT, Mr. BECKHAM, Mr. MCCUMBER, and Mr. GAY entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, in considering this report we should not mislead ourselves at all as to what the Army is to be. It is 240,000 men; that is all. The "average" proposition counts for nothing, except to let us understand that for the next three months we are demobilizing troops. What we are really to have is an army of 240,000 men the last nine months of this year.

Mr. President, I think it is as unwise a performance to limit the Army to 240,000 men for the last nine months of this year as it was in 1916 not to create an army. If we had had any vision in 1916, we would have created an army; and if we had created an army of 750,000 men then, we would have ended the war in 1917, and the cost to the country and the loss of life would have been vastly less than it was.

Mr. President, I desire to discuss this subject really at an hour when Senators are not at dinner.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. KING. This is a very important question. I confess I did not know that the reduction was to the low level indicated by the Senator from Georgia. In the light of his statement, I feel that it is so important that other Senators ought to be present to listen, if not to participate in the discussion.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Why should we not take a recess?

Mr. KING. I was going to suggest a recess until we have dinner.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a question. Does he intend to resist the adoption of the conference report?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I shall submit my views to the Senate and vote against it myself.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator proposes to vote against the conference report?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. And to speak in advance of the vote?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. KING. I ask, if the Senator from Georgia will pardon me, if the Senator having this bill in charge will not consent to a recess until eight o'clock?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think I had better state the situation frankly to the Senate.

It is expected that the sundry civil bill will be here at half past eight; and I had intended to ask for a recess until that time, not knowing that the Senator from Georgia had not spoken. When that bill comes over and is disposed of, nothing will then remain but the enrollment and signature of the bills, and I shall have the concurrent resolution from the House, which I am told they are passing now, for a week's recess; and I am afraid that if we do not go on and finish the Army bill the whole thing may fail. I do not think we ought to waste the time. If there are to be more speeches, I am perfectly willing to stay here and call for a quorum.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will go on now, under the circumstances. What I desired to do was to emphasize the proposition that we are reducing the Army to 240,000 men, and that the other figures are mere incidents to demobilization.

In 1916, Mr. President, we left ourselves without an Army. What is the situation at present? There are 21 wars going on in Europe, so I see it stated upon the authority of Bonar Law in the afternoon paper.

What is the situation in Mexico? In 60 days, at almost any time, we may be called upon to protect the American interests there. Some of us think there have been a number of occasions already when it might have been done with propriety. I am one of them.

If we adopt the league of nations, the responsibility is on us to take care of the territory of Poland, Roumania, and both the Slav countries, and they are all in war to-day. If we do not adopt it, then easily we may be drawn into trouble in Europe or elsewhere.

We know the situation in the Orient, with Japan taking over 40,000,000 of Chinamen, and an intense feeling existing there. I think it is a lack of intelligence on our part—of vision, to put it mildly—to reduce the Army, under these circumstances, to 240,000 men. At least we ought to keep an Army of 400,000 men for the next 12 months. When these conditions change, we may come to a permanent Army of 240,000 men or less; but to-day the world is in a state of disturbance. Germany has signed terms of peace; that is true; but Austria has not.

Mr. KING. Nor Bulgaria, nor Turkey.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Nor Bulgaria, nor Turkey. Why, Senators, we have built up an Army; we have gone to an enormous expense to do so; we have spent great sums of money, on account of the rapidity with which it had to be done, and on account of not realizing the danger at least 12 months before it came upon us. If we had organized in 1916 an Army of 500,000 men advocated at the time by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], who sits in the chair, and by myself, when we opposed an Army bill that contemplated the enlargement of the Army during a five-year period, insisting that what we needed was an Army immediately, not five years off, we would have saved to our country at least half the cost that this war has brought on us; we would have saved probably three-fourths of it; and, still more important, we would have saved many, many lives.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope the Senator will emphasize the fact that it is not the fault of the Senate that this reduction has been made. The bill reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs recognized the importance and seriousness of the condition which the Senator has so eloquently described. It presented for the consideration of the Senate a very different bill, a bill which was cut to the bone as far as existing conditions justified the cutting, but which by no means recognized or made possible the unfortunate action of the committee of conference, which I understand to be the only and the best thing we can hope for. The Senate has done its duty.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes, Mr. President; but I think the Senate should insist still further, and I believe that if we should reject the conference report and let the Members of the House understand that we vision the situation, and can not submit to such legislation, we may then pass the legislation we believe to be essential. I think we had better give up our recess for the present week, and stay here and press this proposition upon the House, and win it.

Poland is involved in several wars—on the east, two; on the west, certainly one; Roumania in several; Serbia in several; the Czecho-Slovaks are in conflict; Russia is in a state of turmoil. I do not know whether we are engaged in war with Russia or not. We have had troops in Russia, fighting. No peace has been concluded. No peace has been concluded with Austria; none with Turkey.

The War Department may have lacked vision in 1916, but the War Department has asked for 500,000 men at the present time. The War Department is not chargeable with lack of appreciation of the situation. In the bill as it stands we have cut the recommendation of the War Department down more than half. We have practically scrapped what we have done during the past two years. We have put our organization where it is worth little, except for police purposes here at home, and not quite big enough for that. The voice of the United States will be little heeded abroad if we again show our indisposition to be prepared for emergencies.

I wish to enter my earnest protest against such a course. I understand we are told that the House will not agree to the figures presented by the Senate. I thought the Senate figures were a little too conservative when the bill was brought in by the committee, but I do believe we should not yield to less than the Senate figures; and a discussion of the subject and a presentation of the subject would make the House realize that there might be a hysteria for a false economy.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. KING. I agree with very much of what the Senator has said. I do not quite agree with all of the implications of the last statement. We have exhibited in this bill a hysterical tendency toward economy that I do not think is warranted; but in other bills that we have passed we have shown a devotion to extravagance, and to the building up of bureaus and agencies and executive instrumentalities, that was wholly unworthy a proper spirit of economy, and shows that we have not the perspective to differentiate between proper economy and false economy. In this bill I think we are pursuing a course that is injurious to our country, to its peace and to its welfare. In other bills we have exhibited an extravagance, a false conception of the obligations resting upon us, which I think is quite inexcusable.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am very much opposed to any action that reduces our Army to 240,000 men at this time. I think it would be better for us to stay here and keep up a struggle with the House rather than to put the Army at 240,000.

CANTONMENTS.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there was a provision in the bill, which the Senate committee put in, to the effect that where Government work was in process of construction and where there was a necessity for its completion it could be completed. That has been stricken out. Nothing of that kind can be done now, except for industrial plants, unless the completion is to salvage the enterprise.

Mr. President, we have built a number of cantonments that ought not to be scrapped. We have built a number of cantonments that are valuable for use even in time of peace.

These cantonments in many instances have taken over small farms of valuable land. They have destroyed their value for anything except cantonment purposes. They have macadamized the farms. They have transformed them into rock and sand.

May I ask the Senator from New York what became of the appropriation for vocational training?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The House appropriated $10,500 for vocational training of soldiers of the Army. I need not remind the Senator that that vocational training under the statute must be offered to every soldier in the Army, and of course the item was utterly inadequate and meant that there would be none. The Senate passed it at $5,000,000, and the best the Senate conferees could bring the House to was $2,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. These cantonments are splendid places for the conduct of these schools for privates. Of course hereafter, where it is found advisable, these pieces of ground can be bought, but if you turn them back to their owners the damage done the property is equivalent to its value. Your options in many instances would buy the land upon which the Government has erected buildings, making them permanent Government property for as little as it would cost to pay the damage, for where you change a farm into a body of sand and rock by macadamizing it you have destroyed it for any use except the new use to which you have put it.

The Senate very wisely put in a clause that permitted the purchase of tracts of land under such conditions. I presume even if the law is left as it is the department will not proceed at once to salvage these cantonments and undertake to settle for the damage done to the lands, which will be equivalent to the value of the lands, but will wait for further action by Congress.

CAMP BENNING.

A good deal of prejudice was gotten up on account of a camp in my own State, Camp Benning. This prejudice is largely due to lack of correct information. I wish to refer to that and to ask for the privilege of putting in the RECORD in connection with my remarks some records on the subject.

Let us see what that camp was for. It was for the joint practice in small arms, grenades, cavalry, machine guns, and tanks. It was to bring together all branches of the Infantry and all the Infantry into one camp, to train it together. At whose instance was it done? At the instance of Gen. Pershing.

I ask leave to print from Gen. Pershing his urgent request to the War Department starting back in the latter part of 1917 and pressing upon the staff here continually the necessity for organizing training schools in rifles, in small arms, and a training school of the character which was establishing at Benning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The military necessities are illustrated from the official cables of Gen. Pershing on the subject, beginning almost with his first cable to this side, No. 85, of August 8, 1917.

"Paragraph 3. Study here shows value and desirability of retaining our existing small arms target practice courses. In view of great difficulty in securing ranges in France due to density of the population and cultivation recommend as far as practicable the complete courses be given in United States before troops embark. Special emphasis should be placed on rapid fire."

Again, on September 25, 1917, cable No. 178:

"Paragraph 1. Referring paragraph 3 my number 85, longer experience conditions in France confirms my opinion highly important Infantry soldiers should be excellent shots. Thorough instruction and range practice prescribed our small arms firing manual very necessary. Our allies now fully realize their deficiency in rifle training. Difficult secure areas for target ranges in France even now when crops off ground. Much greater difficulty soon when plowing begins. After ground secured in France considerable time required for troops to construct ranges and improvise target material. In theater active operations this time should be available for intensive training new weapons and formations. Therefore strongly renew my previous recommendations that all troops be given complete course rifle practice prescribed our firing manual before leaving United States. Specialty of trench warfare instruction at home should not be allowed to interfere with rifle practice nor with intensive preliminary training in our schools of soldiers, companies, and battalions."

Again, on October 21, 1917, his cable No. 228:

"Paragraph 16. * * * Recommend that instruction of divisions in United States be conducted with a view to developing the soldiers physically and in knowledge of sanitation, inculcating high standards of discipline, producing superior marksmanship both on the range and in field firing exercises in large bodies. Close adherence is urged to the central idea that the essential principles of war have not changed, that the rifle and bayonet are still the supreme weapons of the infantry soldier and that the ultimate success of the Army depends upon their proper use in open warfare. * * *"

The next is dated December 22, 1917, his No. 408:

"Paragraph 1. Reference training of troops in United States, deficiencies noted here indicated, first, great laxity on the part of division and brigade commanders in requiring officers to learn their duties or to perform them efficiently; second, almost total failure to give any instructions in principles of minor tactics and their practical application to war conditions. Officers, from colonels down and including some general officers, are found ignorant of the handling of units in open warfare, including principles of reconnaissance, outpost, advance guard, solution of practical problems, and formation of attack; third, no training whatever has been given in musketry efficiency as distinguished from individual target practice on the range. Many officers of high rank are hopelessly ignorant of what this training consists of.

"Subparagraph B. Suggest that important work in practical application of tactics and thorough training in musketry for all units be taken by Maj. Gen. John F. Morrison, and that these subjects be presented to our troops in great detail by his office; also that all officers of whatever rank, including those in Regular Army, be held up to a high standard of accomplishment. Many of our high regular officers do not know how to instruct men practically and they should either be compelled to learn or be removed.

"Subparagraph C. I would recommend Maj. Gen. Richard M. Blatchford, National Army, as assistant to Maj. Gen. John F. Morrison as Gen. Blatchford's experience in musketry should be invaluable. Too much importance can not be placed upon this sort of training as exemplified in our school of musketry at Fort Sill, Okla., the elements of which should be thoroughly pounded into our Infantry. Pershing."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In his testimony before the Military Committee of the Senate Col. Mumma stated:

I might say, by way of diversion, that those duties which were recommended to be placed upon Gen. Morrison and Gen. Blatchford were placed upon Col. Ames and myself, and we were directed to carry out the instructions in the recommendations in this cablegram.

CABLE FROM GEN. PERSHING.

No. 952. APRIL 19, 1918.

Subparagraph 1F. Great battle now raging makes certain that too much trench warfare militates against successful conduct great operations. Morale troops long accustomed duty in trenches lowered thereby. When driven into open men have feeling nakedness and helplessness. Current great battle also emphasizes extraordinary value highly trained riflemen and machine gunners.

Subparagraph 1G. Recommend therefore following outline for training in United States: Thorough instruction in marksmanship to in-

clude known distance firing for all men to 600 yards and in battle practice after method school musketry. Production excellent close-order drill gain of high discipline. Thorough instruction both officers and men in open warfare. Small units should be thoroughly grounded in patrolling in all forms of ——— and in attack and defense of minor warfare. Problems for such should customarily be prepared by next higher commander.

PERSHING.

No. 990. APRIL 25, 1918.

Paragraph 2. Reference target practice have been informed that none of our troops have had practice above 300 yards. Consider this very grave oversight that should be corrected as soon as possible. Target practice should embrace instruction in skirmish firing and practical application of the principles of fire direction, control, and discipline, with especial emphasis upon instruction of your officers in musketry as applied to tactical problem in open warfare. Request advice as to action taken upon above recommendations, and also information regarding what instruction has been carried out in divisions to come over within the next three months.

I will not stop to read what Gen. Pershing says upon the subject, but in several communications, cables to the staff here, he stated that the war must be won in the open field, not in the trenches, and that his officers must be trained in open warfare, with a thorough knowledge of the technic of riflery, single and compact shooting; that it was absolutely essential to train the officers for the service, that they had not been trained, that scarcely any of them had been trained, that he was training them the best he could over in France, but that they needed thorough training at once in this country to become proficient.

The War Department appointed a board to study the question. I have here a statement from military experts showing what was required. It is found in the record of the hearing before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and was presented by Col. Ames. I ask to put it in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

REQUIREMENTS OF A SITE FOR THE INFANTRY SCHOOL OF ARMS.

Climate.—The climate must be such as to permit open-air training the year around. This is necessary on account of the length of the course and the succession of courses necessary for an economical use of the plant. To lose a course during the winter months means the idleness of an expensive plant for at least one-fourth of the time.

There should be an absence of blizzards, hot winds, dust storms, glare, high winds, excessive heat, and excessive cold.

The rainfall should not be excessive, the admissible amount depending largely upon the soil. Rains do not stop work unless the ground becomes miry or water-soaked.

The nights must be reasonably cool in summer because of the classroom work and study periods that are scheduled after dark.

Health.—The locality should be free from endemic diseases, mosquitoes, and other conditions injuriously affecting the health of the troops or difficult or expensive of correction.

Soil.—The soil should be light and porous, sandy enough to avoid mud and mire in rainy weather, but firm enough to stand well in trenches to avoid the expense of revetting.

Cost.—The cost of the land should not exceed an average of about $20 per acre, including improvements except at the cantonment site proper where the cost may be higher.

Urban requirements.—The post should be near enough to a city of at least 25,000 to afford the necessary amusements and relaxation to men and officers as well as to afford a mart in which may be bought those necessaries for personal and community existence. The larger the city the better from a psychological point of view, but from a material point of view it is necessary only that it be large enough for the purposes outlined.

The post should not be more than about 8 miles from the city in order to avoid expense in transportation of persons and materials and to avoid loss of time in transit.

Transportation.—There should be railroads upon the boundaries and through the reservation in order that the expense of truck transportation may be lessened by the use of shuttle trains in distributing students through the area. There should also be enough good roads suitably disposed to facilitate distribution of students by truck and these roads should be firm enough to resist ordinary trucking and inexpensive of repair and reconstruction.

Topography.—The topography of the post site proper should be such as to avoid expensive grading of building sites and roads, but diversified enough to avoid a monotonous aspect. It should be well drained and be adjacent to a suitable site for a target range. (About 5 square miles.)

The requirements of the target range are that it should be level and about 2 miles long at the firing line by ½ of a mile in depth in the direction of fire. The direction of fire should not be within 60° of east nor 90° of west, this direction of fire being a very particular point. It should be toward the north if that direction does not result in making unfavorable the constant winds. Winds should blow from one side rather than in the plane of fire. The soil here is important if the climate is rainy, as the firing lines should be usable immediately after the heaviest rains. Ground water should not exist at less than 5 feet in order that the necessary pits may be dug without excessive expense for draining.

The field firing range should be similar to any good maneuver ground. Diversified with hills, valleys, meadows, villages, streams, roads, etc.

Water.—There should be available on or very near to the building site a supply of not less than 1,000,000 gallons of clear, potable water that may be piped to the site without any unusual cost for piping, treatment, or pumping. Throughout the firing area there should be a number of streams of potable water for use during the day.

Farm lands.—Near the post there should be available an area suitable for truck farms on which the fresh vegetables used by the troops may be grown and pasturage sufficient for the milk herds attached to the post should be available near water and shade.

Geographic location.—In order to avoid expense of transportation of students and of supplies, the school should not be located in the extreme East or West. In order not to lose valuable time in the winter months, it should not be located in the far north. Located in the center of the United States as nearly as may be in view of the other requirements, it should be on at least two railroads with adequate service and schedules, with railroad yards for storing equipment pending a movement of troops, and so located as to avoid the use of Pullman equipment as far as possible.

There should be good markets, refrigeration plants, and like necessities from the viewpoint of subsistence and the general location should be fixed with due regard to the distance from the arsenals and munition factories from which come the bulk of the supplies for the school.

The post proper should not be near, but at the target range, and should be central with relation to the area used for field firing order to minimize the amount of transportation necessary to distribute the classes of their work.

Of all the places examined in the "center of the United States," none approached Columbus in the number of requirements met by the site.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The camp was located as a result of expert study. It has been suggested that political influence had something to do with it. I did not know a study was being made by a board at the time, and I do not know who the officers were on the commission, except as some of their names were mentioned at hearing long after they selected Benning.

Subsequently the subject was submitted to a second board. They visited half a dozen places that had been recommended and confirmed the first report and recommended Benning. Col. Ames inspected Benning, he having had more experience in this line of work than nearly anyone in the army. He approved it. Col. Brookheart and Maj. Critchfield, of the National Guard, experts in this line of work, approved Benning enthusiastically. Gen. Pershing recommended Gen. Blatchford to study the problem and aid. He visited Benning and approved it. So the location was the unanimous choice of different commissions intrusted to find a location best suited for the purposes intended.

Any impression that politics had anything to do with the selection is without foundation. It was entirely the work of members of the staff and officers exercising their best judgment to serve their country.

I have put in the RECORD the report furnished by Col. Ames, of officers showing why this camp should have been selected. I was in Columbus shortly after Congress adjourned, and Col. Ames took me over the camp and showed me his reasons for the selection. I saw a broad area of some 18,000 acres, perfectly level and perfectly suited, without grading, for quarters, and the balance about as changeable as could be, a pretty little valley with hills all around it, gentle slopes, steep slopes, a most varied topography, with ample water, stretching from the riverside.

CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS BEGUN BEFORE ARMISTICE.

Mr. President, when Camp Benning was referred to a few days ago it was stated that the War Department began proceedings after the armistice to condemn this property. That was a mistake. *I have a copy of the procedure instituted by the district attorney to condemn this property. It was filed November 2, 1918. I ask permission to put that into the Record.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PROCEEDINGS TO CONDEMN LAND.

In the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and the western division thereof. The United States of America *v.* One hundred and fifteen thousand acres of land (more or less) in counties of Chattahoochee and Muscogee, Ga., M. A. Anthony and others. No. 42 at law. Original petition to condemn filed in clerk's office November 2, 1918. Hooper Alexander, Esq., United States attorney. Copy for service on W. C. Bradley.

To the district court of said division and district:

The petition of the United States brought by Hooper Alexander, United States attorney for said division and district, acting under the instructions of the Attorney General and at the request of the Secretary of War, respectfully represents to the court as follows:

1. That by an act of Congress approved July 2, 1917, it was provided that hereafter the Secretary of War may cause proceedings to be instituted in the name of the United States in any court having jurisdiction of such proceedings for the acquirement by condemnation of any land needed for the site, location, construction, or prosecution of works for military training camps, such proceedings to be prosecuted in accordance with the laws relating to suits for the condemnation of property of the States wherein the proceedings may be instituted; with a proviso that when the owner of such land shall fix a price for the same which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, shall be reasonable, he may purchase or enter into a contract therefor at such price without further delay; and with a further proviso that when such property is acquired in time of war or the imminence thereof upon the filing of the petition for condemnation of any land for any of the purposes aforesaid, immediate possession thereof may be taken and the lands may be occupied and used for military purposes, and the provision of section 355 of the Revised Statutes, providing that no public money shall be expended upon such land until the written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title, shall be suspended during the period of the existing emergency.

2. That on the 24th of October, 1918, a state of war existed between the United States and the Imperial German Government, and between the United States and the Government of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which state of war still continues.

3. That on the 24th of October, 1918, the Secretary of War elected to cause proceedings to be institute in the name of the United States, in a court having jurisdiction of such proceedings, *for the acquirement by condemnation of the fee simple title* to a large body of land lying in the counties of Muscogee and Chattahoochee, in the State of Georgia, and needed for the site, location, construction, and prosecution of works for a military training camp and camps, and for the purpose of carrying said election into effect did request the Attorney General of the United States to cause condemnation proceedings to be instituted for the acquisition thereof, the need for immediate possession of the same being at that time and now continuing to be urgent.

4. That thereupon, under date of October 25, 1918, the Attorney General directed the United States attorney for the northern district of Georgia, in which district said counties lie, to institute proceedings in accordance with the wishes of the Secretary of War as expressed in the request of October 24, 1918, made as aforesaid by the Secretary of War.

5. Said lands are needed by the United States for the purposes indicated and alleged in the third paragraph of this petition.

6. Included within the body of land which the Secretary of War so desires condemned and acquired, and constituting a part thereof, are certain lands lying in the counties of Muscogee and Chattahoochee, in the State of Georgie, in said Western Division of the northern district of Georgia, included within a boundary described as follows: Commencing at a point in land lot 79 of the seventh land district of Muscogee County where the northern margin of Upatoi Creek intersects with the Chattachoochee River; running thence in a direction generally eastwardly along the northern margin of said Upatoi Creek, upstream and with the meanderings thereof, through lots 79 and 78 of said land district, to the point where the northern margin of said Upatoi Creek intersects the land lot line that divides lots 78 and 83 on the west, from lots 77 and 84 on the east; thence northwardly along said land lot line between lots 59 and 78 on the west, and lots 60 and 77 on the east, to the point at the northeast corner of lot 59, where the Lumpkin Road leaves the land lot line; thence along the Lumpkin Road and with the meanderings thereof, in a direction generally north, through lots 54, 37, 30, 13, and 9, to and across the waters of Bull Creek and to the northern or western margin of said creek; thence in a northeasterly direction along the said northern or western margin of said Bull Creek, to the district line separating lot 9 of said seventh district from fractional lot 85 of the Coweta Reserve; thence easterly along said district line until it reaches the southeastern corner of fractional lot 104 in said Coweta Reserve; thence north along the land-lot line separating fractional lot 104 from fractional lot 105 in said Coweta Reserve, and along the eastern boundary of lots 103, 102, 101, 100, 99, and 98 to the northeastern corner of lot 98; thence west along the northern boundary of lot 98, lot 91, and part of lot 78 to its intersection with Lawyers Lane; thence north and northwest along Lawyers Lane to the Macon Road in land-lot 77; thence northeast along the Macon Road through lots 77, 76, and 93 until it intersects the land-lot line which is the northern boundary of land lot 93 aforesaid; thence eastwardly along said land-lot line, and along the northern boundary of lots 93, 96, 113, 116, 133, 136, and fractional lot 153, to the district line, which is the eastern boundary of the Coweta Reserve; thence north along along said district line a short distance to the southwest corner of lot 10, and the northwest corner of lot 11 in the ninth land district; thence eastwardly along said land-lot line, along the northern boundary of lots 11, 22, 43, 54, and 75 of said ninth district, to the northeastern corner of said lot 75; thence northwardly along the land-lot line, which is the western boundary of lots 87, 88, 89, and 90 of said ninth district, to the northwestern corner of lot 90; thence eastwardly along the land-lot line which is the northern boundary of lots 90, 103, 122, 135, 154, 167, 186, 199, 218, 231, and 250 of said ninth district, to the western boundary of lot 296 in the tenth land district; thence southward along said land-lot line and the eastern bounary of lots 250, 249, 248, 247, 246, 245, and 244, to the waters of Upatoi Creek; thence continuing in said line, across the water of Upatoi Creek and into the county of Chattahoochee, and along the eastern boundary line of lots 243, 242, and 241 of the ninth land district of Chattahoochee County, to the district line which separates the ninth land district from the sixth land district of Chattahoochee County; thence along said district line a short distance eastward to the northeast corner of land lot 33 in said sixth district; thence southward along the land-lot line and eastern boundary of land lots 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42 of said sixth land district of Chattohoochee County and to the southeastern corner of land lot 52; thence west along the land-lot line and the southern boundary of lots 42, 55, 74, and 87 of said sixth land district, to the southwest corner of said land lot 87 and the northeast corner of land lot 107 in said sixth land district; thence south along the land-lot line and along the eastern boundary of lots 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, and 112 of said sixth land district of Chattahoochee County, and continuing along the same line southerly along the eastern boundary of fractional lot 7, and lots 112, 111, 110, 109, and 108 of the thirty-third land district of Chattahoochee County, and to the southeastern corner of lot 108 aforesaid, thence westernly along the land-lot line and the southern boundary of lots 108, 117, 140, 149, 172, 181, 204, 213, 236, and 245 of said thirty-third land district, and continuing the same direction westerly along the southern boundary of fractional lot 30 in the twenty-second land district of Chattahoochee County, to the Chattahoochee River; thence up the eastern margin of said Chattahoochee River northwesterly through said district and the seventh land district of said Chattahoochee County to the apex of the big bend in the river, and continuing up the river northwardly and northeastwardly along the eastern marging of said river, to and across the waters of Upatoi Creek to the point of beginning; together with all the rights, members, appurtenances, and easements, including riparian rights, thereunto belonging or in anywise appertaining, the whole containing by estimation 115,000 acres of land, more or less, and constituting and being, as already alleged, a part of said tract of land so desired by the Secretary of War for the purposes aforesaid.

7. The owners of said lands are unknown to the United States, but it is thought and believed that the persons hereinafter named own or claim to own, or hold some right, title, or interest in various separate parcels thereof, the boundaries and descriptions of which separate tracts can not be at present stated, nor is it definitely known by what title they claim the same, nor even their residences, though it is alleged from information and belief that said parties reside within said western division of the northern district of Georgia, some of them in the county of Chattahoochee and some of them in the county of Muscogee, to wit: Anthony, M. A.; Adams, Mrs. L. C.; Andrews, Mrs. Nellie W.; Browning, John D.; Britt, Mrs. Charity A.; Becker, Tom.; Boland, Mrs. M. A., the administrators and heirs of; Brown, H. P.; Blackmon, Mrs. H. H.; Blackmar, A. O.; Boland, Mattie B.; Bussey, Arthur; Bullock, O. C.; Bradley, W. C.; Clett, W. N.; Commer, M. L. F.; Cunningham, H. J.; Claxton, Woodie; Cook, I., the administrator and heirs of; Canes, John, the administrator and heirs of; Cooper, Harry; Dorrongton, D. L.; Dimon, Julius; Davis, Webster; Evans, Henry, the administrator and heirs of; Felton, Flora; Farley, Abram; Foster, W. M.; Foster, P. G.; Farr, J. A.; Fuller, Ernest C.; George, Mrs. Minnie L.; Garrett, G. J.; Garrett, J. B.; Guerry, Ben; Garret, J. S., the administrators and heirs of; Ginn, T. D.; Ginn, S. A.; Ginn.; J. W.; Ginn, H. E.; Ginn, L. V.; Ginn, L. D.; Green, Mrs. N. F.; Gibson, Mrs. Mattie; Gammell, J. F.; Grisson, J. A.; Hughes, James F.; Jones, Morgan; Jones, Murray; Jones, Robert; Jennings, B. G.; Jordan, Annie; Jones, Wiley; Jefferson, Mrs. Marietta V.; King, G. W.; Kilpatrick, Frank; King, G. D.; Kindricks, W. W.; King, E. L.; King, Mrs. C. N.; King, Chas. N.; Leonard, A. L.; Levy, Mrs. L. C.; Levy, Mrs. Isabel A.; Lewis, Robena H.; Massey, W. Y.; Massey, W. G.; Massey, Joseph W.; Molder, Mrs. M. L.; Moore, E. H.; McMurrain, S. D.; McBride, W. J., the administrator and heirs of; McGirt, W. D.; McGinty, Mrs. Robert; McGarrah, Mrs. B. G.; McClung, John L.; McCutcheon, H. C.; McBride, S. J.; Newsom, John T., and sister, whose name is unknown to plaintiff; Pierce, B. M.; Phelps, H. H.; Parker, Mrs. S. C.; Parker, W. A.; Pharris, Chas. E.; Pawley, H. F., the administrators and heirs of; Pou Bros., whose individual names are unknown to plaintiff; Pou, J. F.; Pou, John Dozier; Rankin, J. A.; Rothschild, B.; Ritch, Mrs. S. A.; Robinson, T. F.; Robinson, H. D.; Rogers, C. D.; Roberts, Mrs. M. L.; Revell, R. W.; Springer, H. A.; Smith, Mrs. Lula K.; Stewart, John; Simmons, S. B.; Swift, Mrs. J. V., the administrators and heirs of; Scott, W. A.; Snelling, J. A.; Snelling, R. R.; Shorter, Delia; Schley, F. D.; Schley, F. V.; Schley, Mrs. F. V.; Schley, William K.; Scroggins, A. G.; Salmonds, J. A.; Sapp, Mrs. Annie F.; Thomas, J. L.; Thomas, J. D.; Taff, Mrs. Chas. M.; Taff, W. M.; Taff, Mrs. Mary; Taff, Sarah; Tenney, Hiram; Tomblin, Ed T.; Thomason, G. J.; Tomblin, Joseph M.; Thornton, Lottie; Thornton, Elbert; Tumblin, Joseph M.; Underwood, Will H.; Underwood, C. B.; Van Horn, J. W.; Van Horn, Mary A.; Van Horn, W. J.; Van Horn, W. I.; Wynn, E. L.; Wynn, Mrs. Emily; Williams, King; Willis, John L.; Walker, J. T.; Walker, T.; Whyte, Mrs. Marie; Woolfolk, Mrs. Annie K.; Whatley, J. T. & Co.; Willis & Harvey, a firm whose individual names are unknown to plaintiff.

8. Should it appear hereafter that there are other parties interested in the land, or having any right, title, or interest therein, or to any part thereof, and whose interests or possible interests are sufficient to entitle them to notice, plaintiff will undertake to amend this declaration and petition and set out the same, and reserves the right so to do, as well as to correct any errors or insufficiencies that may exist in the descriptions heretofore given in the land.

Wherefore, upon consideration of the premises set forth, your petitioner prays as follows:

First. For a judgment against the property described, condemning the same and each and every interest and estate therein and the entire and unincumbered fee thereof, to the sole use and benefit of the United States, upon payment into the registry, of the court of just compensation therefor; and, as proper and incidental to the principal end.

Second. For an order of the court, presently to be made, requiring all persons concerned, and particularly those persons whose names are hereinbefore set forth, to appear at a time and place in such order to be named, to make known their objections, if any, their rights, if any, their claims as to the value of the property or of their respective interests therein, and any other matters material to their respective rights.

Third. That said several persons named as aforesaid be served with copies of this proceeding as required by law, and that in any case where it may now seem to be in the interest of justice and of more effective notice, or where the same may hereafter appear, such other and additional service be ordered as may appear to the court to be proper.

Fourth. That on the day and at the place named in said order, and after having first passed on and adjudged all questions touching service and notice, and after hearing from all persons responding and desiring to be heard, the court shall make such order as to the appointment of assessors to fix the value of said property or of any interest therein as shall conform to law, or direct the question of value tried by a jury as may be proper and legal.

Fifth. That any and all orders, proceedings, and judgments that may be needed or appropriate to speed the cause or secure due process of law, and which may be legal and appropriate, be made from time to time, to the end that, upon due ascertainment of the value of said property, or of the several interests or estates therein, or liens thereon, and upon the payment of said values into court, the title of said property and of every interest or estate therein may be divested out of any and all other persons, and vested in the United States freed from and disencumbered of any and all liens and other claims thereon, and with full right to such writs of execution, assistance, or possession, and of all and any other writs and process that may be legal and appropriate for giving full effect to such judgment.

Sixth. That at such time hereafter as it may appear necessary or proper to do so an order be made for service of this suit by publication in such appropriate way as may to the court seem legal and proper;

Seventh. That leave be at the present time included in the order for any and all amendments to be made hereto that may hereafter appear to be legal and proper, in the way of adding new parties to be served and notified of the pendency of this proceeding in rem, and such other amendments as may be necessary for giving the court full and complete information in the premises and securing full and complete notice and legal process to all persons in interest.

Eighth. For any and all other judgments and orders, whether the same be herein specifically prayed for or not, that may be legal and appropriate in the premises, and especially that it be ordered and adjudged by the court that all persons, whether named herein or not, who may have or claim to have interests in said property in conflict with or adverse to the title or interests of any other person, have leave to file appropriate pleadings to make known such claim, and to pursue the fund so paid into court and have all such matters adjudicated in legal and timely sort between the respondents, but without further concern to the United States, except to pay into court the ascertained value and be invested with the title to the property aforesaid.

HOOPER ALEXANDER,
United States Attorney.

(United States district court. Filed in clerk's office November 2, 1918. O. C. Fuller, clerk, by Jon Dean Steward, deputy clerk.)

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The condemnation proceedings for Camp Benning were not only begun prior to the armistice, but in pursuance of an order passed on October 24, 1918, a training school for Infantry was already in operation at Columbus at that time. The preliminary project was completed, according to reports from War Department, on October 8, which included five storehouses, medical infirmary, temporary water supply, and electric lights.

Gen. Jervey, in a letter to Hon. W. C. Wright, dated June 6, 1919, advised him that:

The Infantry School of Arms camp was organized October 11, 1918, and by the same order the Infantry School of Arms at Fort Sill was transferred to Camp Benning. * * * The order was issued by order of the Secretary of War and by authority of the President. * * *

Even if the Army is not increased beyond that authorized by the National Defense Act of October, 1916, Fort Sill will be needed as an artillery firing school. * * *

There is now at Camp Benning the Infantry School of Arms moved on October 11, 1918, from Fort Sill, Okla.; the Small Arms Firing School transferred December 6, 1918 from Camp Perry, Ohio, and the Machine Gun School, moved March 14, 1919, from Camp Hancock, Ga.

The procedure for condemnation was under the act approved July 2, 1917. It authorized the Secretary of War to institute proceedings in the name of the United States for the condemnation of such interest or right in any land he might deem needed by the Government for military training camps. It furthermore authorized him upon the filling of the petition to take *immediate* possession of the land to the extent of the interest to be acquired.

On October 24, 1918, the Secretary of War elected to cause the proceedings instituted for the acquirement by condemnation of the *fee simple title* to *this property*, and the condemnation proceedings, filed November 2, 1918, were for the fee simple title.

Immediately notices were issued to owners and parties in possession to leave the land, as immediate possession was required by the United States, and the Government began its use. This was done before November 11, 1918, the date of the armistice.

I have no doubt that this procedure vested the right in the owners of these properties to treat the Government as purchaser and insist upon payment from the Government for the value of their lands. They were farm lands, and tenants and farmers scattered at once to neighboring sections to buy other lands and rent other farms.

While the armistice came on November 11, there was no certainty for quite a length of time that the war was over, and legally or technically it is not yet over.

In the case of an ordinary contract for the purchase of real estate, the party selling, if the purchaser declines to carry out the contract, has the right to elect either to proceed in equity for the performance of the contract or sue for damages on account of breach.

Where the Government legally takes possession of land under an assertion of the purpose to take the fee, an assertion to which the owner was compelled by law to submit, the Government has done more than make a contract with the owner to buy the land, and the rights of the owner would certainly be as great as those of a party to an ordinary contract of purchase.

I do not doubt that both morally and legally the Government was bound to go forward, buy this land, and pay for it, where the parties dispossessed desired the Government to take the fee.

Before the 1st of January over 75 per cent of the farmers on this land had left. They respected promptly, after November 2, the notices of their Government to leave, and they yielded to the action of their Government in proceeding to take from them the fee simple title.

Law and common honesty both required the Government to live up to what it had done.

The school at Benning is essential now, no matter what may be the size of the Army, and I ask to print a statement from Col. Wyllie and Lieut. Col. Whelen, representing the General Staff, showing the necessity for a Small-Arms School and the importance of completing and using Benning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NECESSITY FOR A SMALL-ARMS SCHOOL.

The education and training of an Army officer may be divided into three parts—basic, tactical, and technical. The basic training is obtained at the United States Military Academy, various colleges, and at garrison schools during the first few years of an officer's service. The tactical training is obtained in garrison schools and in experience with troops. Formerly the technical training was also so obtained, but in recent years this has not been possible. The tendency of modern war is to become more and more technical, making necessary a much higher order of technical training for officers to fit them to instruct their troops. Every arm and branch of the Army now recognizes the necessity for a technical training school. Thus we have an Engineer School, a Signal School, a Medical School, a School of Fire for Field Artillery, various flying fields, and a Small-Arms School.

The Small-Arms School is necessary for the technical training of officers of Infantry (including machine-gun officers) and Cavalry, and for certain officers of Artillery and Engineers. The Small-Arms School is the only technical training school for two-thirds of the Army—the Infantry and Cavalry. The necessity for uniform and thorough training of this nature was demonstrated by the lessons of the War with Spain and the British-Boer War, and still further by the Russo-Japanese War. As a result there was organized in the United States Army in 1906 a School of Musketry at Monterey, Calif. This school later developed into the School of Fire, comprising the School of Fire for Field Artillery, the Infantry School of Arms, and the Machine-Gun School. This school was functioning at Fort Sill at the beginning of the war of 1917. These schools were very limited in their scope. They were small and taught only a few selected officers. Thus, while they served to keep the science and technique alive and to a certain extent progressive, yet they had a rather small influence on the efficiency of the troops.

At the start of the war of 1917 we were obliged to rely for subaltern officers almost entirely upon the product of officers' training camps, the officers graduating therefrom after only three months' instruction, and this basic instruction with practically no technical instruction. It very shortly became apparent that the graduates of these three-month schools were not able to train their men to a state of efficiency. The proportion of senior Regular Army officers with organizations (3 per 100 officers) was not enough to carry on officer training while engaged also in organization training. As a consequence the first National Guard and National Army divisions sent to France required from three to five months' training, mostly technical, after arriving there, before they could be placed in the line. The lack of technical training of these troops, particularly in marksmanship and musketry, was the subject of many cablegrams from Gen. Pershing. As a result, there was organized a Small Arms Firing School at Camp Perry, Ohio, a Machine Gun Training Center at Camp Hancock, and the scope of the Infantry School of Arms at Fort Sill was enlarged. During the early part of 1918 about one-fifth of the graduates of officers' training schools were sent to one or another of these schools for one month's training in addition to their three months at the various officers' training schools.

Even these schools proved inadequate for the efficient training of subaltern officers, and when, in July, 1918, it was determined to raise a large number of additional divisions it was felt that it was absolutely necessary to give the officers of these new divisions at least six months' training before joining their organizations, three months of this to be basic and three months technical. Accordingly steps were taken to combine the Infantry School of Arms, the Small Arms Firing School, and the Machine Gun Training Center into one central school to be located at Columbus, Ga. The product of this school was to be 4,000 officers per month. This school would have started to function about December 15, 1918, had not the armistice been signed.

The lessons of the war of 1917 show the greatly increased importance of technical training of troops. As has been stated, the tendency of modern war is to become more and more technical. In order that this technical training shall be efficient and uniform enough to function correctly in any organization of the Army, it must be conducted for instructors (officers) at one central school. Moreover, as it necessitates a large amount of firing of a character simulating battle firing, it requires a special locality selected for its safety factor. Thus in training officers to use with effect the fire power of their troops it is necessary to give them facilities for using this power in at least five fire problems in which the officer shall command a fire unit (platoon). If we have 500 officers to train, this means 2,500 problems. To complete these problems in a reasonable time, it is necessary to hold a large number at once; hence a very large tract of land is necessary.

It has been demonstrated beyond doubt that it requires at least four weeks to train an officer to efficiency as an instructor in marksmanship, four weeks as an instructor in musketry, and four more weeks for trench mortar, 37-millimeter gun, and grenades, making three months at least necessary for the technical training of the Infantry officer. The machine-gun officer requires at least this much time for his technical training.

While we were still at war, our needs for the technical training of officers of units armed with the rifle were provided for by the establishment of the Infantry School of Arms at Columbus, Ga., based on a student body of 12,750 officers. This large reservoir of officers, from which there was to be a steady flow of 4,000 per month, was provided for by the establishment of a special officers' training camp at Camp Fremont, Calif. Immediately upon acceptance of the armistice this training camp was abolished along with all the others, and the student body of the Infantry School of Arms was reduced to a peace-time basis of 2,000 officers, noncommissioned officers, and selected privates. At the same time, steps were taken to further consolidate the training of officers and prospective officers by combining with the two schools already at Columbus the Tank School from Camp Polk and the Machine Gun School from Camp Hancock. This consolidation made it necessary to retain the total land area as planned, or nearly all of it. The cost of construction was not materially reduced because the character of the buildings was changed from temporary war-time construction to a type more suited to peace-time conditions and more durable in character.

It is axiomatic that every officer and noncommissioned officer in whom is vested the proper training of the other members of his command must, himself, be properly trained, and especially is this true of the weapons with which he fights. The student body at the school at Columbus has been fixed at 2,000 as being a number adapted to peace-time needs, regardless of the size of our Army, and capable of rapid expansion to meet any emergency. Our late experience taught us to turn to the well-trained noncommissioned officer as our first reliance for officer material. The smaller our peace-time Army the greater the importance of training such material. The proportion of officers and noncommissioned officers in this student body of 2,000 would be determined by the particular needs of the Army at the time and these needs would be largely indicated by the size of the Army. For the present, and for two or three years, these students would be largely lieutenants, after which the larger portion would be noncommissioned officers and selected privates. Provision has also been made, at certain periods of the year, for instructing in marksmanship the officers of the National Guard of the several States, groups of civilians who are identified with the rifle clubs of the country, and specially selected men from the colleges and universities which have military training as a part of their curriculum.

The necessity for these schools in the technical training of the various arms of the service has been recognized for many years, by the establishment of the School of Fire for Field Artillery at Fort Sill, the Coast Artillery School at Fortress Monroe, and the Engineer School

at Washington Barracks. This school at Columbus is the one and only school of arms for the Infantry and Cavalry arms of the service, which in any army must form the larger part of the whole. The War Department considers a small arms school of the size and scope set forth above was absolutely necessary for the efficiency of the Army.

ROBT. E. WYLLIE,
Colonel, General Staff.
TOWNSEND WHELEN,
Lieutenant Colonel, General Staff.

At this point Mr. SMITH of Georgia yielded to Mr. LODGE, who moved that the Senate take a recess until 8.15 p. m., which was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, at the time of recessing I was seeking to remove the adverse opinion entertained by some of the Senators with reference to Camp Benning, and I will repeat briefly to Senators now present the facts. I have already put into the RECORD the reports upon which my present statement is based.

Late in the fall of 1917 and up to April, 1918, Gen. Pershing was pressing continuously for training of officers and soldiers while in the United States which had not been given, and I wish to read just two or three lines from his cablegram of December 22, 1917:

"*Officers from colonels down and including some general officers are often ignorant of the handling of units in open warfare, including principles of reconnaissance, outposts, advance guard, solution of tactical problems and formation of attack. No training whatever has been given in musketry efficiency as distinctive from individual target practice on the range. Many officers high in rank are hopelessly ignorant of what this training consists of.*"

In these letters from Gen. Pershing it is shown that early in the war he had a vision of the fact that we were to whip the Germans not in trench warfare but in open warfare. He dwells upon the fact that less attention should be given to trench warfare and that the officers must be taught the technique of open warfare, such in detail as I have just referred to.

Following this urgent request from Gen. Pershing the War Department sought first to train at Fort Sill and Camp Perry, but finding this not satisfactory a commission was appointed by the War Department to find a desirable place for the training of a comprehensive character urged by Gen. Pershing. Officers of the War College or General Staff prepared specifications as to the conditions, surroundings, and topography of the place that would be required.

The first commission examined a number of places and finally settled upon land near Columbus, Ga. A second commission reviewed the work and settled upon Benning, and finally Gen. Blatchford examined and approved Benning.

Let me read just a word from Col. Mumma on this subject. I thought he was from Illinois, but probably he is from Iowa. He was from the Middle West. All of the officers so far as I know who approved Benning are from the Middle West or East.

Col. Mumma stated before the Military Committee of the Senate: "*I am directed to appear before this committee by the Chief of Staff to present to you our military reasons for desiring the retention of Camp Benning. I came here not to present a brief for any location except in so far as that particular locality meets our military requirements, and I assure you that a careful, complete, and thorough investigation of all available proposed sites leads us to the conclusion that Camp Benning is more nearly adapted to our military needs than any other site.*"

What I wish to emphasize before the Senate is that the selection of this place by the military boards was purely a military selection without the knowledge, so far as I know, of any but military officers.

It is a place of unusual variety of topography. I was driven over it in April by Col. Ames. It contains 98,000 acres of land fronting on the Chattahoochee River. There are 18,000 acres of perfectly level land in one body and the balance of it is not only rolling but there will be a valley surrounded by hills, then a valley, then hills, there being the most varied topography, with an ample supply of clear water streams.

Following the selection of Benning by these boards and its approval by the War Department, at the direction of the Attorney General, condemnation proceedings were instituted for the property. Col. Ames, who was in charge, testified that on November 2 he notified the occupants of the land to leave immediately after petition for condemnation was filed. As I said before, this condemnation was under an act of Congress which authorized the Secretary of War to take possession of the fee in the land, to take immediate possession without the Attorney General passing upon the title, without obtaining any conveyance, without a payment, to take possession of what he needed for military purposes and to take it either as a lease or with the fee, as he determined. He took it as of the fee on November 2. The act of July 2, 1917, authorized seizure of the land so soon as the condemnation procedure was filed. No delay was required for service of the petition.

What was done? It was not simply a small-arms school that was to be placed there. Machine guns were assigned to Benning, the tank school was to be located there, the Cavalry school was to be located there. It was to be the school of technique for all officers not in the Artillery; and the General Staff and the War College worked out a plan and approved the place and approved the consolidation of these schools at that one place upon the theory that these schools must operate together, that the officers might have technical training and be practically proficient in the utilization for actual warfare of cooperative movements.

I have put into the RECORD a statement from Col. Wyllie and Col. Whelen, prepared at the instance of the General Staff, as to why such a school was essential as a permanent school, no matter what might be the size of the Army, and also why Benning was especially suited for the school. I have put in a statement of Col. Ames to the same effect, and of Col. Mumma. It was to be for small arms, grenades, machine guns, tanks, and cavalry, and the school is actually in progress there now for officers and men and has been since the middle of October. At first they occupied chiefly tents. Now, I think, a number of buildings are completed.

I wish to come to what happened on March 4. The Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate was told by the Secretary of War in January that he would not proceed if they objected. That was the substance, I think, of what he said. I do not quote the language exactly. The committee then disapproved the project. I submit that the Secretary of War himself could not have been as familiar with the necessity for this school as the General Staff and War College. His statement shows that he was not. It was Gen. Pershing, the General Staff, and the War College who were really behind this school much more than the Secretary of War. The Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Crowell, had given more attention to it than the Secretary. Finally, a revised plan for the school was brought forward, reducing very much its size and reducing very much its cost. At one time they wanted 200,000 acres. It was finally brought to 98,000 acres.

I have a memoranda from the General Staff giving a statement of the reduced project, together with a memoranda in support of it, prepared, I believe, last February, which I ask leave to print.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Reduced project, Camp Benning, Columbus, Ga.

Construction.	Estimated cost.	Actual money needed.
For construction	$6,600,000.00	$3,300,000.00
For land	2,600,000.00	2,600,000.00
Total value	9,200,000.00	[1] 5,900,000.00

[1] Cost.

While the estimate for construction is $6,600,000, as stated above, only $3,300,000 of actual money will be needed, because of the work already done and the existence of a large amount of material now owned and paid for in adjacent camps. All of the money needed is now appropriated and allotted, so that no new appropriation is asked or needed. Adding to the cost of the land this $3,300,000, the total money needed is $5,900,000.

It will be necessary to transfer a sum amounting to $210,000 from one allotment to this, in order to build the warehouses, but this is a matter of bookkeeping and requires no additional appropriation. The most economical rather than the best construction has been substituted for that estimated upon in the former project.

Land.—Because of reduction in the size of the school from 10,000 to 5,040, it will be practicable to reduce the acreage from 115,000 to 98,000, thus relieving the Government of the necessity of buying 17,000 acres of high-priced land near the city of Columbus.

Personnel.—In order that the Infantry shall not be entirely denied the schools that are necessary to its efficiency, it is proposed that the former scheme for 2,000-student capacity be reduced to half that number and that the garrison be correspondingly reduced so as to make it necessary only to provide for 5,040 instead of the original 10,000 officers and men.

MEMORANDA OF EXPLANATION.

For a number of years it has been realized by the most progressive officers in the Army that special training was necessary for the Infantry and Cavalry in the technique of arms. During the last five years some training in this direction, more or less efficient, has been conducted at Fort Sill, Okla., and at Perry, Ohio. The experience of the war has shown the absolute necessity for such training; accurate and technical knowledge of the use of arms; long distance firing; short distance firing; combined firing; the use of hand grenades; cooperation between infantry and machine guns; cooperation between both and the tank service. The General Staff and the War College now most

earnestly commend this plan of instruction as essential, and admit that the lack of it in the past caused the losses of many lives in France.

About twelve months ago commissions were appointed upon this subject and they undertook the selection of a desirable place for such a school. The location required approximately 100,000 acres of land, and land of varying character—some level, some hilly—suited for trench work, with a climate suited for work the year around.

Two boards selected Columbus, Ga., or land near Columbus, Ga., in Chattahoochee and Muscogee Counties, as most desirable for the purpose. It was a question between this and Fayetteville, N. C.

It was finally determined that the School of Artillery should go to Fayetteville and the Infantry School of Fire, the Machine Gun School, and the Tank School should go to Columbus, Ga. This school, also, was to embrace training for Cavalry officers, commissioned and noncommissioned. It is proposed that this shall be the only school of this character for Infantry, Cavalry, machine guns, and tanks; constituting all of the Army except the Artillery.

It may be accepted as a demonstrated fact that such a school is essential to the efficiency of Army training, and equally important, no matter how small the Army.

A review has been made of other locations, and the Government has not the land available anywhere suitable for the purpose. It might be suggested that such a school could be located upon Government land in the West. The cost of transportation from the centers of population would far exceed the interest on the investment required at Columbus.

It was the plan of the Army before the armistice to build for a school of 25,000 men to be handled all the time at Columbus. With the armistice the school plan was first reduced to 10,000, and it has been more recently reduced to 5,000.

In this school in peace times it is proposed to train all commissioned and noncommissioned officers from the Regular Army and select men from the National Guard. That we must have such a school somewhere is the opinion of all who can be considered experts on military subjects. That we must procure the place is also their opinion.

It has been suggested that Fayetteville would do and that the land already bought there would suffice.

Col. Eames, the head of the school, stated a few days ago before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate that the land finally purchased at Fayetteville would not meet the requirements for the school. It is not the land which was approved for a school there. Much of it is wooded, and the expense of clearing and putting in shape for use would be great, and in other respects it was pointed out that the land was not adapted to the purpose.

Now let us consider the cost of the project reduced in size at Columbus.

First, already there has been spent at Columbus in round numbers $1,500,000. Columbus is about in the center of a number of cantonments where material has been collected for enlargement of cantonments not now needed. This material has been cut and sawed and will be of little value put upon the market for sale. The balance can be accumulated most economically at Columbus and will be worth, if used there in construction, what it would cost now to buy on the market.

Procedure has been begun in the United States court under the act of Congress authorizing the War Department to take title and immediate possession of property for such a purpose. This procedure covers land amounting to approximately 115,000 acres. The procedure being for the fee, and the act of Congress authorizing the Government to take the fee, and the Government having taken possession as of the fee and dispossessed the owners, the only matter remaining is to determine the value of the land. It is recognized by the authorities that the procedure had does not leave the Government the right to dismiss and settle in damages, the only question remaining is the amount to be paid each property owner, ascertained through arbitration if not agreed upon between the property holder and the Government.

Agreements have been reached with property holders as to the value of their land, reaching nearly to a million dollars. Seventy-five per cent of the property holders, in compliance with the notice from the Government, have given up possession to the Government and have moved off, in many instances having contracted for the purchase of other lands, depending upon the Government to pay for the land taken by condemnation procedure from the owners.

A large part of this land was farm land on which tenants, in many instances, were located who had been selected after years of experience for their capacity and industry, a substantial part of the value of the farms was the location of these capable tenants; live stock has been sold, houses have been pulled down, and, as before stated, very many farmers have moved to adjoining sections and purchased on credit land to be paid for by the amount to be received from the Government for the land taken by the Government under the right of eminent domain from former owners.

As before stated, the Government has not the option to pay damages. Its procedure, coupled with a physical taking of possession, leaves the Government where it must pay the value of the land as a legal proposition, so that the Government must go on and become the owner of this land, except where by agreement the former owner settles with the Government. Any adjustment by way of settlement of damages would be most expensive for the damages have been very, very great.

As before stated, 75 per cent of the farmers on 100,000 acres of this land have moved off, yielding their farms to the possession of the Government, and have gone to other locations, having sold their stock, their cattle, and their hogs and repurchased elsewhere. Their losses on an effort to return to this land would be almost as great as the value of the land.

Seventeen thousand acres of this land is located quite close to the city of Columbus. This tract the officers in charge now feel is not essential to the project. This land is estimated at $1,000,000 of the $3,500,000 which the land would cost. The chamber of commerce of Columbus, the members of which are perfectly responsible financially, have agreed in case the Government goes on with the project and desires to abandon this 17,000 acres to assume all liability for the Government to the property owners and to take the question of responsibility of the Government to the property holders, both as to the acquirement of the fee and to any damages, off the Government, so that the Government by going on with the project would be relieved of $1,000,000 of liability for this 17,000 acres of land.

Now, let us come down to the cost of the project under the reduced size adapted to the work of 5,000 men.

The Government will be called on to pay for the land approximately two million and a half. But this is already a liability, and to buy it does not increase the liability. Indeed, by buying it and going on a liability of a million dollars for the 17,000 acres is written off. With the material already on the ground, brought there from neighboring cantonments, and with other similar material from neighboring cantonments, in addition to the purchase of the land, it will cost the Government not more than $4,000,000 to complete the project.

As before stated, the Government has many times as much lumber and other materials as will be needed at neighboring cantonments which has already been sawed and put in shape for use, and which will be of little value for salvage. The Government can therefore complete the project at Columbus for less cost than it can carry on the project anywhere else. It is an economy to go on with it there in preference to making a construction anywhere else.

It might be suggested that at some of the existing cantonments land should be acquired and thus save the cost of construction. This subject has been carefully studied by the officers, and the necessary additional land is not available at prices which would compare to the cost of completing the project at Columbus. So that at Columbus the location selected by the officers is found most desirable in every way, and the cost of completion less the cost of abandonment makes a more economical proposition than any effort to locate elsewhere.

To summarize in conclusion: An expenditure will be required of $6,500,000 to complete Fort Benning. But there is a liability of three million five hundred thousand for the land if the project does not go on, so that really the increased expenditure to complete the project may be fairly estimated at $3,000,000 in excess of what would be required to be expended if the project is not completed. To abandon the project there will also be the loss of the million and a half already expended.

The schools must be used somewhere. It will be impossible to locate them elsewhere with so small an expenditure or in so satisfactory a manner.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. On March 4 the committee voted 6 to 6 and then 7 to 7 on a motion to reconsider the expression of opinion adverse to Benning. After the committee disapproved the Benning project, the General Staff took up the subject of locating the general school at Bragg, near Fayetteville, N. C. They insisted that if Benning was abandoned still there must be a consolidated school of technique in small arms, machine guns, and work other than artillery. They took up the study of Bragg as a place at which they might locate the school. The board from the General Staff reported about 4th of March on this subject and their report closed with this statement:

"This shows it will cost only $750,000 more to complete Benning than to convert Bragg, but for the additional $750,000 the Government secures the Infantry, Cavalry, and machine-gun school, and the Artillery training center, both of which establishments are deemed absolutely necessary by the War Department and both of which have been approved by the General Staff and the Secretary of War. Thorough investigation shows that Camp Bragg is not in any wise suitable for the small-arms schools, while after three years' search Benning is shown to be ideal."

That was the report about March 4. Camp Bragg in the meantime had been reduced 80 per cent; new construction at Bragg stopped; and Bragg was left as it stood for a much smaller Artillery school than was at first intended, work only continuing for buildings begun at an earlier period.

I presented a letter to the Secretary of War, which I have printed in the RECORD. I reviewed in it the facts and insisted that the effect of the action of the committee was to leave the question of completing Benning to the department, and that the decision of the department to construct Benning on the reduced scale was wise. I urged in this letter that the Benning project be continued. I called with Representative WRIGHT on the Secretary of War and with the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Crowell, Mr. Crowell being himself earnestly in favor of going on with Benning. I read the letter to the Secretary of War, and that was all I said. He turned to Mr. Crowell and asked: "What does the General Staff say?" He replied: "The General Staff and the War College are heartily in favor of continuing Benning," and the Secretary of War simply said, "Go ahead with the project on the reduced plan."

What influenced the Secretary was the report of the General Staff and War College. The letter that I read him showed that the Senate committee voted 7 to 7 and that one member of the committee not present at the meeting preferred Benning to Bragg and another had told the Secretary this was also his view. This is a frank statement of the whole facts.

I believe that such a school is essential. I talked with one of the ablest generals in the service within the past 60 days, not referring to Benning; I was asking him about technical instruction for Infantry officers after they left West Point. The general to whom I refer had fought in most of our battles in France and in the Argonne Forest. He said that if you would give him 100,000 men with officers thoroughly trained along the lines urged by Gen. Pershing, he could whip an army of twice the number without the training; that we had now learned from the war the handling of infantry was a problem of scientific management, scientific mass shooting, and scientific firing and massed firing utterly different from what we had conceived it to be a few years ago. He added that this training not only doubles the effectiveness against an enemy but saves the lives of the men with such training.

This project was the project of Gen. Pershing and of the General Staff and War College, acquiesced in by the Secretary of War because he felt the views of experts should control. That is the whole story.

Practically all of the land has been bought. A large number of buildings have been completed and we have a contract for the erection of the remainder. They are running a school there for officers and men in these lines. In 60 days more I have no doubt that the remainder of the buildings would have been completed. They have gathered there the material left over from other camps, which, instead of being salvaged and disposed of for a nominal price, has been moved to Camp Benning and is being put into the building.

Gen. Marshall presented to the Military Committee a memorandum from the General Staff or War College which I request printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON CAMP BENNING, GA.

ORIGINAL PROJECT.

The original project for the establishment of the Infantry School of Arms and Machine-Gun School at Camp Benning, Ga., before the armistice was signed, included the acquisition of approximately 115,000 acres of land by purchase, and the construction of a cantonment for the accommodation of approximately 26,000 officers and men. It was contemplated to establish there a technical Infantry School to train each month 4,000 graduates of Central Officers' Training Schools for Infantry. The course was to be for three months, making a total of 12,000 students in attendance at one time. Experience had shown that this training, in addition to the training received in the Central Officers' Training Schools was absolutely necessary to develop these young officers into efficient instructors and leaders for the new divisions forming.

PEACE PROJECT.

Upon the signing of the armistice the War Department considered this project, and it was decided that a school of the nature contemplated here, and to develop Infantry technique, and particularly to teach the application of Infantry technique in Infantry tactics, including the proper tactical cooperation between the Infantry, Artillery, tanks, and airplanes, would be absolutely necessary for our future Army, no matter what size or kind of an Army that might be. For this purpose a large tract of suitable land was necessary. The War Department had no land well suited to this purpose, and no land of a size necessary that it would not have to devote to other necessary training. Inasmuch as condemnation proceedings had already been instituted relative to the land at Columbus, Ga., and the United States being obligated to purchase the land by reason of having removed the owners and taken possession, and because investigation showed that it would cost approximately as much to abandon the land and pay damage thereon as it would be to complete the purchase, and furthermore, because this land was perfectly suited in size and nature for the purpose, it was decided to proceed with this project on a peace basis.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Secretary of War had the funds and the authority for this project, he nevertheless considered that he should consult Congress in the matter, as this was a new project intended for peace-time training. Accordingly, he submitted the project to the Military Committee of the Senate, where it had a most thorough hearing.

This reduced peace project as decided upon involves the purchase of 98,000 acres of land, and the erection thereon of a cantonment for 5,000 officers and men. The entire project is to cost complete not to exceed $9,200,000, of which $2,600,000 was to be for land, and which included $3,000,000 of building material already bought and paid for and on hand at other camps. Therefore, the total cash expenditure involved was $6,200,000, to be paid from funds already on hand and available from money appropriated for the fiscal year 1919.

NECESSITY FOR THE CAMP.

Before the war we had no large Government reservation where Infantry could be trained under conditions such as confront it in time of war. As a result we had no big and suitable training center, and our officers—even those of the Regular Army—were not sufficiently instructed, and as a result of this deficiency undoubtedly many valuable American lives were needlessly lost in the fighting in Europe. It is absolutely impossible to properly instruct Infantry officers or enlisted men at the small garrison posts.

A great part of the time of Infantry troops should be used in solving small maneuver problems in which as many of the possible war-time situations should be presented as possible. There must be hills and valleys, woods and fields, rivers and flat country. The climate should permit outdoor work all the year. In battle an Infantry battalion commander commands troops armed with rifles, trench mortars, 1-pounders, one or more pieces of field artillery, tanks, etc. He must be trained to use all these under varying terrain and must have maneuver problems in which the firing of service ammunition for all Infantry weapons is the important part. All foreign countries have such big training centers with large tracts of land for this purpose. At a training center a large number of maneuver problems must be going on at the same time.

This training center is to be used for training not only the officers and men of the Regular Army but also those of the National Guard and of the Reserve, and also will be needed to produce instructors in case any form of universal military training is adopted.

In case of war it would be an invaluable asset to the country, not only for the instruction given in time of peace but also as a going plant ready to operate in greatly enlarged capacity.

The United States must surely have such a training plant for the Infantry, and no other place is so available or can be found and developed for less money than is needed to complete the present project at Camp Benning.

WHY OTHER LAND COULD NOT BE USED.

The question has often been brought up as to why the War Department could not have used some of the land they already had for this school instead of acquiring new land for it at Columbus, Ga., at an expense of $2,600,000?

The answer is that there was no tract of land of sufficient size and suitable character available that was not just as urgently needed for other purposes. The functions of the school demand a very large tract of land, approximately 100,000 acres. This land must be diversified enough to permit the staging of every kind of a tactical situation. We had certain pieces of land of sufficient, or nearly sufficient, size, and the reasons why none of these could be used are as follows:

Fort Sill, Okla.—Terrain absolutely unsuited. Climate eliminates training for four months annually. Needed and ideal for School of Fire for Field Artillery. No other place so ideal for this latter school. Having these two schools at same location has been tried, and found impracticable. A memorandum relative to the Wichita National Forest adjoining Fort Sill is appended hereto.

Camp Bragg, N. C.—Terrain unsuited because of its monotonous character. Would cost more to start school here than to purchase land at Camp Benning and build cantonment there. Absolutely needed for garrison and training center for Field Artillery.

Camps Knox and Taylor, Ky.—Same reasons as to Camp Bragg.

Fort Wingate, N. Mex.—Too far from center of military activities, making mileage and transportation very expensive. Used as a forest reserve. Terrain not suitable. Used as storage place for T. N. T. which can not be placed elsewhere.

Camp Kearney, Calif.—Too remote from center of population, thus making mileage and transportation very expensive. Needed as a division camp and mobilization point for Mexican border.

The above are the only military reservations that can be regarded as at all suited in size.

PRESENT ACTIVITIES.

* * * At present a class of 113 officers of the Regular Army is under instruction at Camp Benning and will graduate September 15, 1919. A class of 150 noncommissioned officers will start July 15, 1919, 125 of whom are being trained as sergeant-instructors for duty with the National Guard.

The experimental department of the school has tested, developed, and reported upon 61 various military devices and ideas. Nine pamphlets and manuals have been prepared and issued for the instruction of the Army. Thirteen of the instructional moving picture films in use in the Army were written, prepared, and taken at the school.

PERCENTAGE OF COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION AT CAMP BENNING.

Railroads, complete.
Wagon roads in part, 40 per cent complete.
Sewers, 40 per cent complete.
Water lines, 50 per cent complete.
Transmission lines, 60 per cent complete.
Warehouses, 75 per cent complete.
Motor transport block, 15 per cent complete.
Remount station, 80 per cent complete.
Base hospital, 10 per cent complete.
Officers' quarters, 10 per cent complete.
Student officers' quarters, 50 per cent complete.
Enlisted men's barracks, 90 per cent complete.

In general, it may be said that the construction is about 65 per cent complete, June 15, 1919.

FINANCIAL STATUS OF CONSTRUCTION, JUNE 15, 1919.

Money so far spent for construction	$1,601,221
Money value of material so far expended for construction, approximate	820,000
Total	2,421,221

PRESENT STATUS OF LAND PURCHASE.

59,293 acres of land have been bought and paid for at a cost of	$1,657,000
11,540 acres have been contracted for, but money not yet paid, valued at	262,866

Twenty-six thousand four hundred and forty-five acres, the remainder of the actual 97,328 acres to complete the project, is in court or about to go to court to adjust values. The land on which the cantonment is being constructed is included in this lot, and if this land is not bought the construction will be a total loss, and the United States will become liable for heavy damages, both physical and those resulting from the removal from the land of all owners and tenants.

COST OF SALVAGE.

It is estimated that to salvage the project entirely all the land would have to be purchased and then sold, at a loss of approximately $1,000,000. Also, the cantonment, approximately two-thirds completed, and costing, roughly, $2,500,000 would have to be salvaged at what the material would bring, approximately $400,000.

Cost to complete project:		
Purchase of land	$680,134	
Completion of construction	1,998,779	
Total	2,678,913	
Cost to abandon project:		
Present worth of project		$4,078,221
Sale of land, approximately	1,600,000	
Sale of material, approximately	400,000	
	2,000,000	
Purchase of land	680,134	
		1,319,866
Cost of abandoning		2,658,355

MEMORANDUM RELATIVE TO THE WICHITA NATIONAL FOREST IN ITS RELATION TO THE CAMP BENNING, GA., PROJECT.

Information has been requested as to why the War Department proceeded with the purchase of a reservation at Camp Benning, Ga., for Infantry special schools, when there was available a forest reserve that could be utilized for this purpose without cost adjacent to the Fort Sill, Okla., military reservation.

Forest reserves were investigated in connection with this project, but it was found that invariably they were rough mountain land, heavily wooded, and entirely unsuited to the purpose. Moreover, they were needed for the purpose for which they were acquired.

In the case of the Wichita National Forest, this tract was set aside as a game preserve by President Roosevelt under the authority of the act of Congress dated January 24, 1905 (33 Stat., 614). It is now being used partly as a game preserve, approximately 10,000 acres being fenced with a buffalo proof fence, and containing approximately 100 buffalo, 250 elks, 250 white tail deer, and large numbers of wild turkey

and small game. All the land outside the fenced area is being used for grazing purposes. Approximately 4,710 head of cattle are being grazed on this land, and these cattle belong to 70 families. If these families are dispossessed some adequate remuneration must be made for dispossessing them of their grazing rights and their practically only means of livelihood.

Moreover, this reservation has been stated by the Forest Service to consist of a large granite outcrop, very rough and mountainous, suited only to grazing, and entirely unsuited to military purposes. It has little water. The railroad is five miles from the edge of the tract. The reservation comprises only 61,480 acres which is too small for the purpose intended. It is so far from the Fort Sill reservation that it would be necessary to build a new cantonment on it to house the garrison.

It is estimated that to build the necessary cantonment on this forest reserve, adequate to house 5,000 officers and men, would cost over twice as much as it is going to take to build a similar cantonment at Camp Benning, owing to the distance from adequate labor and from building material.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have a letter from Col. Dougherty, which I ask to put into the RECORD, in which he points out the conditions and urges a continuation of the work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

JUNE 28, 1919.

This memo is based on facts within my personal knowledge; is not written at the request of any member of the War Department, but because of my personal interest as an infantryman in seeing corrected one of the grave deficiencies of the late war.

England saved France in 1914 through her excellence in rifle fire and musketry training, but to-day we actually have no school in operation for this instruction.

We started this instruction at Monterey, 1907–1910, but the post was occupied by Cavalry and was too small either for Cavalry or the school. The results were not satisfactory even in time of peace. The school was moved to Fort Sill. That post was not large enough for needs of the Artillery. There was therefore constant friction and lack of room causing lack of efficiency. At the beginning of the war I was director of the Department of Engineering at Fort Sill, and spent a month on a joint Infantry-Field Artillery board trying to stretch the ground to accommodate both schools when it was not big enough for one. I therefore know the facts at first hand. The school was finally moved to Benning and will be in operation, Congress permitting, on October 1, 1919.

To concentrate on an enemy the fire of 250 rifles, each fired by a different individual more or less tired and scared and hungry, and get results is a most difficult task. Musketry is a book of 250 pages, containing the principles needed for the work. Pages 16 to 34 of this book contain a bare list of the duties of private to colonel. If the officer is not thoroughly familiar with these duties the men under him are needlessly killed. I am sure that hundreds of men now lying dead in France would now be alive had their company officers possessed this training in the proper degree. Those who were responsible in many former years for the lack of facilities for this instruction are responsible for the deaths of these men.

An example: A company commander is told to attack between that tree and the haystack. He can estimate the range accurately, say, at 800 yards. To estimate the width between the tree and the haystack is very much more difficult. He might miss it a hundred yards or so easily. But by the following simple rule he can arrive accurately at the desired result: Width of target in yards equals range in yards times width in mils as read through field glass, divided by 1,000. Then, if the width were 250 mils, the width of his target would be 800 times 250 divided by 1,000, or 200 yards, the width of two platoons. If he had not known this, he might easily have placed three or four platoons in line and on advancing close to the enemy been badly crowded and lost two men where he should have lost but one. These things must be taught our young officers to save lives in battle. They are taught efficiently only at a central school of small arms.

During the late war, having found the school of small arms at Sill entirely inadequate for the task, and with no available ground on which to spread out, we tried to do this work at training camps, supplemented by special schools in the divisional camps.

This resulted in excessive overhead in both money and instructors, lack of uniformity and coordination and hence lack of efficiency. I was training officer of the 179th Brigade, 90th Division, and know these facts from first hand. Finally the school of small arms was moved to Benning where it was proposed to give every new Infantry officer a course of instruction. War impressed the absolute necessity of this plan. Benning was selected by Army officers interested only in winning the war. I was then, and now am, a member of the Operations Division, General Staff, and know these facts at first hand. The case was considered absolutely on its merits for the best interests of the country as a whole.

Benning, Sill, Bragg, and Kearney were considered. The Field Artillery had to have Bragg. Kearney was too far off in one corner which would have increased the cost of transportation for student officers many thousands of dollars. The choice narrowed down between Sill, which had already been found by experience to be lacking, and Benning.

Benning is more nearly in the center of population than is Sill. A radius of 700 miles from Benning takes in practically all the big camps except those west of the Rocky Mountains. The same radius from Sill adds some sparsely settled western country and leaves out the thickly populated States from Pennsylvania to the northeast.

Sill is not big enough for Artillery needs. It would be totally inadequate for the needs of both; and has already, by actual trial, been found inadequate for the needs of the Infantry in time of war. There is apparently enough ground at Sill; but remember that the biggest half is nothing but thick woods, a forest reserve, totally unfit for either general Artillery or Infantry training, and could be made fit only by extensive clearing. To cut down the trees of this forest reserve in Oklahoma would be nothing less than a national crime.

The climate at Sill is much less desirable than that at Benning and would cause the loss of two or three months outdoor work. This is a fatal defect in time of war, when every minute counts.

Every officer with whom I have talked, who has seen Benning, is enthusiastic at its possibilities as a training center. Maj. Frank Maloney, formerly adjutant general of Tennessee, and Maj. Critchfield, formerly adjutant general of Ohio, and the man who built Camp Perry, are, or were, both at Benning engaged in the erection of the plant there. They say they have never seen a tract as well suited to infantry training. Maj. Gen. Farnsworth, in command of the Infantry school at Sill at the beginning of the war, and of the Thirty-seventh Division during the war, and now in command at Benning, concurs with the views of Majs. Maloney and Critchfield.

Much ground is needed for a school of small arms, even in peace. The principles of musketry must be illustrated by numerous problems, each problem being repeated many times on different ground; for the application of these principles in battle must become a habit. In time of war we can increase the capacity of the same school fifteen or twenty times by running problems simultaneously on each block of ground, changing the students each day for the problems. To enable this to be done in safety from bullets which will go from 3 to 3½ miles requires a large area for each problem.

Benning is the only post in a large section of the South which would be available for use in case any legislation favoring universal military service is passed.

The attached letter from Gen. Farnsworth, Commanding at Benning, shows the state of progress of the work there. On June 21 we had spent some $5,735,000, and the amount now has probably reached $6,000,000, as the need for the school is urgent, since it is intended to give the West Point class graduating this year a course at Benning, beginning October 1, and most of our younger officers are in need of this instruction.

To move this school now would not only mean a grave set-back for infantry efficiency, but would also be poor economy. It would seem to be bad policy politically for any party doing it.

Very respectfully,

A. J. DOUGHERTY,
Colonel, General Staff, Chief Equipment Section,
Equipment Branch, Operations Division.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am advised that the work has progressed since June 15, both as to construction and purchase of land, and that the remainder of the work is principally the completion of buildings already under way. The railroad is finished, the dirt roads are built, sewerage has been constructed, and much of the work completed. The land is nearly all paid for. I do not desire to say anything more about Benning.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Did I understand the Senator to say that Secretary of War Baker directly gave the order to proceed with the construction of Camp Benning?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can not say about that. I have stated just what happened, and will repeat it for the benefit of the Senator from New Jersey. I went with the Assistant Secretary of War to the Secretary of War, at the request of the Assistant Secretary, and read the letter which I have put into the RECORD written by myself to the Secretary of War. The Secretary of War turned to the Assistant Secretary and asked, "What does the General Staff say?" The Assistant Secretary said in substance, "They urge the continuation of the project." The Secretary of War then said, "Go ahead with it on the reduced plan." Mr. Crowell may have given the order; I do not know. I never saw the order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Secretary of War ordered the construction of the camp to proceed in the Senator's presence?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Secretary of War said, "Go ahead with it on the reduced plan." I give the Senate exactly what I said, for I simply read my letter, and I give substantially what occurred.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Was that after the Military Affairs Committee had voted to discontinue the project?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That was on March 7. I claimed in my letter that the final vote of the committee was 7 to 7 on a motion to reconsider, and that, as between Bragg and Benning, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] preferred Benning, that the department was contemplating using Bragg if it could not use Benning, and I handed him a letter from the Senator from Colorado stating that if one of the two was to be used he preferred Benning. I think the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] also had a conference with the Secretary of War and explained to him his preference for Benning, if it was essential to have such a camp. I insisted that, to say the least, the Secretary of War was relieved from any claim of advice by the committee against Benning. That was the argument in my letter; that the vote was 7 to 7, that it was a tie; that the letter of the Senator from Colorado and the conference with the Senator from Wyoming freed him from any restraint on account of the action of the committee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand that the vote of 7 to 7 in the committee was against reconsideration.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand that; I so stated; but I stated that the other two Senators practically put themselves also on the side of Benning, and I claimed in my letter, and for that I take the full responsibility, that the letter from the Senator from Colorado and the interview by the Senator from Wyoming, coupled with the vote, left the Secretary of War free from any advice by the committee. That was the argument; that was my contention; and I still consider that was the effect of the action of the committee.

Frankly, my first intense interest in Benning grew out of the fact that in January I found a large number of the farmers formerly living on this land had been driven off on the 2d of November by the action of the War Department.

Many of them had bought other places on credit, expecting to get the pay for their land which their Government had taken and with it pay for their new purchases. I believed then, and believe now, when the department took possession with a claim of title there was no right to recede from that position, and that the department was compelled both by good faith and law to pay for the property.

Subsequently I became interested, and am now interested, in a school of small arms. I have been much impressed by the officers who have talked with me on the subject; I have come to the conclusion that somewhere we must have a high-class school of small arms, with the opportunity for cooperation on the part of machine guns, grenades, and cavalry.

My purpose in bringing the facts about Camp Benning before the Senate is to remove the prejudice which inaccurate criticisms have created against this splendid work of the War Department. The present conference report may temporarily suspend completion of some of the buildings and some of the work. Sufficient has already been done to make it practical to continue the school, and the school need not be suspended. Col. Earnest telegraphed me from Columbus:

> Answering inquiry, construction has advanced so far that approximately $2,000,000 is all that is left unexpended from original appropriation, and this amount which is credit of Benning at present will complete it.

I feel confident that the Congress, on reflection, will see the wisdom of the General Staff and War College with reference to Camp Benning, and provide for its completion.

THE SIZE OF THE ARMY.

Mr. President, I come back to the substance of the report and to what is much more important than this one subject about which I thought it was my duty to give an explanation. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee what disposition is to be made of the 240,000 men who are going to be left in the Army? How are they going to be handled, and what is to be done with the 500,000 men? Are we to leave any men abroad?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, probably I can answer that question. It so happens that I took some notes of the testimony given before the committee which was not in the hearings. Had the Army been placed at an average strength of 500,000, as requested by the War Department, the disposition of the troops would have been, roughly speaking, somewhat as follows: One hundred and fifty thousand to compose the mobile forces in the United States, subject to any duty upon call; along the Texas and Mexican border 35,000 men, and I may say that there are approximately that number there now; in the Coast Artillery defenses 65,000 men, which would give one crew for each gun mounted in the coast defenses of the United States; in the insular possessions—the Philippines, Hawaii—Panama and Vladivostok, Siberia, 50,000 men; in France, for the purpose of guarding the great stores of Government property, which it is anticipated can not be sold with any great degree of promise and which are scattered all over the country in France in enormous depots, 100,000 men. That makes a total of 400,000 men. That does not take into account two factors: First, we inherited from this war something like 50,000 wounded and sick, who are now in the hospitals, who are soldiers of the Army and must be carried upon the pay rolls until they recover and are discharged. The Medical Department estimates that for the next 12 months the hospital population of the Army will average 17,000 men per month. The other factor is this: How many Americans are to be kept in the occupied territory of Germany? That number is indefinite and unknown, but that some are to be kept there the War Department has been informed.

Mr. President, on the basis of 240,000 men a redistribution might be made somewhat as follows—and I suggest this distribution largely upon my own responsibility; it does not come from any member of the department: Instead of a mobile army in the United States of 150,000 men, we reduce it to 100,000 men; we would still keep 35,000 men along the border; instead of 65,000 men in the coast defenses we would put 20,000 men there, which is about 2,000 more than we had in our coast defenses before we went into the war with Germany; in the insular possessions, instead of 50,000 men, we would have 35,000 men; and in France guarding property which must be left there for a while before it is sold, instead of 100,000 men, 50,000 men. That makes 240,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What about the 17,000 in the hospitals?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does not take into account the estimated average hospital population submitted by the Medical Department of 17,000 per month during the next 12 months, nor does it take into account any troops that may be left in Germany for the purpose of showing the flag. That is the situation as nearly as I can describe it.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. KING. As I understand the Senator from New York, the reduction of the Army to 240,000, which will be the case for the last nine months of the fiscal year——

Mr. WADSWORTH. Approximately.

Mr. KING. Would make no provision for those in the hospitals, would make no provision for troops in Germany or other occupied portions of Europe, would make no provision for a greater number of troops upon the Mexican border in the event of difficulties or possibility of hostilities with Mexico, and would leave only a mobile force of 100,000 men to be scattered throughout the United States?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, it is fair to say that the 100,000 men which the conference committee figured upon as available as a mobile force in the United States would also be available for use in Mexico if required in addition to the 35,000 who are now along the border or within striking distance of the border. It would not be fair to say that only 35,000 men would be available for service on the Mexican border. Undoubtedly more could be sent there from Army posts in the different parts of the country.

Mr. KING. Did the War Department think that for the last nine months of the fiscal year the number of soldiers carried upon the rolls in the hospitals incapacitated for service would be only 17,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Medical Department sent to us after the hearings a little table showing what they estimated would be the hospital population month by month for the succeeding 12 months. It starts somewhere around 50,000, which is the hospital population of to-day, and it goes down to something like 5,000 or 3,000 in June, 1920. The average for the 12 months they figure to be about 17,000. Of course it ought to be said that that is merely an estimate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Your committee——

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. FALL. I wish to ask the Senator from New York a question along the line the Senator from Utah has been questioning him. I understood the Senator from New York to say that the War Department thought that it would be necessary to retain men on German territory.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; the conferees were informed by the War Department that they had received definite information that an agreement had been entered into to leave some American forces in the occupied territory of Germany.

Mr. FALL. That agreement has been entered into, I presume, across the water?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. FALL. And communicated to us?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Communicated to the War Department.

Mr. FALL. The War Department had definite information that that agreement had been reached across the water?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is so.

Mr. FALL. Was there any intimation as to when our soldiers might be returned or whether they would be indefinitely kept there?

Mr. WADSWORTH. None whatsoever; nor is there any information as to how many are to be kept; it may be merely a regiment; it may be a brigade; it may be a division; no one knows.

Mr. FALL. It may be as many as are there now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It may be, but my own idea is that it is unlikely.

Mr. FALL. How many are there now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are five combat divisions in the occupied territory of Germany, two of which, I am informed, have received their orders to prepare to return to the United States. The total force abroad is approximately 500,000 men, including service and supply troops. I may say also to the

Senator for New Mexico that there are approximately 8,000 men at Vladivostok, and westward from Vladivostok along the line of the Siberian railway, and that their stay upon that duty in that country is, for the purposes of the present discussion, indefinite.

Mr. FALL. The chairman has no intimation as to when they may be returned?

Mr. WADSWORTH. None whatsoever, nor has the War Department.

Mr. FALL. Nor whether they may be reenforced?

Mr. WADSWORTH. None whatever; nor has the War Department.

Mr. FALL. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, with the permission of the Senator who has the floor, if recent events and a varied experience have not led him to believe that the proposition which was advanced two years ago or more that the border conditions should be looked out for by a special force, and which in fact was provided for by this body in the appropriation bill or the draft bill, may not yet be the best solution of that portion of the difficulty?

Mr. WADSWORTH. My position upon that question has been stated on a former occasion. I believe the most expensive and ineffective way to do police duty is by employing troops. I think we should employ policemen. I anticipate that for many years to come we shall have to maintain a patrol along the Mexican border, and we would save millions of dollars and do it just as efficiently if we would organize something to correspond to the Canadian Mounted Police, and do it with that sort of a force with one-tenth the number of men, and do it just as well. This country can not go on indefinitely keeping 35,000 men on the Mexican border merely for patrol work. That line can be patrolled by a much smaller force of mounted police, recruited for that special purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Or we might advise the Mexican Government that they must control their people in that section, or we will move a little farther down to protect ours.

Mr. WADSWORTH. However, the question of a mounted police force along the border does not occur in this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit as a part of my remarks a table showing the total appropriations of the different proposals thus far made, including the last one.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

Pay of the Army:	
Passed Senate (includes authorization for expenditure of $100,000,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the pay of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919)	$315, 880, 578. 50
Adopted, first conference (includes authorization for expenditure of $100,000,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the pay of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919)	272, 209, 675. 50
Adopted, second conference	214, 429, 107. 00
Decrease between Senate bill and first conference	101, 451, 471. 50
Decrease between first and second conferences	57, 780, 568. 50
Total of bill:	
Passed House	718, 654, 591. 00
Passed Senate (does not include the $100,000,000 above referred to)	885, 562, 548. 50
First conference (does not include the $100,000,000 above referred to)	766, 011, 592. 00
Second conference	775, 241, 543. 50

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate. I regret very much that this report reduces the Army for nine months at this time to 240,000. I think the original action of our committee was as conservative as to size as the situation justified. With Russia in a state of turmoil, with 21 wars going on in Europe, with Mexico constantly interfering with our citizens and with their property, with disturbances almost everywhere, I regard it an utter lack of vision for us to scrap our Army and to fail to retain, at least for the next 12 months, an Army sufficient to do forceful and vigorous service.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I shall not at this hour of the night attempt to reply at any length to the very elaborate defense made by the Senator from Georgia and the War Department of the purchase of Camp Benning. I shall at this time make only two statements in connection with it.

The Senate will remember that the criticism of the War Department was that the department was using money appropriated by Congress for war purposes for the purchase of Camp Benning that had nothing whatever to do with the war, and I said at that time that that action of the War Department came very near to being a violation of law. Now, the Senator from Georgia to-night makes a defense of the action that never occurred to Secretary Baker or the War Department. The Senator from Georgia to-night says that the Government was obligated at the time of the signing of the armistice to purchase this land; but, Mr. President, Secretary Baker did not think so at the time he ordered this construction to go on, and this 115,000 acres of land to be purchased. Secretary Baker testified last January before the House Committee on Military Affairs that only a very small amount of this land had been purchased; and because there had been so little money spent, he and Assistant Secretary Crowell, in view of the action of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, ordered that all proceedings in that matter be abandoned. At that time Mr. Woods, of the War Department, testified that the total obligations of the Government in January with reference to Camp Benning were, construction, $29,000; the land, $118,000, and he stated that the Government could get out of that whole proposition at a cost, in his judgment, of not exceeding $300,000.

So, Mr. President, the defense that the Senator now makes of the War Department can not be set up by them at all, because it is very clear from this testimony that irrespective of whether the Government was obligated or not, they did propose and did take this money, appropriated for war purposes, to the extent of $7,000,000 for this project, which was wholly a peace project; and as to that matter there is no defense.

The Senator says that Secretary Baker acted upon the recommendation of the general staff that this was a good proposition. Mr. President, the General Staff had no more right to recommend to Secretary Baker to take $7,000,000 of the people's money, appropriated to carry on this war, and use it for a peace project than a private citizen had.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, just a word in correction, and yet not correction. The Senator may have read correctly from the testimony; but, in point of fact, when the Secretary gave those as the figures in January he had not received an accurate statement of the figures. There had been over $500,000 spent on the building of a railroad. There had been something over $1,250,000, as I recall it, spent at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which was read:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 5227) entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920," the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to amend the title so as to read as follows:

"An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate concur in the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House further insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; agrees to the further conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GOOD, Mr. MAGEE, and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WARREN. I submit the report on the sundry civil bill and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 6, 8, 11, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 24, 29, 30, 31, 35, 40, 44, 51, 52, 56, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 68, 72, 74, 88, 96, and 112.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 12, 17, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28,

32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 48, 57, 64, 66, 67, 70, 75, 77, 80, 92, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 114, and 115; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$48,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Assistant Surgeons General at Large not exceeding three in number"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The heads of the several executive departments and other Government establishments are authorized and directed to submit to Congress not later than the first Monday in December, 1919, a statement showing for the fiscal year 1919 the activities of their respective departments or establishments pertaining to the public health and the amounts expended on account of each of the said activities."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreeemnt to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $2,500 per annum except the following: One at $7,500, 1 at $5,000, 10 at $3,600 each, and 40 from $2,500 to $3,000 each, inclusive"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$356,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out amended to read as follows:

"For commencing the construction of a reflecting pool in West Potomac Park, $175,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,461,353.50"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,201,897"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: " : *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to adjust the compensation of officers and employees of St. Elizabeths Hospital"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "offices," in line 11; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The appropriation herein made for the enforcement of the immigration laws shall be available for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes,' approved October 16, 1918, and acts amendatory thereof."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "To" strike out the word "equip,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"HOUSES.

"Aberdeen, Md., $5,000;
"Alliance, Ohio, $6,500;
"Bath, Me., $7,500;
"Bremerton, Wash., $24,000;
"Bridgeport, Conn. (site 4—Crane tract), $19,000;
"Bridgeport, Conn. (site 5—Mill green), $19,000;
"Bridgeport, Conn. (site 12—Grassmere), $8,000;
"Charleston, W. Va., $8,000;
"Erie, Pa. (east tract), $4,500;
"Erie, Pa. (west tract), $18,500;
"Hammond, Ind., $13,000;
"Indianhead, Md., $8,000;
"New Brunswick, N. J., $17,000;
"New London, Conn., $8,000;
"Groton, Conn., $1,750;
"Newport, R. I., $3,750;
"Niagara Falls, N. Y., $13,000;
"Niles, Ohio, $5,750;
"Philadelphia, Pa., $44,000;
"Portsmouth, Va., district: Craddock, $47,000; Truxton, $12,500;
"Pompton Lakes, N. J., $1,000;
"Quincy, Mass., $36,000;
"Rock Island district: Davenport, Iowa, $15,000; Moline, Ill., $9,000; East Moline, Ill., $8,000; Rock Island, Ill., $16,500;

"Vallejo, Calif. (Mare Island), $21,000;
"Washington, D. C., Navy Yard, $1,000;
"Waterbury, Conn., $4,000;
"Watertown, N. Y., $7,000;
"In all, houses, $412,250."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Amend the matter inserted by said amendment as follows: In line 2 strike out "$220,000" and insert "$165,000"; in line 3 strike out "$99,000" and insert "$74,000"; in line 5 strike out the word "equip,"; in line 14 strike out "$925,940" and insert "$700,000"; in line 14 strike out "$1,244,940" and insert "$939,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"RESTAURANTS.

"Quincy, Mass., $2,500;
"Vallejo, Calif. (Mare Island), $110,000;
"In all, restaurants, $112,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"APARTMENTS.

"Bremerton, Wash., $6,000;
"Bridgeport, Conn. (site 1, Black Rock), $33,000;
"Bridgeport, Conn. (site 14, Connecticut Avenue), $15,000;
"Erie, Pa. (west tract), $1,000;
"Portsmouth, Va., district: Craddock, $6,000;
"Washington, D. C.: Navy yard, $600;
"In all, apartments, $61,600."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"DORMITORIES.

"Indianhead, Md., $6,000;
"Quincy, Mass., $74,000;
"Vallejo, Calif. (Mare Island), $28,000;
"Washington, D. C.: Navy yard, $4,000;
"In all, dormitories, $112,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"In all, $2,068,970: Provided, That no part of the appropriations heretofore made and available for expenditure by the United States Housing Corporation shall be expended for the purposes for which appropriations are made herein."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 16 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the words "after the"; in line 17, strike out the words "conclusion of the war" and the word "it"; strike out all of line 39, after the word "away," down to and including the word "President" in line 42; in line 55, strike out the word "commission" and insert in lieu thereof the word "corporation"; in line 57, after the word "therefrom" insert the following: "together with a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures on account of the other activities authorized by law"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 1, 2, and 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the following: "pursuant to section 1 of the act approved March 4, 1913, entitled 'An act to create a Department of Labor,' to continue"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment and transpose the remainder of said amendment to follow line 8 of page 2 of the bill; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For additional amount for driving the automobiles of the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, $240 each, $480."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Renumber the section to read "Sec. 6"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the numeral "8" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Renumber the section to read "8"; strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment after line 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "And with jurisdiction also to hear, consider, and adjudicate any and all other claims or demands by or against either party to said litigation, to the end that a complete and final adjustment may be had between said parties as to outstanding matters of controversy or account between them: *Provided*, That nothing in this amendment shall be construed to include claims by J. F. McMurray or Mansfield, McMurray & Cornish relating to the sale of the Choctaw-Chickasaw coal lands or claims relating to the leased district, or claims relating to proceeds arising from the sale of timberlands, unallotted or other lands or any other claim where the services were not actually rendered and finished and resulted to the benefit of said people: *Provided further*, That the said J. F. McMurray shall be limited in presenting such additional claims to such matters as may have or shall hereafter be set up by way of set-off or counterclaim by the defendants."

And the Senate agree to the same.

F. E. WARREN,
REED SMOOT,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. W. GOOD,
W. W. MAGEE,
J. W. BYRNS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WARREN. I ask for the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

REGULATION OF SALE OF EXPLOSIVES.

Mr. PHELAN (at 10 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.). Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no parliamentary situation.

Mr. PHELAN. May I ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations concerning the report just adopted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming will be glad to reply.

Mr. WARREN. On one of the large supply bills there is an expectation that there will be an agreement very shortly, but of course, necessarily, there must be some delay about bringing the enrolled bills in for the signature of the Presiding Officer.

Mr. PHELAN. I understand that; but I desire some information concerning the conference report on the sundry civil appropriation bill. I have just been informed that the conference eliminated the provision for the support of the Explosives Division of the Bureau of Mines. Is that correct?

Mr. WARREN. They did; not the conferees, but the House itself. The House did not permit the bill to go to conference until they eliminated that item.

Mr. PHELAN. I simply desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that at this time of all others there should be legislation upon the subject of the regulation of the sale and disposition of high explosives, and perhaps during this interim it would be well to call the attention of the governors of the States who are calling special sessions for consideration of the woman-suffrage amendment that they may include in their call legislation on the subject of the regulation of the sale and dis-

position of explosives, because vigilance now is needed in all parts of the country against depredations of anarchists and the Bolshevists.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is correct. At present there has been no declaration of the finishing of the war, and I take it for granted we are still under the protection of the United States in that respect. But the suggestion of the Senator from California is absolutely correct. Attention ought to be drawn to the matter in the several States. The States ought to provide against it. In addition to that, there could be a bill introduced in the Senate dealing with the subject, and it could go to the Committees on Mines and Mining. It is not necessary to pass it in connection with an appropriation bill.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator agrees with me that there should be some legislation on the subject?

Mr. WARREN. Undoubtedly.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 to the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and agrees to the same.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House, in compliance with House concurrent resolution No. 14, providing for a joint committee to confer with officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relative to a contemplated observance of the three-hundredth anniversay of the landing of the Pilgrims, had appointed as the committee on the part of the House Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCARTHUR, Mr. DOREMUS, and Mr. WHALEY.

The message further announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing that when the two Houses adjourn on Tuesday, the 1st day of July, 1919, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday the 8th day of July, 1919, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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 President pro tempore:

H. R. 3478. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4226. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4630. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River near the Texas & Pacific Railroad bridge in said county and State;

H. R. 4631. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River, at or near Blackman's Point, in said county and State;

H. R. 5227. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6176. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL JULY 8.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which was read:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Tuesday, the 1st day of July, 1919, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, on Tuesday, the 8th day of July, 1919.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the foregoing concurrent resolution, reported favorably thereon, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m., Tuesday, July 1, 1919), the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the concurrent resolution of the two Houses, until Tuesday, July 8, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed June 30, 1919.

[Omitted from RECORD of June 30, 1919.]

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Boaz W. Long, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Cuba.

FIRST JUDGE, CIRCUIT COURT OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

Cornell S. Franklin, to be first judge of the circuit court, first circuit of the Territory of Hawaii.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Charles B. Ames, to be assistant to the Attorney General.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 1 (legislative day of June 30), 1919.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Charles F. Lynch, to be United States district judge, district of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Joseph L. Bodine, to be United States attorney, district of New Jersey.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *July 1, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Let Thy blessing, Almighty God our Heavenly Father, descend in full measure upon us, that we may be prepared for the joys or sorrows, victories or defeats, hopes or disappointments of this day, that with faith and confidence we may go forward to our duty leaving the results to Thee, who doeth all things well. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 206. An act concerning actions on account of death or personal injury within places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 661. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the middle judicial district of the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes;

S. 253. An act for the payment of claims for loss of private property on account of the loss of firearms and ammunition taken by the United States troops during the labor strikes in the State of Colorado in 1914;

S. 202. An act providing for an additional judge for the district of Montana;

S. 1373. An act to amend the Articles of War;

S. 248. An act for the relief of Henry P. Grant, of Phillips County, Ark.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

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

S. 661. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the middle judicial district of the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1373. An act to amend the Articles of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 206. An act concerning actions on account of death or personal injury within places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 202. An act providing for an additional judge for the district of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 248. An act for the relief of Henry P. Grant, of Phillips County, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 253. An act for the payment of claims for loss of private property on account of the loss of firearms and ammunition taken by the United States troops during the labor strikes in the State of Colorado in 1914; to the Committee on Claims.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 2954. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in the State of Washington;

H. R. 3157. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; and

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of two persons, whose names shall be placed on the rolls of employees of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to issue permits for the diversion of water from the Niagara River.

PROCEDURE RESPECTING CONFERENCE REPORTS.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege involving a matter of procedure under the rules of procedure of the House, as well as the practice with reference to conference reports between the two branches of the Congress. Upon page 2195 of the RECORD of yesterday, June 30, 1919, in the proceedings of the other branch, a statement is made by a Member of that branch with reference to the motion to recommit the Army appropriation bill, and following the statement made by that Member the presiding officer of the other branch decided that the papers should go back, evidently agreeing with the contention made by the Member referred to that the motion to recommit the Army appropriation bill conference report affects only the Journal of the House.

I direct the attention of the Chair, in order that it may be included in the RECORD of the proceedings of this branch of the Congress, to the precedent established in the other branch, and which has been followed in this branch, to be found in Volume V of Hinds' Precedents, at page 794, section 6545, where a motion to recommit a conference report was made in the other branch, and the point of order being raised that it was not parliamentary and that recommital would only be had by concurrent action, the presiding officer of the other branch at that time held:

The Chair has known it to be done several times; that is, to recommit without concurrent action.

None of the papers are now in the hands of the House. The report has not been made in the House. It has only been made in the Senate. * * * It would simply require that the House shall be notified of the action of the Senate.

On the same day the following resolution was transmitted to the House by message:

Resolved, That the conference report on the bill (H. R. 12684) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian Tribes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes, be recommitted to the conference committee.

That message was received by the House and was held in order by the Chair. That is precisely what has taken place with reference to the Army appropriation bill in this case.

For the purpose of the RECORD I desire to state that as affecting the procedure of this House we have followed the precedents established not only in this House but in the branch of the Congress in which yesterday a certain Member desired to question the regularity of the proceedings, and that although, as I am informed, the papers have been informally returned to the House, they are now properly in the hands of the conferees; that upon the contention made by the Member of the other branch and the decision of the presiding officer of that branch, it can not be held that they have refused to receive our message announcing that the conference report has been recommitted to the conference, because, as a matter of fact, neither branch has taken any action upon the conference, and that the papers and the recommittal should now be in the hands of the conferees and should be returned to the managers on the part of the other branch.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is obliged to the gentleman for bringing this matter up. A point of order was raised yesterday as to the propriety of the motion to recommit. The Chair examined the precedents and ruled in accordance with the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], but he had not observed what occurred in the Senate.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I think we should have a quorum present to consider this conference report, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously there is no quorum present.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were closed, the Sergeant at Arms was directed to notify absentees, and the Clerk called the roll.

The following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Ellsworth	Knutson	Reed, N. Y.
Anthony	Emerson	Langley	Rhodes
Ashbrook	Fairfield	Lea, Calif.	Riordan
Ayres	Fess	Lehlbach	Robinson, N. C.
Bacharach	Fields	Lesher	Rowan
Baer	Fitzgerald	Longworth	Rucker
Begg	Focht	Luce	Sabath
Bland, Ind.	Fordney	Lufkin	Sanders, N. Y.
Browne	Frear	McClintic	Sanford
Brumbaugh	Fuller, Mass.	McCulloch	Saunders, Va.
Burdick	Gallagher	McKenzie	Scully
Burroughs	Gallivan	McKinley	Sherwood
Caldwell	Gandy	McLane	Shreve
Campbell, Pa.	Garland	MacCrate	Sinclair
Cantrill	Garrett	Maher	Slemp
Caraway	Godwin	Mann	Small
Carew	Goldfogle	Mansfield	Smith, N. Y.
Carss	Goodall	Mead	Snell
Casey	Gould	Merritt	Snyder
Clark, Fla.	Graham, Pa.	Mooney	Stedman
Cole	Graham, Ill.	Moore, Ohio	Steele
Connally	Greene, Mass.	Moore, Va.	Stiness
Cooper	Hamill	Morin	Sullivan
Copley	Hayden	Mudd	Temple
Crago	Heflin	Murphy	Tilson
Cullen	Hernandez	Neely	Towner
Curry, Calif.	Hill	Nichols, Mich.	Treadway
Dallinger	Houghton	O'Connell	Venable
Darrow	Howard	Osborne	Ward
Davey	Humphreys	Padgett	Weaver
Dempsey	Husted	Paige	Webb
Dent	Hutchinson	Parker	Whaley
Dewalt	Igoe	Pell	White, Me.
Dickinson, Mo.	Jefferis	Peters	Williams
Dickinson, Iowa	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Winslow
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Porter	Wise
Dooling	Kahn	Purnell	Wood, Ind.
Doremus	Kendall	Ragsdale	Woods, Va.
Doughton	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey, Henry T.	Woodyard
Dunn	Kennedy, R. I.	Rainey, John W.	Young, N. Dak.
Eagan	Kettner	Randall, Wis.	
Eagle	King	Reavis	
Edmonds	Kleczka	Reber	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and fifty-eight gentlemen have answered to their names; a quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, just for the purpose of having the RECORD correct, the gentleman from Kentucky should renew his request to correct the RECORD, because you can not do that until further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks that the Journal and the RECORD be corrected as indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 6176, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up the conference report on the sundry civil bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 6, 8, 11, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 24, 29, 30, 31, 35, 40, 44, 51, 52, 56, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 68, 72, 74, 88, 96, and 112.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 12, 17, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 48, 57, 64, 66, 67, 70, 75, 77, 80, 92, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 114, and 115, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$48,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Assistant surgeons general at large not exceeding three in number"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The heads of the several excutive departments and other Government establishments are authorized and directed to submit to Congress not later than the first Monday in December, 1919, a statement showing for the fiscal year 1919 the activities of their respective departments or establishments pertaining to the public health, and the amounts expended on account of each of the said activities."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: " : *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $2,500 per annum except the following: One at $7,500, 1 at $5,000, 10 at $3,600 each, and 40 from $2,500 to $3,000 each, inclusive"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$356,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out amended to read as follows: "For commencing the construction of a reflecting pool in West Potomac Park, $175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,461,353.50"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,201,897"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to adjust the compensation of officers and employees at St. Elizabeths Hospital"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "offices," in line 11; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The appropriation herein made for the enforcement of the immigration laws shall be available for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes,' approved October 16, 1918, and acts amendatory thereof."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "To," strike out the word "equip"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"HOUSES.

"Aberdeen, Md., $5,000;
"Alliance, Ohio, $6,500;
"Bath, Me., $7,500;
"Bremerton, Wash., $24,000;
"Bridgeport, Conn. (site 4—Crane tract), $19,000;
"Bridgeport, Conn. (site 5—Mill Green), $19,000;
"Bridgeport, Conn. (site 12—Grassmere), $8,000;
"Charleston, W. Va., $8,000;
"Erie, Pa. (east tract), $4,500;
"Erie, Pa. (west tract), $18,500;
"Hammond, Ind., $13,000;
"Indianhead, Md., $8,000;
"New Brunswick, N. J., $17,000;
"New London, Conn, $8,000;
"Groton, Conn., $1,750;
"Newport, R. I., $3,750;
"Niagara Falls, N. Y., $13,000;
"Niles, Ohio, $5,750;
"Philadelphia, Pa., $44,000;
"Portsmouth, Va., district: Cradock, $47,000; Truxton, $12,500;
"Pompton Lakes, N. J., $1,000;
"Quincy, Mass., $36,000;

"Rock Island district: Davenport, Iowa, $15,000; Moline, Ill., $9,000; East Moline, Ill., $8,000; Rock Island, Ill., $16,500;
"Vallejo, Calif. (Mare Island), $21,000;
"Washington, D. C., navy yard, $1,000;
"Waterbury, Conn., $4,000;
"Watertown, N. Y., $7,000;
"In all, houses, $412,250."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Amend the matter inserted by said amendment as follows: In line 2 strike out "$220,000" and insert "$165,000"; in line 3 strike out "$99,000" and insert "$74,000"; in line 5 strike out the word "equip"; in line 14 strike out "$925,940" and insert "$700,000"; in line 14 strike out "$1,244,940" and insert "$939,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"RESTAURANTS.

"Quincy, Mass., $2,500;
"Vallejo, Calif. (Mare Island), $110,000;
"In all, restaurants, $112,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"APARTMENTS.

"Bremerton, Wash., $6,000;
"Bridgeport, Conn. (site 1, Black Rock), $33,000;
"Bridgeport, Conn. (site 14, Connecticut Avenue), $15,000;
"Erie, Pa. (west tract), $1,000;
"Portsmouth, Va., district: Cradock, $6,000;
"Washington, D. C.: Navy yard, $600;
"In all, apartments, $61,600."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"DORMITORIES.

"Indianhead, Md., $6,000;
"Quincy, Mass., $74,000;
"Vallejo, Cal. (Mare Island), $28,000;
"Washington, D. C.: Navy yard, $4,000;
"In all, dormitories, $112,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "In all, $2,068,970: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriations heretofore made and available for expenditure by the United States Housing Corporation shall be expended for the purposes for which appropriations are made herein"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 16 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the words "after the"; in line 17 strike out the words "conclusion of the war" and the word "it"; strike out all of line 39, after the word "away," down to and including the word "President," in line 42; in line 55 strike out the word "commission" and insert in lieu thereof the word "corporation"; in line 57, after the word "therefrom," insert the following: "together with a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures on account of the other activities authorized by law"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"To enable the Secretary of Labor to maintain in the District of Columbia an organization to coordinate the public employment offices throughout the country by furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment and by maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States, including a director at $5,000 per annum, an assistant director at $4,000 per annum, four chiefs of divisions at $3,000 each per annum, and such other personal services at rates of compensation not exceeding $1,800 each per annum as may be necessary, supplies and equipment, telegraph and telephone service, and printing and binding, $200,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment and transpose the remainder of said amendment to follow line 7 of page 2 of the bill; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For additional amount for driving the automobiles of the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, $240 each, $480."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Renumber the section to read "Sec. 6"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the numeral "8" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Renumber the section to read "8"; strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment after line 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "And with jurisdiction also to hear, consider, and adjudicate any and all other claims or demands by or against either party to said litigation, to the end that a complete and final adjustment may be had between said parties as to outstanding matters of controversy or account between them: *Provided*, That nothing in this amendment shall be construed to include claims by J. F. McMurray or Mansfield, McMurray and Cornish relating to the sale of the Choctaw-Chickasaw coal lands or claims related to the leased district, or claims relating to proceedings arising from the sale of timber lands, unallotted or other lands or any other claim where the services were not actually rendered and finished and resulted to the benefit of said people: *Provided further*, That the said J. F. McMurray shall be limited in presenting such additional claims to such matters as may have or shall hereafter be set up by way of set-off or counterclaim by the defendants"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES W. GOOD,
WM. S. VARE,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
REED SMOOT,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of said amendments, namely:

On No. 1: Appropriates $250,000, as proposed by the Senate, for temporary employees in the Department of State.

On No. 2: Reappropriates an unexpended balance for employment of personal services in the office of the Auditor for the Post Office Department, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 3: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire a site for a new post-office building at Pittsburgh, Pa., at a cost not exceeding $950,000.

On No. 4: Strikes out the appropriation of $496,000, proposed by the Senate, for a site and working drawings for an archives building in Washington.

On No. 5: Appropriates $220,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $200,000, as proposed by the House, for remodeling public buildings in special cases.

On No. 6: Strikes out the appropriation of $176,775 for acquisition of the Baltimore Quarantine Station.

On Nos. 7 and 8, relating to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing: Appropriates $2,375,000 instead of $2,300,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,429,500, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries of employees; and restores the paragraph, stricken out by the Senate, authorizing the use of proceeds received from work performed during the fiscal year 1920.

On Nos. 9, 10, 11, and 12, relating to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance: Appropriates $48,000,000, instead of $40,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $53,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the payment of military and naval family allowances; appropriates $50,000,000, instead of $24,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $70,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for military and naval compensation; appropriates $10,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $40,000, as proposed by the Senate, for rent of quarters in the District of Columbia; and inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, prohibiting the use of appropriations for reimbursement of the Public Health Service for care of war-risk insurance patients.

On Nos. 13, 14, and 15, relating to the Public Health Service: Inserts the authority, proposed by the Senate, for the employment of assistant surgeons general at large, modified so as to limit it to not more than three; and strikes out the increase of $100,000, proposed by the Senate, in the fund for prevention of epidemics for reimbursement of expenses incurred in combating influenza in Alaska.

On No. 16: Requires each department and establishment to report to Congress its activities and expenditures during the fiscal year 1919 for public health work, instead of the provision, proposed by the Senate, calling for the submission of a plan for the consolidation of the various health divisions and bureaus of the Government.

On No. 17: Inserts the appropriation of $12,000, proposed by the Senate, to provide additional compensation to the engine-room forces of the sewage pumping station and the water department pumping station in the District of Columbia.

On No. 18: Strikes out the increase of $2,900, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for Columbia Hospital and Lying-in Asylum.

On Nos. 19 and 20: Strikes out the appropriation of $840 for an additional stenographer in the Employees' Compensation Commission.

On Nos. 21, 22, and 23, relating to the Federal Board for Vocational Education: Appropriates $6,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,000,000, as proposed by the House; inserts the language, proposed by the Senate, providing that the appropriation made in the bill shall be in lieu of the appropriation contained in the act amending section 2 of the act approved June 27, 1918; and inserts a substitute for the limitation, stricken out by the Senate, upon rates of compensation which may be paid under the appropriation contained in the bill.

On No. 24: Provides for the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board in the manner as proposed by the House instead of the manner as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 25: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the language giving authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission to have printing done outside of the Government Printing Office in an amount not exceeding $1,500.

On Nos. 26, 27, and 28, relating to the emergency shipping fund: Appropriates $356,000,000, instead of $276,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $491,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the construction of ships; and inserts the authority, proposed by the Senate, for the disposition of "plants" as the President may direct.

On Nos. 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33, relating to the Smithsonian Institution: Appropriates $45,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $40,000, as proposed by the Senate, for international exchanges; appropriates $42,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $40,000, as proposed by the Senate, for American ethnology; restores the paragraph, stricken out by the Senate, reappropriating an unexpended balance for an observation of the total eclipse of the sun in Bolivia; and appropriates $55,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House, for heating, lighting, etc., of the National Museum.

On No. 34: Appropriates $100,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House, for headstones for graves of soldiers in national cemeteries.

On No. 35: Appropriates $25,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the increased cost of park maintenance in the District of Columbia.

On No. 36: Appropriates $20,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $10,000, as proposed by the House, for an extension of the bathhouse at the tidal basin bathing beach.

On No. 37: Appropriates $175,000 for commencing the construction of a reflecting pool in west Potomac Park.

On No. 38: Appropriates $1,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $500, as proposed by the House, for appliances for disabled soldiers.

On No. 39: Appropriates $1,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,000, as proposed by the House, for trusses for disabled soldiers.

On No. 40: Strikes out the authority, proposed by the Senate, for the transfer of ambulances and trucks from the War Department to the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

On Nos. 41 and 42, relating to the survey of public lands: Appropriates $700,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $675,000, as proposed by the House, and requires the use of $50,000 of that sum for the survey and classification of lands in the so-called Oregon & California Railroad lands and the Coos Bay Wagon Road lands.

On No. 43: Makes available for the fiscal year 1919 not to exceed $25,000 of the sum of $150,000 authorized by the Indian appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920 for improvements to the irrigation systems in the Big Horn Valley, on the Crow Reservation in Montana.

On No. 44: Strikes out the appropriation of $8,000 for the construction of a bridge across the Two Medicine River, in the Black Feet Indian Reservation in Montana.

On No. 45: Reappropriates the sum of $10,000 for the construction of a bridge and the sum of $5,000 for the construction of wagon road on the Shivwits Indian Reservation in the State of Utah.

On Nos. 46 and 47: Appropriates $325,000, instead of $289,000, as proposed by the House, and $425,000, as proposed by the Senate, for topographic surveys.

On Nos. 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, and 53, relating to the Bureau of Mines: Increases the appropriation for the investigation of causes of mine explosion from $402,210 to $422,210, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $150,000, instead of $135,000, as proposed by the House, and $160,000, as proposed by the Senate, for investigation of mineral fuels and unfinished mineral products; appropriates $125,000, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the House, and $150,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of petroleum and natural gas; strikes out the appropriation of $75,000, proposed by the Senate, for the establishment of three mine experiment stations; strikes out the matter, proposed by the Senate, amending the explosives act approved October 6, 1917.

On Nos. 54 and 55, relating to the Reclamation Service: Appropriates $75,000, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the Senate, and $50,000, as proposed by the House, for secondary projects.

On No. 56: Appropriates $2,038,029, instead of $12,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for continuing the construction of the Alaskan railway.

On No. 57: Appropriates $250,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $215,000, as proposed by the House, for education in Alaska.

On No. 58: Strikes out the appropriation of $50,000, proposed by the Senate, for the division of educational extension in the Bureau of Education.

On Nos. 59, 60, 61, 62, and 63, relating to the National Park Service: Appropriates $40,000 instead of $25,000, as proposed by the House, and $50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Grand Canyon National Park; strikes out the paragraph proposed by the Senate making a national park of the Hot Springs Reservation, Ark.; strikes out the appropriation of $20,000 for construction of an automobile highway to and through Mount Ranier National Park, Wash.; strikes out the increase of $15,000, proposed by the Senate, for the Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.; and strikes out the reappropriation proposed by the Senate for the Yellowstone National Park.

On Nos. 64, 65, and 66, relating to St. Elizabeths Hospital: Appropriates $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $875,000, as proposed by the House, for maintenance; inserts a substitute for the language stricken out by the Senate authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to adjust the compensation of officers and employees; and strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the limitation relative to the detail of soldiers and sailors for service at the hospital.

On No. 67: Appropriates $121,937.75, as proposed by the Senate, for the Howard University.

On No. 68: Strikes out the appropriation of $14,440, proposed by the Senate, for additional clerks in the office of the Attorney General.

On No. 69: Appropriates the sum of $1,600,000 instead of $1,400,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the detection and prosecution of crime.

On No. 70: Appropriates for nine law clerks, at not exceeding $3,600 each, as proposed by the Senate, for the justices of the Supreme Court.

On No. 71: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, increasing from $50,000 to $60,000 the amount which may be used by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for the maintenance of branch offices during the fiscal year 1920.

On No. 72: Strikes out the appropriation of $354,000, proposed by the Senate, for a new vessel for the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

On Nos. 73 and 74, relating to the Bureau of Fisheries: Appropriates $15,000, instead of $7,500, as proposed by the House and $25,000 as proposed by the Senate, for statistical inquiry; and strikes out the appropriation of $25,000, inserted by the Senate, for the development and improvement of the herring fisheries in Alaska.

On No. 75: Appropriates $5,550, as proposed by the Senate, for contingent expenses of the Steamboat-Inspection Service for the fiscal year 1919.

On No. 76: Strikes out the appropriations of $300,000 and $350,000, respectively, proposed by the Senate, for the enforcement of laws against alien anarchists and the deportation of aliens, and inserts authority for use of the appropriation of $2,450,000 for the regulation of immigration for the enforcement of the laws against alien anarchists.

On No. 77: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, extending without cost the benefits of the naturalization laws to aliens who have served in the military or naval forces.

On Nos. 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, and 90, relating to the United States Housing Corporation: Inserts the amendment, proposed by the Senate, modified as follows: Appropriates $2,068,970, instead of $2,992,415, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the authority, proposed by the Senate, for the equipment of projects; inserts a paragraph, providing that no part of the appropriations remaining to the credit of the Housing Bureau shall be expended for the purposes for which appropriations are made in the bill; strikes out the authority proposed by the Senate for the transfer of property to other departments of the Government; provides for the sale of the property as soon as it can be advantageously sold, and requires that the report covering sales shall include a report showing receipts from other authorized activities.

On No. 91: Appropriates $200,000, instead of $400,000, proposed by the Senate, for the maintenance of an organization in the District of Columbia to act as a central clearing house in connection with the employment of labor.

On No. 92: Appropriates $41,500, as proposed by the Senate, for rent for the Department of Agriculture.

On No. 93: Appropriates $125,000, as proposed by the Senate, for additional quarters for the Department of State.

On No. 94: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, consolidating the statement of appropriations for the third session of the Sixty-fifth Congress and the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

On Nos. 95 and 96, relating to the Botanic Garden: Appropriates $1,350 for the purchase and installation of a boiler, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the authority, proposed by the Senate, for the transfer of motor equipment from the War Department to the Botanic Garden.

On Nos. 97, 98, 99, 100, and 102, relating to the Senate: Appropriates for expenses and employees of the Senate in the manner proposed by the Senate amendments.

On No. 101: Appropriates $240 each additional for the drivers of the automobiles of the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

On No. 103: Appropriates $50,000, instead of $25,000, as proposed by the House, and $65,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries.

On No. 104: Appropriates $2,000 for payment to James J. Britt for expenses incurred in a contested-election case.

On No. 105: Authorizes the use of $50,000 of the appropriation for public printing and binding for the reconstruction of a garage for use as a warehouse.

On Nos. 106, 107, and 108, relating to the Panama Canal: Appropriates $729,898, as proposed by the Senate, for the completion of two seagoing coal barges.

On No. 109: Authorizes the Joint Committee on Printing to requisition for the Government Printing Office all surplus and unneeded printing and binding materials, equipment, or supplies in the possession of other departments of the Government.

On No. 110: Inserts a modification, proposed by the Senate, in the section authorizing the President to transfer to the regular departments of the Government any of the files and records of the agencies created for the period of the war.

On No. 111: Inserts the section, proposed by the Senate, relative to the disposal of unused and surplus motor-propelled equipment in the War Department.

On No. 112: Strikes out the section, proposed by the Senate, for a joint commission to report a plan for a national budget system.

On Nos. 113, 114, and 115: Reduces from $300,000 to $200,000, as proposed by the Senate, the amount to be covered into the Treasury from the unexpended balances of the appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission.

On No. 116: Inserts the section, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the University of the State of Washington to exchange certain school lands heretofore granted by the United States.

On No. 117: Inserts a substitute for the section proposed by the Senate, referring to the Court of Claims for consideration and adjudication certain matters between J. F. MacMurray or Mansfield, MacMurray and Cornish, and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians.

JAMES W. GOOD,
WM. S. VARE,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the conferees have come to a complete agreement. The bill as it passed the House carried $483,595,013.20. It passed the Senate carrying $778,650,778.95. The Senate added to the House bill $295,055,765.75. The Senate has receded to the extent of $173,690,391, and the House has receded to the extent of $121,365,374.75. The amount now carried in the bill as agreed upon by the conferees is $604,960,387.95. The principal items which were in dispute and upon which the House has yielded are the following: The State Department, for employees, $250,000. The Assistant Secretary of State advised the conferees that unless that amount was appropriated it would be absolutely necessary to close down the Passport Division. At the present time all of the countries of Europe are maintaining a passport division or service. They do not grant passports promiscuously, and they will continue to maintain passport regulations, and the United States will also maintain a passport service, but at the present time, unless this appropriation is made, we are advised that they would absolutely discontinue that service, and with the present orders not to permit anyone to enter any foreign country unless they had a passport from the country from which they come, it would deprive American citizens of the right to go to a foreign country. We have yielded and given the amount which the State Department insisted was the smallest amount they could get along with to maintain that service. At Pittsburgh, Pa.——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman understand that now that peace is declared this same passport system is expected to be kept up?

Mr. GOOD. It is expected to be kept up for a number of months. It will be kept up until we are advised of the ratification of the treaty of peace, at least, and then it is proposed by the State Department, as well as by the foreign Governments, that some regulation of that kind will be the best safeguard against the country receiving undesirable people of other nationalities.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Just one suggestion further. While it has no application to the situation right now, which, of course, must be taken care of, there is no reason why this Passport Bureau should not pay its way by fees, and I hope arrangements will be subsequently made so it will.

Mr. GOOD. They get about $700,000 now from fees, and that more than covers expenses, but I think perhaps they could well afford to charge a larger fee.

Mr. SIEGEL. If the gentleman will permit, the Passport Bureau pays for itself.

Mr. GOOD. I say it does.

Mr. SIEGEL. They earned over $900,000 last year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask the gentleman, is it not a fact fees are only paid to the Government in the event the passport is granted, and in case the passport is denied no fee is paid the Government?

Mr. GOOD. I understand that is the case.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There are thousands and thousands denied; many more refused than granted.

Mr. GOOD. Another item in the Senate bill to which the conferees have agreed is that of $950,000 for acquiring a site at Pittsburgh, Pa. This is simply a reappropriation of funds that will be received from the sale of the old site. The old site has been sold for $950,000———

Mr. MADDEN. New site for what?

Mr. GOOD. For a post office.

The next item is the family allowances for persons in the military and naval service of the United States. The House bill carried $40,000,000 and the Senate bill carried $53,000,000 for that service. The conferees have agreed to $48,000,000, or an increase of $8,000,000. It is quite likely with the very slow rate of demobilization that it will require a larger sum than this for the payment of family allowances on account of men in the military and naval services of the United States.

In this connection I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the bill that passed the House in February carried $33,000,000 and made it immediately available. The deficiency bill for the same service carried $39,000,000, and that has already been paid out. I do not know, if Congress had adjourned and had not met until December, what would have been done for the payment of the family allowances on account of men in the military and naval services of the United States, because the bill we passed carried only $33,000,000. We have already appropriated $39,000,000 since, or $6,000,000 more than the former bill carried, and that money has been practically all paid out or will have been sent out on the 1st day of July. The department is asking for considerable more than this. The conferees felt, therefore, that while it might be necessary to recommend a deficiency in this regard, that the $48,000,000 would be required in addition to the $39,000,000 which was carried in the deficiency bill.

And so, too, with the payment for military and naval compensation. The House bill carried $24,000,000 and the Senate bill carried $70,000,000. The bill that failed carried only $20,000,000. The Senate bill carried practically all of the estimate. It was stated by the director of this service that the $24,000,000 which was carried in the House bill would be required to pay the claims already allowed, and that if the House had insisted and we had appropriated only $24,000,000 for the year there would have been no fund at all with which to pay the compensation arising under new claims. We therefore agreed upon $50,000,000 for this service, which is an increase over the amount previously carried in the bill of $26,000,000.

The next item of any size is the increase over the House bill of $2,000,000 for the Federal Board for Vocational Education. We have had this matter before the House several times, and the situation in which we found ourselves was about this, that the sundry civil bill carried $4,000,000, and while that was pending in conference a bill reported out by the Committee on Education carried $6,000,000, and at least a large part of it was for the same service for which we had appropriated the $4,000,000. And what the conferees did was this: We increased the amount formerly carried in the sundry civil bill from $4,000,000 to $6,000,000, which was the total amount asked for by the board, and then put in a provision that that amount of $6,000,000 should be in lieu of the $6,000,000 carried in bill recently passed amending section 2 of the original act.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. SEARS. I think that is hardly a correct statement. While we raised the appropriation from $4,000,000 to $6,000,000, included in that $6,000,000 is $2,000,000 appropriated by this House, and so the appropriation was made practically at $4,000,000 as passed by the House last year.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman is mistaken about that. It was in addition to the $4,000,000 that had been appropriated.

Mr. SEARS. Two million dollars previously passed by the House.

Mr. GOOD. The language of the bill was that "it shall be in addition to the $2,000,000" carried in the act. At any rate, we have given them all they have asked for the entire service, and simply provide it shall be in lieu of the $6,000,000 carried in the bill amending the act.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In order that in the future there may be no confusion about these figures, I want the gentleman to state categorically whether or not he is in position to state that the aggregate sum of $6,000,000 now carried in the bill is all that the Federal Vocational Board says they will require for their general administrative purposes and for the purpose of paying this $80 a month to these 4,000 additional soldiers that we expect to take over under the provisions of the bill passed in the House a few days ago?

Mr. GOOD. I would not put it just that way. I would say this: My recollection is that it was a little over $6,000,000—I think $6,300,000, based on $75 a month. Our hearings were had when that was all they were asking, but the House and the Senate subsequently agreed upon paying $80 a month.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Have you had before your committee any member in authority to speak for the Vocational Board who stated that the sum of $6,000,000 would be sufficient to take care of their necessities in view of the legislation we passed a few days ago taking over these additional soldiers?

Mr. GOOD. We have had no hearings since the matter came up and have had no hearings since the allowance was raised from $75 a month to $80 a month. And I will say to the gentlemen that the only estimate that was made before the committee was for $6,000,000 for the entire service, and that included the allowance of $75 a month for the men who availed themselves of this training or went to school or college.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In other words, then, the gentleman does take the positive attitude that the Vocational Board has stated before his committee that the sum of $6,000,000 carried by this bill is sufficient to meet all their necessities in view of the legislation existing with reference to that board?

Mr. GOOD. I have said to the gentleman that we have had no hearings since we passed the law increasing the amount from $75 to $80 a month. We have had no hearings and nobody has appeared, therefore, before the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That very fact, I will say to the gentleman, is the reason why I anticipate it will develop that the amount you have appropriated is not sufficient for the purposes intended and you will have to bring in a deficiency to cover it.

Mr. GOOD. Now, the next item of any magnitude and, in fact, the large item, is the question of the Shipping Board. The House provision carried $276,000,000 for that board. The Senate carried $491,000,000 for the same service.

In order that we may have this matter straight, I want, first, to give you a picture of the balance sheet in so far as the ship construction item is concerned. The total authorization for ship construction, aside from requisitioned ships or purchased ships, was $2,884,000,000. Contracts have been let for all of that authorization except $220,000,000. This bill reduces the authorization by $120,000,000, leaving to the Shipping Board the right to enter into new contracts for new construction to the extent of $100,000,000. The amount, therefore, effective as an authorization when this bill shall have been approved will be $2,764,000,000. We have already appropriated under this authorization, not including the amount carried in this bill, $1,938,451,000. The amount of the authorization remaining, therefore, before taking any action on this bill except to reduce the authorization by $120,000,000, is $825,449,000.

This bill either appropriates or makes available toward that authorization $604,471,855. This does not take into account $100,000,000 for requisitioned ships, which would make up the entire amount of their estimate of $704,000,000. Of the whole amount of the ship construction authorization, therefore, after we shall have enacted this bill into law, there will remain to be met from appropriations or revenues, if all the ships are built within the limit of cost as authorized, $221,067,145.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. NOLAN. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if it is the intention of the committee to allow the Shipping Board to go along with the program of shipbuilding to the extent of $704,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. They have that money.

Mr. NOLAN. This $604,000,000, with the reserves they have on hand, will provide the necessary $704,000,000 to carry out that program?

Mr. GOOD. That is the intention, and the only thing that stands in the way is, first, the sale of ships by the Shipping Board to the extent of $75,000,000. They have already sold ships to the extent of $51,000,000, and they tell us that we are the only country where there are ships that can be delivered at this time, the only producer that has ships to sell, and that there is a big market for the ships. The other item of $60,000,000 is in regard to operations.

Last year the Shipping Board made considerable money from operations. Now, we have not attempted in this bill to take any of that, because that was used in this way: The War Department owes them $45,000,000 for services that they performed for the War Department. The Navy Department owes them $2,000,000. The Belgian Relief Commission owes them $11,000,000. They

have $12,000,000 in their treasury, after charging off for depreciation something over $35,000,000, which was money received in operation and which has gone back into the shipbuilding program, or will go back in the next year.

It was the statement of Mr. Rossiter that unquestionably they would make more than $5,000,000 a month without touching their earnings of last year. We simply say that if they meet anything like their expectations, if they make $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 this year, they can use that amount in ship construction. There is no doubt about that at all.

Mr. NOLAN. If they can not meet their expectations is it the intention of the committee to assist them in carrying out their program with $704,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. If they can not equal their old operations, then we insist that they shall collect from the Navy and War Departments and the Belgian Relief Commission $58,000,000, which will be within $3,000,000 of all that we have estimated for operation.

Mr. NOLAN. Is it possible for them to collect that $58,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly. If you can not collect from the War Department when we have been appropriating for that department money by the billions, if one arm of the Government can not collect its debt from the War Department, I do not know how an individual or corporation can do it.

Mr. NOLAN. It was stated repeatedly on the floor that it was merely a matter of carrying the money on the books, and that no actual money passed in the transaction.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. As I understand it, the gentleman came in here, when the bill was first brought into the House, with the statement that the Shipping Board and the committee had come to a perfect agreement on a definite program of construction, totaling $704,000,000 for the fiscal year 1920, and that the bill introduced into the House and passed by this House provided, by one means or another, for this total of $704,000,000 for the fiscal year 1920. I understand that the gentleman agrees that the existing program should not be abated and that commitments made should be carried out, so that no shipyards should be scrapped and no workers put out of work during this next fiscal year. The gentleman stated that on the floor, did he not?

Mr. GOOD. That is true to an extent, except where the gentleman said no shipyards should be scrapped. It is the intention to scrap some of these Government yards and to sell them as soon as we can sell them.

Mr. ELSTON. I remember that the gentleman qualified his statement to that extent. But I remember also his statement here, that the program agreed upon by the committee and the Shipping Board should be carried out. Now, I would like to ask with regard to the total amount of $135,000,000, namely, the difference between the Senate appropriation of $491,000,000 and the House appropriation of $276,000,000. This difference of $135,000,000 is not intended to diminish the program of $704,000,000 to the extent of $135,000,000, is it?

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. ELSTON. Now, it is intended to make good that $135,000,000, as I understand it, from other sources, namely: Capital stock of the United States Shipping Board, $50,000,000; working capital or operation proceeds of the Shipping Board, $60,000,000; and the amount of $25,000,000, which is an excess estimate on the part of the House committee over and above the estimate of $50,000,000 made by the Shipping Board of what would be received during the fiscal year 1920 out of the sale of ships. Is that true? That is, that there was a difference of opinion between the committee and the Shipping Board as to what they would receive out of the sale of ships during the next fiscal year 1920?

Mr. GOOD. That is true.

Mr. ELSTON. Now, I understand the gentleman to have said this in reply to a question by the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] that if any one of these three items, namely, the capital stock item of $50,000,000, or the working capital item, that is, the operation proceeds of $60,000,000 for the fiscal year 1920, and the excess estimate of $25,000,000 from the sale of ships—if any one of these items does not come up to expectations, or is not collectible, or liquid, although they may all be assets of the Government, nevertheless, this House is committed to the program of $704,000,000, and the gentleman will assist in making up deficiencies if they should occur. Now, we want that understood, because promises and expectations have been made on that basis.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the Congress is committed to this program. If for any reason the operations or the sale of ships shall fall short of the amount taken into consideration, of course that amount will have to be supplied in some other way; but I want to say to the gentleman now, and I want the Shipping Board to take judicial notice of it, that I do not believe that Congress will for a minute temporize with any organization that will hold that great number of ships which the Shipping Board now holds and refuse to sell them, when everybody knows that as the months pass we are going to sell these ships on a declining market, that the market will unquestionably go down, according to the statement of experts, to below $175 a ton. We have too many ships of one class, that make our fleet an unworkable fleet, and the Shipping Board has assured the committee that it proposes to sell these ships and sell them now. Mr. Hurley's estimate was that they could sell $100,000,000 worth of the requisitioned ships. Most of them were requisitioned from Norway. We requisitioned those and continued to build them, and they are ready for delivery. They can be sold now for cash to foreign countries. Most of those ships are sold in the United States, under an agreement that they will fly the American flag; but there is absolutely no reason why these ships should not be sold and why they should not be able to sell for foreign account more than the amount we have taken into consideration.

Now, with regard to the ships sold in the United States, they are sold on time. Only about an average of 33⅓ per cent is paid in cash, and that was the reason advanced by the Senate why this amount should be reduced to $50,000,000, where we had practically taken into consideration $150,000,000.

Mr. ELSTON. Is it not true that the gentleman's estimate of $75,000,000 realizable from the sale of ships during the fiscal year 1920 was predicated on a percentage payment on an assumed total sales of something like $200,000,000 worth of ships?

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. ELSTON. What was the percentage?

Mr. GOOD. We assumed that they would sell, as they said they were going to sell, about $100,000,000 worth of these foreign ships that were requisitioned; that they would be sold to foreign countries and cash would be obtained for them.

Mr. ELSTON. Under any circumstances the estimate of the gentleman, and of the Shipping Board as well, calls for the sales in the fiscal year 1920 in the aggregate of over $100,000,000. There is no great difference of opinion in that regard between the Shipping Board and the gentleman?

Mr. GOOD. I think not. I am not sure that I understood the gentleman's question.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

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

Mr. SCOTT. In connection with this appropriation, did the committee grant any portion of it in view of the proposed plan of the Shipping Board to construct 125 ships of 10,000 dead-weight tons or over?

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will look in the table he will find a statement that gives just exactly the number of ships that are on the ways, the number that are in the wet basin, and the number for which the keels have been laid. I can not carry all these figures in my mind. There is a table giving it all, and it was based upon that table that the committee arrived at its conclusions.

Mr. SCOTT. I will say to the gentleman that I am fairly familiar with the work that is now in process of construction, but my question is not directed to the ships that are now on the ways or that are partially completed, but it is directed to 125 ships that have not even been started yet, and that the Shipping Board propose to construct in the future, the ships to be of 10,000 or 12,000 dead-weight tons and upward.

Mr. GOOD. There is no estimate for those.

Mr. SCOTT. That is not contained in this estimate.

Mr. GOOD. That is not contained in this bill. The only estimate was for the ships that are in process of construction at the present time.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. How much money is left in the bill for the Shipping Board now?

Mr. GOOD. Three hundred and fifty-six million dollars of appropriations.

Mr. CARTER. That is the capital stock to be used for the expenses of running the work?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. How much did the original House bill carry?

Mr. GOOD. The House bill originally carried $276,000,000.

Mr. CARTER. How much did the Senate increase it?

Mr. GOOD. The Senate increased it to $491,000,000.

Mr. CARTER. Now, does the gentleman think he has left sufficient funds for the Shipping Board to run this business without forcing the sale of ships and causing them to be sold for less than they are worth?

Mr. GOOD. Well, yes.

Mr. CARTER. The thing I wanted to get clear in my mind was—I know the gentleman considered this phase of it—that we ought not to permit the appropriation to be cut to a point where the sale of ships might be forced in order to run the business, and thereby the ships be sold for less.

Mr. GOOD. We are going to sell some of these ships at a loss. The market is going down and they anticipate that. They have been fortunate in selling ships so far at a very high price; that is because of the lost tonnage during the war. We are the only country that can supply ships, and we can only supply ships of a certain class. The market will be limited for ships of that class, and after we have supplied the market for that class we will have to sell some of them at a loss.

Mr. CARTER. That does not get quite to the question I asked.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I do not believe the provision carried in the bill will force the Shipping Board to sell at any greater loss than they are having to sell now, but I think by selling the ships now they will not suffer as great a loss as they will by continuing the policy of holding the ships.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield, I will say for the benefit of my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, that there is no such thing as a forced sale of ships. There is the greatest demand for ships, and such ships as are built at Hog Island are worth $2,000 a day for charter rights, and the ships you can sell to-day, but they may not pay as much to-morrow. There is no question about a forced sale of the ships. The question is to get ships enough for those who wish to purchase them.

Mr. CARTER. The ship purchasers know as much about what the Government is doing as do Members of Congress. If they know that the Shipping Board has not sufficient funds to conduct the business and that they have to sell ships to get funds, naturally that would depreciate the price.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, not at all.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. For information, I desire to ask the chairman this question. It is disclosed by questions asked the chairman that it is contemplated that there shall be built for the Shipping Board something like 100 vessels.

Mr. SCOTT. One hundred and twenty-five new ships.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Then it seems to be in contemplation that the Shipping Board will dispose of the ships under the general power now exercised. I want to ask the chairman of the committee what is his judgment with reference to the advisability of the Government, through its Shipping Board, having the ships constructed, which, in the judgment of the chairman, it is evident that the Government will have to sell at a loss?

Mr. GOOD. The ships that will be constructed will be constructed in part out of material already on hand. A part of the plates have been fabricated. If that is sold, it will be sold at a great loss. The type of ships that will be constructed now will be of a different type altogether from the ships we have been constructing; they will be larger and faster and will fit in with the fleet we now have. It will be absolutely necessary for the management of the fleet to have additional ships.

I do not know how many they can construct out of their authorization. We have left $100,000,000 of that authorization for new ships, but, of course, they can not avail themselves of it if they do not complete the ships already under contract within the limit of cost.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am not quite clear about that. I understood from the questions propounded to the chairman that the Shipping Board was contracting for the construction of 125 ships, the construction of which is not yet begun. I understood in some sort of a way that the Shipping Board was obligated. It seems to me a wise policy, if the ships now held are to be disposed of, for the Shipping Board not to take on any new contracts for ships when it now seems reasonable that they must sell them at a loss. It is not a wise public policy to carry forward such a contract.

Mr. GOOD. I think there would be no difficulty in arriving at a similar conclusion as far as the committee was concerned if we had not had a large amount of material on hand that could be used. Some shipbuilders were willing to take it off the Government's hands. One builder would take five ships at $230 a ton actual cost to the Government. He would also take the contract for building new ships and take the material on hand at a greatly reduced price. It seemed to the committee that it was the only way we had to utilize the material on hand to make the fleet a balanced fleet.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. One more question and then I will not trouble the gentleman further. Does the material we have on hand go into the structures of the total number of ships, or could we reduce the total number and use the material on hand?

Mr. GOOD. The committee did not go into the question of new contracts. My understanding is that the new contracts are reinstatements of the old contracts for larger ships. I will say that item was not before the committee and I do not know about it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I want to make this suggestion, with the gentleman's permission: While we were on the other side we found that there seems to be an inability on the part of this Government to let up on its purchase of materials when there is a reduction in need for the use of the materials. In other words, there is not a coordination between that branch of activities that has to do with the use of things we buy and that part of the Government having to do with the purchase and acquiring of things that we buy.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman a question upon another subject if he is through with the shipping proposition.

Mr. GOOD. Let us get through with the shipping proposition first.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to make this suggestion, if the gentleman will yield, that on paying a visit to the Hog Island shipyards I found they had an immense quantity of material on hand there, the greater portion of which, the superintendent informed me, would have to be scrapped unless these contracts were carried out and unless this material was used in those particular ships, which they were all ready to build. I also find they were at that time—I suppose not counting the overhead expenses—selling ships they were turning out at an actual profit to the Government.

Mr. NOLAN. Is not this the fact, that last January the United States Shipping Board sent word out to the shipyards of the country canceling a number of contracts?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I understand they did.

Mr. NOLAN. And in May word went forth that a great number of other contracts were to be canceled. In other words, that the contract for every ship, the keel of which would not be laid by July 1, was canceled or suspended. The $704,000,000, as I understand it, is to carry out the unsuspended portion of the Shipping Board's contracts, as from last January, and if there is any reinstatement of a larger type of ship, it will be of contracts suspended as far back as last January only, however, to the extent of $100,000,000; that they are going to try as far as they can to save the salvage of this material in the shipyards and going to use it in the construction of these ships, a type of ship that is of the greatest use to this country, and that the addition of these ships they propose to contract for to the extent of $100,000,000 would be to balance the fleet. It is the intention of the Shipping Board in their program to not lay down new keels, but to reinstate some of these suspended contracts. I think the House ought to have that made clear to them.

Mr. GOOD. That is my impression, but I will say to the gentleman that I did not go into that question any further than to ascertain as to the use of the material on hand, and just to what extent that material is new keels I am not informed; but it was to use the material on hand, and my understanding was that it was to reinstate contracts for ships of a larger type, and I am not informed whether the keels had been laid or not.

Mr. NOLAN. The program is also, as far as they can, to sell material at cost price to the shipyards and let them build for private parties and for foreign account.

Mr. GOOD. I understand that is also a part of their program.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] states that his remarks are intended to serve notice on the Shipping Board that it is important to sell some of the ships they now have on hand and some they hope to have in the near future. For what purposes can the Shipping Board now use the proceeds arising from the sale of ships?

Mr. GOOD. The act gives the President the power to construct these ships, and the President has practically unlimited power.

Mr. OLIVER. So the proceeds arising from sales, in fact, constitute a revolving fund for the use of the Shipping Board in ship construction?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; to use for ship construction within the limit of cost.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think the House may have gained a misapprehension from the colloquy between the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN]. Mr. Hurley appeared before the Committee on the Merchant Marine the other day and notified us that the Shipping Board contemplated the construction of 125 new ships which were

larger than the type of ships the yards have been making for the United States Government.

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

Mr. GOOD. Just for a question. I can not yield any more for a statement.

Mr. NOLAN. Just in connection with that.

Mr. GOOD. I know, but my time is almost exhausted, and I have hardly started to explain the bill.

Mr. NOLAN. The chairman ought to explain to the House that the Government wants to get rid of some of these vessels.

Mr. GOOD. I have explained it twice now.

Mr. NOLAN. And that is one of the reasons why they hold up the Jones bill.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. In enumerating certain credits outstanding in favor of the Shipping Board there is enumerated an item of $11,000,000 due from the Belgian Relief Committee. I would like to know what that is.

Mr. GOOD. The Belgian Relief Commission?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. That was for transporting food supplies and clothing to Belgium for sufferers in Belgium.

Mr. MILLER. Who was the creditor in that—who is to pay?

Mr. GOOD. The Belgian Relief organization.

Mr. MILLER. A citizens' committee?

Mr. GOOD. I think associated with the United States perhaps are Great Britain and France in that matter, but I am not sure. I will have to look that up. I only know it is the Belgian Relief Commission.

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

Mr. GOOD. On this subject?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is it not a fact that the Shipping Board now has contracts in many of these shipyards for the construction of standardized ships, fabricated ships, that they are having too many of a certain type to give the fleet balance, and if they can make advantageous arrangements for shipyards for the construction of other types of ships it may be advantageous that they can do so and a great saving in carrying out the program now before the country, and enable them even if they have to dispose of those ships later to do so at better advantage and put us on a better footing and better plane in competing with the shipyards and the ships of Great Britain and other foreign countries?

Mr. GOOD. I do not think there will be any saving. I think there is bound to be a loss, but it will save some material unquestionably and give a better type of ship.

Mr. BRIGGS. I mean in reference to construction and adjustments.

Mr. GOOD. Now, the gentleman from North Carolina the other day made the statement that the sundry civil bill which failed at last session carried for this purpose $649,653,254, but that the House bill at this session, while it carried $276,000,000, made provision for $704,000,000. I want to remind the gentleman from North Carolina that in reporting this bill we found that we had on hand $6,514,220 of a net balance from the housing appropriation, $9,874,691 from transportation, $4,176,000 from the foreign-ship fund, and $118,000,000 from the $150,000,000 appropriation for the purchase of ships, and $25,111,000 from the plant and facilities fund. We also have added $60,000,000 from the operation of ships and permit them to use the $50,000,000 from the capital stock. If the other bill had carried, they could have used the $60,000,000 from operations for building ships, and they could have used the $50,000,000 of capital stock; therefore their bill actually carried or made available $759,653,254. They could also have used, in addition to that, for the purchase of ships, $118,000,000, making a grand total of almost $900,000,000 which would have been available, while this bill makes available at the outside $704,000,000. What was to become of the $118,000,000 that had been appropriated and remained unexpended and unobligated? Was not it the part of wisdom to pick it up and instead of appropriating more money out of the Treasury use what we had already appropriated for ship acquisition, for plants, housing, and transportation purposes? Now, that is what we have attempted to do, and while some gentleman may feel we were cutting pretty low, my opinion is that if the Shipping Board will take up in a vigorous way the sale of these ships, of which they have too many of a given type, there will be no shortage, and the amount appropriated will be found sufficient.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I have several items which I desire to discuss.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my time be extended 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, because I think the gentleman ought to have all the time necessary to explain this conference report, but I would ask the gentleman if he has any objection to my having, say, 20 or 25 minutes?

Mr. GOOD. Not at all. I think the gentleman should have it, and, as far as I am personally concerned, I will ask that my time be extended 1 hour, and I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the time is getting pretty close to a point when debate on this question ought to quit, and I intend to object——

Mr. GOOD. But I have not explained more than half the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think the House cares to hear——

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This bill carries six hundred and odd millions of dollars.

Mr. GOOD. Then I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would not the gentleman couple with that request that I have 30 minutes? There are one or two gentlemen on this side who desire to be heard and I think we are entitled to some time.

Mr. GOOD. I think there will be no trouble at all.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would like to have it understood there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman unless the previous question is ordered.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it ought to be limited as to time, and, still reserving the right to object, I think there is no necessity of having long debate on these questions that have been settled and passed upon. It is just a waste of time of the House and the country. The time has come when we ought to close it up and while I am not going to object to the gentleman's request——

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended for one hour and I will yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

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

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman now yield on another matter?

Mr. McDUFFIE. But, before leaving this question——

Mr. RAKER. I desire to inquire in reference to the amendment numbered 52, page 106 of the bill, the war-time explosive act——

Mr. GOOD. That is out.

Mr. RAKER. The conferees agreed to disagree to that amendment?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; that goes out. It is not in the bill at all.

Mr. RAKER. And that settles the whole matter?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I want to get it clear. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he is satisfied that the $704,000,000 arrived at by his figures, taking into consideration the amount due from the Belgian Relief Committee, which the Shipping Board will have to collect itself, the amount also to be obtained from the War Department, which they will have to collect, make up the $704,000,000?

You feel assured, do you, that the program of the Shipping Board throughout the country will not be hampered by the cutting down of the appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. Not in the least.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Then, if they are not able to make these collections, I understood you to say that the committee would be perfectly willing to pass an additional appropriation in order to carry out the program?

Mr. GOOD. Of course, I do not know what the committee would do or what Congress would do.

Mr. McDUFFIE. But what the chairman would do?

Mr. GOOD. I say that we are committed to this program, and if the money is not available from any source it would be the duty of Congress to appropriate the money.

Mr. McDUFFIE. And you do not think it will stop the working of the Shipping Board?

Mr. GOOD. Not in the least.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The world knows that we have got to sell these ships, and does it not necessarily follow that those ships will have to be sacrificed, largely?

Mr. GOOD. They are advised that we are the only people to make spot delivery of these ships, and we have been selling them without loss so far, and I think nobody connected with the Shipping Board anticipates that the work will remain permanent.

Mr. HAYDEN. I wish to refer to the proviso in amendment No. 111, which says:

That hereafter no transfer of motor-propelled vehicles and motor equipment, unless specifically authorized by law, shall be made free of charge to any branch of the Government service.

Will that interfere with the transfer by the War Department to the various State highway departments of motor-propelled vehicles heretofore authorized by law?

Mr. GOOD. No; because that has been specifically authorized by law, and that comes within the limitation provided for in this language.

Mr. HAYDEN. I wanted to be perfectly sure about that.

Mr. GOOD. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. BLACK. I had marked the same paragraph for a question. I am unable to see any limitation in this amendment No. 111 that would prevent the real repeal of that section 7 of the Post Office appropriation bill. It seems to me that it would be a prohibition.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will look at line 22, page 209, he will see that it reads:

That hereafter no transfer of motor-propelled vehicles and motor equipment, unless specifically authorized by law, shall be made free of charge to any branch of the Government service.

Where they have been made specifically authorized by law they will be transferred free of charge, just as in the case of the St. Elizabeths Hospital and in the case of the Post Office Department they are specifically authorized by law; and therefore that transfer can be made. But unless we specifically authorize the transfer without payment it can not be made.

Mr. BLACK. I had noted that language, but my construction of it was that it would mean that Congress would have to pass a law, for instance, transferring 100 motor vehicles to the Secretary of Agriculture for distribution in that way. When it says "specifically authorized by law," I was of the thought that that would really work a repeal of section 7 of the Post Office appropriation act, and we would hereafter have to take up these specific items and authorize such transfers. Does the gentleman think there is no danger in the interpretation of that paragraph?

Mr. GOOD. Of course, it was a Senate amendment, but it seemed to us it was safeguarded, and that where the law provided a motor-propelled vehicle could be transferred without charge it could be done.

Mr. BLACK. Let me call attention to the fact that section 7 of the Post Office appropriation bill does not mention motor vehicles at all. It authorizes the Secretary of War to transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture for distribution to the several States war equipment and war supplies, and under that the Secretary of Agriculture has assumed the authority, as I think he did have the authority, to transfer motor vehicles. Now, this amendment says that unless we have specific authority of law to transfer these motor vehicles it shall not hereafter be done. I am wondering if that section 7 can be construed to be specific authority of law. It does not even mention motor vehicles.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman we did not have that section of the Post Office bill before us, but if the law authorizing the transfer does not provide they shall be transferred without charge, of course it can not be done. They will have to pay for them out of their appropriation.

Mr. BLACK. That law does provide it shall be without charge, but it does not mention motor vehicles by name, and I really think there is danger that this is a limitation on or a repeal of that section 7, so far as motor vehicles are concerned. I am sure it was not the intention, but I think that will be the effect.

Mr. GOOD. The conferees agreed upon the Senate amendment giving $125,000 additional to St. Elizabeths Hospital and $121,937.75 to Howard University. That latter item went out on a point of order in the House and was restored in the Senate, and the conferees agreed to it.

The House bill carried $1,400,000 for the Department of Justice for the detection and prosecution of crime. The Senate bill carried $2,000,000, and the conferees have agreed upon $1,600,000, or an increase of $200,000 over the House bill.

The deficiency bill, which is in conference, carries a provision that so far as the Housing Corporation is concerned all the receipts from operations shall be turned into the Treasury of the United States, and that Congress shall appropriate the money for running the houses and paying the administrative expense. The Senate, therefore, put into this bill an appropriation of $2,990,000, which was about $400,000 less than the estimate. We have reduced that amount to $2,068,000, or a reduction of $923,000 under the amount carried in the Senate bill.

The Senate amendment of $400,000 for the Employment Service provided not only for a clearing house in the Bureau of Labor, but also provided for a field service. The provision agreed upon in conference carries but $200,000, and only makes provision for a clearing house in Washington.

We had previously appropriated $800,000 each for the construction of two coal barges for carrying coal to the Panama Canal. The increased cost of labor and material made it necessary to increase that appropriation, and the House conferees therefore agreed to the Senate amendment appropriating $729,898 additional.

The Senate has receded on the reflecting pool in Potomac Park with an amendment reducing it from $200,000 to $175,000.

The Senate bill also increased the House amount for the construction of the Alaskan Railroad by about $10,000,000. The bill as it passed the House carried an appropriation up to the limit of cost for the construction of this railroad, and the amount added to the bill by the Senate was in excess of that limit of cost. The House committee refused to hear testimony in regard to the need of appropriations in excess of the limit of cost, preferring that the matter of increasing the limit of cost should be taken up first with Congress and by legislation having that limit increased.

The legislation amending the explosives act and the legislation affecting the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board are out of the bill, the conferees having agreed to eliminate them.

I think that explains in large measure the principal items in the bill.

I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the House have labored very earnestly to come to a unanimous agreement with the conferees on the part of the Senate respecting the differences between the Senate and the House, in order that this bill may be quickly passed and become a law. I dare say that there are a number of items agreed upon in this conference report to which individual members of the conferees on the part of the House would not originally have given assent. But you gentlemen understand, of course, that when we go into conference between the House and the Senate there must be a spirit of compromise between the two bodies in order that a conclusion may be reached.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] has very fully and elaborately discussed the various amendments that have been agreed upon and reported to the House. I simply want to call attention to one or two. In the first place I want to refer to that amendment which relates to the establishment of what is called a clearing house for the United States Employment Service here in the District of Columbia. The conferees have reported a provision to the House providing $200,000 which shall be used within the District of Columbia by the United States Employment Service in the way of a general clearing house. That, of course, is good as far as it goes. But it is my own personal judgment that the amendment does not go far enough. I would have been glad to see some reasonable appropriation made that would have enabled this service to continue its agencies in the various States in order to render effective service, particularly to the discharged soldiers and sailors who find themselves without positions. We have established, in other words, a clearing house here in the District of Columbia, but I call your attention to the fact that the amendment does not provide any agency to originate business for this clearing house. It is on all fours with what might be said of a financial clearing house without banks to originate business for the clearing house to carry on.

Now, in this connection—and I shall not discuss the matter at length—I wish to call the attention of the House to the report that has been made by the Director of the Employment Service and which appears in the hearings which were had by the Senate committee on this particular bill. He submitted a report showing the number of registrations and the number of persons who had been placed by the service from February 8, 1918, down to and including June 7 of this year. That report shows that of soldiers and sailors only there were registered

with the various employment bureaus throughout the country the number of 430,018, and of that number there were placed by the service 262,611.

The statement of total activities for the entire calendar year 1918 and up to and including May of this year, which includes the soldiers and sailors as well as others who applied for positions, shows that they numbered in the way of registrations 6,667,101. There were calls for help for labor on the part of various employers to the number of 11,571,008. There were 6,055,316 referred and 4,147,003 actually placed by the Employment Service during the months to which I refer.

Now, it seems to me, from the report which has been submitted and which is on record, that it is clearly demonstrated that Congress ought to have made some provision to take care of this service in the States and that it has proven of great value. I want to say that it is stated in the hearings that there are not more than eight of the States now which have an adequate employment service, and therefore when we stop these Federal agencies in the States, necessarily the number of soldiers and sailors who are going to be discharged and demobilized in the future and who need positions will have no one with whom they can register, unless they write to the clearing house here.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman speaks of eight States having an employment service. As I understand it, Illinois always has had an employment service maintained at the expense of the State and appropriated for by the State legislature. She has recently added 12 additional stations, so that every city in the State of 25,000 population has a station appropriated for by the State legislature. Chicago has six stations, I believe.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is very commendable legislation, it seems to me, on the part of the great State of Illinois, and, undoubtedly, this service, on account of the action taken by Illinois, will not be so greatly missed in that State as it will be in those States where no such agencies have been created. The director of the service stated—and I quote from him in order that I may be exact in my statement—that perhaps eight States at the most have employment service which might be termed in any way adequate. We have, of course, in the vast majority of the States no employment service and no appropriation for any, and at the present time no possibility for any, because the legislatures of a large percentage of the States have already adjourned.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, you may take many States that are not manufacturing States and you will find that there has been no real necessity for the State establishing this service, because the agricultural people as a rule take care of themselves pretty well without the aid of an employment bureau, as I understand it. Otherwise, if it had been necessary, they would have had them, as we have them in the States that are called manufacturing States.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is quite true; but, undoubtedly, there are a number of States which would even come within the class referred to by the gentleman from Illinois which have to-day no employment service. Their legislatures are not in session. They can not establish employment services, and the point I was seeking to make was that some provision should be made whereby those who are in such States and without positions might have an opportunity to register their desire for employment, and there might be some one who can advise them where they can secure employment.

The very fact that we are establishing a clearing house here in the District of Columbia, confining its activities to this city and to the work it can possibly do by mail, it seems to me does not meet the situation in any sense. I understand that bills are pending before the proper committees of the House and Senate seeking to enact legislation along this line, and I assume that those bills will be reported shortly.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I consumed?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. BRYNS of Tennessee. There is another amendment to which I wish to refer——

Mr. GOOD. Before the gentleman goes to that, I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman realizes, with regard to this Employment Service, that this clearing house will do something in the way of providing employment for the returning soldiers by making available the information furnished by the officer on board the ship, who gets the information and transmits it——

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Undoubtedly.

Mr. GOOD. To the eight States, and also to those employment services in boards of trade and commercial organizations throughout the country.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Undoubtedly.

Mr. GOOD. While the bill that passed the House in February for this year did not carry a penny, even for a clearing house.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I regret to say that it did not, and I was not seeking to minimize whatever service may be rendered by this clearing house. The only point I was making was that, in my judgment, it did not go far enough, because for the life of me I can not see how a clearing house can be effective unless there is some agency to originate business for it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, I want to ask him about this Employment Service.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will make it brief.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How much is appropriated, as the matter now stands in conference?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Two hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The bill I have before me would seem to appropriate $400,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Senate adopted an amendment provided for $400,000 for general employment service. The conferees have agreed upon an amendment to provide $200,000 for the establishment of a clearing house here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania seems to have a very satisfactory employment service of its own, paid for by the State. Just how will this appropriation affect a situation like that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It does not affect it in any sense. This clearing house is intended to be of assistance to the country generally and to those who need employment generally throughout the country in securing positions, and where a State has an employment agency or an employment service I can appreciate the fact that this clearing house here will be able possibly to render some assistance.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is this clearing house for work here in the District of Columbia only?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; it is confined to the District as a central Federal agency.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just very briefly I want to refer to the appropriation for the Shipping Board. As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] very fully and clearly stated, the House adopted a provision making a cash appropriation of $276,000,000. The Senate adopted a provision making a cash appropriation of $491,000,000. The conferees have finally agreed upon a cash appropriation of $356,000,000, which is $80,000,000 in excess of the amount carried by the House. I hope that will be sufficient. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] states that if it is not, a deficiency may be secured later. In my judgment it is a rather doubtful policy to take from the Shipping Board not only its capital stock but also its working capital in addition. Then, too, I may say that the Shipping Board contended that the House had given too much credit for the sale of ships, the House having assumed that they would have $75,000,000 in cash from the sale of ships, which they could use during the next year, whereas the Shipping Board contended that $50,000,000 would be a large sum.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman think we ought to have increased this by $110,000,000?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. So far as I am concerned I will say frankly that if we had increased it by $60,000,000 we would have been nearer what is right and nearer what I firmly believe will be developed later on when we bring in a deficiency bill for this Shipping Board, unless they make more money out of their operations than they anticipate.

If they sell more ships than they anticipate, why, it may be that such a large deficiency will not be required. But here is the situation: By undertaking to provide that such a large amount from the sale of ships shall be taken into consideration and used during the next year we put the Shipping Board in the position of having to sell these ships, and we let the buying public know that the Shipping Board has not in its treasury a sufficient amount of money to do whatever construction is necessary during the next year, and therefore the buying public are in a position to stand back and say to the Shipping Board, "If you want to sell your ships you must take a less price than you otherwise would demand," because these ships are not sold for cash. It is impossible to sell them for cash and realize the best price. In fact, only about 25 per cent cash is realized. Now, in my judgment it would have been wiser if we had made

an appropriation which would not have put the Shipping Board in the situation before the buying public requiring them to sell the ships regardless of the price that they might bring, unless it can come back to Congress and get additional money. The gentleman from Iowa, however, has relieved the Shipping Board of this embarrassment to a certain extent by indicating that a deficiency appropriation may be made later on if needed.

Mr. GOOD. I am sorry to see the gentleman in such complete disagreement with the gentleman from North Carolina in regard to the amount that is carried.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know what the views of the gentleman from North Carolina are, but I believe that when we come to the deficiency bill next winter the facts will show that I am very nearly correct in my contention.

This brings me to another point, and then I must conclude, for I must yield to two other gentlemen. I have signed the conference report. I am in line with the gentleman from Iowa, who is making a very commendable effort to cut expenses, but I do not believe that in cases where we know what is going to be needed next year we ought to cut these expenses with a view of taking them up by a deficiency later on. It is going to be found later on that a number of activities in this bill—and I may say in other bills—will have to be augmented by deficiency appropriations. Therefore the very fact that we are cutting expenses to-day and so greatly reducing expenses, as some gentlemen have claimed, is going to be found rather an exaggeration later on when deficiencies will have to be passed by Congress in order to provide the necessary funds to carry on many of the activities of the Government. The economy record of the Republican Party can not be safely judged by the size of the bills now being passed. It will have been established when we ascertain how much more is to be appropriated later on by way of deficiency appropriations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, at the last session of Congress I reported this sundry civil bill. At this session I have not consumed any time in discussing it because it was my desire to expedite its passage.

The debate here to-day causes me to refer to two subjects in order that the record may be kept straight. Gentlemen on both sides of the aisle attack the Employment Service and have stated their views as to the provision in this bill. The facts are that in the last session of Congress the sundry civil subcommittee, composed of the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Sherley, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Howard, and the distinguished Speaker of this House, Mr. GILLETT, Republican Leader MONDELL, and myself, were unanimously of the opinion that the war having come to a close, the Appropriation Committee was no longer justified in bringing in on appropriation bills legislation establishing new departments and appropriating for them large sums of money; that there was no justification for the usurpation of the functions of the legislative committees of this House. Without passing on the merits of the proposition at all, we took that position, and it was sustained by the Appropriations Committee, with the exception of four members on the Democratic side of the House, who signed a minority report. They were the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GALLIVAN, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. EAGAN, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Howard, and the gentleman from Montana, Mr. EVANS.

When we came on the floor an amendment was offered proposing to appropriate about $10,000,000. A point of order was made against it, and it went out under the rules of the House. I am firmly convinced that the appropriation in this bill, which is in the nature of a compromise, will accomplish nothing. One of two things should be done. The Employment Bureau should exist as it to-day exists, with offices throughout the country and local representatives endeavoring to secure employment for the unemployed, or it should not exist at all. The Labor Committee of the House has had this matter under advisement since May 19, and it ought to have reported a bill so that the House could express its views on the establishment of this service as a permanent activity of the Government.

This appropriation for the service, which can be spent only for employees in the District of Columbia, will be of no service to the returning soldiers. The organization will be disbanded, and we might just as well have refused to appropriate anything at all. If $400,000 was appropriated without restricting the appropriation to the District of Columbia, the field offices could be kept open until the Congress passed on the legislation now being considered by the Labor Committee.

Now, as to the Shipping Board: I rejoice that the gentleman from Iowa, in response to a question, stated that as far as he was concerned, when it was necessary he would favor the appropriation in a deficiency bill of a sufficient amount to carry out this program of $704,000,000. There is no doubt in my mind that the necessity will arise, and in the very near future.

I spent some time in investigating the Shipping Board situation. I know as to the operating division there may be no immediate trouble. But when we take as we do by this bill the $50,000,000 capital stock which is on deposit in banks throughout the country and is used to pay their current obligations on construction account we are taking from them their working capital, and they will have to replace it immediately, and there is only one way in which they can secure funds to replace it and that is by a forced sale of ships at this time.

This bill provides for the sale of $225,000,000 worth of ships. I say that because they can not sell for cash. We may say that they ought to, but they can not. They can not get fair prices when they demand cash, and they have been getting about one-third cash. When we ask them to secure $75,000,000 from the sale of ships it means they will have to sell $225,000,000 worth of ships. But I hope the Shipping Board will consider the statement of the gentleman from Iowa that he will favor a deficiency appropriation when it is necessary, and acting upon this will continue its present policy of selling upon terms that will enable us to secure fair prices for our ships and will not attempt to carry out the program of selling for cash and thereby sacrificing the ships.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Can I have five minutes more?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am sorry but my time is all promised.

Mr. GOOD. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in those five minutes I want to refer to the appropriation of $118,000,000 which has been referred to by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]. I have nothing to do with the debate between the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and the gentleman from Iowa, but the other day I heard the gentleman from Iowa inject into the speech of Mr. KITCHIN, from North Carolina, the statement that when they came to prepare this bill they found $118,000,000, and to-day again the gentleman makes the statement that he found unexpended $118,000,000 that was appropriated for the purchase of ships, and his language implies that the former committee did not know of the existence of this fund, and it was left to him to find this small amount hanging around the Shipping Board's offices. That is a very great reflection upon my friend from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], who was a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but it is a worse reflection upon the distinguished Speaker, who was a member of the subcommittee on the sundry civil appropriation bill. It is a terrible reflection upon the distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and I want to say that if the gentleman from Iowa does not know how to account for that $118,000,000 he ought to have asked his leaders and they would have told him. The fact is the committee in the last Congress knew of the existence of this fund, and for very good reasons did not disturb the $118,000,000; but I know the gentleman could not know about it, because he was not on the subcommittee, and I will tell him why we left it. We discovered from the hearings that there was $118,000,000 left in that fund available for the purpose of purchasing ships, and we were about to cover it into the Treasury when the representatives of the Shipping Board came down, and as there was no politics in the Appropriation Committee, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] was called into conference with Mr. Sherley and myself, and the Shipping Board told us that the President of the United States five days after the signing of the armistice had discovered that the International Mercantile Marine was about to sell its stock to British interests. The President was anxious to control every possible ship in order to hasten the return of our boys from Europe and did not want the control of the International Marine to pass out of American hands. We therefore objected to the sale of the company to the British interests and instead offered to purchase the business for the Shipping Board, in the hope that we could have these ships under the American flag.

Mr. GOOD. But is it not true that that could have been prevented without buying the ships? The transfer of the ships to a foreign power could have been prevented.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It was prevented.

Mr. GOOD. And the $118,000,000 was not needed at all then?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; I am going to tell the gentleman the story. If he ever knew it, he has not up to this time told the committee of it. It was found that the International Mercantile Marine was but a holding company, and

while almost its entire stock was held in this country and it was an American corporation, it did not own the ships but merely owned the stock in the White Star and other corporations which did own the ships, and which corporations were English and not American. We found that even though we purchased the stock of the International Mercantile Marine Co., that we could not get actual control of the ships because Great Britain would not permit the White Star and other corporations to transfer the ships. We refused to permit the Marine Co. to sell its stock to English interests in an effort to control the ships, and Great Britain refused to permit the subsidiary corporations that actually owned the ships to part with them. If we could not get the ships, we did not want the stock. The President and the Shipping Board, therefore, started negotiations with Great Britain to induce them to permit the ships to be transferred to our flag in order that we might be certain of their assistance in returning our troops. It may be that this attempt to purchase the International Marine for the Shipping Board helped us to secure some English ships to bring our soldiers back. At any rate, we did secure some English ships, more than we anticipated at the time the armistice was signed, and they to that extent assisted us in our demobilization. That was the situation confronting the sundry civil subcommittee. Negotiations had not been completed. We knew that if negotiations had gone so far that we were committed to purchase the stock, or if Great Britain decided to permit the transfer, this fund should be left available, as negotiations had been based upon the availability of this fund. Therefore the distinguished Speaker, the Republican leader, Mr. MONDELL, Mr. Sherley, and myself decided not to cover the money into the Treasury. We knew that if it was not spent it would automatically go into the Treasury on June 30. We knew also that if it was not spent for the purchase of the International Marine stock that it would not be spent for any other purchase. And it has not been.

The President found that he could, in an honorable way, avoid the purchase of the International Marine stock and he did so, and the $118,000,000 was left unexpended and would be covered into the general fund of the Treasury on June 30 if you had not put into this bill the provision reappropriating it and making it available for construction during the next year. That was why your Republican leader, Mr. MONDELL, the distinguished Speaker, Mr. GILLETT, Mr. Sherley, and myself left untouched this $118,000,000, which the gentleman from Iowa seems to regard as a lost fund, and that is the story of the $118,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one minute more. I want to say to the gentleman that Gen. Lord and other officers of the War Department came before the committee at this session of Congress and said that the British Government had failed and refused to furnish ships to bring our boys home because they needed the ships to take their own colonial troops home, and that was the reason why they could not be demobilized any faster.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That has nothing to do with our reason for leaving the fund available in case the negotiations were completed in such way as to make it possible to secure the ships and necessitate our paying over the money.

Mr. GOOD. They did not get the ships.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Well, as a matter of fact, the gentleman and I know that we have been using some English ships, regardless of what our friend Gen. Lord may say. I know it is a fact that we were using English ships in January and February, when these negotiations were on, and you will find in the hearings of your own committee a statement as to the manner in which we were to pay for the English ships we used, and when you come to pay for them you will find that they have been used.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes allotted to me I ask the attention of the House to amendment No. 117, which is as follows:

And with jurisdiction also to hear, consider, and adjudicate any and all other claims or demands by or against either party to said litigation, to the end that a complete and final adjustment may be had between said parties as to outstanding matters of controversy or account between them: *Provided*, That nothing in this amendment shall be construed to include claims by J. F. McMurray or Mansfield, McMurray & Cornish relating to the sale of the Choctaw-Chickasaw coal lands or claims relating to the leased district, or claims relating to proceeds arising from the sale of timberlands, unallotted or other lands or any other claim where the services were not actually rendered and finished and resulted to the benefit of said people: *Provided further*, That the said J. F. McMurray shall be limited in presenting such additional claims to such matters as may have or shall hereafter be set up by way of set-off or counterclaim by the defendants; and the Senate agree to the same.

I do this because I think it is a duty I owe to the membership of this body. This amendment embraces a controversy which has been before Congress ever since I became a Member, some 12 years ago, and I believe a few years prior to that.

The amendment, as will be noted, proposes some slight changes to chapter 8, Laws of 1918, which law conferred on the Court of Claims jurisdiction to settle certain claims of one J. F. McMurray.

Mr. McMurray was a member of the firm of Mansfield, McMurray & Cornish, which some 14 years ago acted in the capacity of attorneys for the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians. This employment was finally terminated, and out of it grew several claims of Mr. McMurray against the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians and some counterclaims of these Indians against him. Both sides to this controversy have made repeated, vigorous attempts to have the matter taken up by the courts, and for the past 12 years these friends, like the poor, have seemed to be with us, always haunting the corridors of the Capitol in their pleas for relief, until it seemed impossible to step outside the door of this House without being lobbied with concerning this matter.

Time and again the Senate placed in appropriation bills legislation in connection with this proposition, and time and again would the House conferees refuse to agree to same, until a little over a year ago, when your House conferees found the item carried in the annual Indian appropriation bill. In order that the matter might be put behind us and not further consume the time of Congress, your conferees thought it best to agree to some character of legislation with limitations giving proper protection to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes, and we brought back to the House a provision sending to the Court of Claims several different contentions between the tribes and Mr. McMurray. First, McMurray was permitted to sue for his fee in the Freedman cases; second, for two warrants amounting to some $10,000 as expenses in citizenship cases; and, third, some expenses in connection with tribal tax-suit collections. The fourth proposition permitted the tribes to sue for certain advance coal royalties claimed to be due on McMurray's coal leases, and the tribes were furthermore permitted to set up any counterclaims and offsets in connection with these matters. The conference report was adopted and this limited jurisdictional act became a part of the act of May 25, 1918.

These cases in due course of time went to the court, and Mr. McMurray claimed that the department and tribal attorneys attempted to set up counterclaims which were not embraced in or contemplated by the jurisdictional act. As to whether or not he was right in this contention is really, of course, a matter for the courts to decide. Be this as it may, Mr. McMurray's suggestions to me were all to the effect that he simply wanted to restrict the tribes to lawful counterclaims contemplated by the jurisdictional act.

When over in the Senate late Saturday afternoon my attention was called to an amendment which was intended to be proposed to this the sundry civil bill. I was somewhat surprised to find that this amendment was not a restrictive provision at all, but really undertook to remove all limitations set up by the jurisdictional act. The amendment as originally drafted is embraced in the first part of the language of this amendment No. 117, containing all the language coming before the first proviso, by which it will be noted that jurisdiction was sought to be conferred on the Court of Claims "to hear, consider, and adjudicate," not the claims set out in the original jurisdictional act at all, but "all other claim or claims by or against either party to said litigation."

This language seemed to undertake to revive certain old contracts for a fee of 10 per cent of the coal and asphalt, timber lands, unallotted lands, and other property of the Choctaws and Chickasaws, a matter about which there had been a good deal of discussion and controversy and which had already been rejected by Congress. Because it undertook to revive these claims and open up matters which had been settled and closed, I objected to the amendment, and one of our Oklahoma Senators agreed to make a point of order against it unless proper safeguards to the Indians were provided. After some further talk it was agreed that the first proviso should be added to the bill. The measure then passed the Senate, and Mr. McMurray agreed that I might write the final amendment in case it was agreeable to the conferees.

The House conferees were kind enough to consult with me concerning the matter and to express a willingness to defer to my judgment. I then called in Mr. Walter J. Turnbull, attorney for the Choctaws, Mr. McMurray, and the gentleman from Okla-

homa [Mr. HASTINGS], and it was agreed, at the suggestion of the attorneys for the Choctaws, that the second proviso should be added. This, we believe, gives full protection to the tribe and assures to Mr. McMurray his final day in court, which I hope forever and eternally settles the matter, to the end that it will not be brought back to Congress to take up the time of busy Members in the future as it has in the past.

While it is no fault of mine, I want to apologize to the House for this Oklahoma item being again brought to your attention at this time. It is certainly not my fault that it was attached to this bill, for we all understand this bill is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Indian Affairs, of which I am a member. I make this apology because when this McMurray jurisdictional provision was carried in the Indian appropriation bill last year I believe I told the House that the legislation then proposed sought to end the matter, and that the time of Congress would not again be taken up in consideration of same. Now, as far as I am concerned, I give notice that I am through with it. I know the House is tired of it, and I hope that it will never be brought back here again. We have sent all these propositions to court in language agreed to by both parties to the contention, so let us hope to rely on the court to settle it under the law as now provided. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, so far as my feeble influence in this House may go, I expect to try to prevent any future legislation of any character whatever upon this particular subject, and certainly I shall do all in my power to prevent matters like this being placed on a bill where it has no place and going before a committee not having jurisdiction.

I have made this explanation in order that the House might understand the amendment, and in order that both parties to the contention might be given notice that Congress is through with haggling, chewing, and sawing over this proposition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. GOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously there is no quorum present——

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names.

Ackerman	Fairfield	Kinchelce	Randall, Wis.
Andrews, Md.	Fess	King	Reavis
Ashbrook	Fields	Kleczka	Reber
Bacharach	Fitzgerald	Knutson	Reed, N. Y.
Baer	Flood	Langley	Riordan
Begg	Fordney	Lehlbach	Robinson, N. C.
Bell	Frear	Lesher	Rowan
Benham	Freeman	Lever	Rucker
Britten	Fuller, Mass.	Luce	Sabath
Browne	Gallivan	Lufkin	Sanders, N. Y.
Buchanan	Gandy	McAndrews	Sanford
Burdick	Garland	McClintic	Saunders, Va..
Caldwell	Garrett	McKinley, Ill.	Scully
Caraway	Godwin, N. C.	McLane	Sherwood
Carew	Goldfogle	Maher	Shreve
Carss	Goodall	Mann	Sinclair
Casey	Gould	Mansfield	Smith, N. Y.
Cole	Graham, Pa.	Mead	Smithwick
Connally	Greene, Mass.	Merritt	Snell
Cooper	Hadley	Mooney	Steele
Copley	Hamill	Moore, Ohio	Stiness
Crago	Harrison	Moore, Va.	Sullivan
Dallinger	Heflin	Morin	Temple
Davey	Hickey	Mudd	Tilson
Denison	Hill	Murphy	Treadway
Dewalt	Houghton	Neely	Voigt
Dickinson, Mo.	Hulings	Nichols, Mich.	Ward
Dickinson, Iowa	Husted	O'Connell	Webb
Donovan	Hutchinson	Oldfield	Whaley
Dooling	James	Osborne	Wheeler
Doremus	Jefferis	Paige	White, Me.
Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Parker	Wilson, Pa.
Dunn	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pell	Winslow
Eagan	Johnston, N. Y.	Peters	Wise
Eagle	Kahn	Phelan	Wood, Ind.
Ellsworth	Kelley, Mich.	Porter	Woodyard
Elston	Kelly, Pa.	Purnell	
Emerson	Kendall	Ragsdale	
Evans, Nev.	Kennedy, R. I.	Rainey, H. T.	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and seventy-eight Members have answered to their names, a quorum. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill and ask that the report be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 45 to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, having met, after a full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 45.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same.

C. R. DAVIS,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
Managers on the part of the House.
CHARLES CURTIS,
LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,
JOHN WALTER SMITH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I attempted to get this bill before the House, and objection was made because that voluminous report which you have just heard was not printed. I was exceedingly sorry that the circumstance happened, because, in my judgment, owing to the condition the Congress was in relative to the passage of bills which are very important, there was more time last evening to discuss perhaps the two matters involved in this case than there will be now. This, as the House well knows, is the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia. It is composed, I might say, of thousands of items contained in 102 pages. The bill as it passed the House seemed to be quite satisfactory to the entire House, so much so that a roll call or a vote on tellers was not taken. The Senate added thereto 136 different amendments. After a protracted conference a few days ago your conferees agreed with the Senate conferees upon 134 of the 136 amendments. That conference report was brought back and seemed to be almost the unanimous opinion and wish and will of the House. We kept our word and did not then agree upon the two amendments—amendment numbered 1 being the half and half, the other amendment, numbered 45, being the so-called Keller proposition. Since then we have had another conference with the Senate, and we have agreed upon those two amendments. The House, as the report indicates, has receded from Senate amendment numbered 1, the half and half, and the Senate has receded from amendment numbered 45. Hence, gentlemen of the Congress, the only two things at present before this Congress are those two amendments.

Mr. CANNON. Is it a complete agreement?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. A complete agreement.

Mr. CANNON. And the only thing before the House is to accept or reject the conference report?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am going to get to that.

I wish to be as fair in this matter as it is possible for a man to be. All of the conferees signed this last conference report except my friend from Texas, Mr. BUCHANAN. The other five conferees, three of the Senate and two of the House, signed it.

I have said heretofore that I never expected to make another speech on the subject of the half and half. I do not know whether it is because the subject has become obnoxious to me or not, but I believe I fully understand it, and, having heard it voluminously for the last 16 years, I am getting tired of hearing it talked about. I remember sitting a few years ago, for three months nearly, in a conference upon that proposition. I have studied the report of the commission which my friend from Ohio, Mr. GARD, made and signed. It is true, perhaps, that many of the new Members here do not understand it, but I do not believe there is an old Member here, a Member who has been here on the floor for 4, 6, 8, or 10 years, but has been surfeited with argument on the half and half, for and against.

Now, two of your conferees have receded, which makes a majority. I will say that about a year ago the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] and myself, who were two of the con-

ferees, stood out upon this proposition as valiantly as ever two men did, and my friend from Mississippi arose on the floor of the House and stated with my consent that we would have to recede, and we did recede. Now, we are before you again in partly the same position. We have receded, and it depends upon what the Congress says as to whether the conference report will be adopted or not. The Keller matter is a little matter of $3,800, and that is as old and gray-headed, almost, as the half and half. At least the Senate has receded, and I think the whole House is glad that they have done so.

Now, as to the half and half, I know in my own mind, and I am thoroughly convinced, that there ought to be a rearrangement of the financial condition of the District of Columbia. I believe after the statements made by one of the conferees on the part of the Senate yesterday, and knowing that when he undertakes a proposition if there is any bottom to it he will find it, some legislation and satisfactory rearrangement can be brought about. The gentleman I have mentioned is fearless, and is also chairman of the District legislative committee of the Senate. He stated, in substance, that he knew very little about this proposition, but that he had heard something about it, and if the matter could be brought before his committee as a legislative proposition he would delve into it and find out what there was to it, and then legislation would be had if it was in his power to bring it about.

I hope that the District legislative committee, of which my friend from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] is chairman, will take the same view, and when another District appropriation bill is presented to this House we will not then have to contend with this half-and-half proposition, but we will have a definite and satisfactory method upon which to base appropriations.

But, Mr. Chairman, this bill is a remarkable bill in a way. In one item—that of the salary of the teachers—in some instances it almost doubles the salary of the low-priced teachers, $500 and $600, so that this bill will give them about $1,100 for the lowest. It is something that should have been done before.

The police are well taken care of. The city needs many repairs to its streets, not only cleaning, assessment, and permit work, but many of the streets have been neglected for a year or two because of the lack of material and lack of labor. They are in bad condition. Much-needed additions to school building is provided for. I believe it is a bill that Congress is perfectly satisfied with except as to the half and half. Now, gentlemen, it is up to you whether you will adopt this conference report or not, with assurance upon my part and upon the part of the conferees that before another bill is presented here the financial conditions and plans will be properly taken care of.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. I understood the gentleman to say that the provisions of the bill were such that the streets will be improved. We all know that they ought to be improved. Is there any provision in this bill whereby the street car companies will make proper repairs at the crossings, instead of leaving the death traps as they are at present?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. If the gentleman will study this bill and the hearings of the utility commission, he will be satisfied upon that.

Mr. RAKER. Do they intend to improve them?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They intend to improve them. They intend to make possible, with the money we are now giving them, many, many additions, beautifying the Capital of the Nation, and not only looking to the beautification but to matters that are absolutely necessary at this time. I really think that it would be almost a catastrophe to the District of Columbia if this bill did not pass at this time, and I trust when the roll is called, if it is, upon this proposition, that, regardless of party, you will adopt this conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Upon the point of beautifying the city, while it does not come in the matter of the appropriation, has the gentleman any information as to the probability of the temporary buildings erected during the war being removed from some of the beauty spots of the city in the near future?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It does not come within the province of this bill, but within the province of other bills, the sundry civil and deficiency, and so forth; and, while I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have not been on the subcommittees that made the bills referred to; but I believe some drastic measures are going to be taken along that line. I believe that is so. But I have been very busy. I hate to use the word again; but I have spent nearly all my time during this session of Congress trying to act as an alderman for this District and trying to present to this Congress a bill that is satisfactory and can pass. The only snag now is the half and half.

Mr. BEE. What is the basic pay of teachers now under the law?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It ranges from $860 in the low grades up to $1,000. And, of course, the higher grades are up to $1,800 or $2,000, and so on. Added to all this is the $240 bonus, which the teachers have demanded. And they are still demanding increases. They always have and they always will; and, God bless them, I hope they will always have a desire to progress and get higher. It is a bill which I think is reasonably satisfactory to them at this time.

Now, gentlemen, I do not know what the opposition is to this half-and-half proposition; no, I will not say "opposition to the half and half"; I hate to use the word "opposition." It ought not to be designated in that way. But I will say I do not know how much time the gentlemen who will oppose this proposition want. I am willing to yield time, but I will say that it is my purpose now to close this debate on the conference report within the hour that it started.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I will say that I have no disposition, so far as I am concerned, to consume more than my share of the time. I hope the gentleman will divide the time about equally.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will; and I will be liberal. The gentleman knows that I am liberal in regard to time. But under the existing circumstances I think it is my duty, not as a Republican but as a National Congressman, to endeavor to close this matter within the hour.

Mr. SISSON. Of course, this is not a partisan question at all.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Not with me.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield 30 minutes to this side? He has an hour.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. SISSON. I would like to have 30 minutes. I have a few words to say, and one or two other gentlemen have something to say on the matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield to the conferee, Mr. BUCHANAN, and he can parcel it out to suit himself. But I wish it to be understood that I do not yield the floor during the hour, and I will not yield for motions to be made or anything of that kind.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I am going to add briefly to what I have said heretofore on this matter. This is not a partisan question. I will ask the House to be as quiet as it can. I do not usually make this request, because I usually talk loud enough to be heard, but I am here now over the protest of my physician.

Gentlemen, this matter has been up in this House eight different times, and by large majorities the House has passed this proposition over to the Senate. The Senate has not seen fit and proper to act upon this matter; that is, they have never discussed it or gone into the merits of the controversy. They simply struck it out. Most of them admit that they know nothing about it.

Now, it is apparent that the influences in the District of Columbia that have been operating upon both Houses of Congress heretofore have about lost their force in the House. It does seem that their influence is strong elsewhere. But let me tell you, gentlemen, that if the House wants to preserve its self-respect you had better do as you did yesterday. We have sent this matter over to the Senate repeatedly, and they have practically ignored the overwhelming majorities of the House.

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

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman has just stated that this matter had come up in the House eight times heretofore.

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. It has been brought in as a rider each time, has it not?

Mr. SISSON. Not a rider, in any sense, for it is in accordance with the rules of this House, and only appropriates the District money first on District expenses before anything is taken from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. LAZARO. But, nevertheless, it has been brought in as a rider, has it not?

Mr. SISSON. No. It is not a rider.

Mr. LAZARO. I ask the question for information. Why has it not been brought up as a separate proposition and considered on its merits?

Mr. SISSON. Oh, if the gentleman waits for a separate proposition to get this half-and-half repealed he will look like Methuselah before it is done. This is the same old story, told over and over again. Those who have their hands in the Federal Treasury do not want them taken out, and for years they have furnished excuses to Members which on their face are plausible, but in the end do not withdraw the hand from Uncle Sam's pocket.

Mr. LAZARO. But the gentleman will admit that he is not getting anywhere by this method.

Mr. SISSON. No; for the House Members are weak kneed and will not stand. The House needs more manhood. If this House adheres to its present position the Senate will be compelled to take notice of the House in this matter. Not only that, but this is a splendid time for the bill to fail. My friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], and I let it fail before, because it was a good time then to let it fail. The condition now is just as it was a few months ago. My friend and I agreed then. Why not now?

Now, the time that my friend from Minnesota speaks of, when we had the matter in position where we could not afford to let the bill fail without injury to the District, I went to certain gentlemen because they had been opposed to it all the time and were then liberal in their views, for the garbage matter was in a bad shape and the city could not afford to be in position where the garbage was not cared for properly. The health of the city was involved. So I went to several gentlemen who had theretofore been opposed to any change in the amount paid, and they said, "If you will let the bill pass this time we will see hereafter that the Senate acts upon it. We will stand with you to the end." My friend the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] said, "Let the bill pass this time, and I will stay with you the next time to the end." The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Sherley] went to the present Speaker of the House, who was then a member of the Appropriations Committee, and reported that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] said there should be a change of policy and that he would no longer oppose the amendment if we would then recede. In that way, after consulting many Members, who said that if I would let the bill pass that time that in the future they would stand pat and kill the bill unless the Senate took some action, I in good faith asked that the House recede. I now call upon those gentlemen to make good their promise.

I remember also before that when with our overwhelming majorities we stood here apparently firm and safe, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. UNDERWOOD, then a Member of the House and now a Member of the Senate, got up and made a motion and asked that the matter be referred to a commission composed of three Members of the House and three Members of the Senate who should go fully into the matter and report upon the half-and-half. Those three gentleman who were appointed from the House had always voted in favor of the half-and-half. It was then understood that we would abide by the action of that commission. Mr. Page of North Carolina and I thought we had not been treated properly, because no man from the House on that commission was in favor of our proposition, and in fact no member of the commission in either branch of Congress in favor of our proposition was appointed on that commission. But imagine our delight when the three gentlemen in the House and the three in the Senate made their report and stated that the half-and-half was no longer tenable. Mr. GARD of Ohio, and Mr. Cooper of Wisconsin, and Mr. RAINEY of Illinois, the three Members of the House, all of whom had consistently voted in favor of the half-and-half proposition—imagine our delight, I say, gentleman of the House, when they reported with a unanimous report, embracing the opinions of both the House and Senate members of the commission, that the half-and-half principle was not justified.

My friend from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and I fought this matter as he has told you. I was no more earnest an advocate of abolishing the half-and-half than was my friend from Minnesota at that time and before and since that time up until this session. He was as strong as I was in reference to that matter.

At that time I, perhaps, was twitted by some Members, and maybe among them my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] for yielding. But under the conditions that confronted us at that time on account of the garbage situation it was insisted that we ought to yield because the health of the city was involved. What is the matter with my friend now?

No such conditon now prevails, and if there ever was a time in the history of this Congress when this bill should fail, now is the time, unless the Senate yields. But I shall not ask that the bill fail. I shall make a motion to recommit this bill to the conferees with instructions that the conferees adhere to the action of the House.

Then if this House passes that proposition the Senate will be compelled to take some action and to treat us with ordinary courtesy or the bill will fail. The only thing now needed in the House is manhood. Just a little courage and a determination to do right. A great majority of you know that the House is right. Have the manhood to say so by your votes.

Mr. KEARNS. Can the gentleman give the House information as to the rate of taxation paid by the residents of the District of Columbia?

Mr. SISSON. They pay 1½ per cent on a two-thirds valuation of real estate and on visible personal property—or 1 per cent on a full valuation. On choses in action they pay one-third of 1 per cent, which is so nominal that it makes Washington the great tax-dodging place for the rich people of the larger cities, who come here to avoid taxes at home and to avoid taxes here.

Mr. KEARNS. They have an exemption of $1,000 on household goods to start with?

Mr. SISSON. My recollection is that that exemption is $1,000 on household goods, and in addition certain other articles, like a lawyer's law books, a doctor's medical books and apparatus, and a great long list of exemptions. In fact, most liberal exemptions.

Mr. KEARNS. They have here what they call intangible property?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. That includes mortgage-secured notes?

Mr. SISSON. All intangible property, and on that they pay one-third of 1 per cent.

Mr. KEARNS. One-third of 1 per cent on mortgage-secured notes and money in bank?

Mr. SISSON. Yes

Mr. KEARNS. One-third of 1 per cent is all that such property pays?

Mr. SISSON. That is all they pay here.

Now, I would not do the District of Columbia any injustice. I want to appeal to you gentlemen only because I feel it my duty to tell the facts. There is absolutely nothing partisan in this whole bill and should not be. I have not the least particle of personal feeling in it. I have not the least particle of pride in it. I was not the author of this proposition. This amendment was the action of the Committee on Appropriations, and a subcommittee was appointed to prepare it. It was the handiwork of Mr. Sherley, of Kentucky, and the committee had authorized him to do it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Give me three minutes more.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield three minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. SISSON. Take this into consideration, gentlemen: You do not change the rate of taxation; you do not change the assessment. You simply appropriate the District money first and then the balance out of the Federal Treasury. It simply says in this amendment that there shall first be paid on the amount appropriated by Congress the amount in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia before the Federal Government pays anything.

Mr. RICKETTS. How much is that amount?

Mr. SISSON. It is now something over $5,000,000. At the present rate, by the end of the next fiscal year it will be between $6,000,000 and $7,000,000 unless Congress is riotously extravagant.

Mr. RICKETTS. Where is that money now?

Mr. SISSON. That money is now in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Is there a debt owed by the District of Columbia that will wipe that out?

Mr. SISSON. Oh, no. The debt of the District of Columbia is about $2,000,000. By the way, the Federal Government took up that debt and paid it off when she had not incurred it. In three years from now all that debt will have been liquidated. The Federal Government has amortized that debt, and is paying it now at the rate of $900,000 a year. That debt consists of the 3.65 bonds, and is all that the District owes. Go to your cities in your own States and find them overburdened with taxation, some of them owing $30,000,000, $40,000,000, $50,000,000, and paying 3 and 4 per cent taxes, State, county, and municipal, and compare that condition with the situation in the District of Columbia, where a great city like this owes only $2,000,000, the Federal Government having liquidated that debt of $44,000,000 for it, and now pays less than any of them; then look those home people in the face, if you can, and say, "You pay twice as much tax at home as they do in Washington, but I voted to have you pay half of theirs in addition." No; you will not. It would mean your defeat.

In all fairness, gentlemen, in all honesty, as men believe in equal rights in a republic, as men believe that every man should bear his just proportion of taxation, I appeal to this House not to put ourselves again in the position where we lose a certain amount of self-respect by continually yielding to the Senate, when the Senate declines to discuss these matters. I have no personal interest in it. God knows I have not. The only interest I have is to do right as God gives me the power to see it. I am unwilling to take a penny out of the Federal Treasury, out of the pockets of the constituents whom you and I represent, and pay it for the benefit of people who are more able to pay than we are and who are taxed already less than half as much. It is the principle underlying it which is important, and I ask the Republicans here not to yield just for the sake of having it said that this bill must pass. If this half and half is wrong, vote against it.

I believe this is one economy which is based upon everlasting justice, and that you will do your constituents at home an everlasting injustice if you vote now to yield. Let us make the District of Columbia no longer a haven for tax dodgers, who come here to defeat taxes at home and then pay no taxes here. They do not help to build the roads, schools, and bridges, and to maintain the State governments at home, but bring their fortunes here to escape taxation. Gentlemen, help us to remedy this evil. [Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, when the people throughout the country realize their unwitting contribution to an unnecessary fund, I take it there will not be a man in this House who will insist upon carrying out this fictitious principle of the so-called half-and-half. And when the people who live here, the humble taxpayer and home owner, who have to pay out of all proportion for small benefits received—not the people representing the great interests and those generally representing the powerful as against the weak correctly appreciate the conditions, and when the school-teachers, the firemen, the policemen, all who under personal service here come to realize that every year their tenure and their pay are endangered because of the stubborn insistence on this fictitious principle of the half-and-half, I take it there will not be anybody of reason in the District of Columbia who will insist upon it, because it is fictitious, it is not necessary, it disturbs conditions every year, and there is no reason in law and no justification in fact for the maintenance of this which is called "the half-and-half."

Now, we face this situation: For seven years the House has gone on record and has declared in favor of the abolition of this scheme of arbitrary proportionate participation in the taxation of the District of Columbia. It has done this in the face of a paid lobby maintained for its continuance, a lobby disclosed by a recent congressional investigation. In every year it has dragged along by the slow process of conferences until we come as we come to-day, and they say it is necessary for the District of Columbia that the House recede; in every year it is the same old thing over again. They say, "Why, this is a rider, and you must not pass a rider, you must wait for general legislation." As soon as it is deferred you never hear a word again about the subject of general legislation until the next year. It goes back into the tomb where it is kept, and the great interests in the District of Columbia never suggest or advocate anything except their insistence on the necessity of this obsolete and unnecessary system of the half-and-half.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. I have but a short time, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TINCHER. Is not the real evil in the tax laws that govern the District?

Mr. GARD. Oh, no.

Mr. TINCHER. What is the difference whether we pay half or pay the deficiency when no money can be taken out of the Treasury except by an appropriation by Congress? What is the difference, so long as we do not correct the evil in the tax laws of the District of Columbia?

Mr. GARD. This is the difference: This appropriation repeals the half and half. It in no way affects the tax rate of the District of Columbia. If you repeal it, the individual taxpayer pays not one cent more, but it establishes a proper method of contribution by taxes of those who reside in the District of Columbia.

Mr. TINCHER. Let me ask the gentleman one more question. I am a new Member. Here are $6,000,000 going to be taken out of the Federal Treasury. No matter what the amount is, it is going to be appropriated by Congress out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman knows that, if we continue to appropriate so that we pile up a credit to the District of Columbia in the Treasury of the United States a vast amount of money, that some day there will be an effort to take that money out, and it will be supported by the legitimate contention—I say it as a lawyer—that we have deposited that money in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia, and that it can not go for any other source, that it belongs to the District, although at present not appropriated, and they may call for it.

Mr. TINCHER. That is simply argument.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. TINCHER. Would not that still be argument, and it would take an act of Congress to appropriate it for any other use for the District of Columbia?

Mr. GARD. It is argument, and a strong argument, that can be made, because the gentleman can see that if at present $6,000,000 are in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia, then why the necessity of making the District of Columbia contribute more in taxes when they have a surplus in their fund continuing year after year, and why now make them pay more taxes? That is the argument, that is the contention, that sometime something will happen here whereby there will be brought out either an effort to abrogate taxes entirely or take it for a great expenditure, which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia themselves may not hold necessary. But the contention is to cut down the taxes of these people who hold great interests in the District of Columbia. That will be the ultimate contention.

Mr. TINCHER. Is not that really the evil? Is not that what Congress ought to correct by changing the tax laws? Is not it a difference between tweedledee and tweedledum?

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. I will.

Mr. SISSON. It has been urged and suggested by a commissioner not long ago that since this money was accumulating in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia we should reduce taxation in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GARD. I am glad that the gentleman from Mississippi has spoken about that. I will say that Commissioner Gardiner—and I have no hesitation in mentioning his name—of the board of commissioners, has said that there is a great accumulation of unexpended money in the District of Columbia, and the thing to do is to cut off the taxes on personal property. They pay a very small personal tax now. They pay none on intangible personal property, so the District has become the refuge of the wealthy tax dodger, and now the proposition is, because of this accumulation of funds in the Treasury, they should not pay any personal-property tax at all. It is a question where the Speaker of this House realizes that it is wrong. Your majority leader realizes that it is wrong. Every man on the Appropriations Committee in the House realizes that it is wrong, and the time is here now to insist. In this present state of affairs we are confronted with the elimination of the so-called Keller claim, which has been used year by year as the same old tongs to draw the chestnut of the half and half out of the fire of opposition. It is always the Keller claim, always the Senate recedes, because they never intended to insist upon it, and always the House comes in and says, "We, too, will recede." Thus is yearly continued this tax monstrosity. It is time now for affirmative action for definite repeal. This is the time. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire at this time to attempt to make a speech on the merits of the half and half, but to take a few moments of the time of the House, if I may, to say that the half-and-half matter in controversy is in effect a rider upon an appropriation bill. Under the practice for many years the expenditures for the District have been paid half by the District and half by the Federal Government.

In this bill as it passed the House there was inserted a provision changing that proposition fundamentally, providing that in place of the system that has prevailed for many years the expenditures should be paid out of the revenues of the District in so far as they might be sufficient, and that the balance, if any, required should be taken from the Federal revenues. That was a radical change, and being in fact legislation and attached to this bill, it becomes a rider upon an appropriation bill. It appeals to me that this House ought not to insist to the utmost upon a rider, except in the most clear case, in a case where the

facts most clearly justify it. In this particular case I am convinced as one of the conferees, and as a conferee that is in favor of the abolition of the half-and-half plan, that for the House to further insist would not accomplish the purpose. It will not cause the abolition of the half-and-half plan. It may cause this bill to fail for 30 days or 60 days, or for whatever period the House chooses to stand out, but that is all. During that time, instead of the bill being in force as a law, there will be in force continuing resolutions, necessarily, and those continuing resolutions, instead of being formed and planned to fit the present need, will be based upon the appropriations of a year ago. They will continue the appropriation of last year for the necessary period. This bill last year was framed upon the needs of war time, as were other appropriation bills, with this difference.

The District bill of last year framed upon war-time conditions was necessarily limited. It provided nothing whatever for new street pavements. It provided only a limited amount for street repair work. It provided nothing for school additions. And here we are in the great Capital of the country, with an urgent need for better streets, for new pavements, for new schoolhouses to accommodate many children who are prevented from attending school for the full hours, all in order that we may wrangle here about a piece of legislation. The situation as to that legislation is such as to make such a wrangle unnecessary, because the House committee that is in charge of such legislation is prepared to take it up and give it consideration and bring it before the House. The House is ready to send it on its way to the Senate, and the Senate committee that has that in charge is ready to take it up and give it consideration. What the House has been seeking in this fight is to get consideration of the legislation in the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes more.

Mr. CRAMTON. We are given assurance of that consideration, and it seems to me that the House may well accept that promise, and in a year from now if the experiment is not successful we may take it up again in the appropriation bill.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. If I understand it, this matter has been before Congress for six or eight years constantly. Has there ever been legislation passed by this House separate and apart from an appropriation bill covering this matter?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am advised not, and further I am advised that there never has been a bill given consideration by both legislative committees of the House and Senate, and we now have a definite promise that that will be done.

Mr. TINCHER. If it is a matter of legislation, as I understand it, the majority side of the House, I hope, will present legislation of that kind apart from the appropriation bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. And I want to say that I hope the majority side of this House is ready to proceed in a businesslike way with the Government and to appropriate by bills carrying proper items rather than through resolutions continuing bills that are entirely misfits.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I am one of the conferees and did not sign the conference report, I expect it is due to the House for me to state the reason why. The abolition of the half-and-half plan has been presented to the Senate, as I understand it, for 8 or 10 or 12 years. Their attention has been called to it, and yet, from what I can understand, they never have given the question of the abolition serious consideration at all. Even members of the conference committee on the part of the Senate state that they know but little about it. I came to the conclusion that there was but one way to make them consider it, and that way is not to yield one foot, one inch, to intrenched wrong. That is the stand I take. So long as I am on this committee I serve notice that I will never yield unless so instructed by the House. I am not going to yield to wrong. We have the anomalous condition in this House to-day of two members of the conference committee with me, both condemning and voting against the half-and-half plan, yet standing up before the House and now asking the House to approve the half-and-half plan. It is not consistent with what is right in legislation.

What have you? Six million dollars piled up in the Treasury to the credit of the District. Why do you impose taxes and collect the money except to pay the expenses of the District government? In no other department of the Government, and I dare say in no State do you collect the taxes and let them pile up from year to year in the Treasury and not use them. The House bill provision is to use these taxes in making improvements as far as they go and to pay the balance out of the Treasury of the United States, and that is proper. Therefore I did not sign the conference report, and I am not going to sign it. I hope the House will stand firm and make the Senate consider it, and that it the only way we will ever get it considered.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, without regard to our opinions as to the virtue or propriety of the so-called half-and-half plan, we should vote for this conference report because of the fact that it is absolutely necessary for the good of the Capital City of the Union and the District of Columbia that this bill become a law. I have been surprised at the attitude of some of the people of the city relative to the repeal of this so-called half-and-half plan and the adoption of the plan provided in the District bill as it passed the House. As a matter of fact, it is in operation now. The revenues of the District go into the Treasury of the United States, and the expenditures of the District are paid out of the Treasury of the United States. As a matter of fact, at this very hour, and for some years past, the plan proposed and outlined in the bill as it passed the House has been and is the practice. There is no reason why that practice should not be written into law. The Senate has this excuse for its action, that the House through its legislating committees has not passed on this question.

That should be done. I hope it will be done very soon. It is a fact, however, that it is within the purview and jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations to make this change in the fiscal system. The fact that the amendment is not subject to a point of order proves that. It is not a rider; it is a proper part of this appropriation bill; and yet the Senate has some little defense in the fact that the proper legislative committee has not passed upon the matter. I hope that in the near future the District Committee will pass on the matter and will write into the law some provision similar to that which the House placed in the appropriation bill. In the meantime, this conference report should be adopted.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield six minutes, the remainder of my time, to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in order to understand this half-and-half proposition we ought to get down to this fundamental, which is that as long as the half-and-half is written in the bill we never will be able to get the property in Washington City to pay what the property ought to pay. That is the fundamental proposition. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] just stated that what the House proposed to write into the bill is the present practice. That is true with this distinction, that if it is written into the law, then these millions will not accumulate in the Treasury to the credit of the District. If it is written in the law, as the House has repeatedly declared it should be written, then it will be impossible to accumulate this money in the Treasury to the credit of the District. The danger of permitting this accumulation, gentlemen, is this: That whenever you attempt to make the property, real and personal, tangible and intangible, of this District meet its just and fair proportion of taxation, you will be met by the fact that there is money to the credit of the District in the Treasury, and therefore it is wrong to tax the people for improvements for which they already have the money on hand. Now, the position that I take in regard to property in this District is this: That every dollar of property in the District of Columbia, real and personal, should be made to bear its just proportion of the burdens of Government. That is all. I am not opposed to the Nation spending money here to beautify this, the Nation's Capital. I am not opposed to appropriating money out of the Treasury to make this the city beautiful of the world, but I am opposed to any kind of legislation that in the meanwhile will prevent the dollar in the District from bearing its just proportion of the burden of government. Now the half-and-half plan is nothing but a screen behind which the dollar hides in the District. That is all it is; and as long as it is upon the statute books just so long will property in this District neglect and refuse by virtue of its operation to pay what the dollar ought to pay.

Now, gentlemen, all the talk about the property that the Government owns in the District, all the talk about how much the Government owes to the District is pure and simple nonsense. The Government owes this District everything, and the dollar that is located in the District owes a duty also, and that is to shoulder its responsibility of carrying on this Government. It is the man and the property in the District that owns the dollar that hides behind the half-and-half and does not want to pay his just proportion of taxation that demands its retention. Now, as far as I am concerned, in the town where I live I pay my just proportion of the taxes to keep up

the Government, and I am willing so to do; but I want every man who owns any property in this District, be that man a home owner or be he a speculator in real estate, I want him to pay his just proportion of the burdens of Government, and I do not want one penny taken out of the Treasury that my people have paid to beautify this city until and unless the city itself is willing to pay its share. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, the half-and-half proposition judging by standards of equity or by standards of proper and scientific methods of taxation, is, in my judgment, absolutely indefensible. I think the time has come when we must change the conditions with regard to the proportion or method of taxation in the District of Columbia. The matter, Mr. Speaker, however, is of too great importance to be taken up and discussed or determined as we are now discussing the proposition with intelligence and good judgment. I have always desired that the matter should be presented in proper legislative form. The Senate has refused to pass the House amendments as they have done principally and nearly always upon the ground that it was a rider upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I have not the time to yield. I am very sorry indeed, I will say to the gentleman. I just want to say this, that with regard to the proposition of changing the method of taxation let us do it in a reasonable way. Let it come as a legislative bill and then let us place upon the Senate the responsibility of acting upon it. If they refuse then to do what we think is just, then we may talk about some other means of accomplishing the result. I am very strongly in favor of approving at this time—and I think it is our duty at this time before anything else—quickly to approve the report of the conferees on this bill, although I do not want it ever said that this House is committed to the half-and-half principle with regard to taxation in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the present law of the District of Columbia is the half-and-half placed thereon in 1878. That law has been all we have been governed by ever since. There have been many attempts made to change it upon this particular appropriation bill. I think it has been attempted to be changed for the last six or seven years since I have been a member of the subcommittee on this bill. Now, if any man says this is not a rider, I do not know what a rider is. It is a rider, however, that is permitted under the Holman rule, but it is a rider. It is an attempt to change absolute law upon an appropriation bill. That is all there is to it, but the Holman rule permits it to be done upon the theory that it reduces expenses. That is all. Now, gentlemen, I want this law changed, ultimately, in the manner desired by Congress. During my 16 years here I never saw an opportunity in my life to get the two legislative committees of the House and Senate to agree even to say that they would entertain legislation along this line.

Now, it is your duty——

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

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I have only one minute left.

It is your duty on that side and it is the duty of Members on this side to have legislation along this line in order to change this law in some proper manner before the next appropriation bill is attempted to be passed. And I am going to use all the power I have to that end.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield for one short question?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I have not time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question upon the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves the previous question upon the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SISSON. At what point do I offer a motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. After the previous question has been ordered. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi offers a motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SISSON moves to recommit the District of Columbia appropriation bill to the conferees with instructions to the House conferees to adhere to the disagreement of the House on Senate amendment No. 1.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit and instruct the committee.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, in order to save time I make the point of no quorum, in order to get at the yea-and-nay vote.

The SPEAKER. Obviously there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of recommitting the bill with instructions will, as their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 113, nays 165, answered "present" 2, not voting 150, as follows:

YEAS—113.

Alexander	Frear	Lonergan	Sanders, La.
Almon	Gard	McAndrews	Scott
Aswell	Garner	McDuffie	Sears
Ayres	Garrett	McGlennon	Sims
Babka	Goodwin, Ark.	McKeown	Sisson
Bankhead	Graham, Ill.	McKinley	Small
Barkley	Hardy, Tex.	Major	Steagall
Bee	Hastings	Mapes	Stephens, Miss.
Black	Hayden	Martin	Stevenson
Bland, Ind.	Hersman	Mays	Sumners, Tex.
Bland, Mo.	Howard	Miller	Taylor, Ark.
Blanton	Huddleston	Minahan, N. J.	Taylor, Colo.
Box	Hudspeth	Moon	Thomas
Brand	Hull, Tenn.	Nelson, Mo.	Thompson, Okla.
Buchanan	Igoe	Nicholls, S. C.	Tillman
Byrnes, S. C.	Jacoway	Oldfield	Upshaw
Byrns, Tenn.	James	Oliver	Vinson
Candler	Johnson, Miss.	Overstreet	Walsh
Carter	Jones, Tex.	Park	Walters
Clark, Fla.	Kearns	Parrish	Watkins
Clark, Mo.	Kelly, Pa.	Quin	Welling
Collier	Kettner	Rainey, J. W.	Welty
Crisp	Kincheloe	Ramseyer	Wingo
Dominick	Kitchin	Rayburn	Woods, Va.
Dowell	Lampert	Ricketts	Wright
Drane	Lanham	Romjue	Young, Tex.
Ferris	Lankford	Rose	
Fields	Larsen	Rouse	
Fisher	Lever	Rubey	

NAYS—165.

Anderson	Esch	Lazaro	Rogers
Andrews, Md.	Evans, Nebr.	Lee, Ga.	Rowe
Andrews, Nebr.	Evans, Nev.	Linthicum	Sanders, Ind.
Anthony	Focht	Longworth	Schall
Barbour	Foster	Luhring	Sells
Benham	Freeman	McArthur	Sinnott
Benson	French	McFadden	Slemp
Bland, Va.	Fuller, Ill.	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Boies	Ganly	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Ill.
Bowers	Glynn	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Good	McPherson	Snyder
Brooks, Ill.	Goodykoontz	MacCrate	Steenerson
Brooks, Pa.	Gould	MacGregor	Stephens, Ohio
Browning	Green, Iowa	Madden	Strong, Kans.
Burke	Greene, Vt.	Magee	Strong, Pa.
Burroughs	Griest	Mason	Summers, Wash.
Butler	Griffin	Michener	Sweet
Campbell, Kans.	Hadley	Monahan, Wis.	Taylor, Tenn.
Campbell, Pa.	Hamilton	Mondell	Thompson, Ohio
Cannon	Hardy, Colo.	Montague	Timberlake
Chindblom	Haskell	Moore, Pa.	Tincher
Christopherson	Hawley	Moore, Va.	Tinkham
Classon	Hays	Moores, Ind.	Towner
Cleary	Hernandez	Morgan	Valle
Coady	Hersey	Mott	Vare
Costello	Hickey	Newton, Minn.	Vestal
Cramton	Hicks	Newton, Mo.	Voigt
Crowther	Hoch	Nolan	Volstead
Cullen	Holland	Ogden	Wason
Currie, Mich.	Hull, Iowa	Olney	Watson, Pa.
Curry, Calif.	Humphreys	Padgett	Weaver
Dale	Ireland	Platt	Webster
Darrow	Jefferis	Pou	White, Kans.
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Wash.	Radcliffe	Williams
Dempsey	Jones, Pa.	Raker	Wilson, Ill.
Dunbar	Kennedy, Iowa	Ramsey	Wilson, La.
Dupré	Kiess	Reavis	Wood, Ind.
Dyer	Kinkaid	Reed, W. Va.	Yates
Echols	Kraus	Rhodes	Young, N. Dak.
Edmonds	Kreider	Riddick	
Elliott	LaGuardia	Robsion, Ky.	
Elston	Layton	Rodenberg	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Bell	Booher

NOT VOTING—150.

Ackerman	Burdick	Copley	Donovan
Ashbrook	Caldwell	Crago	Dooling
Bacharach	Cantrill	Dallinger	Doremus
Baer	Caraway	Davey	Doughton
Begg	Carew	Davis, Tenn.	Dunn
Blackmon	Carss	Denison	Eagan
Brinson	Casey	Dent	Eagle
Britten	Cole	Dewalt	Ellsworth
Browne	Connally	Dickinson, Mo.	Emerson
Brumbaugh	Cooper	Dickinson, Iowa	Evans, Mont.

Fairfield	Kahn	Neely	Sherwood
Fess	Kelley, Mich.	Nelson, Wis.	Shreve
Fitzgerald	Kendall	Nichols, Mich.	Siegel
Flood	Kennedy, R. I.	O'Connell	Sinclair
Fordney	King	O'Connor	Smith, N. Y.
Fuller, Mass.	Kleczka	Osborne	Smithwick
Gallagher	Knutson	Paige	Snell
Gallivan	Langley	Parker	Stedman
Gandy	Lea, Calif.	Pell	Steele
Garland	Lehlbach	Peters	Stiness
Godwin, N. C.	Lesher	Phelan	Sullivan
Goldfogle	Little	Porter	Temple
Goodall	Luce	Purnell	Tilson
Graham, Pa.	Lufkin	Ragsdale	Treadway
Greene, Mass.	McClintic	Rainey, H. T.	Venable
Hamill	McCulloch	Randall, Calif.	Ward
Harrison	McKinley	Randall, Wis.	Watson, Va.
Haugen	McLane	Reber	Webb
Heflin	Maher	Reed, N. Y.	Whaley
Hill	Mann	Riordan	Wheeler
Houghton	Mansfield	Robinson, N. C.	White, Me.
Hulings	Mead	Rowan	Wilson, Pa.
Husted	Merritt	Rucker	Winslow
Hutchinson	Mooney	Sabath	Wise
Johnson, Ky.	Moore, Ohio	Sanders, N. Y.	Woodyard
Johnson, S. Dak.	Morin	Sanford	Zihlman
Johnston, N. Y.	Mudd	Saunders, Va.	
Juul	Murphy	Scully	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ZIHLMAN with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.
Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. BRINSON.
Mr. WINSLOW with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
Mr. WHITE of Maine with Mr. CALDWELL.
Mr. WHEELER with Mr. CARAWAY.
Mr. WARD with Mr. CAREW.
Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. DAVEY.
Mr. STINESS with Mr. DEWALT.
Mr. REED of New York with Mr. CASEY.
Mr. TILSON with Mr. CONNALLY.
Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri.
Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. GANDY.
Mr. PORTER with Mr. FLOOD.
Mr. REBER with Mr. FITZGERALD.
Mr. PETERS with Mr. EVANS of Montana.
Mr. SHREVE with Mr. GALLAGHER.
Mr. PARKER with Mr. HEFLIN.
Mr. OSBORNE with Mr. ASHBROOK.
Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan with Mr. DOREMUS.
Mr. PAIGE with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.
Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
Mr. MUDD with Mr. DOUGHTON.
Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. LEA of California.
Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. EAGAN.
Mr. MORAN with Mr. EAGLE.
Mr. HULINGS with Mr. LESHER.
Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. MAHER.
Mr. MOORE of Ohio with Mr. SHERWOOD.
Mr. DUNN with Mr. O'CONNELL.
Mr. JUUL with Mr. SULLIVAN.
Mr. DENISON with Mr. PHELAN.
Mr. COPLEY with Mr. SABATH.
Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.
Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. PELL.
Mr. ACKERMAN with Mr. SCULLY.
Mr. HUSTED with Mr. MCLANE.
Mr. CRAGO with Mr. WHALEY.
Mr. BROWNE with Mr. MANSFIELD.
Mr. LITTLE with Mr. RAGSDALE.
Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. STEDMAN.
Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.
Mr. SNELL with Mr. RIORDAN.
Mr. BEGG with Mr. MEAD.
Mr. FESS with Mr. WEBB.
Mr. GARLAND with Mr. SMITHWICK.
Mr. FAIRFIELD with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.
Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. WATSON of Virginia.
Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. RUCKER.
Mr. GOODALL with Mr. ROWAN.
Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. VENABLE.
Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. RANDALL of California.
Mr. COOPER with Mr. CARSS.
Mr. KING with Mr. NEELY.
Mr. PURNELL with Mr. MCCLINTIC.
Mr. SANFORD with Mr. HARRISON.
Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. BOOHER.
Mr. GRIEST with Mr. WISE.
Mr. DALLINGER with Mr. GALLIVAN.
Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CANTRILL.
Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. BELL.
Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. MOONEY.
Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.
Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.
Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa with Mr. DONOVAN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

PROHIBITION—MINORITY REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the members of the Committee on the Judiciary who desire to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 6810 may have until the first day of the session after the recess, which I understand will be taken, or until the 8th day of July, in which to file the minority report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the members of the Committee on the Judiciary who wish to file a minority report on the prohibition bill may have until the 8th day of July.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. I desire to ask whether those who wish to file a minority report on the bill can send it to the Public Printer notwithstanding the House may not then be in session?

Mr. IGOE. I would like to include that in my request.

The SPEAKER. And that it may be printed without the House being in session. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman include my suggestion?

Mr. IGOE. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this request is, of course, with the understanding that the filing or the failure to file these minority reports will in no wise interfere with the consideration of the measure.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit a question?

The SPEAKER. It certainly would not interfere.

Mr. DYER. What does the gentleman mean by that, that it will not interfere?

Mr. MONDELL. I mean just what I say.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman mean that this will probably be called up before the 8th of July?

Mr. MONDELL. No. I am not making any such statement, but I want to have it clearly and definitely understood.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that.

Mr. MONDELL. That the opportunity to file a minority report will not interfere with the taking up of the measure.

Mr. DYER. We hope that it will prevent the favorable consideration of the measure.

Mr. MONDELL. That is understood, Mr. Speaker, is it?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Are we to take up the measure as it is now or in separate and divided form?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to answer that question.

Mr. GARD. I make the inquiry so that we may file our minority report in the proper way.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know. The bill is reported to the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection, with the understanding suggested?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN A MEMBER.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Alaska, Mr. GEORGE B. GRIGSBY, be sworn in. His credentials are in proper form and are signed by the returning board, and they have been examined by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will come forward.

Mr. GRIGSBY, Delegate from Alaska, appeared before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

HOUSING FOR WAR NEEDS—PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and

ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918, I transmit herewith reports covering all of the transactions with relation to the subject matter of that act, up to and including February 28, 1919, and of all of the divisions other than the Fiscal Division, up to and including April 30, 1919.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 1, 1919.*

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER POWER.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3184, the water-power bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly 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. 3184, the water-power bill, with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania 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. 3184, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3184) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose to-day an amendment was under consideration, offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE]. Without objection, the amendment will be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LITTLE: Page 16, line 11, after the word "issued," strike out "that contemplate the use of Government dams or other structures owned by the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I do not see the proponent of the amendment present.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ESCH. I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over temporarily and that the Clerk proceed with the reading of the bill, beginning with section 11.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 12. That whatever application is filed for a project hereunder involving navigable waters of the United States, and the commission shall find upon investigation that the needs of navigation require the construction of a lock or locks or other navigation structures, and that such structures can not, consistent with a reasonable investment cost to the applicant, be provided in the manner specified in section 11, subsection (a) hereof, the commission may, before taking action upon such application, cause a report upon such project to be prepared, with estimates of cost of the power development and of the navigation structures, and shall submit such report to Congress with such recommendations as it deems appropriate concerning the participation of the United States in the cost of construction of such navigation structures.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, on page 19, line 17, to strike out the word "whatever" and insert the word "whenever." It is evidently a typographical correction.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ESCH: On page 19, line 17, strike out the word "whatever" and insert in lieu thereof the word "whenever."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANKFORD: Amend paragraph 12, on page 20, by adding, after the word "structures," in line 6, the following: "Whenever it is made satisfactory to the commission that the needs of navigation can be provided for in a way profitable to the United States by the joint activity of the United States and a State or States, or municipality or municipalities, or other interested parties, and that an essential water power and a needed navigable waterway can be obtained by the performance of a contract whereby the United States makes certain improvements, provided the other interested contracting parties do the things obligated to be done, then the commission shall cause the necessary surveys to be made, the necessary data obtained, and the necessary estimates made to determine the things which can be profitably done by the United States and other contracting parties and may recommend to Congress that the United States obligate to make certain improvements in said scheme of water-power and waterway development, provided a satisfactory contract is entered into by the other contracting party to complete said development."

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am a friend of this matter now pending before the House and am anxious that this measure pass, and that the United States get the very best possible law. I have offered this amendment because I believe it will make the bill a better one. There are provisions in the bill for the United States to make improvements for the purpose of helping navigation and for the purpose of constructing better water power. There are provisions for municipalities to be authorized by the commission to make improvements, to develop water power, and to develop navigation. There are provisions for corporations to make these improvements. I have offered the proposed amendment, therefore, to permit the United States Government to act in connection with the States or with municipalities or with corporations in making the improvements necessary to construct better waterways and to develop better water power. We all realize that whenever the National Government makes an improvement on a river and improves navigation it helps the State in which that particular improvement is made. The improvement also helps the cities which are situated on the stream, and it also helps the individuals who live on that stream. If the improvement is made by the State, it inures to the benefit of the Government and to the benefit of the municipalities situated on that stream. If the improvement is made by individuals, it helps the National Government, helps the State, and helps the municipalities located along that particular stream. Therefore it occurred to me that it would be proper to authorize this commission, when it is made satisfactory to them that the needs of navigation can be provided for, in a way profitable to the United States, by the joint activity of the United States and a State or States or municipality or municipalities or other interested parties, and that an essential water power and a needed navigable waterway can be obtained by the performance of a contract whereby the United States makes certain improvements, provided the other interested contracting parties do the things obligated to be done—then, and in that event, the commission is authorized to make the necessary surveys to obtain the necessary data in order to determine whether or not the United States ought to agree to enter into the enterprise and make the proposed improvement, provided the other parties contract to make the specified improvements in advancement of the general scheme of waterway and water-power development. It certainly seems that there should be no objection to this. It seems to me this amendment would make a better bill. The commission does not make the contract, but it makes a report back to Congress, and recommends that the contract be entered into and that the United States Government do certain things provided the State or States make improvements called for or provided the municipality makes those improvements. The amendment provides that the commission may recommend that the United States make certain improvements on a river, provided a municipality located on that river builds a dam and causes that river to have a higher water lever or if the municipality spends a certain amount of money in an effort to make the stream more navigable—that in that event the United States will make certain expenditures. All that matter can be reported back to Congress, and then Congress can say whether or not the enterprise shall be entered into. It seems to me a reading of this amendment will convince us that it should be adopted. I certainly hope that the committee will approve it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of this amendment. The principal object of this bill is to make unnecessary for the Government to expend money in developing water power. I do not believe this Government ought at this time to enter into any further projects. We have already enough projects on hand to swamp the revenues of the Government and to make it one of the greatest problems that was ever before this Congress as to how we shall raise money enough to carry on what we already contemplate. As for the Government helping the States to carry out this matter—to increase water power—I think we have done enough in that line. We have agreed to expend, as I understand, something like $20,000,000 on the Muscle Shoals project, for example, partly for navigation, but mostly for water power—a water power that was said to be needed in time of war, but which, after we had authorized the project, it was discovered would not be finished until some five years after the war was over.

There is no limit to the help asked nowadays from the National Government. It makes no difference what is proposed, let Uncle Sam do it, until I think that will be the slang phrase—

instead of "Let George do it," "Let Uncle Sam do it." The States want the National Government to do everything, forgetting that very often they can do these things very much better, at much less cost, and with equal benefit. The time has come when we should immediately close down upon all of these plans for outside operations.

Mr. LANKFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. LANKFORD. Has the gentleman any objection to the commission making recommendations to Congress along these lines?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have objections to any start being made on this line. I do not think such a proposition should be made.

Mr. LANKFORD. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. With pleasure.

Mr. LANKFORD. Does not the gentleman think it would be better for the United States Government to make certain improvements along rivers or navigable streams, provided the State made additional improvements, than for the United States Government to make improvements, as we are now doing, without the States helping in any way?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Where the improvement is in the nature of a benefit to navigation, so that it comes within the domination of the Government, I think we might well ask the State for contributions or the local authorities for contributions. That is something that I have advocated for a long time, but which the River and Harbor Committee has never put into action.

Mr. LANKFORD. If the gentleman will read my amendment, he will see that that is exactly what I provide for.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But the projects I am talking about now are a benefit to navigation. They improve navigation. I think the localities ought to be required in nearly every instance to add something to the amount appropriated by the National Government. But I am not in favor of carrying this into the water-power proposition. We have got now all that we can attend to in the matter of navigation, and therefore I think the amendment ought not to be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANKFORD) there were—ayes 11, noes 31.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 16, subsection e.

Mr. ESCH. Yes; I promised the gentleman that I would return to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to return to page 16, subsection e, for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LITTLE: Page 16, line 11, after the word "issue," strike out "that contemplates," and all of line 12, and the words (in line 13) "the United States."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, this provision in the bill very properly is to the effect that where license is issued for Government dams or structures owned by the United States or constructed, there shall be a readjustment of the license charge at the end of 20 years, and then future readjustments at periods of not exceeding 10 years. The gentleman proposes to strike that out in so far as the language is embraced in his amendment, so that it will read:

When licenses are issued in the discretion of the commission the charges to be paid—

And so forth. In other words, the effect of the gentleman's amendment is to require a readjustment at the end of 20 years, and subsequently at the end of periods not exceeding 10 years, for all licenses issued by the commission.

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

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. My purpose is not to require but to permit and make possible a readjustment. We can not have one now.

Mr. SMALL. For the purpose of my argument I wish to submit it is harmful in either form. I think the committee understands this already, but if there is any doubt about a complete understanding of the effect of it, the committee ought to be advised. The purpose of this entire bill is to attract capital for investment in water-power development upon such conditions that shall be just to the United States. Unless both purposes are met in this bill, there will be no result, and we will be confronted by the same conditions that have existed for a long period of years. No capital will be invited and there will be no investment in water power. Members understand very well that even now we have water-power legislation, legislation which it was contemplated at the time it was enacted would invite capital, but it has not done so, and no water power is being developed. This bill was drafted for two purposes—one to attract capital in the development of water power under such terms as might be just to the United States——

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

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Does the gentleman think it would be just to the United States to give away this privilege?

Mr. SMALL. Oh, there is no thought of giving it away.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman does not claim that the charge will be anything more than a nominal charge, does he, at first?

Mr. SMALL. That depends upon the conditions under the terms of the bill.

Mr. LITTLE. If it were more than a nominal charge, you would not sell the bond?

Mr. SMALL. Surely not. The license charges must be reasonable, of course.

Mr. LITTLE. Does the gentleman think a charge that would be reasonable now would be reasonable in 50 years? Would it not be practically nothing, comparatively?

Mr. SMALL. That does not affect the point that I am trying now to make.

Mr. LITTLE. I think it disposes of it.

Mr. SMALL. I think the gentleman will agree with me, if he will listen to me for a moment.

Mr. LITTLE. I always listen with pleasure to the gentleman.

Mr. SMALL. The line in its present form permits the commission to require a readjustment of charges to the licensee of Government dams. The gentleman's amendment makes this applicable to every license issued by the commission. There is a vast difference between Government dams already constructed and dams that are to be constructed by private capital. A very much larger sum of money is necessary in the investment. There are more contingencies to be met and chances to be taken by the capital that is invested, and unless those who are invited to invest that capital have some assurance that for a long term of years all of the conditions of the license shall be fixed, the capital will not be invested, and we will be in the same condition that we are in at the present time.

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

Mr. SMALL. In a moment. The gentleman from Kansas says that under this provision here it is in the discretion of the commission; but capital would be just as fearful of investment with the discretion reposed in the commission as if they were directed to do so. I now yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELSTON. As I understand, the gentleman from Kansas is making some point of the fact, the supposed fact, that licenses are given here by the Government for nothing. Now, is it not true that the developing company goes in and takes one of these licenses and invests a certain amount of money and that the rates charged upon its investment will be subject to regulation by the utility commission of the particular State, which will grant it only a reasonable return upon their investment——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. I ask for two minutes more.

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

Mr. ELSTON. And the benefit will be spread to the consumers.

Mr. LITTLE. The public utilities can not control the Government enterprise.

Mr. ELSTON. There is an express provision in here that that shall be done, and in addition to that any earnings above a certain reasonable return shall be amortized into a sinking fund to pay for the investment itself.

Mr. SMALL. To reduce.

Mr. ELSTON. To reduce the investment. Being subject to regulation by a utility commission, they will get only a reasonable return on the money invested, and the public, the people, or whatever word you want to use to designate the wards of the Government, will get the indirect benefit.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman from California is correct, and all that is provided in the bill. I will yield to the gentleman from Kansas now.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman speaks of the fellows getting their money back. Well, that is a good provision; but if the gentleman has the idea that a State utility commission can control this fund and these Government enterprises, he is very much mistaken. That is not the law.

Mr. ELSTON. They will control the rates. All charges in any particular State will be subject to a utility commission in that State, and it will not permit the corporation to have any more than a reasonable return on its investment.

Mr. LITTLE. In the first place, the gentleman is mistaken, and in the second place, they will only determine what they charge the people, not what the Government gets out of them. If a utilities commission should fix the charge to be made a consumer, that would not bring the Government any money—I want the Government to be paid for what it gives.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call attention to a rule of the House, which it might be well to observe, that gentlemen should rise to address the Chair when they desire to interrupt a gentleman. The gentleman from North Carolina will proceed.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, just in conclusion I wish to emphasize the statement I made. The objection to this amendment is that it will prevent the investment of capital in the development of water power in those cases where dams are going to be constructed in the future which propose to make an investment and ask for a license.

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

Mr. SMALL. May I have one minute more?

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

Mr. SMALL. And this amendment applies to every license issued for the development of water power, reposes in the commission the discretion to require an adjustment at the end of 20 years and then an adjustment at every 10-year period thereafter. Bonds are to be issued by these companies. It takes great capital in the development of water power, and those bonds, it may be assumed, will run 20 years, 30 years, perhaps 40 years, and capital will not be invested in those bonds nor in the stock of the company which is seeking a license. In other words, capital will not be invested in development of water power if the license to be issued carries any such condition as that provided in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas; and one of the features intended to be accomplished by this bill will have failed if that amendment shall be adopted.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I listened with close attention to the statement of the gentleman from Kansas and also to his amendment and his argument and logic. It is not without considerable foundation. It is a thing to think about that any commission might at the beginning fix a term which would hold and be sufficiently elastic for an entire period of 50 years, and on that proposition the gentleman from Kansas bases his argument and logic. I am comforted, however, with the proposition that appears on page 11, in section 6, which, I think, pretty well meets the criticism of the gentleman from Kansas. I can not do better than read those words:

That licenses under this act shall be issued for a period not exceeding 50 years.

There is no controversy about that. We have been willing to accept the 50-year tenure in every bill that has passed the House. That has always been accepted as the correct term. Then follows what I desire to call to the attention of the gentleman from Kansas:

Each such license shall be conditioned upon acceptance by the licensee of all the terms and conditions of this act.

Now, that would not satisfy him, and I want him to hear just what follows:

And such further conditions, if any, as the commission shall prescribe in conformity with this act, which said terms and conditions and the acceptance thereof shall be expressed in said license.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. In just a moment. Now, Mr. Chairman, this commission is clothed with full power, with full authority to insert in the contract, which is a binding contract between the water-power developer and the Government, any condition they may desire, and once accepted—it will be accepted if there is any procedure under it at all—they may provide for the first 10 years that the royalty under this act shall be 25 cents per horsepower, the next year it may be 50 cents, the next year 75 cents, and the next year a dollar, and so on, so that a correct rate may be provided for, and they can even do more than that if the commission desires. They could even prescribe that a license or royalty be paid to it based upon the earning power of the corporation.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I will yield.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman's suggestion is that the proviso I seek is practically included in this other clause that you read.

Mr. FERRIS. Within their power. That is my thought.

Mr. LITTLE. If that is so, what is the objection to putting it in here by law? If this commission can do it, why should not we do it by law?

Mr. FERRIS. I will answer the gentleman frankly. There are many Members of this House and of the Senate that will be hoisting the scarecrow that it will keep down development. And the answer to all of that is that there are 60,000,000 of potential hydroelectric energy in the United States and only 6,000,000 in use, and Congress has been in a constant quarrel over a period of 12 years, to my knowledge, and the Lord knows how much longer, and it is up to us to have something that we can agree on and something which the Senate will accept. The commission can safeguard it—the public interest will be conserved. It is all right.

Mr. LITTLE. Is it not a fact that the scarecrow you are talking about is in this condition you mention? If there is such a power lodged there, there is where the scarecrow would be. Would it not be better to say definitely 20, or 30, or 40 years, so that a man will know when he invests what he is going to pay?

Mr. FERRIS. I will answer that by saying that in some small plant, where it is understood the earning capacity of the plant will be little or nothing, you might want to free the man from a 20-year adjustment. It might require an assurance of no periodical adjustment in order to secure development.

Mr. LITTLE. The commission can do it.

Mr. FERRIS. It can, and can do it now, but they would not be compelled to do it as the law now stands and as the gentleman, I understand, would compel him.

Mr. LITTLE. I do not seek to compel them to change the rate. I merely wish to give the commission power to change the rate from time to time, so that a commission could change it, if it seemed necessary, in 10, or 20, or 40 years, whereas you want it fixed in the license.

Mr. FERRIS. In the stage of water-power development as it is now, I think there will be many cases when the developer is entitled to know in the beginning, on any unconstructed water-power site, something of what is going to happen to him during the life of his franchise. He can not secure money to build it without some assurances as to what will happen clear through. The commission is given the very widest powers and they will safeguard the public and at the same time be reasonable so as to get development.

Mr. LITTLE. That is what I say. However, the right of the Government should be safeguarded, too. If the developer knows his beginning rate will continue for 20 years that is enough. He can also know the Government has the right to adjust the rate in 20 years, according to the conditions therein. Under the present plan of starting at a nominal charge the Government will never get any returns for the rights it gives away.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, in the development of hydroelectric power two elements are essential. First, we must have the power to develop; and, second, we must have the money with which to develop it. We have in this country untold millions of hydroelectric power now going to waste, and it is a burning shame that Congress has not already passed legislation to permit the development of this power for commercial and other purposes.

It is absolutely necessary that, as a second essential element, we have money with which to develop this power, and I think it is well established that the Government is not going into the business of building and selling electric energy. Therefore it is incumbent upon Congress to pass such legislation as will invite capital to come in and invest in order to develop this power.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McARTHUR. Just a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oregon yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. McARTHUR. No; I decline to yield now.

Congress therefore ought to pass legislation that will be just as inviting as possible to capital, in order that these latent resources may be developed. If Congress fails to do that it fails in its duty to the country in the development of this great energy. Money does not grow on bushes, and money can not be created, and therefore the developers of hydroelectric energy, when they have water-power developments in view, must go on the market and compete with other business propositions in the effort to secure credit and capital. And they are not going to be able to go into the market and get their money unless they have something to show from which a reasonable return may be expected.

Gentlemen talk about putting in restricting amendments here. Every amendment that is being offered to this bill is by the

way of a restriction, making it harder to raise money under the terms of the bill. I would like to know what gentlemen here, as trustees for an estate, would invest in bonds unless they knew they were going to get their money back and also a reasonable return on the investment?

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McARTHUR. No; not now.

I want to see the committee sustained in this matter. It has gone over this bill several times, has held exhaustive hearings, and has unanimously reported to the House a bill that I believe will be attractive to capital and at the same time safeguard the public interest. I hope all of these amendments that are put on here with a view to restricting development and making it harder to raise money to develop hydroelectric energy will be voted down and that the committee will be sustained all through this bill, a bill almost identical to that which passed the House in the last Congress and got as far as conference in the Senate, where it was blocked.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman said that two things were essential—the power and the money. Is it not just as essential that, if the Government gives anything away, it gets something for it?

Mr. McARTHUR. The Government is not giving anything away. If the gentleman will examine the terms of this bill, he will find that it is the most restrictive measure that has been brought into this House. It is a lease, pure and simple——

Mr. LITTLE. It is a gift for 50 years. If it is a lease it is none the less a gift.

Mr. McARTHUR. No; it is not a gift.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman asks who would invest the money of his ward in this. The gentleman would invest the Government's property—something the Government has.

Mr. McARTHUR. The Government does not own a bit of the waterpower in the different States where these lands lie. The Government is really stepping in here and taking something away that belongs to the States. But I am not going to raise that old question, because it has been thrashed out here fully.

Mr. LITTLE. If the Government is not giving something away, then it is a waste of time.

Mr. McARTHUR. I do not believe the gentleman, who is a good lawyer, would invest money as a trustee unless he knew he was going to set something back.

Mr. LITTLE. Nor would I invest the money or the rights of the Government without getting something back.

Mr. McARTHUR. It is not the money of the Government that is invested. It is money invested by individuals or corporations under terms prescribed by Congress.

Mr. SIMS. I want the attention of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] for just a moment. The objects and purposes of the gentleman from Kansas in his proposed amendment are impressively just and right. There is no need of any argument to demonstrate that there should be some opportunity given the Government to adjust charges so as to bear some relation to the profit of the project, and this bill permits that. The only thing the commission has got to do in issuing the license is to see to it that there shall be provisions made for a proper and reasonable charge. Whatever charge is made must go into the license. The commission may provide in the license issued that the charge in the first 10 years shall be nominal, 5 cents or 10 cents a horsepower, or whatever it may be, and in the next five years so much more, and so on, so as to accomplish the purpose in the early operation of the enterprise, and to increase it as it goes on, as the business increases. The commission can provide for a certain per cent of the gross receipts to be paid in the first 10 years, and a greater per cent in the next 10 years, and so on, so that the company that makes large gross receipts will pay a large return. Some companies might have considerable gross receipts at the start and have no net receipts. This commission, under the powers of the bill, can really do all that is necessary, not only to promote the enterprise, but also to do justice to the Government that permits the promoters of the enterprise to have this opportunity to make money.

I do not consider this bill as having been introduced and put through simply to make an attractive safe place for somebody who has got money that he can not make as much out of as he would like to make to invest it. I am not one of those who believe in legislating all the time for those who have at the expense of those who have not. Consequently the attractiveness of the enterprise as to capital makes no difference.

Mr. LITTLE. But they have to do it when they issue the license or they forever forfeit any chance to adjust the charge to changing conditions.

Mr. SIMS. They have to put it in the license.

Mr. LITTLE. If they do not do it, they lose it for 50 years. Why not, if they can do it now, provide that they can do it at any time in the next 40 years?

Mr. SIMS. The act provides that they shall put in the license a reasonable charge.

Mr. LITTLE. If they do not put it in the license, they will have no right to make the charge?

Mr. SIMS. It is put in the license. The investor does not have to accept the license if it is not satisfactory.

Mr. LITTLE. But the gentleman from Tennessee understands that the minute that license is issued the Government of the United States is estopped for 50 years from exercising that right, and all that I ask is to make the payment fair in proportion to the investment as the years go by.

Mr. SIMS. If borrowed money is used, you have to pay interest on it, and if it is your own money, you lose the interest on it, so that at the beginning the charge should be merely nominal.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; and you are either going to give this away for nothing or you are going to make it so high that nobody will go in. The charge will be nominal, and as the years go by it will be infinitesimal. I think the Government should get payment from these investors.

Mr. SIMS. We are fixing it so that——

Mr. LITTLE. Why do you not fix it now?

Mr. SIMS. We give the commission all the power that it needs to make just and reasonable charges for the power produced.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; the first year.

Mr. SIMS. You can not put them up and put them down, but you can provide in the license readjustment periods without prescribing the amount.

Mr. LITTLE. It is just and right to do that now, is it not, and if it is not, why not let them have the power for 40 years?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment be closed in five minutes.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to be recognized to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that, when one of these licenses is issued, that license contains a fixed charge that is unbreakable for 50 years?

Mr. SIMS. It must be a just and reasonable charge.

Mr. LAYTON. I want the question answered categorically. When the license is issued is it a fixed rate of charge per kilowatt, and does that last until 50 years when once fixed?

Mr. SIMS. The commission has the authority to shape the rate or charge as it sees fit, so that it comes within the terms "just and reasonable."

Mr. LAYTON. Can they fix that charge for 10 or 20 years, according to the emoluments that the company owns?

Mr. SIMS. It can reserve the right if it wants to do so.

Mr. LAYTON. If it is in the license, does it stay at that fixed charge for 50 years?

Mr. SIMS. Unless the Government exercises the right to take it over in the meantime it does.

Mr. LAYTON. Then I am against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 13. That the licensee shall commence the construction of the project works within the time fixed in the license, shall thereafter in good faith and with due diligence prosecute such construction, and shall within the time fixed in the license complete and put into operation such part of the ultimate development as the commission shall deem necessary to supply the reasonable needs of the then available market, and shall from time to time thereafter construct such portion of the balance of such development as the commission may direct, so as to supply adequately the reasonable market demands until such development shall have been completed. The periods for the commencement and completion of construction may be extended by the commission when not incompatible with the public interests. In case the licensee shall not commence actual construction of the project works, or of any specified part thereof, within the time prescribed in the license or as extended by the commission, then, after due notice given, the license shall, as to such project works or part thereof, be terminated upon written order of the commission. In case the construction of the project works, or of any specified part thereof, have been begun but not completed within the time prescribed in the license, or as extended by the commission, then the Attorney General, upon the request of the commission, shall institute proceedings in equity in the district court of the United States for the district in which any part of the project is situated for the revocation of said license, the sale of the works constructed, and such other equitable relief as the case may demand, as provided for in section 26 hereof.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GREEN of Iowa having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 45 to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 4630. An act granting consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River, near the Texas & Pacific Railroad bridge, in said county and State; and

H. R. 4631. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River at or near Blackmans Point, in said county and State.

FEDERAL WATER-POWER COMMISSION.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. ESCH, Mr. RAKER, and Mr. MORGAN rose.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ESCH: Page 20, line 9, after the word "license," insert "which shall not be more than two years from the date thereof."

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, during the consideration of this bill in committee there was much discussion as to the advisability of putting in some time limit within which work should be commenced after the license is issued, but no determination was reached in committee, nor was any change made when the bill was in the House. It seems advisable that there be some time limit fixed within which work should be commenced after the issuance of the license, and this amendment simply prescribes a period of two years thereafter, so that after the license has been issued there may not be an indeterminate period within which the work should be commenced. It does seem to me that this is a reasonable limitation and would tend to stimulate the construction of these great water powers.

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

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Do we not provide that in the period before a license is issued he must have the preliminaries all ready, and then when the work is commenced his license is issued? If you give him two years will he not use up that two years without any development work at all?

Mr. ESCH. No. On the contrary I think that by fixing the period at two years you will stimulate the licensee in getting busy and performing work. The things that the gentleman has in mind only relate to securing the necessary data. The plans and preparations, and so on, to present to this commission, in advance of the issuance of the license. All this is to be done before the license is issued.

I will say that I intend to follow that up with an amendment later in the same section.

Mr. RAKER. This section provides that the licensee shall what—

shall commence the construction of the project work within the time fixed by the license.

And he must thereafter continue in good faith. I do not remember that question being considered by the committee in fixing a definite period. He must commence the construction of the project work. Otherwise he has to abandon his entire project. It is the duty of the commission to order proceedings to be had against him to forfeit his license.

Mr. ESCH. A like provision was contained in previous bills, and it seems to me as though the sense of both Houses is that there should be some limitation, and I can see no harm in it. In fact, I can see some benefit in it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ESCH. I offer the following amendment, supplementary to the one just adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 20, line 18, after the word "commencement," insert "of construction may be extended once, but not longer than two additional years"; and after the word "and," in line 19, insert "the period for the," and after the word "construction," in line 19, insert the following: "carried on in good faith and with reasonable diligence."

Mr. ESCH. So that the paragraph as amended will read, beginning with line 18—

The period for the commencement of construction may be extended once, but not longer than two additional years, and the period for the completion of construction carried on in good faith and with reasonable diligence may be extended by the commission when not incompatible with the public interests.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In my time I ask to have a couple of letters read, letters from two soldiers, about a matter which I think is of interest to all the Members of the House.

Mr. ELSTON. Reserving the right to object, how long will it take?

Mr. GARNER. Why does the gentleman want to bring in here on a proposition of this kind some letters from soldiers? If you are going to begin that kind of thing, everybody in the country will want to have letters read here.

Mr. ELSTON. Can not the gentleman ask unanimous consent to have the letters printed in the RECORD?

Mr. GARNER. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH], chairman of this committee, going to agree that a Member can move to strike out the last word in order to read letters from soldiers? If we are going to begin that kind of work it seems to me we will get along very slowly with this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma in his time ask unanimous consent to have these letters inserted in the RECORD? The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to have these letters inserted in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MORGAN. My request was that they be read. I do not want to impose on the House——

Mr. SIMS. I will ask the gentleman not to do that now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SIMS. I shall object if the letters do not pertain to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. SIMS. I object unless the letters pertain to the bill. I do not know what is in them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that he did not rise and address the Chair, which is customary. The Chair stated the question and asked if there was objection, and there was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. I do not know how to make an objection then.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit the request again. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD certain letters which he has sent to the Clerk's desk. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMS. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee objects. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for the balance of his time.

Mr. MORGAN. The Chair submitted a proposition which I did not ask for. What I asked for was to have these letters read, but I will proceed now for five minutes. I am sure the gentleman from Tennessee did not understand what the proposition was. It seems to me we have been going along here very leisurely and there is a very important proposition to come up shortly, and that is the question what, if anything, Congress shall do to provide homes for our soldiers and provide for their general welfare? Now, all of us agree that that is a very important question. I have a couple of letters from soldiers who served in France. They have expressed an interest in H. R. 5545, which I introduced. A number of other important bills have been introduced on this subject. The House should be informed on the subject. The soldiers should be heard. Their views should have great weight. Their opinions are important. Whatever Congress does should have the approval of our soldiers, seamen, and marines. Instead of talking to the House myself, I wanted the House to hear what these two soldiers had to say on the subject.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MORGAN. I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. RAKER. A point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled, as the gentleman from California declines to state it.

Mr. RAKER. No; I do not decline to state it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California was recognized by the Chair to state his point of order, and then declined to state it.

Mr. RAKER. No; I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is out of order.

Mr. RAKER. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. MORGAN. I want to finish my statement.

Mr. RAKER. Then I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MORGAN. There are a number of important propositions pertaining to the soldiers pending in Congress. I have received a number of letters from soldiers approving the plan to provide homes for our soldiers, seamen, and marines as proposed in my bill (H. R. 5545). These letters are on that subject. The gentleman who objects does not desire to show any discourtesy to the soldier.

Mr. SIMS. Neither does any gentleman here.

Mr. MORGAN. I thought the House might stop for five minutes and listen to the reading of these letters. I again renew my request and I hope no gentleman will object. I will modify my request and ask unanimous consent that one of the letters be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma, within his rights, asks that one of the two letters he sends to the desk be read. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, have they any connection with the subject matter here?

Mr. SIMS. No.

Mr. MORGAN. Both bills are designed for the public good.

Mr. WALSH. I object.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that these two letters may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the two letters be printed in the RECORD as a part of his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letters are as follows:

THE HAMPTON,
Washington, D. C., June 30, 1919.

Hon. DICK T. MORGAN,
House of Representatives, City.

MY DEAR MR. MORGAN: May I not take the liberty of writing you to express appreciation on the behalf of myself and others who served our country either in the military or naval forces during the emergency just passed of the interest you are taking and the effort you are making toward effecting the passage of H. R. 5545, "the Soldiers' and Seamen's Federal Home Founding Act"?

In my opinion this bill admirably covers the question of providing homes for the soldiers, and from the standpoint of one who hopes soon to acquire a home, I feel qualified in saying that this bill can not fail of meeting with the approval of those for whom its benefits are intended.

The clause providing for the acquisition of city property or farm land, according to the desire of the soldier or sailor concerned, is but one of the many points that makes this bill stand out as the most acceptable of any that have thus far been introduced for the purpose of providing homes for these men. As you so clearly pointed out in your speech, as printed in the RECORD of June 16, this bill provides for a more even distribution of benefits than do the other bills, which limit acquisition of property to rural or reclaimed areas, and also serves the twofold purpose of aiding the soldier and thereby adding to the number of home owners in every State in the Union.

As the time required to put into effect the provisions of this bill is estimated at from six months to one year after its passage, I sincerely hope that every effort will be made to secure prompt action.

As a supplement to the above I might add that I entered the Army from the State of Rhode Island, serving almost a year in France, in addition to some few months in the United States. I am furnishing the Congressman from my district (Mr. KENNEDY, third Rhode Island) with a copy of this communication, as I feel that it is not only desirable but the duty of every soldier, sailor, or marine concerned in the passage of this bill to acquaint his Congressman with his opinion of the same.

Assuring you of my highest consideration, I am,

Very sincerely, yours,

J. J. CONDON,
Formerly Sergeant, First Class,
Headquarters Four hundred and thirteenth Telegraph Battalion,
Signal Corps, American Expeditionary Forces.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *June 28, 1919.*

Hon. DICK T. MORGAN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your kind favor of the 24th instant to hand and very glad to receive a copy of the bill (H. R. 5545). I have carefully examined same and find it perfect in every respect, and will certainly urge its consideration by Louisiana's two Senators and many Congressmen—I believe eight or nine. However, I am personally acquainted with J. Y. SANDERS; also GARLAND DUPRÉ. By the way, send me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I may enlist some of our neighboring statesmen to come to our support.

Say, that's a real true American bill, and should go through like a shot; those are all my sentiments. I don't know why our statesmen don't pass more laws like that.

Now, my dear Mr. MORGAN, I am going to write every statesman I know to support this bill. Say, I did not find a copy of your speech before Congress. Please send me a copy. I am interested in anything pertaining to this kind of legislation; so kindly accept my hearty congratulations and assurances; I will work hard for its success. Don't forget to send me a copy of your speech and a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Awaiting your reply, I am,

Yours, respectfully,

RICHARD ALF. UHALT,
402 Interstate Bank, New Orleans, La.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 15. That if the United States does not, at the expiration of the original license, exercise its right to take over, maintain, and operate any project or projects of the licensee, as provided in section 14 hereof, the commission is authorized to issue a new license to the original licensee upon such terms and conditions as may be authorized or required under the then existing laws and regulations, or to issue a new license under said terms and conditions to a new licensee, which license may cover any project or projects covered by the original license, and shall be issued on the condition that the new licensee shall, before taking possession of such project or projects, pay such amount for the property taken, and assume such contracts as the United States is required to do, in the manner specified in section 14 hereof: *Provided*, That in the event the United States does not exercise the right to take over and does not issue a new license to the original or a new licensee, then the commission shall issue from year to year an annual license to the then licensee under the terms and conditions of the original license until the property is taken over or a new license is issued as aforesaid.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this to obtain an opportunity to make some inquiries of the chairman having in charge this bill. I want to know what effect this bill will have on the law known as "water-power acts" of certain of the States, which provide a scheme of revenue for those States in providing a rental on the power generated. How will it affect such revenues?

Mr. ESCH. Section 27 of this bill provides:

That nothing herein contained shall be construed as affecting or intending to affect or in any way to interfere with the laws of the respective States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation or for municipal or other uses, or any vested right acquired therein.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Would the bill affect the States that have undeveloped water power, which they claim as a natural resource and as coming exclusively within their jurisdiction and control?

Mr. ESCH. I can not conceive of any such project unless it is on a nonnavigable intrastate stream over which we do not claim jurisdiction.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I have in mind my own State of West Virginia, which has considerable undeveloped water power. We have a statute, passed a little while before the war began, which would bring to the State considerable revenue if any person or corporation were authorized thereunder and did install a plant under the terms of the act.

Now, thus far the State board—having the matter of granting permits in charge—has never been able to agree with an applicant for a license to dam the Kanawha River. It was proposed to erect a very high dam, one, perhaps, one hundred feet in height and one that might involve the safety of the people of the entire valley, including the city of Charleston, and while it was realized that the water power was every day going to waste and that the carrying out of the project would be of great advantage to the State from a revenue point of view, yet the people felt that their lives would be imperiled by the erection of the dam and their influence was such as to deter the commission from granting the application. As I understand the measure under consideration, the board that you would create would consist of three men vested with full power to authorize the erection and construction of that dam without regard to what the people of that valley thought or had to say about it. It seems to me there are two main things to look after in the preparation of an act of this sort. One is the public safety and the other is revenue for the State.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I will.

Mr. SINNOTT. Paragraph (b), page 14, says:

(b) Satisfactory evidence that the applicant has complied with the requirements of the laws of the State or States within which the proposed project is to be located with respect to bed and banks and to the appropriation, diversion, and use of water for power purposes and with respect to the right to engage in the business of developing, transmitting, and distributing power, and in any other business necessary to effect the purposes of a license under this act.

So before he can get a license from this commission he must supply the necessary evidence showing that he has absolutely conformed to all of the requirements of the laws of the particular States in which he desires to venture on the project.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I thank the gentleman; his information is reassuring to me.

I am bound to say, however, that water power is an asset of the State and the State is entitled to the revenue and that the Federal Government has no jurisdiction over the bed and shores of streams and no just right to take income for permits to use the same.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 17. That the charges arising from licenses hereunder shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States. Fifty per cent of the charges arising from licenses hereunder for the occupancy and use of national forests is hereby reserved and appropriated as a special fund in the Treasury to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture in the survey, construction, and maintenance of roads and trails within such national forests. Fifty per cent of the charges arising from licenses hereunder for the occupancy and use of national parks is hereby reserved and appropriated as a special fund in the Treasury, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior in the improvement and development of such parks. Fifty per cent of the charges arising from licenses hereunder for the occupancy and use of public lands, and of national monuments, and power site or other reserves outside of national forests shall be paid into, reserved, and appropriated as a part of the reclamation fund created by the act of Congress approved June 17, 1902, known as the reclamation act. All proceeds from any Indian reservation shall be placed to the credit of the Indians of such reservation. Fifty per cent of the charges arising from all other licenses hereunder is hereby reserved and appropriated as a special fund in the Treasury to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War in the maintenance and operation of dams and other navigation structures owned by the United States, or in the construction, maintenance, or operation of headwater or other improvements of navigable waters of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This is one of the more important sections of the bill, which provides for the disposition of the receipts. It provides that 50 per cent of the charges for licenses for occupancy and use of the waters and land for this project in a national park shall go into the Treasury as a special fund. Then there is another special fund under the reclamation act, another special fund under the projects which are erected under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War.

Mr. ELSTON. Domain of the Secretary of War.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] says in the domain and not in the jurisdiction is the better language. It may be the better language in California, under the teachings of the Berkeley Institute, but I prefer old Harvard to the newer institution of learning.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. No; I prefer not to yield now. I would like to know what is to be gained by creating these special funds. Why not have the receipts covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts?

Mr. McARTHUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. McARTHUR. Does not the gentleman believe that some of this money ought to go to the States that are being robbed of their right to tax water power? Does not the gentleman believe that the Federal Government is substantially appearing in the guise of a blackmailer in collecting these taxes simply because it has the power to do so?

Mr. WALSH. Not in the guise of a blackmailer, I would say, but it is approaching the blackjack stage. It would seem to me, however, Mr. Chairman, it is better to cover these receipts into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. You are going to have involved bookkeeping to trace these receipts from reclamation projects and national parks, the public domain, and from navigation structures under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War. It would seem to me to be an unwise policy in embarking on a program of this importance to require that exactly 50 per cent of the receipts should be taken and applied to one fund in one class of cases, 50 per cent in another class of cases, and 50 per cent in another class of cases. If all of the receipts go into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, it is not going to affect the jurisdiction of Congress on the recommendation of its appropriate committees from appropriating money, as we have heretofore done for reclamation projects, for the national forests and the public lands and these various other matters in these newly developed States of the far West, about which we hear so much when a bill of this sort comes before Congress for consideration.

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

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I object. The gentleman criticizes my English, and I do not think I owe him any consideration.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, the stricture made by the gentleman is not very well founded as it stands at the present time, for the reason that when we attempt to take 50 per centum of the proceeds for the licenses issued, where the land is in the national forests, it will be used in the State where the land is located. The same with reference to when the land is in a national park. That is for the purpose of providing that these States where the land is—for instance, on the public lands or in a national park or in a forest reserve—might get at least half of the money received, to be paid into their treasury for the purpose of assisting what otherwise would be obtained from the States in the way of taxation, were they not Government property. The Secretary of the Interior will improve the national parks.

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

Mr. RAKER. In a moment—and the Secretary of Agriculture will assist in building roads, trails, and so forth, through the national forests. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. What do the States get in lieu of taxation now?

Mr. RAKER. Where it is the national forest, we get a certain percentage in the way of an amount being set aside for our schools and roads.

Mr. WALSH. Fifty per cent.

Mr. RAKER. About 36, I think it is.

Mr. WALSH. Why should you raise the limit in case of water power?

Mr. RAKER. You are now taking an additional part of the land, you are using the land now, Government land, for all purposes that you might use it for. It is not taxable. You build up a project in the forest reserves by allowing certain parts of the land to be used for reservoir purposes. That make an addition. It adds more money in the community where it is located, because if it was State land or private land it would advance that whole community that much, there would be that much more tax gathered, that much more paid to the county or the local municipality and the State. Therefore, the Government still owning the property, having authorized its use in one of these projects, it should pay to that State or to that county where the land is located at least one-half, to go to improve the local community.

Mr. WALSH. Would not writing this into the law postpone the happy day when the States shall have taken complete jurisdiction and control of these lands within their borders as they ought to do at some time, and take these lands out of the control of the Federal Government?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. We hope you will help to do it.

Mr. WALSH. Any time I will do it.

Mr. RAKER. I do not think that is proper at this time. They have been fairly well administered and we do not want to turn them over to the States at the present time.

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

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3184) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties and had come to no resolution thereon.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California presents the conference report, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report be considered, notwithstanding the rule for the printing of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report, notwithstanding it has not been printed according to the rule. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from California if he does not think this is a very bad practice with as big a bill as this?

Mr. KAHN. Ordinarily I should say it is, but we are under a peculiar situation. To-day is the beginning of the new fiscal year, and I take it that it is very desirable that this bill should pass at once.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, what difference does it make really whether it passes to-day, to-morrow, or the next day, or

the next as the President can not possibly sign this bill until he gets here. He did sign one yesterday at mid-ocean, but they are not sending him any more.

Mr. KAHN. He will probably be here before the recess is over. I understand it is proposed that Congress take a recess for a week.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. When are we going to take it?

Mr. MADDEN. To-night.

Mr. KAHN. To-night.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How long is it to extend?

Mr. KAHN. A week.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why not take a month's recess to give people like the gentleman and myself who live quite a distance away a chance to get home?

Mr. KAHN. I agree with the gentleman that it would be a very good idea.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the gentleman will agree to do that, I will not object.

Mr. KAHN. I presume that many Members want to shake hands with the President when he comes back.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would rather shake hands with my constituents for a while. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. Amen.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that the report is practically the same as the report which was printed in the RECORD several days ago with four exceptions and those I can fully explain to the Members, I think.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, now if we let the gentleman through, are you going to take this recess beginning to-night?

Mr. KAHN. I understand so.

Mr. GARNER. Let us have that understood. There is no reason otherwise why you should do this, and I would like the gentleman from Wyoming to make a statement as to what he intends to do.

Mr. MONDELL. "The gentleman from Wyoming" expects a little later in the afternoon to present a resolution to the effect that when the House adjourns this evening we will adjourn until Tuesday, the 8th of July.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman does not intend to consider the deficiency bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will give the gentleman a pointer, that he can not make such a motion and it would not be in order if he did make it. One House can not adjourn more than three days at a time.

Mr. MADDEN. It is a concurrent resolution.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman intend to consider the deficiency appropriation bill this afternoon?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I am not at this time informed definitely whether the deficiency bill will be considered, but the resolution which I propose to offer will bring an adjournment, if it is adopted by the Senate, until the 8th of July.

Mr. KAHN. From the date of adjournment this afternoon?

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman proposes to offer a resolution regardless of whether the deficiency bill is considered or not?

Mr. MONDELL. I think I shall.

Mr. GARNER. That is the main point.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Has the gentleman any knowledge as to what the other body will do?

Mr. MONDELL. I understand there will be no difficulty about securing an agreement.

Mr. CANNON. This means the deficiency bill will go over until after the adjournment?

Mr. MONDELL. That may occur.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I do not think it ought to occur.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. I did not catch the last statement.

Mr. CANNON. I said I did not think it ought to occur, and I do not think we ought to agree for the deficiency bill to go over until after Congress should convene on the 9th or the 10th of the month.

Mr. GARNER. The reason why I made this inquiry a moment ago was there is no reason why we should consider this bill at this time unless it is agreed that we should take a recess until Monday, the 7th. If the gentleman is going to do that, I am not going to object to considering it now without having it printed under the rule.

Mr. MONDELL. I think I made it plain.

Mr. GARNER. I think the gentleman from Wyoming has, and if the gentleman is going to offer his resolution anyway, all right.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say to the gentleman, if I may be allowed, so far as I am concerned I will not vote for any adjournment to go over until the 8th or any other time, except at the end of the legislative day, until the deficiency bill carrying what is necessary for the public service is enacted into law. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from Illinois is on the conference committee that is considering the deficiency bill, if I remember correctly.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. So the gentleman must have better knowledge than anyone could possibly have as to the probability of getting that bill through.

Mr. CANNON. I have no knowledge at all that every individual Member in the House does not have. I am only speaking for myself, that I will not vote for adjournment until the deficiency bill and the Army bill have passed the House and the Senate. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the reading of the statement in lieu of the report? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the statement.

The statement was read.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 18, 44, 51, 53, 58, 81, 83, 90, 91, 93, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, and 110.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 10, 12, 16, 17, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 45, 47, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 95, and 99, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "*Provided*, That the restrictions herein above recited concerning personal services and the amount allowable for per diem allowance shall not apply to so much of the funds herein appropriated as may be required to carry out the purpose of existing laws relating to the sale of war supplies: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or made available under this act shall be used for the payment of any salary in excess of $12,000 per annum to any civilian employee in the War Department: *Provided further*, That in addition to the delivery of the property heretofore authorized to be delivered to the Public Health Service, the Department of Agriculture, and the Post Office Department of the Government, the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to sell any surplus supplies, including motor trucks and automobiles, now owned by and in the possession of the Government for the use of the War Department to any State or municipal subdivision thereof, or to any corporation or individual upon such terms as may be deemed best"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"Appropriations, Air Service: Creating, maintaining, and operating at established flying schools, courses of instruction for aviation students and enlisted men, including cost of equipment, and supplies necessary for instruction and subsistence of students, purchase of tools, equipment, materials, machines, textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, and instruments and material for theoretical and practical instruction at aviation schools; purchase of supplies for securing, developing, printing, and reproducing photographs made by aerial observers; to maintain and replace the equipment of

organizations already in service; improvement, equipment, maintenance, lease, and operation of aviation stations, balloon schools, plants for testing and experimental work, including the acquisition of land, or any interest in land by purchase, lease, or condemnation, where necessary to procure helium gas; procuring and introducing water, electric light and power, telephones, telegraphs, and sewerage, including maintenance, operation, and repair of such utilities; salaries and wages of civilian employees in the District of Columbia or elsewhere as may be necessary, and payment of their traveling and other necessary expenses as authorized by existing law; experimental investigation and purchase and development of new types of aircraft, accessories thereto, including helium gas rights, and aviation engines, including patents and other rights thereto, and plans, drawings, and specifications thereof; purchase, manufacture, construction, maintenance, repair, storage, and operation of airships, war balloons, and other aerial machines, including instruments, gas plants, hangars, and repair shops, and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction, or equipment of all types of aircraft, and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith, and also for the purchase or manufacture and the issue of special clothing, wearing apparel, and similar equipment for aviation purposes; for all necessary expenses connected with the sale or disposal of surplus or obsolete aeronautical equipment, including the hire of civilian employees, and the rental of buildings, and other facilities for the handling or storage of such equipment; for the services of such consulting engineers at experimental stations of the Air Service as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, including necessary traveling expenses: *Provided*, That the entire expenditures for the services of consulting engineers for the fiscal year 1920 shall not exceed $100,000; purchase of special apparatus and appliances, repairs, and replacements of same used in connection with special scientific medical research in the Air Service; for the establishment of aviation stations in the Philippine Islands, including the lease of land or any interest in land for landing fields only and the preparation of land now owned by the Government necessary to make the same suitable for the purpose intended, buildings, heating, lighting, plumbing, water, sewer, roads, and walks, at a total cost not to exceed $350,000, in all, $25,000,000: *Provided*, That claims not exceeding $250 in amount for damages to persons and private property resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad may be settled out of the funds appropriated hereunder, when each claim is substantiated by a survey report of a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer of the nearest aviation post, and approved by the Director of Air Service: *Provided further*, That claims so settled and paid from the sum hereby appropriated shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of $150,000: *Provided further*, That hereafter actual and necessary expenses only, not to exceed $8 per day, shall be paid to officers of the Army and contract surgeons when traveling by air on duty without troops, under competent orders: *And provided further*, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to subscriptions for foreign and professional newspapers and periodicals to be paid for from this appropriation.

"The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to establish and maintain at one or more established flying schools courses of instruction for aviation students.

"Aviation students shall be enlisted in or appointed to the grade of flying cadet, Air Service, which grade is hereby established: *Provided*, That the total number of flying cadets shall not at any time exceed 1,300. The base pay of a flying cadet shall be $75 per month, including extra pay for flying risk as provided by law. The ration allowance of a flying cadet shall not exceed $1 per day, and his other allowances shall be those of a private, first class, Air Service.

"Upon completion of a course prescribed for flying cadets, each flying cadet, if he so desire, may be discharged and commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Officers' Reserve Corps: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is authorized to discharge at any time any flying cadet whose discharge shall have been recommended by a board of not less than three officers."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For pay of officers of the line, $20,300,000.

"For pay of the officers of staff corps and departments, $19,429,367.

"Pay of officers, National Guard, $100.

"For pay of the officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, $2,325,000.

"For pay of warrant officers, Mine Planter Service, $83,700.

"For pay of the officers, Bureau of Insular Affairs, $15,000.

"Aviation increase, to officers of the Signal Corps, $775,000.

"For pay of the officers, Philippine Scouts, $483,600.

"Additional pay to officers for length of service, $2,892,925.

"PAY OF ENLISTED MEN.

"For pay of enlisted men of the line, $92,728,230: *Provided*, That the pay due enlisted men of the Army shall not be withheld from them by reason of the fact that their service records or other official papers showing the status of their accounts with respect to pay have been lost or not returned from overseas and, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, these men may be paid upon their personal affidavit as to date of last payment and condition of their accounts: *Provided further*, That payments made in accordance with such regulations (or which have already been made upon the affidavit of the soldier) shall be passed by the accounting officers of the Treasury to the credit of the disbursing officers making them.

"For pay of enlisted men of National Guard, $100.

"For pay of enlisted men of the staff corps and departments, $48,162,500.

"For pay of enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserves, $224,750.

"For pay of enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, $77,500.

"Aviation increase, to enlisted men of the Signal Corps, $7,750.

"For pay of the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts, $1,007,500.

"Additional pay for length of service to enlisted men, $3,875,000: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 10 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States, approved May 18, 1917, in so far as it increases the pay of the enlisted men of the Army, be, and the same hereby are, continued in force and effect from and after the date and approval of this act.

"PAY OF PERSONS WITH RETIRED STATUS.

"For pay of the officers on the retired list, $2,500,000.

"For increase pay to retired officers on active duty, $200,000.

"For pay of retired enlisted men, $3,000,000.

"For pay and allowances of retired enlisted men on active duty, $20,000.

"For pay and allowances of Regular Army reservists on active duty, $40,000.

"For pay of retired Philippine Scout officers, $45,000.

"For pay of retired pay clerks, $18,000.

"For pay of retired veterinarians, $3,500.

"CLERKS, MESSENGERS, AND LABORERS, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF.

"One chief clerk, at $2,500 per annum, $2,500.

"One clerk, at $2,250 per annum, $2,250.

"Six clerks, at $2,000 each per annum, $12,000.

"Eight clerks, at $1,800 each per annum, $14,400.

"Thirteen clerks, at $1,600 each per annum, $20,800.

"Twenty-one clerks, at $1,400 each per annum, $29,400.

"Twenty-four clerks, at $1,200 each per annum, $28,800.

"Twenty-six clerks, at $1,000 each per annum, $26,000.

"One captain of the watch, at $900 per annum, $900.

"Six watchmen, at $720 each per annum, $4,320.

"One gardener, at $720 per annum, $720.

"One packer, at $840 per annum, $840.

"One chief messenger, at $1,000 per annum, $1,000.

"Three messengers, at $400 each per annum, $2,250.

"Fifteen messengers, at $720 each per annum, $10,800.

"Two laborers, at $720 each per annum, $1,440.

"One laborer, at $600 per annum, $600.

"Five charwomen, at $240 each per annum, $1,200.

"PAY OF ARMY FIELD CLERKS AND CIVIL-SERVICE MESSENGERS AT HEADQUARTERS OF THE SEVERAL TERRITORIAL DEPARTMENTS, ARMY AND CORPS HEADQUARTERS, TERRITORIAL DISTRICTS, TACTICAL DIVISIONS AND BRIGADES, SERVICE SCHOOLS, CAMPS AND PORTS OF EMBARKATION AND DEBARKATION.

"Eighty clerks, at $1,800 each per annum, $144,000.

"Seven clerks, at $2,000 each per annum, $14,000.

"One hundred and seventy-two clerks, at $1,600 each per annum, $275,200.

"Eleven clerks, at $1,800 each per annum, $19,800.

"Two hundred and twenty-two clerks, at $1,400 each per annum, $310,800.

"Fourteen clerks, at $1,600 each per annum, $22,400.

"Five hundred and twenty-six clerks, at $1,200 each per annum, $631,200.

"Thirty-two clerks, at $1,400 each per annum, $44,800.

"One hundred and nineteen messengers, at $720 each per annum, $85,680.

"Fifty-seven clerks, at $1,200 each per annum, $68,400.

"Forty-nine clerks, at $1,200 each per annum, $58,800.

"Thirty-nine messengers, at $720 each per annum, $28,080.

"Additional pay while on foreign service, $8,000.

"For commutation of quarters and of heat and light, $23,040: *Provided*, That Army field clerks shall have the same allowances and benefits as heretofore allowed by law to pay clerks, Quartermaster Corps, not including retirement: *Provided, however*, that the minimum or entrance pay exclusive of said allowances, of said Army field clerks shall be $1,200 per annum: *Provided further*, That Army field clerks shall receive the same increase of pay for service beyond the continental limits of the United States as is allowed by law to commissioned officers of the Army: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of War is authorized to employ, during the present emergency and for a period not exceeding four months thereafter, such additional Army field clerks as may be necessary, not exceeding 4,272.

"For commutation of quarters and of heat and light for field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, $76,800: *Provided*, That said clerks, messengers, and laborers shall be employed and assigned by the Secretary of War to the offices and positions in which they are to serve: *Provided further*, That no clerk, messenger, or laborer at headquarters of tactical divisions, military departments, brigades, service schools, and office of the Chief of Staff shall be assigned to duty in any bureau of the War Department.

"MISCELLANEOUS.

"For pay of contract surgeons, $90,000.

"For pay of nurses, $800,000.

"For pay of hospital matrons, $3,600.

"For pay of reserve veterinarians, $350,000.

"For expenses of courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, retiring boards, and compensation of reporters and witnesses attending same, and expenses of taking depositions and securing other evidence for use before the same, $200,000.

"For additional pay to officer in charge of public buildings and grounds at Washington, D. C., $500.

"For commutation of quarters and heat and light to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Nurse Corps, and enlisted men on duty at places where no public quarters are available, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, $4,821,150.

"For interest on soldiers' deposits, $145,000.

"For pay of expert accountant for the Inspector General's Department, $2,500.

"For extra pay to enlisted men employed on extra duty for periods of not less than 10 days in the offices of Coast Defense Artillery Engineers and Coast Defense Ordnance officers, and as switchboard operators at seacoast fortifications, $25,000.

"For extra pay to enlisted men employed on extra duty as switchboard operators at each interior post of the Army, $19,215.

"For extra pay to enlisted men of the line of the Army and to enlisted men of the Quartermaster Corps, Medical Department, and of the Signal Corps employed in the Territory of Alaska on the Washington-Alaska cable and telegraph system for periods of not less than ten days at the rate of 35 cents per day, $38,430.

"For mileage to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, when ordered to active duty, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks, and field clerks of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, $2,500,000.

"For additional 10 per centum increase of pay of officers on foreign service, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That hereafter warrant officers shall receive the same increase of pay for service beyond the continental limits of the United States as is allowed to commissioned officers of the Army.

"For additional 20 per cent increase of pay of enlisted men on foreign service, $4,000,000.

"For pay of one computer for Artillery Board, $2,500.

"For payment of exchange by acting quartermasters serving in foreign countries and when specially authorized by the Secretary of War by officers disbursing funds pertaining to the Quartermaster Corps when serving in Alaska, and all foreign money received shall be charged to and paid out by disbursing officers of the Quartermaster Corps at the legal valuation fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, $1,000.

"For additional pay to officers below the grade of major required to be mounted and who furnish their own mounts, $240,000.

"For amount required to make monthly payment to Jennie Carroll, widow of James Carroll, late major, United States Army, $1,500.

"For amount required to make monthly payments to Mabel H. Lazear, widow of Jesse W. Lazear, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, $1,500.

"For amount required to make monthly payments of $100 to John R. Kissinger, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-seventh Indiana Volunteer Infantry, also late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, $1,200.

"All the money hereinbefore appropriated for pay of the Army and miscellaneous, except the appropriation for mileage to commissioned officers, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks, and field clerks of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, shall be disbursed and accounted for as pay of the Army, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$62,526,466.50: *Provided*, That not to exceed $22,500 of this sum be made available for the care of the peach orchard on Poole Island, Aberdeen Proving Ground, and the grain now growing at this and other reservations and the harvest and disposal of the crops; and such disposal by sale or otherwise shall be made pursuant to such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That all moneys received by the United States as the proceeds of such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as 'miscellaneous receipts.'"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$10"; and, on page 25, line 19, of the engrossed bill, strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$30,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$7,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$675,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$30,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"Land for hospital and other purposes: For the purchase of land contiguous to the Walter Reed General Hospital, District of Columbia, 26⅝ acres, more or less, for the final location of the Army Medical Museum, the Surgeon General's Library, and the Army Medical School, and for the improvements now on the land to be purchased, $350,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert: "$300,000: *Provided*, That the services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, and such other services as the Secretary of War may deem necessary may be employed only in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry into effect the various appropriations for 'Engineer equipment of troops,' 'Engineer operations in the field,' and other military appropriations, to be paid from such appropriations: *Provided further*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1920 shall not exceed $225,000. The Secretary of War shall each year, in the annual estimates, report to Congress the number of persons who are employed, their duties, and amount paid to each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$5,000,000: *Provided*, That all the moneys hereinbefore appropriated for the arming, equipping, and training of the National Guard shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "cantonments except in such cases at National Army or National Guard camps or cantonments which were in use prior to November 11, 1918, where it has been or may be found more economical to the Government for the purpose of salvaging such camps or cantonments to buy real estate than to continue to pay rentals or claims for damages thereon, and except where industrial plants have been constructed or taken over by the Government for war purposes and the purchase of land is necessary in order to protect the interest of the Government"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"That the several organizations of the Army, to wit: The Chemical Warfare Service, the Air Service, the Construction Division, the Tank Corps, and the Motor Transport Corps, with their powers and duties as defined in orders and regulations in force and effect on November 11, 1918, shall be continued to and until June 30, 1920.

"That officers of the emergency Army appointed to the Officers' Reserve Corps may be appointed therein to the grade held by them in the emergency Army or next higher grade, as the Secretary of War may direct."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "Sec. 2." in line 1 of the second paragraph of the amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"Exchange of Army cold-storage plant, Chicago, Ill.: That the President is hereby authorized, through the Secretary of War, upon terms and conditions considered advisable by the Secretary of War, to dispose of the United States Army cold-storage plant in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, with machinery and equipment therein contained, and appurtenances thereunto belonging, and to accept in part payment therefor a warehouse adjacent to the Army general supply depot in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, containing approximately 650,000 square feet of storage space, together with the land comprising the site of same: *Provided*, That such exchange shall be effected without expenditure for this purpose by the United States, except necessary costs of conveyancing not exceeding $500, hereby appropriated for this purpose. The President, through the Secretary of War, is hereby authorized to execute and deliver in the name of the United States of America and in its behalf any and all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments necessary to effect such sale or exchange.

"That all moneys received by the United States as the proceeds of such sale or exchange shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of 'Miscellaneous receipts,' and a full report of the same shall be submitted to Congress."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Insert at the beginning of the amendment a side title as follows: "Boughton Memorial Association"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"Medical supplies for the American Red Cross: The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to place at the disposal of the American Red Cross, such medical and surgical supplies, and supplementary and dietary foodstuffs used in the treatment of the sick and injured now in Europe and designed for but which are not now essential to the needs of the American Expeditionary Forces, or needed for use in military hospitals in the United States, or as military or hospital stores for the Army of the United States, to be used by said American Red Cross as it shall determine, to relieve and supply the pressing needs of the people of countries involved in the late war. The Secretary of War shall prescribe regulations and conditions for the selection and delivery of said supplies and foodstuffs to the American Red Cross for the purposes aforesaid."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"Prosecution of claims by former Government employees: That it shall be unlawful for any person who, as a commissioned officer of the Army, or officer or employee of the United States, has at any time since April 6, 1917, been employed in any bureau of the Government and in such employment been engaged on behalf of the United States, in procuring or assisting to procure supplies for the Military Establishment, or who has been engaged in the settlement or adjustment of contracts or agreements for the procurement of supplies for the Military Establishment, within two years next after his discharge or other separation from the service of the Government, to solicit employment in the presentation or to aid or assist for compensation in the prosecution of claims against the United States arising out of any contracts or agreements for the procurement of supplies for said bureau, which were pending or entered into while the said officer or employee were associated therewith. A violation of this provision of this chapter shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both: *Provided*, That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with any of the provisions of this act are hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JULIUS KAHN,
D. R. ANTHONY, Jr.,
S. H. DENT, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the House.

J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
HOWARD SUTHERLAND,
GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on:

On amendment No. 1: The House receded from this amendment with an amendment which authorizes in the first proviso to employ men who are capable to dispose of the Government property. The second proviso prohibits the payment of any salary in this act in excess of $12,000 per annum. In the third proviso the conferees inserted a provision authorizing the Secretary of War to sell any surplus supplies, including automobiles in the possession of the Government, to any State or municipal subdivision, or to any corporation or individual, upon such terms as may be deemed best.

On amendment No. 2: This amendment relates to the Military Intelligence Division, for which the House appropriated $250,000, but the Senate increased this amount to $430,000. Your conferees compromised this sum by allowing $400,000.

On amendment No. 3: On this amendment the Senate recedes, which restores the House text naming Fort Sill, Okla., for the Infantry School of Arms.

On amendment No. 4: The Senate recedes from this amendment, which restores the words "Fort Sill, Okla."

On amendment No. 5: This amendment appropriated $10,000 for textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, and for other expenses required for Field Artillery brigade firing at Camp Bragg, Camp Knox, and Camp Taylor, from which the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 6: The Senate recedes from this provision relating to special prices on typewriting machines and thus restores the House text.

On amendment No. 7: This amendment appropriates for the Signal Service of the Army which the House passed at $3,000,000 and the Senate increased to $3,500,000. Your conferees agreed to this amendment by allowing $3,250,000.

On amendment No. 8: Your conferees accepted the Senate appropriation of $140,000, which is for the maintenance of the Washington-Alaska Military Cable and Telegraph System.

On amendment No. 9: Provides the procurement of helium gas; limits the establishment of aviation stations in the Philippine Islands; limits the leasing of land in the Philippine Islands for landing fields only, and limits the expense for aviation in the Philippines to $358,000. Provisions for the purchase of land at Buffalo, Dayton, Ohio, Burlington County, N. J., and San Diego, Calif., are eliminated. It provides for courses of instruction for aviation students, and the creation of the grade of flying cadet of the Air Service. The amount of money allowed is $25,000,000, as compared with $54,400,000 as passed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 10: The House conferees agreed to the Senate provision which allowed $3,500,000 of the unexpended balances of the appropriation on June 30, 1919, for all necessary expenses for the completion, preservation, and transportation of the records pertaining to the draft act and authorizes the employment of clerical help to furnish the adjutants general of the several States statements of service of all persons from those States who entered the military service during the war with the Central Powers.

On amendment No. 11: This amendment relates to the pay of the Army. The amount appropriated is based on an Army of 325,000 men. The figures are those of the House bill, with the addition of $15,000,000 for the increase of the personnel from 300,000 to 325,000. The total for the pay of the Army is approximately $213,000,000.

On amendment No. 12: The House conferees recede from this amendment, which will allow members of the Officers' Reserve Training Corps at camp subsistence in the Army.

On amendment No. 13: This amendment relates to appropriations for subsistence of the Army. Your conferees allowed $62,526,466.20, which is estimated as all that is necessary. The House passed this provision at $67,500,000 and the Senate at $85,000,000. This decrease is the result of maintaining an Army of 325,000 men. It also provides $22,500 for the harvesting and disposal of crops on Poole Island, Aberdeen Proving Ground.

On amendment No. 14: The Senate recedes from this amendment, which restores the appropriation allowed by the House for the regular supplies of the Army.

On amendment No. 15: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment, which allows a donation of $10 to each dishonorably discharged prisoner upon his release from confinement under court-martial sentence. The conferees compromised on the total for incidental expenses by allowing $30,000,000.

On amendment No. 16: This amendment struck out the provision for the transportation overseas to the United States of the bodies of officers and enlisted men who died in Europe during the present war, which the House conferees accepted for the reason that this appropriation is carried in the sundry civil act.

On amendment No. 17: This amendment relates to transportation of the Army.

On amendment No. 18: This amendment relates to water and sewers at military posts, which proposed to strike out the House text, from which the Senate recedes, thus restoring the House language.

On amendment No. 19: The House appropriated $5,000,000 for water and sewers at military posts and the Senate increased this amount to $10,000,000. Your conferees allowed $7,000,000.

On amendment No. 20: The House conferees receded from this amendment which allowed each soldier a suit of citizen's outer clothing at a cost not exceeding $15, which is an increase of $5 as passed by the House.

On amendment No. 21: The House allowed $18,750,000 for clothing and camp and garrison equipage which the Senate increased to $25,000,000. By reason of the reduction of the Army to 325,000 men it was estimated that $20,000,000 would be sufficient, which your conferees allowed.

On amendment No. 22: This amendment is for horses for the Army which passed the House at $1,000,000 and was increased in the Senate to $5,000,000. Your conferees compromised by allowing $2,500,000.

On amendment No. 23: This amendment relates to barracks and quarters for the Army which was passed by the House at $2,000,000 and increased in the Senate to $15,000,000. The House conferees allowed $7,500,000.

On amendment No. 24: The House appropriated $150,000 for equipment of amusement rooms and gymnasiums at military post exchanges, which the Senate increased to $1,350,000. Your conferees receded from this amendment by allowing $675,000.

On amendment No. 25: This amendment relates to barracks and quarters in the Philippine Islands for which the House appropriated $150,000. The Senate increased this amount to $350,000 and your conferees compromised by allowing $250,000.

On amendment No. 26: The House appropriated $3,000,000 for the construction and repair of roads, walks, and wharves and for the disposal of drainage, which the Senate increased to $5,000,000. Your conferees receded by allowing $4,000,000.

On amendment No. 27: The House conferees accepted this amendment as it was a decrease of $100,000 in the appropriation for shooting galleries and ranges.

On amendments Nos. 28 and 29: These amendments authorized the increase of $100 in the salaries of the assistant engineer and a carpenter at the Army War College which your conferees accepted.

On amendment No. 30: This amendment is merely a change in total, hence the House recedes.

On amendment No. 31: Your conferees recede from this amendment as it reduces the appropriation $15,000 for rental of buildings for military purposes in the District of Columbia and does not allow any appropriation if space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission in Government-owned buildings.

On amendment No. 32: This amendment relates to vocational training under the national-defense act, for which the House appropriated $10,500. The Senate increased the amount to $5,000,000. Your conferees receded from this amendment by allowing $2,000,000.

On amendment No. 33: This amendment is merely a change in title. Your conferees recede.

On amendment No. 34: This amendment relates to rifle ranges for civilian instruction. The Senate increased the House amount of $10,000 to $100,000, and provided that the governors of States and Territories and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia may designate which team shall represent their respective State, Territory, or the District of Columbia. The House accepted the Senate amendment.

On amendment No. 35: This amendment relates to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. The Senate increased the amount from $1,000,000 to $4,000,000 and the House receded.

On amendment No. 36: Your conferees accept the Senate amendment for the reason that it strikes out the authority to purchase land for storage and shipping facilities.

On amendment No. 37: The House allowed $22,750,000 for storage and shipping facilities which the Senate increased to $45,000,000. The House conferees yielded to this amendment by allowing $30,000,000, which is a decrease of $15,000,000 as passed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 38: Your conferees allowed $4,500,000 for the Medical Department of the Army, which is a decrease of $500,000 of the amount allowed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 39: Your conferees accept the Senate amendment, as it is a decrease of $10,000 for hospital care at the Canal Zone garrisons, and allows $50,000 for this purpose.

On amendment No. 40: This amendment relates to the purchase of land for the Army Medical Museum contiguous to Walter Reed General Hospital. The amount involved is $350,000 and the House accepted the Senate amendment.

On amendment No. 41: This amendment relates to the Engineer equipment of troops for which the House allowed $200,000 and the Senate increased to $400,000. Your conferees allowed this item at $300,000 and allowed the Secretary of War to employ the services of skilled draftsmen and civil engineers in the office of Chief of Engineers.

On amendment No. 42: This amendment provided for $25,000 for civilian assistants to Engineer officers, which the Senate increased to $50,000. Your conferees accepted this amendment by allowing $40,000.

On amendment No. 43: This amendment relates to Engineer operations in the field, which the House allowed $2,000,000 and the Senate increased to $5,000,000. The House conferees yielded to this amendment by allowing $3,000,000.

On amendment No. 44: The House appropriated $100,000 for the construction and maintenance of military roads in Alaska, which the Senate increased to $300,000. The Senate receded from this amendment, which restores the House text.

On amendment No. 45: The House accepted the Senate amendment, as it prohibits any purchase of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles by the Ordnance Department.

On amendment No. 46: Under this amendment the House allowed $5,000,000 for the Ordnance Department, which the Senate increased to $14,000,000. Your conferees compromised on this item by allowing $7,000,000, which is a decrease of $7,000,000 in the Senate item.

On amendment No. 47: Your conferees yielded on this amendment and accepted the Senate provision, which allows $1,600,000 for the Frankford Arsenal.

On amendment No. 48: The House accepted this amendment, as it was a reduction of $50,000 in the appropriation allowed for small-arm target practice as passed by the House, and did not allow the Senate provision for the appointment of a director of marksmanship in the Army.

On amendment No. 49: The House conferees accepted the Senate amendment, which struck out the provision for "purchase and manufacture of ordnance stores to fill requisitions of troops."

On amendment No. 50: The House conferees accepted this amendment, as it is a reduction of $1,000,000 in the appropriation passed by the House, which provides for ordnance stores and supplies. Your conferees accepted the amount allowed by the Senate, which was $2,000,000.

On amendment No. 51: The Senate recedes from this amendment, which was a change in phraseology, thus restoring the House text.

On amendment No. 52: This amendment relates to the purchase of automatic machine rifles, for which the Senate allowed $1,000,000. This is a reduction of $500,000 in the amount passed by the House. Your conferees accepted this decrease.

On amendment No. 53: Ths amendment of the Senate related to incidental expenses for the Tank Corps School, from which the Senate receded.

On amendments Nos. 54 and 55: These amendments change the word "horses" to "animals," which also permits the purchase of mules for the arming, equipping, and training of the National Guard.

On amendment No. 56: This appropriation was $250,000 less than the amount passed by the House. The House conferees accepted this amendment.

On amendment No. 57: Your conferees accepted the amount allowed by the Senate for the pay of property and disbursing officers for the United States, which was passed by the Senate at $43,750, an increase of $8,750 over the amount allowed by the House.

On amendment No. 58: The Senate receded from this amendment, which restored the House amount for travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers making inspections.

On amendment No. 59: Your conferees accepted this amendment, as it is a reduction of $4,000 in the travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers changing stations.

On amendment No. 60: The House allowed $40,000 for travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers on visits of instruction, which the Senate reduced to $30,000, making a decrease of $10,000, which your conferees accepted.

On amendment No. 61: The House conferees accepted the Senate provision allowing $200,000 for the transportation of supplies.

On amendment No. 62: The House conferees receded from the appropriation of $5,000,000 for the pay of the National Guard and accepted the amendment of the Senate, which provides that this amount shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund.

On amendments Nos. 63 to 78, inclusive: The House conferees receded from all of these amendments, as they are merely changes in phraseology of the paragraphs relating to the equipment for the National Guard.

On amendment No. 79: Provides for the cancellation of previous enlistments in the National Guard.

On amendment No. 80: The House conferees receded from this amendment, as it simply provides staff officers appointed in the National Guard of the District of Columbia shall have the same status as officers appointed from the States.

On amendment No. 81: Provides for the appointment of National Guard officers without physical examinations, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 82: The House conferees accepted this amendment, as it is only a change in the title to the paragraph.

On amendment No. 83: This amendment, as passed by the Senate, increases the appropriation of $100,000 for ordnance equipment for rifle ranges, but the Senate receded and thus restored the original appropriation as passed by the House of $100,000.

On amendments Nos. 84 to 86, inclusive: Your conferees accepted these amendments, as they only add to the language of the titles of the national defense act.

On amendments Nos. 87 and 88: your conferees accepted these amendments, as they only provided for the changing of certain provisos in the bill to paragraphs.

On amendment No. 89: This amendment proposes to strike out a provision authorizing the Secretary of War to have printing done elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office, and in view of the fact that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs received a communication from the Secretary of War requesting that this amendment be agreed to, your conferees accepted the same.

On amendment No. 90: The Senate receded from the amendment providing for the purchase of land for an aviation field at Eberts Field.

On amendment No. 91: The Senate receded from the text of this amendment so as to transfer the language contained therein to amendment 92.

On amendment No. 92: This amendment accepted the House language regarding the purchase of real estate and made an exception as to camps and cantonments that were in use prior to November 11, 1918, where it has been found more economical to the Government to purchase such camps or cantonments than to pay rentals or damages thereon, and made further exceptions as to industrial plants which were constructed or taken over by the Government for war purposes.

On amendment No. 93: The Senate recedes from the striking out of the bonus provision and the stop-watch system, and left the language as passed by the House.

On amendment No. 94: This amendment provided that all of the several organizations of the Army should be continued until otherwise provided for by law, but the House conferees receded with a provision which authorizes the continuation of the War Chemical Service, the Tank Corps, the Motor Transport Corps, and the Air Service.

On amendment No. 95: This amendment provides for the dispossession of certain balances from a previous appropriation relative to a memorial archway at Vicksburg, Miss., which your conferees accepted.

On amendment No. 96: This amendment provides for the disposal of real property by sale or lease which, in the judgment of the President or the head of such department is no longer needed by the Government, and the moneys derived therefrom shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and a report made annually to Congress, which your conferees accepted.

On amendment No. 97: This amendment authorizes the Secretary of War to exchange the Army cold-storage plant at Chicago, Ill., for a warehouse adjacent to the Army general depot in the city of Chicago, which is recommended by the Secretary of War. Your conferees accepted this amendment.

On amendment No. 98: This amendment authorizes the Boughton Memorial Association to erect and maintain a building at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., to be first approved and constructed in such location as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, upon condition that the ground floor of said building shall be

used by the Post Office Department free of charge, which your conferees accept.

On amendment No. 99: This amendment permits the Secretary of War to transfer certain ammunition, explosives, and other ammunition components to other executive departments of the Government. The House accepted this amendment.

On amendments Nos. 100 to 108: The Senate recedes from all of the private-claim amendments.

On amendment No. 109: This amendment authorized the Secretary of War to place at the disposal of the American Red Cross certain medical and surgical supplies, etc., which are not needed for the American Expeditionary Force or for use in military hospitals in the United States. Your conferees accepted this amendment with a further condition that said supplies shall not be needed as military or hospital stores for the Army of the United States.

On amendment No. 110: This amendment provides that the Secretary of War is authorized to make use of certain facilities of civil educational institutions for student officers stationed in the vicinity thereof, and the Senate receded from this amendment.

JULIUS KAHN,
D. R. ANTHONY, Jr.,
S. H. DENT, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, when the conference report was before the House yesterday there were four particular provisions that were objected to. The first was with reference to the pay of the Army. An objection was made to a reappropriation of $100,000,000. The conferees were instructed to eliminate that provision. The second was with reference to the Air Service, and the conferees were instructed to reduce the amount of $54,000,000 to the provision in the House bill, which was $15,000,000. The third was with reference to a piece of property at the Walter Reed Hospital, which was to cost about $350,000, and the fourth provision——

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, would the chairman yield me two or three minutes just to make a statement?

Mr. KAHN. About the Walter Reed Hospital?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. I will yield three minutes to the gentleman on that. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I shall not oppose the adoption of this conference report, but I want to say that I am not at all deceived by the fact that while an agreement has been reached it still contains many provisions which do not meet with my approbation, and one of them specifically is the purchase of land at Walter Reed Hospital.

The truth about the matter is that I am willing to challenge every man in this House and make the assertion that there is not a single man in the House of Representatives who knows a solitary thing about the facts in connection with the purchase of this land, what it is worth, whether it is necessary, or any of the facts that we ought to know when we purchase land. The Surgeon General said it was not necessary as an emergency proposition, yet the Senate puts it in and the House concurs in the action to spend $350,000 to buy 26 acres of land. And the one thing that is troubling me and why I wanted to make this statement here this afternoon is that, unfortunately for me perhaps, I am on a committee to investigate the waste of the War Department in buying land here and there and everywhere all over this country, and I can not understand how it is that men can go into convulsions almost over the payment of $42 an acre for land at Camp Benning, which the military men say is necessary, and at the same time vote to pay $13,000 an acre for brush land adjoining the Walter Reed Hospital without batting an eye when they do it. I simply want to say that I do not approve of that system of legislation. We ought to have investigated this matter and found out whether or not we are paying an exorbitant price for the land.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say frankly to the House that the conferees on the part of the House did not approve this provision. There were six pieces of realty provided for in the bill as it passed the Senate. Four were in connection with various aviation projects. One was for a flying field down in Arkansas. The sixth project was this one at the Walter Reed Hospital. We finally succeeded in eliminating the five others, but the Senate stood firm on this.

I have a great deal of respect for the judgment of my friend on the committee [Mr. McKENZIE], but let me tell you the situation. The medical department of the War Department rents quarters in this city for the medical museum, for the medical library, and for the medical school which they conduct here in connection with their service. I believe that the rentals are not less than $22,000 a year, and maybe they are more than that. I do not recall the testimony of the Surgeon General, but he did appear before the committee and advocated the purchase of this land. He said this, in effect, that it is the intention of the medical department to concentrate its activities around the Walter Reed Hospital. That hospital is located on a beautiful tract of land, some little distance from the center of the city. The medical museum is visited annually by thousands of physicians who come to Washington from every section of the country. It is admitted that the medical library is probably the best in the whole world. The medical school performs a very great and important service to the medical department of the Army. Now, we have had some experience that I want to call to your attention about the purchase of land in a growing city like Washington or the construction of buildings in a place that is near a big city like New York. It is contended that you can probably buy this land cheaper to-day than you could in three or four years from now, because everybody knows that property in the District of Columbia is going up all the time. But the Military Committee itself some 10 years ago adopted a plan for new construction at West Point. Instead of going ahead boldly and appropriating the necessary money for that construction, we dillydallied with it and constructed it piecemeal, until the buildings there have cost the Government practically double the amount that they would have cost originally, because everybody knows that material has gone up and the price of labor has gone up, and so on. So that the Government in that instance lost many millions by delay.

It is only a matter of time when Congress, in my opinion, would ultimately authorize the purchase of this piece of land. It is going to save rentals, and I submit that in the condition we found ourselves, with the Senate yielding on five purchases of land and demanding that the House do some receding also, the conferees submitted.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the gentleman from California if there is one scintilla of evidence that has been submitted to him that will enable him to say whether this land is worth $150,000 or $350,000?

Mr. KAHN. Yes. I did ask some questions about the value of the land in that neighborhood. I was told that it is a neighborhood where the price of land is going up constantly, because new buildings are being constructed there for residence purposes. In fact, anyone who takes the Georgia Avenue cars and goes out to that part of the city will see that there has been a good deal of new construction of residences, and that naturally enhances the value of realty.

The last Senate amendment that the House objected to embodied the so-called special private bills. I want to say for my colleagues that they have opposed that kind of legislation always. We have repeatedly insisted that that kind of legislation be not put on the appropriation bill, and I am glad to say that for two or three years we were successful in keeping those items out of it. This year the Senate simply loaded the bill with some eight of those items, and declined for a while to recede on any of them.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the chairman of the committee please yield for a question?

Mr. KAHN. A short question, if you please.

Mr. LAZARO. Does this bill contain sufficient appropriations to care for the boys who went into the service and who are now temporarily deranged mentally, so that they can get the care that they are entitled to and have a chance, maybe, of getting well? This was discussed before, and your committee, I understand, stood one way and the Senate the other way. I would like to have an explanation on that.

Mr. KAHN. I want to say to the gentleman that that proposition is not contained in this bill, except in so far as the bill appropriates lump sums of money for hospitals and pay of the soldiers. I have strong convictions about the men who were injured in this war. I believe that this country owes an everlasting debt of gratitude to all its soldiers, but I have extreme sympathy for those soldiers who lost their mental powers or their limbs and were otherwise disabled in this war, especially for those soldiers who were badly wounded and mangled in this war. They will not be in the same position to take up the burden of life as they were in before they went into the Army. The country owes a special duty, in my opinion, to men of that class, and I for one favor treating them with exceeding liberality.

I want to say just briefly that there were many statements made on this floor yesterday about the cost per man of a soldier in war times. There were many misstatements made on the

floor; but I will say this, that the amount of $2,000 per man does not pay for all the instrumentalities of conducting the Army, even during a period of demobilization. You have many extraordinary expenses. As I said yesterday, the matter of transportation is largely out of proportion to what it is in peace times. The matter of clothing is an exceedingly costly matter in war times, and there are a number of other activities that materially add to the cost over and above the $2,000 per man referred to by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

I want to say that in the item of pay for the Army your conferees succeeded in eliminating the reappropriation of $100,000,000. [Applause.] In fact the Senate took the House provision and the House figures and made an addition for the 25,000 men for whom we provided by adding $15,000,000 to the total. The House bill provided for pay of the Army $198,000,000. The bill as it now stands provides for $213,000,000. As a matter of fact, the Senate bill, without the lump sum of $100,000,000, provided $215,000,000 for pay of the Army, so that your conferees really have saved $102,000,000 on that one item. But it is only fair to say that Gen. Lord, the Director of Finance of the War Department, announced to Senator WADSWORTH and me that there would undoubtedly be a deficiency appropriation by the 1st of January next.

As to the matter of aviation, the House conferees raised the amount to $25,000,000. The House on yesterday appropriated that amount for the Navy. The Army Air Service is a very much larger establishment than the Navy Air Service, so that the appropriation of $25,000,000 for the Air Service in the Army relatively is smaller than what the House allowed the Navy on yesterday.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that motion a moment, so that I can ask him a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I want to have clearly in mind just what occurred in conference. My understanding is that the Senate increased the House bill $267,000,000, in round numbers. I believe that is correct. In the first conference the Senate receded from appropriations amounting to $110,000,000, and the House from appropriations amounting to $157,000,000. In the last conference the Senate has receded further in the sum of $100,000,000, so that as matters now stand the Senate has receded from appropriations amounting to $210,000,000 and the House from appropriations amounting to $57,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. I think that is approximately right, but I want to say that in addition to that, as I stated a moment ago, the House saved $2,000,000 additional in the matter of the pay of the Army.

Mr. MONDELL. That is, on the conference report now before us?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. So that the saving from the first conference report is approximately $102,000,000?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

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

Mr. KAHN. For a brief one.

Mr. BEE. Amendment No. 91 refers to the purchase of real estate that was contracted for since November 11, 1918, and I understood that that was adopted in the conference report. As to No. 92, will the gentleman tell where that is?

Mr. KAHN. That is in the printed copy of the report.

Mr. BEE. I was not able to get hold of it.

Mr. KAHN. There are some at the desk.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. KAHN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States, was transmitted by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries.

CONGRATULATIONS TO FIRST TRANSATLANTIC FLIERS.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House joint resolution 118, notwithstanding it has not been printed under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House joint resolution 118, which the Clerk will report. The committee amendments to it have not yet been printed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 118) tendering the congratulations of Congress to those associated in the achievement of accomplishing the first trans-Atlantic flight of an airship from America to Europe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Let us have the resolution read, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas, due to the skill of American engineers, the genius of American mechanics, and the bravery of American officers, communication between the New World and the Old has been established by the navigation of the air in the flight of a Navy seaplane from Newfoundland to Portugal; and

Whereas this signal achievement—the first in history—has brought fame to the country, prestige to the service, and honor to those associated in the daring enterprise: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the congratulations of Congress be, and the same hereby are, extended to Lieut. Commander Albert C. Read, United States Navy; Lieut. Commander Elmer F. Stone, United States Coast Guard; Lieut. James L. Breese, United States Navy; Lieut. Walter H. Huntin, United States Navy; Chief Machinist Mate C. F. Rhoads, United States Navy; Chief Special Machinist E. H. Howard, United States Navy; Ensign Herbert C. Rodd, United States Navy; Commander John H. Towers, United States Navy; Commander Holden C. Richardson, United States Navy; Lieut. Commander Robert A. Lavender, United States Navy; Lieut. David H. McCulloch, United States Navy; Boatswain Lloyd R. Moore, United States Navy; Lieut. Commander Richard E. Byrd, United States Navy; Lieut. Bradston Rhoads, United States Navy; Lieut. Commander Patrick N. L. Bellinger, United States Navy; Lieut. Commander Marc A. Mitscher, United States Navy; Lieut. Louis T. Barin, United States Navy; Lieut. Harry Sadenwater, United States Navy; Machinist Resmus Christensen, United States Navy; Chief Machinist Mate C. I. Kesler, United States Navy.

And that as further appreciation the President is hereby authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a medal of honor to Albert C. Read, United States Navy; John H. Towers, United States Navy; and Patrick N. L. Bellinger, United States Navy.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 3 of page 1, commencing with the word "That," strike out all down through and including the word "Navy," in line 24 of page 2, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That the congratulations of Congress be, and the same hereby are, extended to Lieut. Commander Albert C. Read, United States Navy; Lieut. Commander Elmer F. Stone, United States Coast Guard; Lieut. James L. Breese, United States Navy; Lieut Walter Hinton, United States Navy; Chief Machinist Mate E. S. Rhoads, United States Navy; Ensign Herbert C. Rodd, United States Navy; Commander John H. Towers, United States Navy; Commander Holden C. Richardson, United States Navy; Lieut. Commander Robert A. Lavender, United States Navy; Lieut. David H. McCullock, United States Navy; Boatswain Lloyd E. Moore, United States Navy; Lieut. Commander Patrick N. L. Bellinger, United States Navy; Lieut. Commander Marc A. Mitscher, United States Navy; Lieut. Louis T. Barin, United States Navy; Lieut. Harry Sadenwater, United States Navy; Machinist Rasmus Christensen, United States Navy; and Chief Machinist Mate C. I. Kesler, United States Navy.

And that, as a further mark of appreciation, the President is hereby authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a special gold medal to each of the following-named officers: Lieut. Commander Albert C. Read, United States Navy; Lieut. Commander Elmer F. Stone, United States Coast Guard; Lieut. James L. Breese, United States Navy; Lieut. Walter Hinton, United States Navy; Ensign Herbert C. Rodd, United States Navy; and Chief Machinist Mate E. S. Rhoads, United States Navy: *Provided,* That each of said medals shall bear the name and rank of the authorized recipient.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know why we should take the time to congratulate people who never crossed? Is this to be the foundation for reward hereafter?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from New York if this does not include, in the part of the resolution proposing to extend the congratulations of Congress, the names of those who did not make the trip in the plane which was successful in landing?

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I shall be very glad to answer that question and some others. The Committee on Naval Affairs, which is now making the report——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is speaking by unanimous consent.

Mr. HICKS. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes on this resolution.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE OF ARMY BILL.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a concurrent resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 5227) entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920," the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is

hereby, authorized and directed to amend the title so as to read as follows: "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from California if the language in amendments 40, 97, and 104 was corrected in the conference report in accordance with the suggestion that was made——

Mr. KAHN. I was pleased to call the attention of the clerk who prepared the report to the matter that the gentleman from Massachusetts called to my attention, and it was corrected in the report. I want to say, having looked over the papers, that in the copy in the House the matter was corrected.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. KAHN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 1706. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River about 3 miles above its confluence with the Columbia River, near Pasco, Wash.; and

H. R. 5608. An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

THIRD DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. GOOD, from the Committee on Appropriations, presented a conference report on the bill H. R. 3478, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

SUPPLY OF ANTHRACITE COAL.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the following resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution to appoint a committee to devise plans and methods to provide the people an adequate supply of anthracite coal and be properly distributed at fair prices, and to suggest to the House of Representatives such legislation as may or shall tend to accomplish the end in view.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Reserving the right to object, has the resolution been reported from any committee?

Mr. MACGREGOR. It has not. It simply provides for a committee to be appointed by the Speaker to take into advisement the question of means to be adopted to deal with the coal famine that we have before us.

Mr. GARRETT. It has not been considered by any committee?

Mr. MACGREGOR. It has not.

Mr. GARRETT. I object.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, may I have it referred to a committee?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can introduce it in the basket and it will be properly referred.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3184, the water-power bill.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, pending that, will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I do not want to make a point of no quorum; I do not want to prevent the consideration of this bill; but I understood a few moments ago when unanimous consent was given for the consideration of the Army bill that the gentleman from Wyoming, Mr. MONDELL, would introduce a resolution for the purpose of taking a recess until next Tuesday. If that arrangement is to be changed or to be postponed I think the House is entitled to know about it. Unless I can have an assurance somewhere as to what the program is I shall have to call for a quorum.

Mr. ESCH. We have got to wait for the action of the Senate on the conference reports.

Mr. GARNER. That does not keep the House from passing the resolution suggested by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest that the gentleman from Wyoming thinks it would not be wise to send a resolution to the Senate until they have passed the appropriation bills. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The motion of Mr. ESCH was agreed to; accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the water-power bill, with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania in the chair.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to section 17. I move to strike out all of section 17 beginning with line 23 on page 24 down to and including line 24 on page 25, and to insert at the end of line 22 the words "as miscellaneous receipts."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 24, beginning with line 23, strike out all down to and including line 24 on page 25, and insert the words at the end of line 22 "as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in accordance with the suggestion and the inquiries I made at the time I undertook to procure information with reference to the raising of the limit of the amount which shall be paid to the various funds under the license provision of this bill. I submit, in all seriousness, that it is unwise, when we are embarking on a nation-wide program of water-power development, to tie up 50 per cent of the charges for licenses in national parks or in the public lands or various other domains under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, so that 50 per cent of the receipts must be paid into the Treasury to the credit of these particular funds.

I submit that we ought not to discriminate in any way here with reference to the use of the money that is received for licenses under these projects. If we are going to embark on a nation-wide scheme, let us take all the money that is received from these licenses and turn it into the Treasury of the United States, and not permit some little project on public land for a national park or some other reservation where a stream may flow through one corner of it or where the water-power site may be developed to get 50 per cent of the charges that the Government received for the licenses, which would probably be way out of proportion to what would otherwise be a credit to that part of the public domain.

If we cover these all into the Treasury of the United States it is not going to cause any of these Federal domains to suffer. We will not discriminate in making appropriations for their maintenance or improvement in the future. They will be just as well taken care of from the Federal Treasury, and Congress through its appropriate committees will see to it that the proper appropriations are made. I submit that we ought not to set aside 50 per cent of these receipts for these purposes.

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

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. The gentleman's amendment would strike out the following provisions in lines 15 and 16 on page 25:

All proceeds from any Indian reservations shall be placed to the credit of the Indians of such reservations.

If these proceeds are put into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, they will be swallowed up and would not be permitted to be used for the Indians whose lands are taken.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] directs my attention to the fact that the bill provides that all of the receipts on Indian reservations shall go to the credit of the Indians on those reservations, but if my amendment be adopted, there is nothing to prevent Congress when it passes the Indian appropriation bill from crediting the Indians with 100 per cent of the amounts received for these licenses under this act, and I submit that is not a vital objection to my amendments.

The question here is whether the United States Treasury shall receive full credit in the form of miscellaneous receipts for every dollar that these great corporations will pay to the Government for these licenses, or whether the United States will through this means of bookkeeping get credit only for 50 per cent of it and permit the other 50 per cent to be credited to these public domains, whether they are in need of that sum of money or not, because if you permit 50 per cent of these charges to go to the credit of these public domains, such as national parks, public lands, and forest reserves, you will find that it will result in demands for authorizations and legislation for extravagant expenditures of money upon these various

public domains, within the jurisdiction of the United States, and that we will be told in most plausible tones by the distinguished gentlemen having charge of these public domains that they have a surplus to their credit in the Treasury, and that this or that does not take a dollar out of the Treasury, because they have already so many hundred thousand dollars to their credit under the water-power law, and that, therefore, we ought to expend this money for this or that fad or scheme or plan. I submit that if we desire to keep control of the receipts and to insure in the future economic administration of these various public domains, it is better in this bill when we are writing into law something that will have to stand without very vital change for a great many years at least, to see to it that all these receipts are covered into the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and that as from time to time need arises for improvements or extension or the building of roads, or other structures upon the public domain, each one of them shall be considered upon its merits, and we should then make the proper appropriation and authorization for it.

I can not see that there is any serious objection to the amendment which I have offered, particularly in view of the fact that under the present arrangement, as I am advised by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], when it is undertaken to put through some public improvement on the public domain for which money is paid into the Treasury now, they are allowed only 35 per cent to go to the credit of the Treasury. It is expected, and I trust that the expectation is well founded, that when this bill becomes a law we will see enormous development of water power in this country and that it will revolutionize the hydroelectric power plants of the country and result in the payment into the Treasury of the United States of many hundreds of thousands of dollars. I submit that the Congress by providing that this should be paid as miscellaneous receipts would be able thereby to keep control of the money and that it should not permit 50 per cent of it to be piled up as a surplus to the credit of some of these public lands and national parks.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, section 17 has to do with the receipts from royalties or rentals, on the franchises herein granted. There are approximately 165,000,000 acres of forest reserves in the country. Many water power sites are on those forest reserves. They are to be developed under this bill. They are scattered throughout the 17 public land States of the West. This bill provides that 50 per cent of the receipts of this water power development shall go to the development of those forests, the construction of roads, the prevention of forest fires, and improvements generally. The gentleman from Massachusetts would take that away from them. The States own the water and the Government owns the land, and this is a conjoint arrangement whereby this development can go forward. This should not be done. The gentleman should not be indulged to strike down the West.

The gentleman would strip the Western States of all of the income that should be expended there. The West has enough to contend with without the gentleman heaping additional burdens of them.

Now, passing from that the next provision is that 50 per cent of the royalty or rentals is to be expended upon the national parks. There are some 30 or 40 national parks and monuments, the Nation's playgrounds, and every citizen of the Republic is interested in their beautification, their preservation, and development. This bill provides that 50 per cent of the proceeds of the water power developed in these 30 or 40 national parks shall be expended for the beautification of the Nation's playgrounds. Again, the gentleman, by his amendment, would strike them down; again he would denude them—strip them—throttle them—deny them. Mr. Chairman, there are about 335,000,000 acres of public lands in the United States, and about 370,000,000 acres in Alaska, 700,000,000 acres in all, and they have many water-power sites on them and this provides that 50 per cent of the water power or receipts of the water power developed on those public lands shall go to the development of the roads and schools in those sparsely settled States. The gentleman from Massachusetts, with all of his earnestness and zeal, would take that away from the States.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will yield, I recognize the gentleman did not interrupt me, but I desire to ask him a question.

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the Federal Government at the present time——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma may have five minutes additional.

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

Mr. WALSH. Does not the Federal Government at the present time provide money from its Treasury for the construction of roads, the prevention of forest fires, and for the erection of school buildings in these various reservations?

Mr. FERRIS. No; not the erection of school buildings and very scarcely ever at all for roads and improvements. They have to hew out their destiny as best they can from cold steel. They are making a heroic effort. They should not be retarded; they should be helped.

Mr. WALSH. Why, we carried an enormous appropriation in the Agricultural bill for this purpose.

Mr. FERRIS. Not an enormous appropriation. While I do not have the items before me, I would say they are slight; yes, very slight.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, I appreciate, in view of the fact that the Western States get money in considerable sums that does not seem enormous to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. FERRIS. I can not yield to the gentleman any further. No, the gentleman from Massachusetts, in his zeal for the Treasury, forgets that great, teeming West that is struggling and striving to try to get ahead and make itself a creditable productive part of the Republic and trying to increase its population and move forward, and the gentleman should not take the last crumb from the Western States. We do not appropriate lavishly for those roads. There are 165,000,000 acres of forest reserve scattered through those States. Those lands yield no taxes. Those lands are tax free. They are to be held as a Government timber supply and it is a very great burden on these States of the West. In this regard the Western States bear the burden for the whole Republic. They furnish the timber supply. They carry the load of State government while these lands are tax free.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is it not a matter of real complaint in the large Western States that the highways which the State builds come to a dead end when they touch the forest reserves?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; it is a tremendous draft on those people to have those great forest reserves go tax free, to have them withdrawn and held in the interior of those States, and they, in a way, have to contribute to the support of the whole Republic. The Republic needs these lands as a timber supply; it must have a timber supply, and those Western States must supply that, and while supplying it they go tax free, and that being so, they are unable to build up their schools and roads and get those States started. Those States are entitled to a chance. They do not deserve to be assailed. They are entitled to be encouraged. Now we come to the Indian reservations and the potential water power on those lands. If we adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, that would take from the Indian tribes, the original settlers of the country, all of the rights in the water power on their lands. They own these reservations, and I know the gentleman does not want to do that. Again, the gentleman is seeking absolutely to obliterate and cripple the reclamation law. Now, the act of 1902, which established the Reclamation Service to irrigate the West, gave all the proceeds of the public lands, whatever they may be, to the fund for the development and irrigation of those western States. Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts, with one fell swoop and with one sweep of the scythe, would strike that great service down. I am afraid the gentleman has not given the attention which he usually gives to such subjects. He goes on and makes other changes. Now, this is not a new matter. Every year we have been having this same thing. The gentleman is all wrong in his position on this matter. He is usually strong and clear-headed. He would here at one fell swoop strip the West of everything that belongs to them and leave them there naked and bare. Surely no such thing should be done. Surely no such thing will be done. Some one will surely see the justice of this course.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Does the gentleman see any reason why the revenue from the water power of West Virginia should be carried out to educate people in the western country? And if so, give me your reasons for it.

Mr. FERRIS. Please state that again. I did not hear the first part of it.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. The gentleman has said that the effect of the passage of this act made provision that the revenue under the plan entailed under it would be used for the education of people in the West. Can the gentleman show any reason now why the revenues produced from the water power de-

veloped in West Virginia should be used for the education of western people?

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman must have misunderstood me entirely, and if I stated anything of that sort I was clearly outside of the facts, so the gentleman's fears are without foundation.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Does the measure provide that the funds provided by water power generated in West Virginia may be used to educate people in West Virginia?

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, no.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I thought not.

Mr. FERRIS. That is not the case at all; the gentleman has misunderstood me entirely.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] will have seen how futile it will be to let Congress resolve itself into an organization to strip the West of their resources. The West can not grow by hampering them; as they grow the Republic grows.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

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

Mr. FERRIS. What few words I have said have been gleaned from a study of this and kindred western problems covering the last 12 years. I have been on the committee during that time, part of the time as chairman of it. But in all that time I have been convinced of the fact that we must not expect the West, those sparsely settled States, with their droughts, and arid conditions, and newly made towns, and newly settled communities to bear the load of this great, rich Republic. If you compel them to do that you will break the West down. If you do that, you are going to allow the great resources of the West to remain idle. You will be guilty of laying burdens unjustly and on those unable to bear them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 18. That the operation of any navigation facilities which may be constructed as a part of or in connection with any dam or diversion structure built under the provisions of this act, whether at the expense of a licensee hereunder or of the United States, shall at all times be controlled by such reasonable rules and regulations in the interest of navigation, including the control of the level of the pool caused by such dam or diversion structure as may be made from time to time by the Secretary of War. Such rules and regulations may include the maintenance and operation by such licensee at its own expense of such lights and signals as may be directed by the Secretary of War, and such fishways as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce; and for willful failure to comply with any such rule or regulation such licensee shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished as provided in section 25 hereof.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The last word or the paragraph?

Mr. WALSH. I have not the temerity to strike out a paragraph after the glowing and pathetic appeal made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] in opposing the amendment which I offered to the previous section.

But, Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that, while the words of the gentleman were effective in the extreme, those of us who have had the honor to be permitted to follow legislation through the Congress in recent years have observed that the West is pretty well taken care of by Uncle Sam's Treasury—the Indians, reclamation projects, the forest reserves, and last but not least the mighty farmer. And it has gotten to a point, Mr. Speaker, where if it were not for the farmers' vote and the prohibition vote and the western vote Congress could do a pretty good piece of work in legislating. But we have to take all those into consideration and sometimes without getting into a conference we have to make compromises.

The gentleman cites the sparsely settled States of the Great West. I do not know whether there are any waterfall projects in Oklahoma or not, but Oklahoma since its admission into the Union has long since left the class of sparsely settled States, I think. And I believe not very long ago one of the members of that delegation sort of resented the fact when another Member, upon making remarks upon an appropriation, referred to Oklahoma as a sparsely settled State. But it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that in legislating upon a matter that probably will result in bringing in millions of dollars to the Federal Treasury we ought not to be swept off our feet here and permit 50 per cent practically of receipts in certain instances to go into the Treasury to the credit, not of these particular projects, if you please, but of these poor suffering western communities. Gentlemen would have you understand that some of these great western domains have not advanced beyond the stage of the mining claims and the lean-to and the little log cabin. The Western States are developing and growing and thriving, and we are seeing to it, as far as the farmer goes, that he gets his money for his wheat and that we pay the price for the flour.

But it is interesting to observe, in spite of all this artificially created prosperity, that there is not any increase commensurate with the prosperity we have created and stimulated, or proportionate to that prosperity there is not any great increase in the amount of income taxes that these great Western States contribute to the Federal Treasury.

And so I say, sir, while the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma was successful in his appeal, that the Members here need not worry or weep about the poor Western States, particularly when any project before Congress calling for a Federal appropriation is involved. They are taken care of every time. And the Members from those States are most watchful in that regard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the West is all that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts says, why is it that the statesmen and legislators from the Eastern States are always determined to conserve and take care of the Western States?

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Chairman, we were very glad to cooperate in conservation projects, but, as I have said on many occasions before, our first duty should be to conserve the Treasury of the United States.

Why, the great State of Washington, one of the most prosperous empires in the great West, had great cities within its borders years ago that are growing so rapidly that I believe they use hydroelectric power to operate electric signs flashing across the skies, "Keep your eye on Pasco," "Watch Tacoma grow," and "See Seattle prosper," and so forth. The State of Washington is quite a large State and will have several of these projects there. I should like to see efforts put forth by the western Members to come in here behind some comprehensive plan which would provide that these public lands and public domains should no longer be held by questionable constitutional authority and power under Federal jurisdiction, but should be turned over to the States for control, and I shall be ready in my feeble way to assist by my voice and vote those western Members if they will present some such project as that. [Applause.]

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

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

Mr. WALSH. I regret to say my time has just expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I was much interested in what has been said by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. I would be only too glad to join him, and I think all far-western Members would also join him, in a movement that would let the States of the West come into their own. The thing we have complained about all these years is that our growing States, drawing their populations from Massachusetts and New York, and Pennsylvania and Ohio, and Indiana and Kentucky, and all the rest of the country, have been conserved, reserved, and preserved at the behest of the Easterners. They have been determined to fix our future for all time. We are left to take what we can get in such a bill as this one—written not by us but for us.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Would not the gentleman from Massachusetts display a little consistency if he would be willing to let us have the crumbs first and then let us get the whole loaf later on?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Quite so.

Mr. FERRIS. In a brief speech here he said he was not willing to let us have these crumbs, and then a moment later he said he was willing to let us have the entire land at one fell swoop.

Mr. WALSH. Of course the trouble with the gentleman is——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I was about to say that in the passage of these leasing bills the great State of Washington, through the process of the conservation of the public domain, is likely to remain in the future part State and part Province—

partly free, partly under lease; partly run by our governor and our legislature, and partly by the bureaus and the Congress.

Now, when we have tried to develop our own resources out there in our own way we have been met with all sorts of conservation schemes and plans invented by high-minded gentlemen from Pennsylvania and New Jersey and Massachusetts. [Laughter.] While we are a new people out there, coming as we do from all the old States, the South and the East and the Middle West, and are mostly Republicans [applause], we do join at times in the war cry let loose years ago by Henry Watterson—

Things have come to a terrible pass,
When a man can not lick his own jackass.

[Laughter.]

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Washington have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman from Washington was referring to me as a high-minded theorist, I would be strongly tempted to have his words taken down, but I suppose he did not refer to me. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I retract the words. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman name any other Member from Massachusetts whom he would characterize as "a high-minded theorist" who has attempted to foist these conservation schemes on the great State of Washington?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, not in recent years and not in this body; but I did have in mind the Pecks, the Pinchots, the Pecksniffs, and others of that kind, in and out of Congress.

Mr. WALSH. I wondered if there was any "high-minded gentleman" from Massachusetts. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is opposed to the development of the West and to woman suffrage, and all along the line.

Mr. WALSH. Why open up another painful subject? [Laughter.]

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

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 19. That as a condition of the license every licensee hereunder which is a public-service corporation, or a person, association, or corporation owning or operating any project and developing, transmitting, or distributing power for sale or use in public service, shall abide by such reasonable regulation of the services to be rendered to customers or consumers of power, and of rates and charges of payment therefor, as may from time to time be prescribed by any duly constituted agency of the State in which the service is rendered or the rate charged. That in case of the development, transmission, or distribution, or use in public service, of power by any licensee hereunder or by its consumer engaged in public service within a State which has not provided a commission or other authority with power to regulate and control the services to be rendered by such licensee or by its consumer engaged in public service, or the rates and charges of payment therefor, or the amount or character of securities to be issued by any of said parties, it is agreed as a condition of such license that jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the commission, upon complaint of any person aggrieved or upon its own initiative, to exercise such regulation and control until such time as the State shall have provided a commission or other authority for such regulation and control: *Provided*, That the jurisdiction of the commission shall cease and determine as to each specific matter of regulation and control prescribed in this section as soon as the State shall have provided a commission or other authority for the regulation and control of that specific matter.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I ask the Clerk to read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: On page 27, line 6, strike out all of line 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "authorized and empowered a commission or other agency or agencies within said State to."

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is offered with the idea of carrying out the objects set forth in the fore part of the section. The Water Power Committee very wisely provided here that service and regulation of rates should be under the control of a State regulating body where there was a State regulating body, and at the top of page 27, line 1, it defines the State regulating body as "any duly constituted agency of the State in which the service is rendered or the rate charged."

They then take into consideration the fact that some of the States do not have any commission or body empowered to regulate either service or rates, and they provide in that event that service and rates shall be under the regulation of the Water Power Commission at Washington. Now, some of the States have no commissions. Other States have commissions with only restricted authority. Some States have left to municipal bodies the right to regulate service and rates; sometimes only service and sometimes service and rates.

The amendment that I have offered is designed to cover a particular case where a State has delegated to a municipality, as an agency, the right to regulate service or rates, or both. If the amendment is adopted it will merely carry out the original idea of the authors of the section, to leave the regulation of the rates and service to the local authorities. It would then read, "That in case of the development, transmission, or distribution, or use in public service, of power by any licensee hereunder or by its consumer engaged in public service within a State which has not authorized or empowered a commission or other agency or agencies within said State to regulate and control the services to be rendered, and so forth."

In lieu of the provision "other authority," it places the word "agency," the same term that is used on page 27, in line 1.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Perhaps I did not get the language of the gentleman's amendment, but I can not see any difference between the effect of his amendment and the effect of the bill as it is now.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I will try and enlighten the gentleman. The bill as it reads speaks of "within a State which has not provided a commission or other authority with power."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If a municipality, which is an organization under the State, has the power, is not that municipality authorized under the language of this act now?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. There is some merit in the gentleman's contention, but the clause as it was originally drawn has been submitted to several gentlemen, and it was their opinion that there would be a question about it. Now, unquestionably a municipality is an agency of the State, and the word "agency" is used in the fore part of the section, so that if the term is changed to "agency" it does not seem to me that there would arise any question about the right of a municipality so authorized to regulate rates and service.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on page 27, line 4, and also in line 8, on page 27, to change the word "consumer" to "customer." I think we had that in some of the original acts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ESCH: On page 27, line 4, and also line 8, change the word "consumer" to "customer."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 20. That when said power or any part thereof shall enter into interstate or foreign commerce the rates charged and the service rendered by any such licensee, or by any subsidiary corporation, the stock of which is owned or controlled directly or indirectly by such licensee, or by any person, corporation, or association purchasing power from such licensee for sale and distribution or use in public service shall be reasonable, nondiscriminatory, and just to the consumer and all unreasonable discriminatory and unjust rates or services are hereby prohibited and declared to be unlawful; and whenever any of the States directly concerned has not provided a commission or other authority to enforce the requirements of this section within such State or to regulate and control the amount and character of securities to be issued by any of such parties or such States are unable to agree through their properly constituted authorities on the services to be rendered or on the rates or charges of payment therefor, or on the amount or character of securities to be issued by any of said parties, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the commission, upon complaint of any person aggrieved, upon the request of any State concerned, or upon its own initiative to enforce the provisions of this section, to regulate and control so much of the services rendered, and of the rates and charges of payment therefor as constitute interstate or foreign commerce and to regulate the issuance of securities by the parties included within this section.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, on page 28, line 5, to change the word "consumer" to "customer."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ESCH: Page 28, line 5, strike out the word "consumer" and insert the word "customer."

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin how late he expects to run to-night?

Mr. ESCH. We want to run until we finish the bill, unless something intervenes.

Mr. WINGO. Last night, after most of us had missed our dinner, we adjourned. Why could not we take a recess and come back at 8 o'clock? We ought not to punish ourselves for some one else's action.

Mr. ESCH. If we can be permitted to go on, we may finish this in half an hour.

Mr. WINGO. At the rate we have been reading, it will take three hours.

Mr. ESCH. I do not think there is much in the following sections that will cause debate.

Mr. WINGO. I appreciate the situation of the gentleman.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is the purpose to-night to do as we did last night. Mr. Chairman, I rise to be heard in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. ESCH. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment pending, and I would like to be heard on it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from California that the amendment has been adopted.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if, under the provisions of this section, a State has no public-utility commission——

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALSH. I do not yield for any parliamentary inquiry; the gentleman can not take me off my feet for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin has not been agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk informs the Chair that the Chair was in error, and that the amendment was not agreed to. The Chair was mistaken, and the Chair will recognize the gentleman from California, a member of the committee.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The Chair has no right by a ruling, after I have been recognized and have begun my remarks, to then recognize the gentleman from California upon the statement that the amendment is pending that the Chair stated was agreed to. I submit, with all due deference to the Chair, that having begun my remarks under the recognition accorded me by the Chair, I am entitled to complete them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was in error in stating that the amendment had been agreed to, but the Chair has recognized the gentleman from California.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment presented by the gentleman from Wisconsin is to strike out the word "consumer," which runs all through the bill, and I find it in the original bills, and substitute the word "customer." I do not understand, without some explanation, why the change is made.

Mr. ESCH. I think "customer" is a broader term.

Mr. RAKER. The consumer is the actual user.

Mr. ESCH. And so is the customer.

Mr. RAKER. What is the distinction?

Mr. ESCH. A man may be a customer and possibly not a consumer, but if he is a consumer he would be a customer.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman thinks the word "customer" is broader than the word "consumer"?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. And the gentleman's purpose is that the law shall be so worded that if they did not actually use the power they should have the benefit of the just and nondiscriminatory provision of the law?

Mr. ESCH. Yes; it would broaden the action of the law itself.

Mr. RAKER. I think the amendment is wise.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of completing the inquiry which began prior to my being taken off the floor by the gentleman from California under the ruling of the Chair. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if under the provisions in this section if a State has no public-utilities commission, or has provided no board to pass upon the reasonableness of the rates, or whether they are discriminatory or just, if under the language herein contained a Federal commission can go into that State and pass upon those rates and regulate them?

Mr. ESCH. My answer is yes, based upon the language in line 11, on page 27, where it is made a matter of agreement. If it were not a matter of agreement contained in the license, the gentleman's point would be good.

Mr. WALSH. Line 11 is—

It is agreed as a condition of such license that jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the commission.

The license may be issued to a corporation or to an individual; and does the gentleman from Wisconsin contend that you can confer jurisdiction upon the Federal Power Commission by an agreement on the part of a corporation in taking out a license, that jurisdiction is given to the Federal Power Commission, and that commission can go into a State and regulate rates and pass upon whether they are just, reasonable, and discriminatory? The corporation that made the agreement might not be involved at all. It might have gone beyond the question of the corporation; and it would seem to me that there is some doubt there whether a corporation can take out a license under an agreement conferring jurisdiction, and that by that agreement in a license the Federal Power Commission can enter into a State and execute its powers.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I admit the difficulties in the framing of this section from a constitutional standpoint, and it gave the committee considerable concern. We inserted the language that it is agreed as a condition of such license that jurisdiction is hereby conferred, basing it upon the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States arising in the State of Maryland. That is, I submit practically the only authority that we can find, and it may not be conclusive, but we put it in in order that in a State where there is no regulatory body under this act there should be a regulatory body, viz, this commission, upon whom jurisdiction will be conferred in a case of that kind. There are three States in the Union to-day that have no commission whatsoever, so that this commission would operate to fill the gap.

Mr. WALSH. Would it interfere with a State commission which might subsequently be provided?

Mr. ESCH. No; because the proviso reads:

That the jurisdiction of the commission shall cease and determine as to each specific matter of regulation and control prescribed in this section as soon as the State shall have provided a commission or other authority for the regulation and control of that specific matter.

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

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of getting some information from the chairman of the committee, if I may have his attention. On page 28 of the bill you undertake to provide for control by this commission in the issuance of securities covering that part of the business—I presume that percentage of the business—which goes into interstate commerce. As a workable proposition I would like to have the idea of the chairman of the committee how this national commission is to deal with the question of securities of these concerns that produce power, part of which is used in interstate commerce and a part in intrastate commerce. I do not see how it is workable. While I am asking the chairman for information, I would like to know how you are to control this matter when the stream is a boundary stream between two States? Which State is to have jurisdiction?

Mr. ESCH. Neither; but both.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. And in the event of the States being unable to agree, then does the national commission take jurisdiction?

Mr. ESCH. In a case of disagreement, no doubt the Federal commission would then interfere and control the situation, just as in cases where the State commissions can not agree upon rates the commission steps in.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Recurring to the first inquiry, you provide, near the bottom of the paragraph on page 28, that the Federal commission shall control the issuance of securities covering that part of the business, or, rather, of the securities which represent the proportion of the interstate business. How are you going to determine that proportion when you get to the question of determining what shall be the total of securities to be issued by a concern?

Mr. ESCH. I suppose the matter of securities, where it would be a joint project or a project covering more than one State, would be under the regulatory control of the commission created by this act, for it is rather unlikely that either of the States would be in accord on such a proposition. Therefore the Federal commission should be given jurisdiction, just as in the case of a dispute between the States as to rates. I state frankly to the House there are grave difficulties from a legal standpoint in framing sections 18 and 19 of this act, but we did the very best we could, after a search of the authorities.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I appreciate the difficulty——

Mr. ESCH. I think the gentleman from Texas realizes that where there is no State authority that can fully cover the situation, there ought to be some control lodged somewhere, and in order that there may not be a lapse we give it to this Federal commission. We hope it will work out successfully.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas moves that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. WINGO) there were—ayes 14, noes 58.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty Members are present, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 21. That when the licensee is a municipal corporation, or a political subdivision of a State, or a public-service agent of a State, or a public utility or service corporation, and can not acquire by contract or pledges the right to use or damage the lands or property of others necessary to the construction, maintenance, or operation of any dam, reservoir, diversion structure, or the works appurtenant or accessory thereto, it may acquire the same by the exercise of the right of eminent domain in the district court of the United States for the district in which such land or other property may be located, or in the State courts. The practice and procedure in any action or proceeding for that purpose in the district court of the United States shall conform as nearly as may be with the practice and procedure in similar action or proceeding in the courts of the State where the property is situated.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 7, after the word "situated," insert the following: "*Provided*, That the United States district courts shall only have jurisdiction of cases where the amount claimed by the owner of the property to be condemned exceeds $3,000."

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I only want a minute to explain the provision. The jurisdictional amount in all civil cases in the United States district court is now $3,000. This section as it stands leaves the amount for which condemnation can be had in the United States district court just anything. The man who has 100 acres of land worth $1,000 can not afford to go 200 or 300 miles to litigate in the United States district court.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the jurisdictional amount of the district court is limited to $3,000?

Mr. STEVENSON. In excess of $3,000. You can not bring a suit on the civil side of the court on a claim on which there is not something in excess of $3,000; more than $3,000 must be involved. That is the jurisdictional amount now. The minimum is $3,000.01, and the minimum here should be $3,000.01, because the corporation making the condemnation can also under this very section proceed in the State courts as well as in the United States courts, and certainly the man who has only a very small amount involved should not be required to sacrifice it by attending the United States district court and having expensive litigation when it can be done at home.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman from South Carolina yield further?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Is the gentleman's claim based upon the amount claimed in the petition? This is for a petition for damages.

Mr. STEVENSON. The amendment states that it shall be based upon the amount claimed by the man whose property is about to be condemned. If he claims in excess of $3,000, then they can go into the United States court, and if he claims less than $3,000, then they have got to condemn it in a State court. That is the provision of the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. WALSH. Well, does the gentleman think that in dealing with large corporations in these poor Western States that the poor struggling landowner would be as apt to get as full an award of damages from the State court as he would from the United States court? I assume that the award made would cover the cost of the proceedings in the United States court?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes, sir; my experience is that in the poor Southern States—I have never tried it in the poor Western States; I do not think there are any poor Western States; they are the most prosperous people we have—but in the poor Southern States I have always found that a man in his own neighborhood, in his own county, would receive at least justice, and when you go over to another district, or probably the whole State, sometimes he does not get what is coming to him.

Mr. WALSH. Of course some of the poor Western States are going to be confronted with corporation influence perhaps for the first time upon a vast and intricate scale.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. I just rise to express the hope that this amendment may be concurred in. I can see nothing objectionable to it, and it seems to me it will be a most advantageous thing for the many small individual property owners who may live several hundred miles away from the seat of the court in the several districts of the West.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. On behalf of the minority members of the committee, I wish to say that we will be glad to accept an amendment if it meets with the approval of the chairman.

Mr. ESCH. We have no objection to it.

Mr. FRENCH. Then I have nothing further to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 22. That whenever the public interest requires or justifies the execution by the licensee of contracts for the sale and delivery of power for periods extending beyond the date of determination of the license, such contracts may be entered into upon the joint approval of the commission and of the public-service commission or other similar authority in the State in which the sale or delivery of power is made, or if sold or delivered in a State which has no such public-service commission, then upon the approval of the commission, and thereafter, in the event of failure to issue a new license to the original licensee at the termination of the license, the United States or the new licensee, as the case may be, shall assume and fulfill all such contracts.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I should like the chairman of the committee to explain the meaning of that section. I have read it at different times, and never have been able to understand what it means. I refer to section 22. Does it mean that the United States will have to take over a contract from these corporations and carry it out?

Mr. ESCH. If the Government takes over the project under the recapture clause, the Government assumes the existing contract. Whenever the licensee enters into a contract which will run beyond the period of 50 years of his grant, he can not enter into such a contract without first getting the approval of the Federal commission, and also of the public-service commission or other similar authority in the State in which the sale or delivery of power is made.

Mr. WINGO. That is, six months before the time expired, if the State commission was friendly to it, they would probably approve a contract running, say, for 50 years for the benefit of some State corporation at rates that would be lower than the actual cost of operation, and then in six months' time the United States Government, under the law, would take over this contract and be compelled to carry it out, even though it had been made at a rate that was below the cost of production? Is not that possible under this section?

Mr. ESCH. It is possible, but not at all probable, that a State commission would justify authorizing a contract which in the carrying out would result in a deficit to the company. Of course, no such contract could extend into the next 50 years without the consent of both this Federal commission and the State commission.

Mr. WINGO. Is that true?

Mr. ESCH. Yes. It says the joint approval of the commission—that is, the one appointed under this act—and of the public service commission of the State in which the plant is located.

Mr. WINGO. For how long a time beyond the expiration of the lease can it enter into contract to sell power?

Mr. ESCH. There is no limit fixed in this act. Of course, that would be in the sound discretion of the regulatory body.

Mr. WINGO. It is contemplated that the regulatory body shall undertake to fix the terms in kind?

Mr. ESCH. We can not say what the existing laws will be when the lease expires. That would leave something to future Congresses.

Mr. WINGO. I thought we were not trying to leave anything to the judgment of the future.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the gentleman will permit, this does not seem to deal with the prices of power but simply for the term of the delivery of power on the termination of the license. The question of prices is adopted in another part of the bill and in another way.

Mr. WINGO. This is for the sale and delivery of power, as well as the contract for them. What enters into such contract except price and time?

Mr. DEMPSEY. All that seems to be covered in this particular item is the time that they shall be permitted to make the term beyond the expiration of the license. That is all there is in this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee if he does not think in the experimental stage that the contracts for licenses ought not to extend beyond the 50 years, and leave it to subsequent Congresses to permit a longer contract if experience should prove it desirable?

Mr. ESCH. Than the 50 years?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This section seems to contemplate that contracts may be made for a period beyond 50 years. My question to the chairman of the committee is, that in this the organic act, while we are feeling our way, until we see how the thing works out, would it not be a wise thing to provide that the contract shall not be made now for a longer period of time than the period of the license?

Mr. ESCH. The contention in the committee when we framed this act was about limiting the time to even a less period than 50 years. There were some who desired to make it even as low as 20 years, and some who advocated making it 30 years and 40 years. But in view of the fact that some of these great projects would require millions of dollars of investment and require years before they can get any kind of a return, and before they can develop a market that will bring them any return on their investment, the period certainly ought to be more than 30 or 40 years, and so we made the maximum 50 years, realizing that at the end of that time the Government could take it over or give it to a new licensee, or give a new license to the original licensee for what period of time it would be for Congress to determine.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is the point. I did not understand the chairman's explanation in answer to the question of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO]. I understood the chairman to say that the contracts for the sale of power might extend beyond 50 years.

Mr. ESCH. That is true.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. My question, addressed to the chairman, is this, that as a matter of public policy would it not be wise, until we see where we are going, to limit the contract for the sale of the power to the life of the license, 50 years?

Mr. ESCH. Would it not be well to leave that matter to the determination of a subsequent Congress prior to the expiration of the 50 years?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is exactly what I want. I may not be clear about it, but if you now permit a contract of 100 years you withdraw the matter from the discretion of subsequent Congresses.

Mr. ESCH. I do not think it likely that any commission would grant a license for 100 years.

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

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not think the gentleman's view of what this section means is correct. The gentleman's idea of what it means is not what it means on its face at all. This is not the granting of a contract for more than 50 years at all, but it means that when you get toward the end of a 50-year license and it becomes obvious that both in the interest of the consumer and the producer of power a contract should be made for the delivery of power for some period, not 50 years, but some period of 2 or 3 years that will extend beyond the 50 years, then upon the approval of the State commission and the commission created by this act such an extension may be granted.

Now, that does not mean that the license shall be extended at all. That means that the consumer takes his chances with the ones who shall control that water-power project in the new period beyond the 50 years.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It means just this, that after this contract for the delivery of power, which may extend two or three years beyond the 50-year period, if the Government takes over the project the Government will deliver the power and step into the place of the previous licensee. If the license is renewed to the same licensee, the licensee will continue. That is all that that section means. It means that business in the production and sale of power shall be continued and shall not be disrupted because within a few years the license period is to end.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am trying to get this clear in my mind. Your licenses are limited to 50 years?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. But under the provisions of this bill the right of the licensee to sell power extends beyond 50 years, which is the limit of the license period.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Provided he secures the approval of the State commission and the commission created by this act.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. It is not very likely that during the first year of the license, which is to run 50 years, the joint action of the Federal commission and the State commission will permit the making of contracts for power for 49 years. There is no occasion for it, and it would be an astonishing proposition to make when the license is to run so long.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not make objection to that; but——

Mr. ESCH. A contract with a municipality may run out before the 50 years are up, and they may want to renew that contract. They ought to have the right to renew it for a longer time.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. You put no limitation whatever upon the licensee acting with the approval of these commissions—the State commission and the national commission—to bind future Congresses and future generations in regard to contracts which the licensee may make. If I understand your bill, with the consent of the State and Federal commissions the licensee could make a contract which yould extend 200 years, or indefinitely, and which the Government, if it should exercise its rights under the recapture clause, would have to carry out. Is that right or not?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman's position is that under this section the Federal commission and the State commission may authorize the licensee to enter into a contract for 200 years, and if it is approved by them and the Government of the United States takes it over it will have to carry out that contract.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. And when the right of the licensee expires, then the Government is under obligation to come in and carry out the contract.

Mr. RAKER. For 150 years beyond that time. There is no doubt about that under this bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Clearly, no such power ought to exist.

Mr. RAKER. The language is clear and specific, and I suggest to the gentleman from Texas that you might say that whenever the public interest requires or justifies the execution by the licensee of contracts for the sale and delivery of power for periods extending beyond the date of the termination of the license, such contracts may be extended not exceeding a period of, say, 10 years or 5 years.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Or 50 years; but end it some time.

Mr. RAKER. But there is no limitation as to the time beyond which this contract for the sale of power can be extended, and then the licensee who takes it over, or the Government, must assume and does assume and must fulfill all such contracts. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I have the assurance of the chairman of the committee that the point which I have raised will be considered with the view of putting a proper time limit upon the life of contracts which may be made under the provisions of this bill, and therefore will not at this time propose an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 23. That the provisions of this act shall not be construed as revoking any permit or valid existing right of way heretofore granted, or as revoking any authority heretofore given pursuant to law, but any person, association, corporation, State, or municipality, holding or possessing such permit, right of way, or authority may retain the same subject to the conditions set forth in the grant thereof and subject to any and all rules and regulations applicable thereto and existing at the date of the approval of this act, or may apply for a license hereunder, and upon such application the commission may issue to any such applicant a license in accordance with the provisions of this act, and in such case the provisions of this act shall apply to such applicant as a licensee hereunder.

As to all streams or parts of streams, other than streams the use of which is herein authorized to be licensed, over which Congress has jurisdiction under its authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, permission is hereby given to construct dams therein: *Provided*, That any applicant who proposes to construct a dam in any such last-mentioned stream or part of stream may at his option make application to the commission, and if the contemplated improvement is, in the judgment of the commission, desirable and justified in the public interest for the purpose of improving or developing a waterway or waterways for the use or benefit of navigation in interstate or foreign commerce, the applicant may receive a license under the conditions with all of the rights and privileges herein provided for streams or parts of streams used for the transportation of persons or property to interstate or foreign commerce in their ordinary, natural, or improved condition.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twelve Members present, a quorum.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRENCH: Page 31, line 2, after the word "authority" strike out all the rest of line 2, all of lines 3, 4, 5, and the first four words of line 6, so that the paragraph will read:

"That the provisions of this act shall not be construed as revoking any permit or valid existing right of way heretofore granted, or as revoking any authority heretofore given pursuant to law, but any person, association, corporation, State, or municipality, holding or possessing such permit, right of way, or authority may apply for a license hereunder, and upon such application the commission may issue to any such applicant a license in accordance with the provisions of this act, and in such case the provisions of this act shall apply to such applicant as a licensee hereunder."

Mr. FRENCH. Just a word as to that amendment. In the part of the section that has been read there are three provisions set forth governing the rights of persons or organizations that have been granted permits or licenses heretofore. The three propositions are:

First. That this act does not attempt to revoke any existing permit.

Second. We affirm the conditions set forth in any permit that may have been granted.

Third. Opportunity is granted for the concern to apply for a license under the provisions of this act.

Now, I submit that the second proposition ought not to be included in this bill. The first one is all right. We do not care to annul or wipe out by legislation any right or grant that exists now under permit or license that may have been issued by either one of the three departments. On the other hand, we ought not, in a general blanket law of this kind, to affirm, approve, and ratify whatever conditions may be set forth in permits or licenses that may have been issued heretofore by the War Department, the Agricultural Department, or the Interior Department.

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

Mr. FRENCH. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ESCH. Is it the gentleman's contention that the language of the bill as we have it now would take away the revocability of permits heretofore issued?

Mr. FRENCH. I think that is a very reasonable interpretation of the language, that we, in very great likelihood, are ratifying and confirming grants that may or may not have been issued in accordance with law and as to which we are not in a position to know at this time.

Mr. ESCH. If the revocability of the permits is taken away, is it the gentleman's construction that this language will make the permit permanent rights?

Mr. FRENCH. I am afraid the language of the bill would do that, and I seek to strike it out. Then there would be left two alternatives. We propose not to disturb any right heretofore granted, and we leave open the future disposition of whatever action should be taken. The department to-day has the authority to modify and revoke permits heretofore granted. We do not disturb that. On the contrary, we add to that authorization the right for these concerns that have received permits or licenses to make application in conformity with the terms of the pending bill.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman contends that this could not take away any rights already vested, and the only thing it could do is to add to them, and that is not the intention of the bill, to add to any previous grant.

Mr. FRENCH. We are not deliberately trying to do it, but I am afraid if we leave the language in the bill we will do that very thing.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. I understand the gentleman's contention is that with all the terms and rights and authority now given there might be a possibility of confirming them by this legislation.

Mr. FRENCH. I am afraid of that.

Mr. RAKER. Then, because there is no provision, what will become of his right if the board refuses to grant him a permit under this act? It says "may retain the same subject to conditions set forth in the grants thereof." Now, there is no penalty against a man, no taking away that right extended to him by this act, if the commission fails to grant him a license under this act. Is that right?

Mr. FRENCH. No; he has two alternatives. He may first continue under the present term or license until that, under the authority now conferred on one of the three Secretaries, shall be modified, annulled, or set aside, or he may conform to the provisions of this law itself.

Mr. RAKER. That is what I am getting at; he may retain it subject to conditions set forth in the grant.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; but I do not think Congress in a bill like this ought to confirm or put its stamp of approval upon that which we know nothing about. I venture to say there is not an officer in any department that can tell the gentleman or this House precisely what is in one-tenth of these grants.

Mr. RAKER. In other words, by this language we may confirm all the applications now pending without knowing anything about them.

Mr. FRENCH. It is a "pig in a poke." We are confirming that which we do not know anything about. It seems to me the language is subject to that interpretation.

Mr. RAKER. If there is any doubt about it there should be no confirmation of these rights. If there is anything in the gentleman's contention, and there is some considerable meat in the point that the gentleman makes that all the applications for rights are now pending for reservoir sites, it would practically cover all the remaining available sites on the public lands. Do not forget that statement. This bill amounts to but little if we permit the present rights to be confirmed. There is practically no remaining lands upon which sites are desired for reservoirs. The question is whether or not we confirm them.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman has been on the committee a long time. How did this provision escape his vigilant eye?

Mr. RAKER. Oh, well, these things do come in sometimes and even escape such an acute gentleman as my friend from Berkeley. He sometimes allows these things to go over. I noticed a while ago he permitted the word "consumer" to remain in the bill when according to the statement of the chairman it should be "customer." So the best of men will sometimes allow these things to pass. I say to the committee that the gentleman's amendment ought to be adopted. It is too dangerous to confirm these permits at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 24. That any lands of the United States included in any proposed project under the provisions of this act shall, from the date of filing of application therefor, be reserved from entry, location, or other disposal under the laws of the United States until otherwise directed by the commission or by Congress. Notice that such application has been made, together with the date of filing thereof and a description of the lands of the United States affected thereby, shall be filed in the local land office for the district in which such lands are located. Whenever the commission shall determine that the value of any lands of the United States so applied for or heretofore or hereafter reserved or classified as power sites will not be injured or destroyed for the purposes of power development by location, entry, or selection under the public-land laws, the Secretary of the Interior, upon notice of such determination, shall declare such lands open to location, entry, or selection, subject to and with a reservation of the right of the United States or its permittees or licensees to enter upon, occupy, and use any part or all of said lands necessary, in the judgment of the commission, for the purposes of this act, which right shall be expressly reserved in every patent issued for such lands; and no claim or right to compensation shall accrue from the occupation or use of any of said lands for said purposes. The United States or any licensee for any such lands hereunder may enter thereupon for the purposes of this act upon payment of any damages to crops, buildings, or other improvements caused thereby to the owner thereof, or upon giving a good and sufficient bond to the United States for the use and benefit of the owner to secure the payment of such damages as may be determined and fixed in an action brought upon the bond in a court of competent jurisdiction, said bond to be in the form prescribed by the commission: *Provided*, That locations, entries, selections, or filings heretofore made for lands reserved as water-power sites or in connection with water-power development or electrical transmission may proceed to approval or patent under and subject to the limitations and conditions in this section contained.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I called the attention of the committee to the words in this section from line 4 to line 9, page 32, in committee, and I call the attention of the committee now to them, and also of my distinguished friend from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] and the distinguished leader on the other side, who are so much interested in the public domain, because here is a provision that permits every remaining acre of the public domain to be reserved for these corporations without a chance on earth for the homestead or desert claim or any other use until they get through with it. I want them to think for a moment about that provision. I tried to amend it in the committee. I think it ought to be stricken out; it ought to be amended. I desire to read it to the House:

That any lands of the United States included in any proposed project under the provisions of this act shall from the date of filing of application therefor be reserved from entry, location, or other disposal under the laws of the United States until otherwise directed by the commission or by Congress.

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

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. When an application is made and the land covered by the proposed project is not withdrawn from entry, does it not make every such applicant liable to obstruction and blackmail?

Mr. RAKER. Oh, no.

Mr. ELSTON. If it is not withheld from entry it practically permits it to be cut to pieces by subsequent entrymen.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, no. It permits any corporation who wants to go in northern California and say that on the Sacramento River they are going to ask for a power site and put in a reservoir, to take every remaining acre of public domain in northern California tributary to the Sacramento River, whereby there will not be an acre of land upon which there can be a homestead or desert-entry land claim or any other public lease. It stands there until the commission or until Congress sets aside a part of that land.

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

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Is not that the object of the bill?

Mr. RAKER. The committee in consideration said it would not be operated that way; but I know from experience that when you give a man a blanket he is going to use it to its full extent. He is not going to fold it up and cover only a part of the patch; he is going to take everything that that blanket will cover, just as it will be done by this bill. There ought to be a limitation upon it; there ought to be some restriction whereby the commission, upon the application of those who are interested, who know the character of the land, might have it eliminated at the earliest practical day.

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

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. If such a dreadful state of affairs as the gentleman has pictured comes to pass, there will be somebody who will be aggrieved and somebody complaining. There is an adequate remedy in the bill for them to go right to the commission, set forth their grievance, and get relief at once. The commission has the power to regulate the whole matter and to open that land to entry if the applicant is not proceeding in good faith. If you do not withhold it temporarily from entry, you give the water-power applicant no right at all. Anyone can come in and cut the project all to pieces and thereby destroy the project.

Mr. RAKER. There is no conclusion to be drawn. The language is plain and specific. It permits the thing to be done as I have stated, and the only remedy that party has is to the commission, which may be one, two, or five years, or to Congress, to relieve the land when it is filed upon.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 25. That any licensee, or any person, who shall willfully fail or who shall refuse to comply with any of the provisions of this act, or with any of the conditions made a part of any license issued hereunder, or with any subpœna of the commission, or with any regulation or lawful order of the commission, or of the Secretary of War, or of the Secretary of Commerce as to fishways, issued or made in accordance with the provisions of this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall, in the discretion of the court, be punished by a fine of not exceeding $1,000 in addition to other penalties herein prescribed or provided by law; and every month any such licensee or any such person shall remain in default after written notice from the commission, or from the Secretary of War, or from the Secretary of Commerce, shall be deemed a new and separate offense punishable as aforesaid.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will rise informally to receive a message from the Senate.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I object to the informal rising and I insist upon a formal rising. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise. I object to an informal rising of the committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE—SUNDRY CIVIL BILL.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had disagreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and had further insisted upon its amendments disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had asked a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. OVERMAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the proceedings.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its sitting.

The committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. WALSH. The Clerk will not read until I have my five minutes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. I do not propose to let the proceeding which has just taken place go by without a protest.

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

Mr. WINGO. The point of order is that the committee can not rise informally where there is objection. There was objection and without consideration the objection was ruthlessly brushed aside.

The CHAIRMAN. The present Chairman is obliged to overrule the point of order raised by the gentleman. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. WINGO. I make the point of order there is no quorum if the Chair is going to override the proceedings like that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and nineteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3184 had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order there is no quorum present, and obviously there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

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

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON), there were—ayes 103, noes 1.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman withhold that until I may ask leave——

[Cries of "No!"]

Mr. HARDY of Texas. All right.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The call of the House is agreed to. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ackerman	Copley	Gallivan	Kleczka
Anthony	Costello	Gandy	Knutson
Ashbrook	Crago	Gard	Lampert
Ayres	Cullen	Garland	Langley
Babka	Dallinger	Godwin	Layton
Bacharach	Davey	Goldfogle	Lazaro
Baer	Denison	Goodall	Lehlbach
Begg	Dent	Graham, Ill.	Lesher
Bell	Dewalt	Greene, Mass.	Linthicum
Benson	Dickinson, Mo.	Griest	Little
Bland, Ind.	Dickinson, Iowa	Hamill	Longworth
Bland, Va.	Donovan	Hardy, Colo.	Luce
Boies	Dooling	Harrison	Lufkin
Booher	Doremus	Heflin	McAndrews
Britten	Doughton	Hill	McClintic
Browne	Dunn	Houghton	McCulloch
Brumbaugh	Eagan	Howard	McKinley
Buchanan	Eagle	Hulings	McLane
Burdick	Echols	Husted	Maher
Burroughs	Ellsworth	Hutchinson	Major
Butler	Emerson	Ireland	Mann
Byrnes, S. C.	Evans, Mont.	Johnson, Ky.	Mansfield
Caldwell	Evans, Nev.	Johnson, Miss.	Martin
Caraway	Fairfield	Johnson, S. Dak.	Mason
Carew	Fess	Johnston, N. Y.	Mead
Carss	Fitzgerald	Jones, Pa.	Merritt
Carter	Flood	Kahn	Moon
Casey	Fordney	Kendall	Mooney
Clark, Fla.	Frear	Kennedy, R. I.	Moore, Ohio
Classon	Freeman	Kettner	Moore, Va.
Cole	Fuller, Ill.	Kiess	Morin
Connally	Fuller, Mass.	Kincheloe	Mott
Cooper	Gallagher	King	Mudd

Murphy	Randall, Wis.	Slemp	Treadway
Neely	Reavis	Small	Vaile
Nelson, Wis.	Reber	Smith, Idaho	Vare
Nichols, Mich.	Reed, N. Y.	Smith, N. Y.	Vestal
O'Connell	Rhodes	Smithwick	Voigt
O'Connor	Riordan	Snell	Walters
Oliver	Robinson, N. C.	Snyder	Ward
Osborne	Rogers	Stedman	Watson, Va.
Padgett	Rowan	Steele	Webb
Paige	Rucker	Steenerson	Welty
Parker	Sabath	Stephens, Ohio	Whaley
Pell	Sanders, N. Y.	Stiness	White, Me.
Peters	Sanford	Strong, Pa.	Wilson, Ill.
Phelan	Saunders, Va.	Sullivan	Wilson, Pa.
Porter	Scully	Sweet	Winslow
Pou	Sells	Temple	Wise
Purnell	Sherwood	Thompson, Okla.	Woodyard
Rainey, Henry T.	Shreve	Tilson	Young, Tex.
Ramsey	Sims	Tinkham	Zihlman
Ramseyer	Sinclair	Towner	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. GILLETT, and he answered "Present."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. One hundred and ninety-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Speaker's warrant be issued and that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to bring in the absent Members.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] that the Speaker's warrant issue and that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to bring in absent Members.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, is it in order to make a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be pleased to listen to the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT. I desire to inquire whether it would be in order to have the Speaker issue a special warrant for those majority Members of the Rules Committee who are absent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would not be.

Two hundred and twenty Members are present, a quorum. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments on the bill H. R. 6176, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments to the sundry civil bill, and agree to the request for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make a motion to instruct the conferees. I move that the conferees be instructed to further insist on their disagreement to Senate amendment No. 91 on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] makes a motion, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves that the conferees be instructed to further insist upon their disagreement to Senate amendment No. 91.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that not included in the motion made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] to further insist on disagreement to all the amendments?

The SPEAKER. It is technically included, but it is always held in order to make a motion to especially instruct the conferees and disclose the purpose of the House.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

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

Mr. BLANTON. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 2, noes 90.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that that motion is dilatory. We have ascertained that there is a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the motion is not a dilatory motion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the right of making the point of no quorum is a constitutional right.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. Those in favor of the motion will, as their names are called, answer "yea," those opposed will answer "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 10, nays 209, not voting 211, as follows:

YEAS—10.

Blanton	Gould	Sisson	Walsh
Elliott	Graham, Pa.	Thomas	
Garner	Rayburn	Thompson, Ohio	

NAYS—209.

Alexander	Evans, Nebr.	Larsen	Rhodes
Almon	Focht	Layton	Ricketts
Anderson	Foster	Lea, Calif.	Riddick
Andrews, Md.	French	Lee, Ga.	Robsion, Ky.
Andrews, Nebr.	Ganly	Lever	Rodenberg
Aswell	Gard	Little	Romjue
Bankhead	Garrett	Lonergan	Rose
Barbour	Glynn	Luhring	Rouse
Barkley	Good	McArthur	Rowe
Bee	Goodwin, Ark.	McDuffie	Rubey
Benham	Goodykoontz	McFadden	Sanders, Ind.
Black	Graham, Ill.	McGlennon	Schall
Bland, Mo.	Green, Iowa	McKenzie	Scott
Bowers	Griest	McKeown	Sears
Box	Griffin	McKinley	Siegel
Brand	Hadley	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sinnott
Briggs	Hamilton	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Smith, Idaho
Brinson	Haskell	McPherson	Smith, Ill.
Brooks, Pa.	Hastings	MacCrate	Smith, Mich.
Browning	Haugen	MacGregor	Steagall
Burke	Hawley	Magee	Stevenson
Byrns, Tenn.	Hayden	Mapes	Strong, Kans.
Campbell, Kans.	Hays	Mason	Summers, Wash.
Campbell, Pa.	Hernandez	Mays	Sumners, Tex.
Cannon	Hersey	Michener	Sweet
Cantrill	Hersman	Miller	Taylor, Ark.
Chindblom	Hickey	Minahan, N. J.	Taylor, Colo.
Christopherson	Hicks	Monahan, Wis.	Taylor, Tenn.
Clark, Mo.	Hoch	Mondell	Tillman
Cleary	Holland	Montague	Timberlake
Coady	Huddleston	Moore, Pa.	Tincher
Collier	Hudspeth	Moores, Ind.	Towner
Cramton	Hull, Iowa	Morgan	Vestal
Crisp	Hull, Tenn.	Mott	Vinson
Crowther	Humphreys	Nelson, Mo.	Volstead
Currie, Mich.	Igoe	Newton, Minn.	Wason
Curry, Calif.	Jacoway	Nicholls, S. C.	Watkins
Dale	James	Nolan	Watson, Pa.
Darrow	Jefferis	Ogden	Watson, Va.
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Wash.	Oldfield	Weaver
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Tex.	Oliver	Webster
Dempsey	Juul	Olney	Welling
Denison	Kelley, Mich.	Overstreet	Welty
Dominick	Kelly, Pa.	Park	Wheeler
Dowell	Kennedy, Iowa	Parrish	Williams
Drane	Kincheloe	Platt	Wilson, La.
Dunbar	Kinkaid	Quin	Wingo
Dupré	Kitchin	Radcliffe	Woods, Va.
Dyer	Kraus	Ragsdale	Wright
Edmonds	Kreider	Rainey, J. W.	Young, N. Dak.
Elston	LaGuardia	Raker	
Esch	Lanham	Ramseyer	
Evans, Mont.	Lankford	Reed, W. Va.	

NOT VOTING—211.

Ackerman	Crago	Greene, Mass.	McClintic
Anthony	Cullen	Greene, Vt.	McCulloch
Ashbrook	Dallinger	Hamill	McKinley
Ayres	Davey	Hardy, Colo.	McLane
Babka	Dent	Hardy, Tex.	Madden
Bacharach	Dewalt	Harrison	Maher
Baer	Dickinson, Mo.	Heflin	Major
Begg	Dickinson, Iowa	Hill	Mann
Bell	Donovan	Houghton	Mansfield
Benson	Dooling	Howard	Martin
Blackmon	Doremus	Hulings	Mead
Bland, Ind.	Doughton	Husted	Merritt
Bland, Va.	Dunn	Hutchinson	Moon
Boies	Eagan	Ireland	Mooney
Booher	Eagle	Johnson, Ky.	Moore, Ohio
Britten	Echols	Johnson, Miss.	Moore, Va.
Brooks, Ill.	Ellsworth	Johnson, S. Dak.	Morin
Browne	Emerson	Johnston, N. Y.	Mudd
Brumbaugh	Evans, Nev.	Jones, Pa.	Murphy
Buchanan	Fairfield	Kahn	Neely
Burdick	Ferris	Kearns	Nelson, Wis.
Burroughs	Fess	Kendall	Newton, Mo.
Butler	Fields	Kennedy, R. I.	Nichols, Mich.
Byrnes, S. C.	Fisher	Kettner	O'Connell
Caldwell	Fitzgerald	Kiess	O'Connor
Candler	Flood	King	Osborne
Caraway	Fordney	Kleczka	Padgett
Carew	Frear	Knutson	Paige
Carss	Freeman	Lampert	Parker
Carter	Fuller, Ill.	Langley	Pell
Casey	Fuller, Mass.	Lazaro	Peters
Clark, Fla.	Gallagher	Lehlbach	Phelan
Classon	Gallivan	Lesher	Porter
Cole	Gandy	Linthicum	Pou
Connally	Garland	Longworth	Purnell
Cooper	Godwin, N. C.	Luce	Rainey, H. T.
Copley	Goldfogle	Lufkin	Ramsey
Costello	Goodall	McAndrews	Randall, Calif.

Randall, Wis.	Sells	Stephens, Ohio	Ward
Reavis	Sherwood	Stiness	Webb
Reber	Shreve	Strong, Pa.	Whaley
Reed, N. Y.	Sims	Sullivan	White, Kans.
Riordan	Sinclair	Temple	White, Me.
Robinson, N. C.	Slemp	Thompson, Okla.	Wilson, Ill.
Rogers	Small	Tilson	Wilson, Pa.
Rowan	Smith, N. Y.	Tinkham	Winslow
Rucker	Smithwick	Treadway	Wise
Sabath	Snell	Upshaw	Wood, Ind.
Sanders, La.	Snyder	Vaile	Woodyard
Sanders, N. Y.	Stedman	Vare	Yates
Sanford	Steele	Venable	Young, Tex.
Saunders, Va.	Steenerson	Voigt	Zihlman
Scully	Stephens, Miss.	Walters	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. CARAWAY.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas with Mr. BOOHER.

Mr. PETERS with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. PHELAN.

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. BURROUGHS with Mr. AYRES.

Mr. BUTLER with Mr. BABKA.

Mr. CLASSON with Mr. BENSON.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. BLAND of Virginia.

Mr. DALLINGER with Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa with Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. CARTER.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. FREAR with Mr. CULLEN.

Mr. FREEMAN with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado with Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. IRELAND with Mr. MAJOR.

Mr. KERNS with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. KENDALL with Mr. MOON.

Mr. KEISS with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.

Mr. LAMPERT with Mr. O'CONNOR.

Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. PADGETT.

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. POU.

Mr. MURPHY with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.

Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. RANDALL.

Mr. REEVES with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. ROGERS with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.

Mr. SANDERS of New York with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. SELLS with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. UPSHAW.

Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. YOUNG of Texas.

Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. FISHER.

Mr. TINKHAM with Mr. HARDY of Texas.

Mr. VAILE with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. VARE with Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi.

Mr. WALTERS with Mr. KETTNER.

Mr. WILSON with Mr. LAZARO.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana with Mr. LINTHICUM.

Mr. YATES with Mr. MCANDREWS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. GILLETT, and he voted in the negative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a minute to address the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. I trust everybody will stay until this and the other bills are disposed of. We have only a little over a quorum, and we will have to stay here until the sundry civil bill is disposed of, and possibly the deficiency bill. If Members wander out it punishes all of us.

Mr. GARNER. Have we any assurance that the deficiency bill will be considered to-night?

Mr. CANNON. I do not know. I have not been warned in for another conference, but the sundry civil bill has to go back to conference.

Mr. GARNER. I agree with the gentleman; but will the deficiency bill be considered to-night?

Mr. CANNON. I will ask the gentleman, Will the deficiency bill be considered to-night?

Mr. GARNER. I do not know.

Mr. CANNON. I know just as much about it as the gentleman does. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] that the House further insist.

Mr. BLANTON. A point of order. That motion has already been put by the Chair and carried.

Mr. WALSH. It was adopted by the House, and then the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] made his motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; otherwise my motion would not have been in order.

Mr. WINGO. I desire to offer a motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. CANNON. That motion has just been voted down.

Mr. WINGO. Yes; but I offer another motion. I move to instruct the conferees to concur in Senate amendment No. 91.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I do not believe the conferees will have any difficulty in arriving at an agreement and bringing in a report in less time than it will take to act upon the gentleman's motion. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. WINGO. On the assurance of the chairman that he thinks the conferees will reach an agreement I will withdraw my motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the House the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], the gentlemen from New York [Mr. MAGEE], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question being taken, the motion was rejected.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a very brief statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. We hope the conferees on the sundry civil bill will return with an agreement in a very short time, and I trust that all gentlemen will remain here until that report is received. [Applause.] We then expect to ask unanimous consent to consider the conference report.

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

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT. Is it the purpose also to take up the report on the deficiency bill?

Mr. MONDELL. We can not take up the deficiency bill until we have disposed of the sundry civil bill.

Mr. GARRETT. Why not? They are both in the same class.

Mr. MONDELL. We are now operating on the sundry civil bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas will suspend. He can not take the gentleman from Tennessee off the floor.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming yielded to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT. I will say to the gentleman from Wyoming that I think there will be no difficulty whatever about taking up the deficiency bill for consideration under the general rules of the House if any gentleman on that side chooses to ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I repeat my request that gentlemen all remain here until the conference report on the sundry civil bill is received.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. Could the House take up the conference report if it should be brought back here, except by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. It can not, until the bill is printed.

Mr. BLANTON. I will state, Mr. Speaker, that it will be useless to wait here for that, because there will not be any unanimous consent. I intend to object. I do not like to have the Senate ram things down the throats of the Members of the House in the way they have attempted to do to-day on several bills. The deficiency bill, with very important appropriations in it, has been sidetracked. It is just as important that the deficiency bill shall become a law as any other bill we have passed in this Congress, and here it has been sidetracked to take a 10 days' recess.

WATER POWER.

Mr. ANDERSON. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3184, the water-power bill.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 141, noes 1.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum present.

Mr. CANNON. I make the point of order that that is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the point is not dilatory, but will count.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker is not bound by the vote as to whether there was a quorum present or not.

The SPEAKER. That is true, but the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-two Members present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 215, nays 4, answered "present" 4, not voting 207, as follows:

YEAS—215.

Alexander	Ferris	Kreider	Rhodes
Almon	Fisher	LaGuardia	Ricketts
Anderson	Fitzgerald	Lanham	Riddick
Andrews, Md.	Focht	Lankford	Robsion, Ky.
Andrews, Nebr.	Foster	Larsen	Rodenberg
Aswell	French	Lea, Calif.	Romjue
Bankhead	Gard	Lever	Rose
Barbour	Garner	Little	Rouse
Barkley	Garrett	Lonergan	Rowe
Bee	Glynn	Luhring	Rubey
Benham	Goodwin, Ark.	McArthur	Schall
Benson	Goodykoontz	McDuffie	Scott
Black	Gould	McFadden	Sears
Bland, Mo.	Graham, Pa.	McGlennon	Siegel
Blanton	Graham, Ill.	McKenzie	Sinnott
Box	Green, Iowa	McKeown	Sisson
Brand	Griest	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Idaho
Briggs	Griffin	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Smith, Ill.
Brinson	Hadley	McPherson	Smith, Mich.
Brooks, Ill.	Hamilton	MacCrate	Smithwick
Brooks, Pa.	Hardy, Tex.	MacGregor	Steagall
Browning	Haskell	Mapes	Stephens, Miss.
Burke	Hastings	Mason	Strong, Kans.
Byrnes, S. C.	Haugen	Mays	Summers, Wash.
Campbell, Pa.	Hawley	Michener	Sumners, Tex.
Candler	Hayden	Miller	Sweet
Cannon	Hays	Monahan, Wis.	Taylor, Ark.
Cantrill	Hernandez	Mondell	Taylor, Colo.
Chindblom	Hersey	Montague	Taylor, Tenn.
Clark, Mo.	Hersman	Moore, Pa.	Thompson, Ohio
Cleary	Hickey	Moores, Ind.	Tillman
Collier	Hicks	Morgan	Timberlake
Cramton	Hoch	Mott	Tincher
Crisp	Holland	Nelson, Mo.	Towner
Crowther	Huddleston	Newton, Minn.	Venable
Currie, Mich.	Hudspeth	Newton, Mo.	Vestal
Curry, Calif.	Hull, Iowa	Nicholls, S. C.	Vinson
Dale	Hull, Tenn.	Nolan	Volstead
Darrow	Humphreys	Ogden	Walsh
Davis, Minn.	Igoe	Oliver	Wason
Davis, Tenn.	Ireland	Overstreet	Watkins
Dempsey	Jacoway	Padgett	Watson, Pa.
Denison	James	Park	Weaver
Dominick	Jefferis	Parrish	Webster
Dowell	Johnson, Wash.	Platt	Welling
Drane	Jones, Tex.	Quin	Welty
Dunbar	Juul	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Dupré	Kelley, Mich.	Ragsdale	Williams
Dyer	Kelly, Pa.	Rainey, J. W.	Wilson, La.
Edmonds	Kennedy, Iowa	Raker	Wingo
Elston	Kiess	Ramsey	Woods, Va.
Esch	Kinkaid	Ramseyer	Wright
Evans, Mont.	Kitchin	Rayburn	Young, N. Dak.
Evans, Nebr.	Kraus	Reed, W. Va.	

NAYS—4.

Coady	Kincheloe	Minahan, N. J.	Thomas

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Bell	Booher	Christopherson	Steenerson

NOT VOTING—207.

Ackerman	Byrns, Tenn.	Dewalt	Frear
Anthony	Caldwell	Dickinson, Mo.	Freeman
Ashbrook	Campbell, Kans.	Dickinson, Iowa	Fuller, Ill.
Ayres	Caraway	Donovan	Fuller, Mass.
Babka	Carew	Dooling	Gallagher
Bacharach	Carss	Doremus	Gallivan
Baer	Carter	Doughton	Gandy
Begg	Casey	Dunn	Ganly
Blackmon	Clark, Fla.	Eagan	Garland
Bland, Ind.	Classon	Eagle	Godwin, N. C.
Bland, Va.	Cole	Echols	Goldfogle
Boies	Connally	Elliott	Good
Bowers	Cooper	Ellsworth	Goodall
Britten	Copley	Emerson	Greene, Mass.
Browne	Costello	Evans, Nev.	Greene, Vt.
Brumbaugh	Crago	Fairfield	Hamill
Buchanan	Cullen	Fess	Hardy, Colo.
Burdick	Dallinger	Fields	Harrison
Burroughs	Davey	Flood	Heflin
Butler	Dent	Fordney	Hill
Houghton	McKinley	Porter	Steele
Howard	McKinley	Pou	Stephens, Ohio
Hulings	McLane	Purnell	Stevenson
Husted	Madden	Rainey, H. T.	Stiness
Hutchinson	Magee	Randall, Calif.	Strong, Pa.
Johnson, Ky.	Maher	Randall, Wis.	Sullivan
Johnson, Miss.	Major	Reavis	Temple
Johnson, S. Dak.	Mann	Reber	Thompson, Okla.
Johnston, N. Y.	Mansfield	Reed, N. Y.	Tilson
Jones, Pa.	Martin	Riordan	Tinkham
Kahn	Mead	Robinson, N. C.	Treadway
Kearns	Merritt	Rogers	Upshaw
Kendall	Moon	Rowan	Vaile
Kennedy, R. I.	Mooney	Rucker	Vare
Kettner	Moore, Ohio	Sabath	Voigt
King	Moore, Va.	Sanders, Ind.	Walters
Kleczka	Morin	Sanders, La.	Ward
Knutson	Mudd	Sanders, N. Y.	Watson, Va.
Lampert	Murphy	Sanford	Webb
Langley	Neely	Saunders, Va.	Whaley
Layton	Nelson, Wis.	Scully	White, Kans.
Lazaro	Nichols, Mich.	Sells	White, Me.
Lee, Ga.	O'Connell	Sherwood	Wilson, Ill.
Lehlbach	O'Connor	Shreve	Wilson, Pa.
Lesher	Oldfield	Sims	Winslow
Linthicum	Olney	Sinclair	Wise
Longworth	Osborne	Slemp	Wood, Ind.
Luce	Paige	Small	Woodyard
Lufkin	Parker	Smith, N. Y.	Yates
McAndrews	Pell	Snell	Young, Tex.
McClintic	Peters	Snyder	Zihlman
McCulloch	Phelan	Stedman	

So the motion to go into Committee of the Whole was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. ACKERMAN with Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee.

Mr. BOWERS with Mr. CONNALLY.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas with Mr. GANLY.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

Mr. ELLIOTT with Mr. MINAHAN of New Jersey.

Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. GOOD with Mr. OLDFIELD.

Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. OLNEY.

Mr. MADDEN with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.

Mr. MAGEE with Mr. STEVENSON.

Mr. MERRITT with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. KNUTSON. I wish to withdraw my vote of "aye" and answer "present."

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire if the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. FESS, has voted.

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, is it in order to inquire whether the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the Republican campaign committee, is absent making speeches on Republican——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is out of order, as he well knows.

The result of the vote was then announced, as above recorded.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole, I would like to ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not do that, because the vote was taken on going into the committee, and as soon as the vote was cast the House goes into the committee.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3184, with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. When we resume the consideration of the bill, will the gentleman who had the floor on an amendment at the time the committee rose still be entitled to the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman recall whether an amendment was pending?

Mr. WALSH. There was a very important amendment pending, to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to discuss the amendment that was pending at the time the committee rose?

Mr. WALSH. I am asking the Chair if the Member who had proposed the amendment and was recognized at the time the committee rose is now entitled to recognition without reserving his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair ask the gentleman what section he desires to discuss, because the only amendment pending was the pro forma amendment, as the Chair recollects, which the Chair understood was withdrawn.

Mr. WALSH. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word simply for the purpose of asking the chairman of the

committee the reason for including the Secretary of Commerce in section 25 as to notifying people with reference to violations of the act.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, under a previous section of the act the Secretary of Commerce has authority to order the installation of fishways at the time the original dam is constructed or at any time thereafter. Hence if any order of the Secretary of Commerce is not obeyed it comes under the penalties of this section 25.

Mr. WALSH. Would the gentleman state the need for making the Secretary of War a separate official in this act in the same way?

Mr. ESCH. The Secretary of War is given many separate duties in this bill in connection with dams on navigable streams in that the Secretary of War could determine the level of the pool created by the dam and could order the installation of proper booms to protect the entrance to the locks, and can issue orders with reference to the laying of the booms and the locks, and can issue orders with reference to the operating of the locks. For any violation of these orders penalty is provided in this section.

Mr. WALSH. Then in case the Secretary of Commerce issued an order, even though the permit which was granted by the commission might seem to allow this obstruction, the authority of the Secretary of Commerce would be paramount.

Mr. ESCH. We gave him authority to order fishways, but that is about the only jurisdiction we have given him in this bill. If he ordered a fishway to go in and it was disobeyed, the party disobeying could be penalized under section 25.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the other day my colleague from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] made quite an attack on the Secretary of Labor, Mr. W. B. Wilson, for what he was alleged to have said he had done in behalf of Thomas J. Mooney, in a speech delivered by him, Mr. Wilson, on June 13, 1919, at Atlantic City. At the time he made the attack I asked my colleague if he would put in his remarks the speech of Secretary Wilson of which he complained. He did not do this, and therefore I am asking to print Secretary Wilson's entire speech so that readers of the RECORD may judge for themselves whether Mr. Wilson is justly subject to any criticism for anything contained in that speech.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman sure that the Secretary of Labor adhered to his manuscript copy in speaking before a convention and did not, as stated by all the daily newspapers, sidetrack? Is the gentleman sure of that?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I never have seen any statement by any daily newspaper which leads me to believe that Secretary Wilson made any other speech than the one which he told me he had made and gave me a copy of.

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

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. The other part of my question is, Does not the Secretary of Labor, in this speech which the gentleman from Texas holds in his hand——

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Oh, the gentleman can not take up my time in trying to discuss the speech.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not he state that he was going——

Mr. HARDY of Texas. This speech, if the House will permit me, will go into the RECORD, and everyone who reads it can determine whether the speech is justly subject to the gentleman's criticisms. If the gentleman had placed it in the RECORD as I suggested he should when he attacked the Secretary, there would be no need of this proceeding of mine now.

I ask permission to extend my remarks by inserting the speech of Secretary W. B. Wilson at Atlantic City.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by incorporating a speech delivered by Secretary of Labor Wilson at Atlantic City. Is there objection?

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas whether it is his purpose or the purpose of anyone else he knows of to take advantage of the fact of this speech going into the RECORD by sending it out all over the country under anybody's frank?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I will say to the gentleman I have no purpose in it except to correct what I believe was an injustice to an honest public servant, but it will, of course, be entitled to circulate just as the attack on the Secretary may be circulated.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I just would like to state this in reserving it, that the only statement I made in connection with Mr. Wilson was what the newspapers reported, and I put in the RECORD excerpts from three different newspapers bearing out the statement, and there was nothing much more in that statement than in the speech itself, and therefore I do not object.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I will do the gentleman the justice to say that when I asked him to put the speech in the RECORD, as I recall, he declined to say he would put the speech in the RECORD, but said he would put in newspaper extracts or newspaper criticisms, which he did. I read these criticisms and they were and are as unjust and unfounded as the gentleman's attack. I want to add one more statement. I have known Mr. Secretary Wilson for many years, and in my judgment he has always been an honest, fearless, able public servant since his connection with the Government, and in my judgment this very speech shows him to be just that.

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

The speech is as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM B. WILSON, SECRETARY OF LABOR, BEFORE THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR CONVENTION, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., JUNE 13, 1919.

"Mr. President and fellow trade-unionists, it is a great pleasure to have the opportunity of being present, even though it may be at but one of the sessions of this historic victory and reconstruction convention of the American Federation of Labor.

"The wageworkers of our country have reason to be proud of the part which they played in the great World War for freedom and democracy. You have reason to be proud not only of the part you have taken in the struggle but of the great part that has been played in the contest by your selected representative, the president of the American Federation of Labor. [Applause.] Upon him has devolved not only the direction of your forces and associated forces in the great struggle against the military autocracy of Germany, but there has also fallen upon his shoulders—and he has borne the burden manfully; he has directed the movement intelligently—the great burden of conducting the battle against the other insidious forces that would endeavor to utilize violence for the destruction of democracy, the powers of Bolshevism as expressed in some of the countries of eastern Europe.

"The part played by labor has been due in a great measure to the appreciation by labor of the development that has taken place in the progress of human democracies.

"I have a theory, and time alone will demonstrate whether the theory is sound, that every individual and every group of individuals becomes influential in the affairs of the Government just in so far as the individual or the group of individuals is necessary for the defense of the State. I know my British friends will pardon me if I refer to what in my mind was the great starting point in the development of modern democracy. I don't look upon the Battle of Bannockburn as being purely the heritage of the people of Scotland alone, but I look upon it as being the heritage of the masses of the people of all the world. Those of you who are familiar with the history of that struggle and the ones preceding it realize that up until that time the only people who had been permitted to participate in the affairs of government were the monarchs and the nobility, the nobility comprising the flower of knighthood.

"The nobility were permitted to participate because the man on horseback and in armor was the man who at that time was necessary for the defense of the State. Nearly all of the nobility of Scotland had been brought up at the court of England, and when the Battle of Bannockburn took place very few of the men in armor were on the side of the Scottish monarch. He had to depend for support in the conflict upon the yeomanry of his country, and for the first time in the history of warfare the yeomanry, with pikes in their hands, were formed on the battle field of Bannockburn in what has since come to be known as the "hollow square"—only in that case it was the hollow circle. The historians have failed to grasp the importance of that situation. They tell us of the pitfalls that had been made on the moor for the horses of the English monarch and his

men, and how some of these fell into the pits. There were a sufficient number who crossed over the moor to have crushed the Scottish army if it had not been for the new military tactics which the necessity of the situation compelled Bruce to employ, and he formed his men into hollow circles to receive the men of the opposing forces on their pikes, and when the nobles came they came onto the pikes of the yeomanry and were destroyed. The yeoman at that moment became a more important factor in the defense of his country. The British monarch was later compelled to follow the same tactics that Bruce had followed; and when the wars were carried by Edward over onto the Continent, with the yeomen as a fighting factor in his armies, the European military chiefs were compelled also to change their tactics. From that period dated the fall of knighthood and the beginning of manhood. [Applause.]

"Slowly the masses of the people represented in the yeomanry began to realize their importance, and before the reign of Bruce had passed they had compelled him to yield concessions to the yeomanry of his country; and this was true also of Edward and true over all the Continent.

"The individual, the man in the mass, the toiler of society began to see the dawn of a new day. It took centuries before it began to crystallize, but those same people, coming over to our country, settling on our shores, carried with them the ideals of the importance of the workers of humanity. When our Declaration of Independence was proclaimed to the world, when it was being prepared, before it was given to the world, there came down from the North those who insisted that there should be included in the document the statement that taxation without representation was tyranny, and there came up from the South workers who in the meantime had become imbued with a spirit of racial aristocracy but yet were imbued with the same thought that had developed on the other side of the water, who insisted that there should go into the Declaration of Independence that basic principle of all democracies—that every government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. [Applause.]

"Modern warfare has still more thoroughly accentuated that thought. In the battles of ancient times it was frequently possible for large armies to support themselves upon the country in which they were operating, receiving but a small portion of their supplies from home. From the days when Joshua overcame the enemies of Israel until Sherman made his famous march to the sea great armies supported themselves upon the country in which they were fighting. That is no longer possible. It has been variously estimated that it takes anywhere from 6 to 10 workers in the rear to maintain 1 soldier in the trenches. Consequently, the workers of all the world have become more important factors in the defense of their respective countries, and they are insisting and will continue to insist that in the consideration of the problems of reconstruction the laws shall be so constructed and social affairs so conducted that every individual in the community shall have the greatest possible opportunity for self-determination. [Applause.]

"The labor movement of this country is no exception to the rule in that respect. We have in our country our faddists—people, many of them, who have never had any experience in the practical problems of life. Some of them have been following after false gods. It is not those who are following after the false gods that will be the saviors of the workers of our country. It is those who have persistently made and are continuing to make self-sacrifice for the common good who will achieve results.

"I recall, and I may have mentioned it to you on previous occasions, but it will bear repeating—I recall the conditions we found in the Middle West when the President's Mediation Commission was sent out to investigate the conditions brought about by the activities of the Industrial Workers of the World, some two years ago. The Industrial Workers of the World had almost gone out of existence prior to that time. Suddenly there was a renewal of activities. Industries that were essential for the success of the war were being tied up. There seemed to be no way of keeping them in operation. The President appointed a commission, of which I had the honor of being chairman. We found some oddities and many crude theories that the average man in the labor movement would not stand for. We found that people were coming in on the roads to the mining camps of the mountain regions, coming in quite large numbers, and practically over night establishing locals of the I. W. W., and then, without submitting the question to the voice of the workers themselves, either through organization or otherwise, declaring strikes against the companies that were operating; declaring those strikes for a given wage and for a given number of hours, refusing to meet the employers in conference and insisting that it must be this rate which they published and no other, and that idleness would follow the employers' refusal to comply with their demands.

"But that was not all. We found that wherever the legitimate evolutionary aspirations of the workers were given an opportunity to develop, there the I. W. W. found no foothold; that it was only in the places where there was the iron hand of repression on the part of the employer used upon the workers themselves that this peculiarly revolutionary spirit found expression. It found expression, in addition to the manner I have stated, in the philosophy that was being taught.

"They announced as the basis of their movement the philosophy that every man is entitled to the full social value of what his labor produces. Now, that philosophy is purely of socialistic origin. It had its first exponent in Marx. It is also a philosophy that every individualist can subscribe to with thoroughness and with complete acceptance of the principle. Every man is entitled to the full social value of what his labor produces. The great difficulty has been that human intelligence has not yet devised a method by which we can compute what the social value is of anyone's labor. No one can compute the value of your labor; no one can compute the value of my labor; no one can compute the value of the labor that has been performed by the president of this organization or the labor that was performed by the man with a pick and shovel in the ditch. Our intelligence has not yet devised a method by which we can compute it, and so, in the years gone by, we have endeavored to make the computation by one of three processes: By the process of the employer using his economic power to arbitrarily fix the compensation of the workers; by the process of the worker using his collective power, arbitrarily fixing the compensation and imposing it upon the employer; and by the process of negotiation.

"It is the process of negotiation that the American labor movement has insisted upon for the bringing of the different elements together and endeavoring to work the problems out on as equitable a basis as the circumstances will permit. But there is a wide misapprehension of the scope of the labor movement of our country. There are those who assume that the negotiations that the American labor movement seeks with the employers only involve consideration of the question of wages or the hours of labor. But the negotiations that the American wage workers, the labor movement of America, stand for include in their scope every industrial activity that affects the mental, the material, or the spiritual welfare of mankind.

"They laid down as the second step in their philosophy that property is only valuable in so far as profits can be secured from the property; that if you eliminate the profits the property will become valueless and no one will want to retain it; and that, so far as it goes, is also sound. If there is nothing that can be produced from a piece of property that will be valuable to mankind, then no one wants to be bothered with the possession of that property.

"Then came what to my mind and to the minds of the great bulk of the trade unionists of this country that I have come in contact with was the poison in their whole philosophy. They said that the way to destroy the value of the property was to strike upon the job; that is, to "soldier," as we say here in the East; to produce a stint, as they say in Great Britain; to put sand on the bearings, to break the machinery, to reduce production, and to reduce the amount of returns from labor to as small a point as possible and enable the worker to retain his job, then in this way the profits would be destroyed, the value would be eliminated, the owner would no longer desire to retain the property, and it could be taken over by the workers, operated collectively, and the workers secure the full social value of what their labor produced.

"Whatever there may be of value in the collective ownership and operation of property, there is at least no value whatsoever in that method of bringing it about. [Applause.]

"All we had to do amongst those workers in the Middle West was to point to the historical fact that prior to the rebirth of the inventive genius of man, prior to the building up of our modern factory system with its wonderful processes of machinery, when everything that was produced was produced by hand, there was a much smaller production per individual than could possibly result from any system of sabotage that could now be introduced; and yet in those days there were still profits for the employers and there was still value to the property. What did result was a very much lower standard of living for the workers, and the only thing that would result from such a scheme now would be a lower standard of living for the wageworkers of the present, and our wageworkers are not going to stand for any system that will lower their standards of living.

"The employers and the employees have a mutual interest in securing the largest possible production with a given amount of labor, having due regard to the health, the safety, the opportuni-

ties for rest, recreation, and improvement of the workers. These being safeguarded, the larger the amount that is produced the larger will be the amount that there is to divide. If there is nothing produced there will be nothing to divide. If there is a large amount produced there will be a large amount to divide. Their interests diverge only when it comes to a division of what has been mutually produced, and if they are wise in their generation in these modern times, with labor realizing its importance in the defense of the country and the maintenance of the country, instead of solving the problem by the use of the economic power on the part of the employer, imposing his will upon the worker, or the use of collective power on the part of the employees imposing their will upon the employers, they will sit around the council table and endeavor to work out the problem on a democratic basis that will secure to each all that he is entitled to receive. [Applause.]

"Closely allied to the work of the I. W. W. during the past year, at least, there has been more or less Bolshevist agitation in the United States. It has not been to any great extent prevalent amongst the real workers of the country. It has existed principally amongst the 'parlor coal diggers' of our greater cities. I have no fear of a political revolution in the United States. It may be possible that these 'parlorites' may misguide a sufficient number of laboring men to cause local disturbances that will be annoying, but no one in the ranks of labor, whether he is classed as an extreme radical or an extreme conservative, or any of the elements between these two, will stand for Bolshevism for a minute when he knows what Bolshevism itself stands for.

"They talk a great deal about the dictatorship of the proletariat. We who have been more or less familiar with the theories that have been promulgated by Marx and his assertion of the dictatorship of the proletariat had interpreted the term to mean that a majority of the workers of the land would determine the policy of it and impose it upon the balance of our people. And our workers were not willing to accept even that kind of a principle. They realized the many centuries of struggle there had been to secure the franchise on the part of the workers in the face of the claims that had been made that they had no property to be taxed, and having no property to be taxed they should have no voice in imposing the taxes, and, further, that they had not developed enough, that they had not sufficient intelligence to be permitted to participate in the affairs of state. During all the centuries there has been a struggle to remedy the wrong, and the basis of that struggle, the basis of the contention of the workers, has been that every person who has to obey the laws of a country ought to have a voice in determining what those laws should be. Having fought all through the centuries for the accomplishment of that ideal, having accomplished this purpose, the American workingman was not disposed to impose the same kind of a disfranchisement upon other portions of the people that he did not want imposed upon himself.

"The Bolshevists did not even take that interpretation of the dictatorship of the proletariat as their guide in the countries where they are just now supreme. In his long speech before the National Soviet at Moscow a little more than a year ago, Lenin laid down the principle that the dictatorship of the proletariat meant the dictatorship of a self-selected, so-called 'advance guard'; that the proletariat himself was not to be trusted because he would waver; and that this self-selected advance guard would impose its will upon the workers and the others must obey, and in that obedience was included obligatory labor.

"From the time that Moses led the Israelites out of bondage in Egypt until Lincoln issued the emancipation proclamation the struggle of the masses has been to get away from slavery, to get away from compulsory labor, and yet it is proposed by this new form of government to reintroduce obligatory labor upon the workers of the world, imposed upon them by a small group of the 'parlorites' of Russia. The great distinction between slavery and freedom is that under freedom every man shall have the right to cease work for any reason that may be sufficient to himself. [Applause.]

"We have protested to the extent of sacrificing our blood and our treasure against the military autocracy of Germany, and yet the military autocracy of Germany was built upon the self-same idea, that the Kaiser and his group of advisers knew better what the workingman desired, what he needed, and what was good for him than the workers knew themselves, and this new group is setting itself up as the advance guard, taking exactly the same position that they know better what is good for the workers than the workers know themselves, and that one of the things that is good for them is that they must be compelled to labor at any price that the advance guard may say, at any kind of work they may determine, for any number of hours the advance guard may decide upon, and the powers of government are to be used to enforce that will. That is their policy.

"The American workingman wants nothing of that kind of dictatorship of the proletariat. The American workingman wants nothing of that kind of obligatory labor. The American workingman wants nothing of the political, social, or economic conditions that have existed and still exist in Russia. We have worked out our destiny far beyond that stage, and we are going to continue to work it out to the achievement of higher ideals, not by the will of an advance guard, no matter how right or just their position may be, but by the will of the majority themselves.

"The use of force, as some of these people are advocating, for the overthrow of our institutions we will not tolerate. Why, my friends, our institutions have been until recently the most completely democratic institutions in the world, and it is only recently that Great Britain has come up shoulder to shoulder with us. Our Declaration of Independence, while it declared, as I have stated, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, did not give to all of the people a voice in the affairs of state. The adoption of our Constitution did not give that right, that privilege. It was not until after 60 or 70 years of struggle that there came to the workers of our country practically universal manhood suffrage, and every element in our country had at least the right to a voice in determining how the affairs of state should be conducted.

"In eastern Europe they had not reached that stage of development. The workers were not permitted to have a voice in determining the affairs. The only method by which they could bring about change was by the use of force. Force over there and force here are two different propositions. The use of force to overthrow an autocracy may be the highest kind of patriotism. But the use of force to overthrow a democracy is treason to the masses of the people. We are proceeding by evolution, not by revolution. We have the power of the ballot to remedy our grievances. If we fail to use the ballot rightly the fault is our own. And those of us who can not be depended upon to vote right can not be depended upon to shoot right. [Applause.] And may I add that in making that statement I am not advocating either the attachment to any political party or the creation of any new political party.

"Our conditions here are very much different from the conditions on the other side of the ocean. Over there there is a snug little island. The great majority of their people are engaged in industrial and commercial pursuits. A separate party over there can, without having an accession from the intellectuals, become a majority party. That is not the case in our country. There are just as many people engaged in agricultural pursuits, in pursuits that do not lend themselves to organizations, as there are engaged in industrial pursuits, and even if we were able to solidify all of the wageworkers of the country in a common mass, as the others would solidify against us, we could not become a majority party, and any progress we might attempt to make would be retarded as a result of the partisan feeling that would be engendered by virtue of these contests. And so we are in a position where we can, if we will, organize a separate party, or we can pursue the policy that has been pursued successfully so far, and that is to throw the weight of our support, of our influence, to the individuals or to the parties that, for the time being, are willing to go along with our program.

"May I also, Mr. President, take this opportunity of giving a word of advice in connection with another situation that has been tense throughout the country? The advice is given freely, honestly, and earnestly. You may accept it or leave it as your own judgment tells you is best. I have been very much interested in the Mooney case. I was requested by the President, when his commission went West, to look into the Mooney case and report to him. We looked into the Mooney case, and in doing so we came to this conclusion: That so far as the jury was concerned that passed upon the evidence presented to it, it could have come to no other conclusion under its sworn duty than to convict Mooney; that so far as the judge was concerned that tried the case, he tried it with absolute fairness. But there were some things existing in addition to that. At the time of the trial certain evidence had been given by certain individuals relative to the supposed activites of Mooney. It afterwards developed that one of the principal witnesses had written to a friend of his in Illinois asking him to come to San Francisco and be prepared to testify that he had seen Oxman (the witness) at a given point at a given time, so as to testify to the possibility of Oxman's being at the point where he claimed to have secured the evidence.

"The commission was of the opinion that in view of that change in the evidence, and in view of other changes that had taken place in the evidence from the date of trial, Mooney ought to be given a new trial, and his innocence or guilt decided upon the evidence as it existed when this new evidence was produced. [Applause.]

"At that time I had no fixed opinions as to either the guilt or the innocence of Mooney. With me it was not a question of whether Mooney was guilty or was innocent, but a question of securing a fair trial for him under the existing circumstances. [Applause.] Every effort that the national administration was able to put forth was put forth for the purpose of trying to secure that new trial, and we are not through with it yet. We are still working on it. [Applause, long and continued.]

"But that is not the phase of the situation that I particularly wanted to advise you about. I am simply stating these facts as preliminary to what is to follow. There has been carried on throughout the country a nation-wide agitation for a universal strike as a protest against the conviction of Mooney. My friends, do you realize just what that action means to the masses of the people? Do you understand fully—most of you do—the struggle that has taken place in order that trials may take place by jury where people are accused, with the accused having the opportunity of meeting the witnesses and the jury face to face, and the jury having opportunity of witnessing the manner in which the witnesses give their testimony? That change, the establishment of the jury system, was not brought about for the purpose of protecting the monarch or protecting the nobility. It has not been principally essential for the protection of men of great wealth; they have usually been in a position to protect themselves. The jury system was brought into existence for the purpose of protecting poor fellows like you and me from the power and influence of the other fellow.

"It may occasionally miscarry; occasionally an injustice or a wrong may be done, but in the great bulk of cases justice is meted out through the jury system. Neither you nor I nor anyone in the labor movement, no one who belongs to the great masses of our people, can afford to undertake to try Mooney by the process of a strike. [Applause.] If he is to be tried, he should be tried by a jury that can meet him face to face and meet the witnesses face to face and be able to digest the evidence as it comes out, bit by bit. Very few of us have had an opportunity of examining the evidence in the Mooney case, very few of us know anything more about the Mooney case than simply that which is connected with Oxman, one of the principal witnesses, and yet it is proposed that every workingman in the country, whether he has information concerning the Mooney case or not, shall become a juror in this case, and at the same time that he becomes a juror shall enter into a strike to bring about a decision. What influence will it have? The man who, under our laws, can pardon him or liberate him from prison is not under the jurisdiction of the voters of any other part of the country than that of California. And I do not know but that, even though there may be a miscarriage of justice occasionally, it is a wise thing that that is the case. The further you get the responsible officers removed from the electorate the less influence the electorate has with those responsible officers, and while the responsible officers may occasionally pursue a course that is not acceptable to the multitude, it is better that they should be close to the multitude, close to the electorate, than that they should be far removed, as would be the case if the responsibility rested with the Federal official instead of with the State or local official.

"My friends, we in this country have been moving on by the evolutionary processes, taking hold of the problems that confront us, holding fast to that which experience demonstrates to be good, letting loose of those things which experience demonstrates to be bad. It is the safest method, the surest method. Revolutionary processes may move us forward rapidly for a brief period. On the other hand, the chances are that when a revolution takes place no one will be able to determine where it will end. That has been true of nearly all the revolutions of the world, and the policy that has been pursued by the American labor movement of going forward by evolutionary processes, making sure of each foothold with every step that it takes, so that there will be no step backward, is the surest and best process for the achievement of the highest ideals of mankind. I thank you. [Applause, long and continued.]"

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 26. That the Attorney General may, on request of the commission or of the Secretary of War, institute proceedings in equity in the district court of the United States in the district in which any project or part thereof is situated for the purpose of revoking for violation of its terms any license issued hereunder, or for the purpose of remedying or correcting by injunction, mandamus, or other process any act of commission or omission in violation of the provisions of this act or of any lawful regulation or order promulgated hereunder. The district courts shall have jurisdiction over all of the above-mentioned proceedings and shall have power to issue and execute all necessary process and to make and enforce all writs, orders, and decrees to compel compliance with the lawful orders and regulations of the commission and of the Secretary of War, and to compel the performance of any condition imposed under the provisions of this act. In the event a decree revoking a license is entered, the court is empowered to sell the whole or any part of the project or projects under license, to wind up the business of such licensee conducted in connection with such project or projects, to distribute the proceeds to the parties entitled to the same, and to make and enforce such further orders and decrees as equity and justice may require. At such sale or sales the vendee shall take the rights and privileges belonging to the licensee and shall perform the duties of such licensee and assume all outstanding obligations and liabilities of the licensee which the court may deem equitable in the premises; and at such sale or sales the United States may become a purchaser, but it shall not be required to pay a greater amount than it would be required to pay under the provisions of section 14 hereof at the termination of the license.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, page 34, line 15, after the word "any," by inserting the words "permit or."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 15, after the word "any," insert the words "permit or."

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, there is no provision in this bill, as far as I have observed, giving the Attorney General any power to prosecute for violation of any permit.

Mr. ESCH. We will accept the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 29. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be held or construed to modify or repeal any of the provisions of the act of Congress approved December 19, 1913, granting certain rights of way to the city and county of San Francisco.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 38, line 8, after the words "San Francisco," strike out the period and insert a colon and insert the following language: "*Provided further*, That section 18 of an act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, approved August 8, 1917, is hereby repealed."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the rivers and harbors appropriation act approved August 8, 1917, authorized the President to appoint a commission consisting of seven persons, upon which commission the rivers and harbors act conferred very great powers with respect to water powers.

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order it is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate having begun upon this amendment the Chair thinks the point of order comes too late.

Mr. CURRY of California. I do not think debate had begun. The amendment was read and the gentleman started off without an opportunity at all——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota was recognized and he had begun the debate.

Mr. CURRY of California. It is a question what you consider beginning debate. This is legislation and bad legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinking a point of order might be made against this amendment was watching so that a gentleman who might make it would be recognized. It was not made and the gentleman from Minnesota began to discuss the amendment, and it is now too late to make the point of order.

Mr. CURRY of California. I will call the attention of the Chair to the fact that I left the side of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE], and came over here on purpose to be in a position as soon as I could rise to my feet and get the eye of the Chair to make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota make the point of order that the point of order made by the gentleman from California comes too late?

Mr. ANDERSON. I make the point of order that his point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is obliged to sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying when the gentleman from California interposed the point of order, the river and harbor appropriation act of the last Congress provided for the appointment of a commission of seven persons to be appointed by the President.

The powers granted to this commission were very broad indeed. Many of them were practically identical with the powers granted to the commission created by the bill under consideration. For instance, among the powers given to the commission created by the recent river and harbor act was the power to

bring into coordination and cooperation the engineering, scientific, and constructive services, bureaus, boards, and commissions of the several governmental departments of the United States and commissions created by Congress that relate to study, development, or control of waterways and water resources and subjects related thereto. In addition, this commission was empower to formulate and report to Congress as easly as practicable a comprehensive plan or plans for the development of waterways and water resources of the United States for the purpose of navigation and for every useful purpose related to the use of water and water power, and recommendations for the modification or discontinuance of any project hereinafter or heretofore adopted.

It is clear that these powers granted to this commission are in conflict with the powers granted by this bill. I am told that at the time this amendment was adopted to the river and harbor act there was great question in the minds of the members of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors as to whether such an amendment ought to be adopted. I am told that great pressure was brought to bear upon the members of the House from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue to secure the insertion of section 18, creating this commission in the river and harbor bill of the last Congress. As a matter of fact, the commission created by this river and harbor act has never been appointed and probably never will be appointed. There is not any reason on earth for the continuance of that commission. It has power to spend $100,000, which I think the act itself appropriates, and it ought to be abolished, because if it ever should be appointed it will exercise powers in conflict with the powers exercised by the commission created in the bill and in conflict with the action as well as of advice.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will.

Mr. FERRIS. As a matter of fact, the appropriation has lapsed anyway, has it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. I presume it has.

Mr. FERRIS. And the commission never has been appointed?

Mr. ANDERSON. It never has been.

Mr. FERRIS. Then why is not the gentleman entirely right as to repealing it?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am willing to repeal it, and I am willing to let it stand on the gentleman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

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

On a division (demanded by Mr. RAKER) the committee divided; and there were—ayes 94, noes 2.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert, just preceding the amendment that has just been adopted, and following the words "San Francisco," line 8, page 36, the words "in the State of California."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ESCH: Page 36, line 8, after the words "San Francisco" and just preceding the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], insert the words "in the State of California."

Mr. FERRIS. I want to inquire of the chairman if he thinks it was necessary to amend the title in order to show the repeal?

Mr. WALSH. It is not time to do that.

Mr. FERRIS. I think this is the time.

Mr. ESCH. Has the amendment been adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revert to section 4, paragraph (a), page 6, line 12, and amend by striking out the word "navigation" and insert in lieu thereof the word "government," in order to make it consonant with other changes made in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ESCH: Page 6, line 12, strike out the word "navigation" and insert in lieu thereof the word "government."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 23, page 32, line 2, and ask that the word "to" before the word "interstate" be changed to the word "in.'

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to revert to page 32 for the purpose of offering an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ESCH: Page 32, line 2, strike out the word "to" before the word "interstate," and insert in lieu thereof the word "in."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. We have got to get consent to return, first.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to returning to page 32, as indicated. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, line 2, after the word "property," strike out the word "to" and insert in lieu thereof the word "in."

The CHAIRMAN. The qustion is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3184) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Is a separate vote to be had on amendments?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Reserving the right to object, has the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] in view any matter that has a bearing on the bill that is before the House now?

The SPEAKER. It is in regard to the parliamentary business of the House.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I did not understand that the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had completed putting the water power bill through the House on final passage.

The SPEAKER. It simply relates to the proceedings of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the sundry civil bill, in regard to Senate amendment No. 91, have agreed to Senate amendment 91 with an amendment.

The presiding officer of the House had previously decided that the act creating the Department of Labor did not authorize this Employment Service. The Senate amendment provides as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Labor, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor"—

And so forth.

To agree to that would be tantamount to the House agreeing that the decision formerly arrived at and adhered to by the House was erroneous, and therefore the conferees have agreed to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, so that it will read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Labor to foster, promote, to develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States—

And so forth.

We strike out "pursuant to section 1 of the act approved March 4, 1913, entitled 'An act to create a Department of

Labor,'" but the rest of the Senate amendment is agreed to verbatim.

I make this statement now because I expect to ask for unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the report and the amendment. The only other item covered by the report is one to correct an error made by the Senate in regard to rent. The bill as it passed the Senate provided rent for the State Department, whereas it should have been for the Treasury Department, just as it passed the House. It will require at least half an hour to read the statement and the report, and I make this statement so that the House will be informed as to the actual situation.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the conferees agree to the Senate appropriation of $400,000?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; to the entire amendment, excepting that it is modified as I have explained.

Mr. BLANTON. Will there be any effort on the part of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to have the deficiency bill passed to-night?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. I expect to try to have the deficiency bill passed to-night, provided the sundry civil bill goes through. If the sundry civil bill goes through I shall immediately call up the deficiency bill.

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

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT. Let us have a very clear understanding about the deficiency bill. I know the gentleman agrees with me that that should be had. We want to consider the deficiency bill to-night?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. If it is not going to be considered to-night, there is no use in considering the sundry civil bill. It will have to go over until to-morrow.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that if the sundry civil bill passes to-night I propose to call up the conference report on the deficiency bill; but if the sundry civil bill does not pass to-night I shall not call up the deficiency conference report until a quorum of the Committee on Rules is present and a rule can be had. If the conference report is adopted on the sundry civil bill, I propose to move that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 21 on the deficiency bill.

Mr. GARRETT. That is the procedure which the gentleman outlines. Does he know whether his side of the House will keep that sort of an agreement or not?

Mr. GOOD. I think the Speaker will recognize me to call it up and make that motion. That is as far as my agreement can go.

Mr. GARRETT. That report was made first, was it not? That deficiency bill came back before the sundry civil bill. Let us take that one first.

Mr. GOOD. No; I am not willing to take that one first. I am not willing to take it at all until a rule is had unless the sundry civil bill can go through, and I am only willing to do this because I think it is very important that the sundry civil bill should be passed to-night. I do not like to move to recede on Senate amendment 21, the deficiency bill, but I think it is so very important to pass this bill to-night, in order that all these various civil departments of the Government can function without violating the law, so far as Congress is concerned, that I am willing to do all I can to have both bills enacted into law.

Mr. GARRETT. Let me say to the gentleman that I do not favor receding on Senate amendment 21 on the deficiency bill. So far as there not being a quorum of the Committee on Rules present, of course the gentleman knows I am not responsible for that.

Mr. GOOD. I understand that. The gentleman has been here part of the time.

Mr. GARRETT. I wonder what the disposition is in dealing with the deficiency bill, whether points of no quorum are going to be made when we reach it?

Mr. GOOD. There is only one item in disagreement in the deficiency bill, and that is Senate amendment 21. The conference report as to the rest has been agreed to.

Mr. KITCHIN. The hospital item.

Mr. GOOD. The hospital item.

Mr. BLANTON. I object, until there is a printed copy of the conference report.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the deficiency bill conference report is printed.

Mr. BLANTON. I mean on the sundry civil bill.

Mr. GARRETT. May I venture to suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that he ask unanimous consent now to consider the conference report on the sundry civil bill, and that at the conclusion of the consideration of that it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the deficiency bill?

Mr. GOOD. I will do that.

Mr. GARRETT. If the gentleman will make that request——

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the sundry civil appropriation bill, H. R. 6176.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the conference report on H. R. 6176; and when that is acted upon by the House and a vote has been had upon the conference report, I ask then to take up for consideration the conference report on the third deficiency bill, H. R. 3478.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent first that he may call up the conference report on the sundry civil bill, and after that is acted upon, the conference report on the deficiency bill. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman mind taking up the other bill first—the deficiency bill?

Mr. GOOD. No; I prefer to take up this one first.

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker. I will not object if the other bill is taken up first.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. I desire to know whether it is in order for me at this time to move to suspend the rules and adopt the conference report on H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill?

The SPEAKER. At first blush the Chair thinks it is not.

Mr. GOOD. If it is in order, I desire to follow that procedure.

Mr. SEARS. Regular order!

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report on H. R. 6176, the sundry civil bill, for printing under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman submits the bill for printing under the rule. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed under the rule.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MONDELL. I rise to ask unanimous consent to make a very brief statement.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection, with the understanding that the deficiency bill is to be disposed of to-night. I understand that is the agreement.

Mr. GOOD. I will call it up. That is all I can do.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Reserving the right to object, I want to understand what the request is. Is it understood that the deficiency bill shall come up to be considered to-night?

The SPEAKER. That is a part of the request.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Then I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the request of the gentleman from Iowa once more.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa what is the conference report on the deficiency bill? What is the action that you are going to take?

Mr. GOOD. The conferees are in disagreement on Senate amendment 21, which provides for the hospital at Chicago and the $1,500,000 fund that can be expended at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. They have been in disagreement on that for 10 days. What are they agreeing to?

Mr. GOOD. I have said to the gentleman from Tennessee that if the report on the sundry civil bill is acted upon to-night, I shall move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment 21 and agree to the same.

Mr. GARNER. Which concludes the matter.

Mr. GARRETT. All that the request of the gentleman from Iowa includes is that the conference report may be considered now under the general rules of the House.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The other day, when that was considered, the gentleman made a motion, which was held out of order, to defer action for consideration and the appointment of a commission. Now, has the Rules Committee or has the gentleman taken any steps toward bringing about a rule for the consideration of that proposition?

Mr. GOOD. I have done my best; I have labored with the Rules Committee, and submitted a rule with a request that they

report it, but I am advised that when the time came for final action the Rules Committee found itself without a quorum, and therefore no rule was to be obtained. I have followed the hospital matter to the last ditch, and we must act now if we are to pass the bills and have them become laws, as they ought to become laws to-day. But the gentleman understands that we can not have our own way in some of these matters. This bill carries over $600,000,000, and the deficiency bill carries $25,000,000. I am not willing to take on myself the responsibility of having these bills fail because I want legislation on one of them. I think it is a tremendous responsibility. I do not know what might happen, and while I would rather reach some other agreement in regard to these hospitals, I have done the best I can, and have been compelled to submit so far as the hospital item is concerned.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I want to say that it does seem a queer condition when there is absolutely nothing done under the law four months after it passed. It was supposed to be an emergency matter, and now they come in and endeavor to divert that fund for some other purpose. It seems to me it is a deplorable situation. I feel that I would be doing right and an act of justice by objecting, as far as this is concerned, but I do not want to take the responsibility if the House wants to go ahead.

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

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the report and statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the report and the statement. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object to that.

Mr. GARNER. It has been read once.

Mr. WALSH. We want to have it read again to know that it is the same statement.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement in regard to amendment 91 be read and the reading of the balance of the statement be dispensed with and the reading of the report be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement in regard to amendment 91.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the reports of the committees of conferences on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the following titles:

H. R. 5227. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; and

H. R. 6176. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The message also announced, in compliance with House concurrent resolution No. 14, providing for a joint commission to confer with officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relative to the contemplated observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims, the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Ohio, Mr. HARDING, and the Senator from Alabama, Mr. UNDERWOOD, members on the part of the Senate.

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

House concurrent resolution 16.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 5227) entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920," the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to amend the title so as to read as follows:

"An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes."

THIRD DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment 21 and agree to the same.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 to the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have been unable to agree.

JAMES W. GOOD,
J. G. CANNON,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
Managers on the part of the House.
F. E. WARREN,
CHARLES CURTIS,
O. W. UNDERWOOD,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 21 and agree to the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment numbered 21 and agree to the same.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken——

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will yield, has the conference report been adopted?

Mr. GOOD. The conference report has been adopted on all items except Senate amendment 21. I think the House should know just what the situation is in regard to Senate amendment 21. Senate amendment 21 made mandatory the provision in the act of March 3, 1919, with regard to the purchase of the Speedway Hospital in Cook County, Ill.

Mr. Speaker, the act of March 3, 1919, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanitarium facilities for discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines," after providing for the transfer of a number of Army hospitals at training camps that were being abandoned and providing for treatment of such soldiers, sailors, and marines in the Battle Mountain Sanitarium, at Hot Springs, S. Dak., authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to lease bed facilities for such soldiers, exceeding 1,000 beds. The act also authorized the purchase of the following hospitals, either by the building of new hospitals or the acquisition of hospitals already constructed, to wit, the purchase of the hospital at Corpus Christi, Tex., at a limit of cost not exceeding $150,000; the purchase of the Speedway Hospital at Chicago, Ill., at a limit of cost not exceeding $3,000,000; the construction of a hospital at Dawson Springs, Ky., at a limit of cost not exceeding $1,500,000; the construction of a hospital at Norfolk, Va., at a limit of cost not exceeding $900,000; the construction of a hospital in the District of Columbia or vicinity at a limit of cost not exceeding $550,000. For the acquisition of these and other hospital facilities, either by rent or purchase, there was appropriated by that act $9,050,000.

The deficiency bill carries no appropriation for acquiring hospitals. Senate amendment No. 21, however, provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall acquire the Speedway Hospital as authorized in the act of March 3. It appropriates no money, the money for the acquisition of this hospital having already been appropriated under the terms of the act of March 3.

When the matter of the purchase of the Speedway Hospital was before the House on June 17 it was my purpose to prevent the expenditure of any of the money appropriated by the act of March 3 for the acquisition of hospitals. It seemed to me that the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury justified that course, and that no part of the appropriation made in the act of March 3 should be expended for the purchase of hospitals at the points named. The Secretary of the Treasury had pointed out that abundant hospital facilities already existed in practically every part of the United States. That being true, it seemed to me that in view of the condition of the Treasury and the heavy burden imposed upon the taxpayers the question of the building of additional hospital facilities could be postponed until a more thorough and more complete survey could be made with regard to the needs of the Public Health Service for hospital facilities.

Since the discussion previously had upon this subject I have given considerable time to the investigation of the hospital situation, so far as it relates to the Public Health Service. I was amazed to find that notwithstanding the showing made by the Secretary of the Treasury that no additional hospital facilities were needed by the Public Health Service that the ink was hardly dry on the act of March 3 until the hotel at Corpus Christi was purchased under the authority of the act of March 3. Why was this hospital purchased? I am unable to say. Was it

needed? Certainly not, according to the showing made by the Secretary of the Treasury, and most certainly the showing made by the Public Health Service did not justify its purchase.

In order to go to Corpus Christi, Tex., from the southeast and east and northeast one must pass through Houston, Tex. Under the act of March 3 the hospital at the Army camp at Houston was turned over to the Public Health Service. That hospital has 1,500 beds, according to the showing made at a recent hearing before the Committee on Appropriations, and yet there are only 22 patients in that hospital; but it has 5 nurses, 4 doctors, and 115 attendants. But the hospital at Corpus Christi has been purchased, and I assume by this time the money has been paid for it. At any rate, the Government is obligated to buy it, and the Government pays its obligations.

Notwithstanding the Secretary's letter that we have in the United States about 20,000 beds, with only about 2,500 patients, we find the Public Health Service anxious to proceed to buy land to build a hospital in the District of Columbia to cost $550,000. The act of March 3 provided for the location of this hospital on Government-owned land. But since the receipt of the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, to which I referred in my remarks on June 17, I have received an estimate from the Secretary asking that the language contained in that act be amended so as to permit the purchase of the land in the District of Columbia for the purpose of erecting a hospital thereon. If there is any place in the United States where a hospital is not needed by the Public Health Department for the treatment of the discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, it is in the District of Columbia, for there are a great many temporary buildings in the vicinity of Washington, constructed for war purposes, that are available for hospital purposes. Since the enactment of the act of March 3, to which I have referred, the Public Health Service has leased for a period of five years at a monthly rental of $3,000, or $36,000 a year, a rental that no one can justify, the property known as Mount Alto Inn for hospital purposes.

At Norfolk, Va., where it is proposed under the appropriation carried in the act of March 3 to erect a hospital at a cost of $900,000, we find the department busily engaged in the acquisition of lands and in the preparation of the plans to build a hospital at this point. Why? Is a hospital needed there? Certainly not. It is urged that a hospital is desired there because of the importance of Norfolk as a shipping point. There are more Government hospital facilities in the vicinity of Norfolk than there are in the great city of New York, where it is only contemplated to expend under the act of March 3 $225,000 for the purchase of the House of Relief with 100 beds.

At Dawson Springs, Ky., where it is proposed to build a hospital to cost a million and a half dollars, plans are being prepared for the construction of this hospital with great care and unusual rush. Why? No hospital is needed there. This hospital will be located a comparatively short distance from Louisville, where within a few weeks the Army hospital at Camp Zachary Taylor, with 1,000 beds, can be turned over to the Public Health Service.

It is well known that a great many of the Army camps were located in this section of the country. Hospitals were constructed in connection with all of them. The hospital at Alexandria, La., with 1,500 beds, has been turned over to the Public Health Service. Yet that hospital has only 14 patients, 5 officers, 54 attendants, and 4 nurses. At Augusta, Ga., the hospital contains 1,498 beds, but it has only 22 patients, 3 officers, 17 attendants, and 4 nurses. At Greenville, S. C., the hospital with 1,500 beds has but 329 patients, with 14 officers, 228 attendants, and 25 nurses. At Jacksonville, Fla., the hospital with 1,500 beds was available.

So far as I know, no persons have made application for hospital service there and no one admitted there; and yet with all the rush and speed under which any department was working to win the war the Treasury Department and the Public Health Department are now apparently pushing ahead to acquire these hospitals at Corpus Christi, at Dawson Springs, Ky., in the District of Columbia, and at Norfolk, Va. Apparently there is some fear that the act of March 3, 1919, might be modified or repealed before the Government could obligate itself for hospital facilities or the money appropriated by the act of March 3 could be spent for hospitals at each of these places. Now it is urged that all these hospitals be acquired at once, except the hospital at Chicago.

For some reason that I am unable to explain the Public Health Service has entirely changed its point of view with regard to the need of hospital facilities at Chicago, and now insists that the only thing that is needed there at the present time and for the next two years is for the Public Health Service to take over the naval hospital at the Great Lakes Training Station, having a capacity of 1,200 beds. This, too, notwithstanding the fact that the Surgeon General had previously most warmly recommended the acquisition of the Speedway Hospital, and the officers in charge of the Public Health Service in the city of Chicago have likewise strongly recommended its purchase.

Now, what is the situation with regard to the hospital at Chicago? I find that the only hospital in the city of Chicago under the Public Health Service on June 9 had 150 beds, with 195 patients in that hospital. And the telegrams from that city show that all of the hospitals there are full to capacity. The strangest thing that has occurred before the committee for a number of years, in my opinion, was the change of the attitude of the Public Health Service with regard to hospital facilities in Chicago.

While this department felt that it was absolutely necessary to build new fireproof hospitals in the temperate climate of Norfolk and Washington, and Dawson Springs, and Corpus Christi, where in each case abundant hospital facilities existed in the vicinity, and while it is proceeding with great haste to acquire them, yet in the city of Chicago, where the mercury frequently registers as low as 30 degrees below zero in the wintertime, it was seriously contended that a frame hospital was all that was needed. The building at the Great Lakes Training Station is a two-story frame building, and is of the cheapest possible construction. It is built entirely of wood, even the interior walls are constructed of wood. Yet the Public Health Service claimed before the Committee on Appropriations that the buildings constructed in the city of Washington, on the Plaza, were unfit for hospital uses because of the fire hazard. Yet these buildings are of hollow tile construction. It was especially urged by the Surgeon General that if used at all only the first floor could be used for hospital purposes, because it would be dangerous to place patients on the second floor of a building constructed of such inflammable material. Yet in Chicago, where the department has but one hospital of 150 beds, with 195 patients in that hospital, a frame two-story building was not too inflammable for the patients who might be sent to the hospital, and the Secretary of the Treasury is asking legislation to turn that frame hospital over to the Public Health Service. Certainly if a frame building in Chicago is good enough for the discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, a frame building for hospital purposes is good enough for the discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines in Virginia, in Kentucky, in the District of Columbia, and in Texas. I do not propose knowingly to permit favorites to be played in this way. Hence I asked the Rules Committee for a rule making in order a provision as an amendment to Senate amendment No. 21 that would prevent the spending of a cent under the act of March 3 in the way of acquiring hospitals until after an investigation by Congress.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am sure the gentleman will recall that Dr. Blue stated that the buildings on the Plaza in the District of Columbia were not so arranged that they could be used for hospital purposes.

Mr. GOOD. Yes, that is true; but he also said they could not use the second floor, for the reasons I have stated, and that is the point I am making. But they now proposed to use this frame hospital at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, which is a two-story building, constructed entirely of wood, with the sides nailed to wooden studdings, and ceiling nailed to the wooden studdings on the inside. And they expect to use this for a period of two years, and at the same time are rushing with all possible speed in the acquisition of lands and the building of hospitals in the District of Columbia, Dawson Springs, Ky.; Norfolk, Va.; and Corpus Christi, Tex., in order to build fireproof hospitals to take the place of frame hospitals that are already available. Unquestionably the fire hazard would be much greater in an inflammable building, where it would be necessary to use a great amount of fuel in order to heat the buildings during cold weather of the winter, than it would be in like buildings at Corpus Christi and at Norfolk, and even in Washington and at Dawson Springs, where winters are not severe.

In this connection let us try and keep in mind the entire picture. When the act of March 3 was passed there was no obligation on the part of the Government to buy, build, or take over any hospital in the District of Columbia, or Dawson Springs, or at Norfolk, Va., or at Corpus Christi, Tex. But this can not be said with regard to the Speedway Hospital.

Since the former discussion on this subject on the 17th of June, I have read the hearings taken under Senate resolution 386, and I must confess that I do not see how the United States can escape the payment of the equitable claim of the builders of the Speedway Hospital. I find that the construction of that

hospital was originally commenced because of a request of Secretary Baker to look into the project. I find that afterwards the project was investigated and recommended by the Surgeon General of the Army, that its construction had been recommended by Gen. Marshall, the Chief of Construction, who stated that at the price of $2,500,000 for which the hospital was to be built the Government would be getting the land and the building at $127,000 less than the Government's estimate of the value of the land plus the cost of the construction of the hospital. The Speedway Hospital was also approved by Gen. Jervey, Director of Operations; it was cleared by the War Industries Board; the price of the land was approved by the Division of Purchase, Storage, and Traffic, and subsequently, after the building was well underway, and on September 27, 1918, it was disapproved by the Acting Secretary of War. If the action previously taken by Congress to pay the equitable claims of persons and concerns furnishing war material under contracts that had not been legally executed shall apply to a case like this, then I undertake to say that Mr. Hines and the Shank Co. have an equitable claim against the Government, the extent of which I would not attempt to say, for the building of a hospital under a contract that was dictated in the War Department by an officer of that department. I do not believe that Mr. Hines or the Shank Co. have any claim against the Government for work done subsequent to September 27, but I do believe they have an equitable claim for the work done and the material purchased up to that date. I do not know whether it would be more equitable to acquire this hospital and use it temporarily or to pay this equitable claim.

Hence, it was my opinion that we should not proceed further in the acquisition of any of these hospitals until the matter could be thoroughly investigated by a congressional committee. I asked for a rule to bring about this condition. But by a filibuster in that committee it found it was without a quorum, and was unable to report out the rule which I had requested. Hence, we find ourselves in the embarrassing position of being compelled to accept Senate amendment No. 21, which directs the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase the Chicago hospital, which seems to be needed, but which the department does not wish to purchase; and what is more, we are prevented from reporting out legislation to prevent the acquisition of hospitals at Corpus Christi, Tex.; Norfolk, Va.; Dawson Springs, Ky.; and in the District of Columbia, where no hospital facilities are needed.

No one denies the need of additional hospital facilities in the Chicago district. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service proposes to meet this need, first, by the utilization of the Cooper-Monotah Hotel, which will hold about 500 patients, and the utilization of the wooden buildings at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, which will hold about 1,200 patients. Without the utilization of the wooden buildings at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station unquestionably there is not enough hospital facilities in the neighborhood of Chicago for the Public Health Service. This fact is admitted by all.

Again, in this connection, I am unable to understand the Public Health Service or the Secretary of the Treasury. At the hearings held on the 24th of June on this very subject the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, although having previously recommended the acquisition of the Speedway Hospital, stated that he felt at that time it would be unwise to acquire the Speedway Hospital, because it was too large. Yet under date of June 13, 1919, the Secretary of the Treasury, in a letter to me, states:

Since dispatching to you my letter concerning the Speedway Hospital project a memorandum has come to my desk from James A. Wetmore, acting supervising architect, stating that "the working drawings for the hospital are now nearing completion" and pointing out that to complete the scheme as desired by the Public Health Bureau will necessitate an additional appropriation of $1,915,000, as follows:

Two attendants' quarters	$260,000
One nurses' quarters	230,000
One officers' quarters	230,000
Shops and garage for 20 or 25 cars	120,000
Additional administration building	120,000
Commanding officers' quarters	15,000
Chapel and mortuary	40,000
Improvements in main buildings	600,000
Buildings for recreation and training personnel	300,000
Total	1,915,000

It should also be stated that with this expenditure of $1,915,000 in addition to the $3,000,000 originally appropriated the Public Health Service will acquire 835 additional hospital beds and not a maximum of 2,500 beds or a minimum of 2,000 beds, as contemplated by this hospital project as originally presented to the War Department.

If the Speedway Hospital is too large, then why in the name of common sense is it necessary to add two attendants' quarters costing $260,000, one nurses' quarters costing $230,000, one officers' quarters costing $230,000, shops and garage for 20 or 25 cars costing $120,000, additional administration building costing $120,000, commanding officers' quarters costing $15,000, chapel and mortuary costing $40,000, and buildings for recreation and training personnal costing $300,000. It was the statement of Gen. Blue that all of these activities could be housed in this main building, a structure almost half a mile long, and being so constructed that it can be divided not only to take care of all of the hospital needs but to provide quarters for attendants, nurses, and officers, administration, and so forth. If it is too big, why is an estimate made to make it bigger? I must confess that when I am confronted with such unbusinesslike propositions as this I almost lose faith in the position I took on the 17th of June, when I followed the Secretary of the Treasury and the Public Health Department. But when I took that position I had no idea that with the Secretary's letter before me and before Congress that we had more than enough hospital facilities that he would immediately proceed or permit the Public Health Service to immediately proceed with this unprecedented speed for the acquisition of all these additional hospital facilities in the Southern States.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. AYRES. In view of all the gentleman has said, would he advise the House to vote for this amendment?

Mr. GOOD. I am compelled to ask the House to agree to the amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not desire to ask a question, but I do desire to ask the gentleman if he will yield me some time in opposition.

Mr. GOOD. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I want about 15 minutes.

Mr. GOOD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What would happen if this deficiency bill is not passed for a day or two or a week?

Mr. GOOD. This will happen; the same that has been happening, and that ought not to happen with congressional sanction, and that is the payment of money out of the Treasury of the United States when no appropriation has ever been made. The Constitution prohibits a thing of that kind, and this appropriation bill has been hung up for 10 days because the conferees could not agree upon Senate amendment 21. The deficiency bill carries the longevity pay for school-teachers and appropriations for other Government employees. The school-teachers are now leaving on their vacations. Certainly no one would justify action upon our part that would indefinitely hold up these appropriations. This bill carries many appropriations for worthy objects and should pass with as little delay as possible. It does not carry one dollar for these hospitals.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield? I am very much interested in what the gentleman has said, for he has put it in a very clear way. Could not the House by resolution extend these appropriations for 30 days and then this question to which the gentleman calls the attention of the House could be disposed of in a proper way?

Mr. GOOD. Of course, a continuing resolution could be enacted as applied to the sundry civil bill, but not as to the deficiency bill. The gentleman understands very well that we could never reach the items in the deficiency bill by a continuing resolution. And so far as the sundry civil bill is concerned that was enacted for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, it carries more than three times the amount that this bill carries; and if we were to continue one-twelfth of the appropriations in that bill for the month of July, this year, the waste that would result in that action alone would be sufficient to more than pay for the Speedway Hospital.

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

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This bill can not become a law until it is signed. Now, the Rules Committee should be on the job when we reconvene; and why could not a rule be brought in and the bill passed at that time, and not incur the risk of all this waste of money over the country.

Mr. GOOD. We propose to adjourn for one week and——

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then this bill can be signed and become a law.

Mr. GOOD. I have nothing to do with that. I understand the President's advisers feel that the President can cable his approval to these bills. I do not think so. But that is not up to the House. That is not the responsibility of the House. The responsibility of the House is to pass these appropriation bills before the beginning of the next fiscal year. Then if the

President is not here to sign them, and the money is not available to carry on the activities of the Government, the responsibility for the failure is not ours; it is the President's.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. True.

Mr. GOOD. And our responsibility does not end until we do that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And in the meantime this waste of $9,000,000 for hospitals will wait.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman must understand that neither of these appropriation bills carry any money for the hospitals. That money was all appropriated in the act of March 3, and what I have attempted in these bills is to get legislation to hold up all of the appropriations contained in the act of March 3. Part of this money has already been expended, and so far as every hospital described in the bill is concerned, excepting the Speedway Hospital, unquestionably the Government's obligation will be made for its acquisition very shortly unless the Rules Committee could be convened in order to report out a rule making in order the legislation which I have sought.

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

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. LEVER. As I understand the gentleman's position, he is unalterably opposed to amendment No. 21 as it now stands, but he finds himself in a situation in which he can not have what he thinks is a just proposition——

Mr. GOOD. No; I will say to the gentleman that I have been trying to make plain this one thing: I am objecting more to the proposition of building a hospital at Norfolk where there is no need for it; of building a hospital at Dawson Springs where they do not need it, with 1,000 beds available within a couple of weeks in the hospital at Louisville; of the building of a hospital in the District of Columbia, costing $550,000, where they do not need it, with the hospital at Perryville to be opened in a couple of weeks, and with the renting of Mount Alto Inn; of the purchase of a hospital at Corpus Christi, where, as I have completely demonstrated, there is absolutely no need for it. I say I am more opposed to the building of these hospitals where they do not need them than I am to the acquisition of the Speedway Hospital, where the Government has already incurred an obligation and where additional hospital facilities are unquestionably needed.

Mr. LEVER. The point I am trying to get at is this: I think the gentleman in his latter statement says he is not friendly to this entire proposition; that he made every effort to put himself into the position to do what he as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, handling the appropriations for the Congress, would be satisfied with, but that he finds that another committee of this House, controlled by an overwhelming majority of his party, on account of the lack of a quorum has absolutely hamstrung and hog-tied him.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman if he wants to bring that matter up that the Rules Committee met this afternoon. There was a quorum present until the members of the gentleman's own party refused to vote, and broke the quorum. [Applause on the Republican side.] It was not my party that broke the quorum and made it impossible to report out a rule. It was the action of the gentleman's party. I have been trying to keep politics out of this discussion. But, nevertheless, if the gentleman wants all of the facts known I am perfectly willing that they shall be known. And the facts are that it was the Democratic members of the Rules Committee that left the committee room and broke the quorum and prevented the reporting out of the rule.

Mr. LEVER. The Democrats are not in control of this Congress.

Mr. GOOD. That is true, but they have a responsibility, I think.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Had not the gentleman a quorum on his own side of the House, without depending on the Democrats, if the Republicans had been present?

Mr. GOOD. To be frank with the gentleman——

Mr. RAGSDALE. What is the number on the committee?

Mr. GOOD. Twelve.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Eight Republicans and four Democrats?

Mr. GOOD. That is my understanding.

Mr. RAGSDALE. If the Republicans had been there attending to their duties, a quorum would have been present.

Mr. GOOD. A quorum would have been present; yes. A quorum was present until that quorum was broken by the action of the Democratic members in leaving the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the gentleman from Iowa has made a most excellent speech against his own motion, and if one-half of what he says is true there is no excuse for your concurring in the Senate amendment. When this proposition was up before, the gentleman from Iowa on the floor of this House stated:

> I am not willing, while I occupy the position of chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to shirk my duty of trying to prevent an expenditure of an appropriation of $9,000,000 when the Secretary says to you and to me that he does not need it.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee has been in conference twice since that time. Certainly it is violating no confidence, and I make no mistake, when I say that in the last conference no serious argument was made by the House conferees in behalf of the position taken by the House by an overwhelming vote when this proposition was last considered here. It was stated that a substitute motion was to be offered here. I expected to vote for that substitute motion. And now, at this time, for some reason unknown to me, the chairman has suddenly changed his mind, and instead of saving, as he said he would, this $9,000,000, instead of preventing this extravagant expenditure, and for no reason other than that we may have a recess, he is asking you to reverse your position and vote for a proposition that he appealed to you to vote against just 10 days ago.

What reason is advanced? That the Rules Committee was not here. If members of the Rules Committee are absent today, they are not going to permanently remain away from this House. Why pass this bill to-night? What necessity demands it? Will we not be here to-morrow? Can we not get hold of the members of the Rules Committee? Can the bill be signed to-night? You and I know that it can not be. Will we advance one single step by passing this bill under the circumstances? You know that this bill can not be signed until next week, but for some unknown reason you are called upon to reverse your position and concur in this amendment. Now, what is it?

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] very unfairly and very inaccurately stated that the Secretary of the Treasury was anxious to build a hospital at some place in Virginia. He knew that was not so. He knew that it was no action of the Secretary of the Treasury that caused a hospital to be built there. This Congress passed a bill in the closing hours of the last session which directed the Secretary of the Treasury and the Public Health Service to build a hospital at Dawsonsprings, Ky.; Norfolk, Va.; and at other places. Now, is it fair to come in here and attribute this to the Secretary of the Treasury when he had nothing to do with it? The bill authorizing the construction of a hospital in Virginia was passed by you. The Secretary can only carry out the direction of Congress. Now, is it fair to make such an appeal here in order to induce you to stand for this proposition, which he has denounced time after time?

What was the provisions of that bill in so far as the Speedway Hospital is concerned? This Congress said to the Secretary of the Treasury, "You are to determine whether or not the proposition of the Speedway Hospital shall be accepted. You are to exercise that discretion." The Secretary of the Treasury called upon the Supervising Architect to ascertain whether it could be transformed into a hospital suitable for the Public Health Service. The Supervising Architect has not yet finally reported, but in his preliminary report he says it will cost $1,900,000 more than the Congress appropriated.

And while the Secretary, pursuant to the act of Congress, is endeavoring to determine whether or not the plans can be redrawn so as to bring the cost within the $3,000,000 limit the Senate inserts this amendment, which says, in effect, to the Secretary of the Treasury, "We told you to exercise your discretion. You say you are investigating the matter and that you want to protect the taxpayers of the country and do the right thing, but we, the Congress of the United States, take back from you the discretion we placed in you and, without having one bit of information, command you by this Senate amendment to accept this Speedway proposition. Will you do it?"

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman want an answer to the questions he has asked with reference to the charge against the Secretary of the Treasury of hastening these buildings?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then I will answer it this way: The gentleman knows perfectly well that when we passed the bill at the former session of Congress it was put up to you and to me on your side that if we did not pass it we would be judged to be against the interests of the wounded soldiers, and you know now that that statement was not correct.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Did you vote for it?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I was opposed to it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Did you vote against it?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. There was no opportunity for me to vote.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Why wasn't there? Who disfranchised you in this House? [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Do you say on your side that we were not willing to provide for the soldiers?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I am not talking about that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; you are not talking about that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend a moment. Gentlemen must observe the rules of the House and not address each other in the second person.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Both sides of the House clamored for that Public Health Service hospital bill. Gentlemen on that side of the House advocated it. We all know they did, as did gentlemen on this side of the House. My friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] properly said, in closing that debate, in opposing it, that "gentlemen were looking after the interests of the back yards of their districts instead of the interests of the taxpayers of the United States." That was true. He said it, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] said so, and I agree with him. But the difference between us is that he deserts our cause and now wants to concur in this amendment which he has up to this moment opposed. You were right then if you opposed it and you are wrong now if you favor it.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman is addressing the gentleman from Iowa personally.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I was addressing my good friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and all other gentlemen on this side of the House.

The SPEAKER. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. DENISON. The point of order is that the gentleman from South Carolina was addressing the gentleman from Iowa in a personal way.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I have no desire to be personal. I want to call attention to another thing here. Senate amendment No. 21 provides that $1,500,000 that never was available to buy lands on which to construct hospitals before this shall, by this provision, be made available for new construction, and I understand the object is to have a new hospital built at Colorado Springs, Colo. The gentleman from Iowa says there is no necessity for it and yet moves to concur. There is no necessity for it. In the original bill it was called an emergency fund, and it was put in there for the purpose of enabling them to take over some hotel property that might be used, when the clamor was made that we did not have sufficient beds to take care of wounded soldiers and sailors, and now when there is no necessity for it, and the gentleman from Iowa proves to you we have thousands of beds that we have no use for, he moves to make this million and a half available for new construction.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I can not yield.

Mr. TINCHER. Just for a question.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I regret I can not yield. At this time when there is no necessity, the Senate puts in here a provision making available for the purchase of land and the construction of new buildings that emergency fund of $1,500,000, and while you are here condemning extravagance, you are to-night going to be extravagant to the extent of $1,500,000 more than was the Congress in the closing days of the last session. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] criticizes that bill as extravagance. It was. But even that bill did not make this $1,500,000 available for new construction, and he now proposes to do that.

After arguing that none of these hospitals are needed, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] asks you to agree to build the Speedway Hospital, and then for good measure to spend a million and a half of dollars in addition to what he says you have already thrown away. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] will plead for economy, and then the chairman of the Appropriations Committee will plead with you to forsake your economy. I care not what may be said here; I appeal to the gentlemen on this side of the House not to vote to concur in this Senate amendment. The Secretary of the Treasury has made an honest effort to protect the taxpayers of the country against this raid. He is doing his best to comply with the act of Congress. If the original act was unwise legislation, then repeal it. You can bring your Committee on Rules together here next week. Repeal that bill, if you will, but do not pretend that we are trying to save money and then throw away a million and a half in this item and $4,000,000 on the Speedway Hospital. That is the queerest appeal for economy that I ever listened to. I appeal to gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House. You said to the Secretary of the Treasury, "We commission you to go and investigate this matter. We rely on you to protect the interests of the taxpayers." He is doing that. Now you are going to say to him, "We gave you that discretion, we believe you are honestly trying to exercise it, but you are not going to put a hospital in somebody's back yard," as my good friend from Illinois says, "and therefore we take it away from you, and without knowing a single thing about it, we vote to throw away the people's money here to-night"?

I appeal to you not to adopt the motion to concur. Let us go back into conference. You know the unwritten law of conference. The House proposing the legislation on an appropriation bill should recede. This is legislation on an appropriation bill. If an honest, firm effort is made the Senate will recede on this proposition. I stake my reputation that this House will never forgive itself if it indulges in the extravagance asked for by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to-night. Following his leadershp you overwhelmingly voted against this amendment. Do not stultify yourselves. Stand by him as he stood two weeks ago and not as he stands to-night. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will ask the gentleman for some time.

Mr. GOOD. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this is the strangest situation, the most remarkable exhibition I have ever witnessed during the over ten years that I have been a member of this House. The Secretary of the Treasury of the United States comes before Congress and says to you, on pages 1312 and 1313 of its CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, 1919, that the Public Health Service does not need any more hospitals; that there are some 15,000 idle beds now in good hospitals, and that there will soon be 30,000 idle beds. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. GOOD] made a magnificent, patriotic, splendid speech on this floor on June 17, saying that you would be absolutely throwing away $9,000,000 if you agreed to this identical Senate amendment No. 21. The House stood by him by a vote of 219 to 92. On page 1310 of the RECORD of that day he said:

> Let us keep in mind that during the next two years, without repealing a single tax law in the United States, you will expend all the money provided for by taxation and you will have to borrow more than $7,000,000,000 to pay the actual expenses of the Government, and because of the war, and I want to present this matter to you as a business proposition. I am embarrassed in presenting it. Chicago is at my front door, 200 miles from my home, and I have as much interest in the soldiers of Iowa and in seeing that they get proper hospital facilities as any man from Kentucky or Tennessee can possibly have in the discharged soldiers from his State, but I am not willing while I occupy the position of chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to shirk my duty of trying to prevent an expenditure of an appropriation of $9,000,000 when the Secretary says to you and me that he does not need it.
>
> Fifteen thousand beds to-day to accommodate less than 2,500 honorably discharged soldiers and sailors! Just think of that, and that we are seriously thinking of ordering more hospitals. We have just concluded hearing the Bureau of Public Health, and they say that next year they estimate they will have about 10,000 of these soldiers and sailors in the hospitals at one time, and the Secretary of the Treasury says that more than 30,000 beds will be available without building a single additional hospital, without taking over the hospital in Boston, without occupying the hospital in Pennsylvania, and I have no doubt that there are a great many of these hospitals that will be available. While I am willing to appropriate any sum to care for these honorably discharged soldiers and sailors, I am not willing to vote to take out of an empty Treasury $9,000,000 to build hospitals for which we have no need——
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> There are, or soon will be, more than 30,000 beds available for the Public Health Service to take care of these boys that are discharged from the Army and naval service of the United States; and if these hospitals are filled, as estimated by the Surgeon General in the Public Health Service, you will have only 10,000 men for 30,000 beds. [Applause.] And seriously you ask here that an appropriation of $9,000,000, wrung from the taxpayers, who are getting very weary of paying taxes, shall now be expended in the doing of what? The building of more hospitals in the United States.

And in the face of that speech the chairman now comes back here and asks this House to absolutely stultify itself and brazenly throw away $9,000,000 of the people's money. It seems to me if you now reverse yourself and adopt this Senate amendment you are making a mockery of economy and a mockery of the rights of the people by flagrantly squandering their money.

I do not care where the money goes for these hospitals, whether it is North or South or East or West, we have no right to profligately waste it for hospitals we do not need, and it is an outrage to jam this infamous Senate amendment through in this way and try to cram it down our throats to-night. I am

not surprised at the members of the Committee on Rules absenting themselves. It seems to me they are amply justified in hiding out, if they are, when you try to force upon them a rule which permits this kind of thing. For these reasons I feel that this House, if you force the Treasury to squander $9,000,000, will simply disgrace itself before the American people, and with your eyes wide open. There is no use trying to make an excuse by saying that because there is some waste of money somewhere else you are justified in coming here and throwing away $9,000,000 more. That is what it means, and there is no use shirking it or trying to explain it. It seems to me the very explanation of the chairman of the committee is sufficient to condemn the matter and to make every honest man on the floor of this House vote against this amendment, and I certainly hope they will. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, my young friend from South Carolina is always eloquent, sometimes he is funny, and he was very funny to-night as he endeavored to persuade gentlemen on this side of the House that we were squandering the public money. Why? Because we are proposing out of the great sums of money that are to be spent for hospitals to have one good one, one fine, first-class, up-to-date, fireproof hospital, splendidly located in the largest city in the interior of the country. That is the indictment of the gentleman from South Carolina. He is not satisfied, apparently, because all of the hospitals are not along the Mexican border and down among the rivers and bayous of the south Atlantic coast.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will—I have only five minutes—if the gentleman will be very brief.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Does the gentleman know that under this bill the hospital had to be built at Chicago; either a new one or this Hines hospital taken over?

Mr. MONDELL. I knew that.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. And then it makes no difference whether you kill this or not, the hospital will be built.

Mr. MONDELL. Apparently, it will not if the Secretary of the Treasury can divert the money from that hospital elsewhere.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I defy the gentleman to name a single case where he has ever diverted any money.

Mr. MONDELL. When this matter first came before the House I said on the record as it then stood I did not believe we could afford to agree to the Senate amendment. I agreed with the gentleman from Iowa that all this hospital construction should be held up until we could investigate it. Gentlemen on the other side refused to allow us to do that, and we must either accept the Senate amendment or this deficiency bill, carrying many millions that are so badly needed, will fail. At the same time I made that statement I said I did not think the House could afford to vote for the amendment on the record, but that I had mental reservations as to the truth of the record. I could have put it very much stronger than that; I did not entirely believe that record and I do not now.

I believe now, as I believed then, that the Speedway Hospital was a first-class proposition, but I have preferred not to compel the Secretary to take it while he was making statements adverse to it without giving an opportunity for examination. You gentlemen on the other side would not give an opportunity for examination, so we will take the hospital. This hospital has been approved on several occasions by the Public Health Service and by officials close to the Secretary of the Treasury. It is a splendid building. There is not a finer one for hospital purposes anywhere. It will not cost $1,900,000 to complete it. It might cost $1,900,000 to build the buildings that the Public Health Service said they would like to have in connection with it. They could just as well say it would cost $10,000,000 more for additional buildings that could be built in the vicinity.

Mr. SCHALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. SCHALL. The hospital is 60 per cent completed now and the claim against the Government in equity would be equivalent to that amount of money. It is not a question of throwing money away, but of conserving the hospital, which is 60 per cent completed.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know how far it is completed. I know that it is a magnificent building, splendidly adapted to the purposes, and it will not cost $1,900,000 to complete it unless we want to add many buildings to it. This Speedway Hospital is in the very center of the country where there are thousands and tens of thousands of men needing hospital facilities. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to proceed for three minutes, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], which impugned my motive. I ask to be allowed to say a word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has control of the floor, and has already yielded three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Then I ask that I may have three minutes after the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can present his claims to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Speaker, I simply rise to clear up what I believe to be a misapprehension on the part of the House. I want to say that when this bill was first passed I was opposed to it, and I wrote a minority report, in which I opposed the passage of the bill, because I believed then and believe now that it was not necessary to build these hospitals, but the bill was passed. This is the situation regarding the Speedway Hospital in Chicago: The War Department authorized, through its officials, the construction of this building. They were in a big hurry for it. At that time they believed they needed the building. The war had not yet ended, and work was begun upon it before the blue prints were even complete. The contractors were rushed on this work. This is the proposition now before us: The War Department is not going to need the hospital, and suspended work on it last fall. In the hospital bill passed on March 3 we provided for a hospital in Chicago, to be used by the Public Health Service. I understand that the Treasury Department feels that a hospital is needed in Chicago, and under the provisions of the hospital bill they are permitted to erect one, not to exceed a limit of cost of $3,000,000. This amendment directs the Secretary of the Treasury to take over and use the hospital which has been partially constructed and is now 60 per cent completed. Here is a photograph of the building. It is under roof.

The windows are all in, but it is not partitioned off. This hospital can be completed for two and a half million dollars and can be equipped for $500,000 as it was originally intended by the War Department it should be equipped, all within a total limit of cost of $3,000,000. I really do not believe the cost need exceed $2,500,000. The building is larger than is necessary, and the only thing they need is the power plant. They can use part of the hospital building for administration purposes, and need not erect a separate building for this purpose. Here is the whole proposition. By accepting this amendment we are directing the Secretary of the Treasury to take the building that was contracted for by the Secretary of War for the War Department.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KREIDER. No; I can not yield. I have only three minutes.

If the proposition could come before the House, as has been advocated by the chairman, Mr. GOOD, that all building on all of the hospitals should be suspended and the building of all the hospitals be referred to a committee to pass on the need of these hospitals, then there is a possibility of saving $9,000,000; but this amendment does not involve the expenditure of any such sum as $9,000,000, and it is only a question whether you want to settle with the contractors on a salvage basis or direct the Secretary of the Treasury to use this building for the Public Health Service. I think there is no question but that we are building more hospitals than are actually needed; yet it seems, under the circumstances, that if we are going to have a hospital in Chicago we should use the building which has been constructed. It will be cheaper and more sensible than to construct another.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, reference has been made to the possibility of a hospital being purchased or built in Colorado, and that my State is an ideal place for one. There is no question but what Colorado is the best place in the world for a hospital, especially a tubercular hospital, and I would, of course, be delighted to have the Public Health Service select Colorado for its site of a large modern general hospital. But I do not want a hospital in my State bad enough to vote for a $9,000,000 raid on the Treasury like this, no matter where it is put.

If there was an emergency for hospitals when we passed the emergency appropriation for them on March 3 last, the Public Health Service ought to have gone ahead and purchased and used them. But now that they have waited four months and now learn that they don't need any, I am not in favor of forcing them to build any more.

My objection to the bill is placed on what the chairman of the committee himself said here on the 10th. It was an appropriation of $9,000,000 of money that he said was absolutely unnecessary, and the Secretary of the Treasury also said it was absolutely unnecessary, and they submitted figures to show it was utterly unnecessary, and this House voted that it was unnecessary. I feel we can not go before the country and honestly claim that we are trying to economize and save money for the taxpayers in the face of the Treasury Department reporting that $9,000,000 is unnecessary, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee vigorously reporting it as unnecessary.

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

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] did not intend to make a misstatement in regard to this matter, because he does not indulge in that sort of thing. But I think he misspoke himself when he said that this Senate amendment would take $1,500,000 out of the Treasury. Neither part of this amendment appropriates a dollar out of the Treasury of the United States. The appropriation for the hospitals was carried in the act of March 3, 1919, and all of these hospitals were specified, excepting only the hospital or hospital facilities to be acquired under the provision of the second part of Senate amendment No. 21. The act of March 3 did carry $1,500,000 as an emergency fund for the purchase of land and buildings suitable for hospital and sanatoria purposes. The second part of Senate amendment No. 21 changes the language so as to permit the purchase of land and the construction of a building suitable for hospital and sanatoria purposes. The only difference in that respect is that by the terms of the original act the Secretary could buy land and buildings suitable for hospital purposes, whereas by the terms of the amendment he may buy the land and construct the building. But in neither case is it mandatory on the Secretary of the Treasury to expend this $1,500,000 if it is unnecessary. I understand it is intended to expend this appropriation of $1,500,000 at some point in Colorado for a tuberculosis hospital, and I want to commend the selection of Colorado for a tuberculosis hospital as contrasted with the location of one in Kentucky.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Why did not the gentleman say so?

Mr. GOOD. I have said so, and all amendment No. 21 does is to give the Secretary of the Treasury the right to locate such hospital wherever he pleases, and it does not appropriate a single dollar out of the Treasury of the United States.

Now, a word more regarding the Speedway Hospital. I can well understand how the friends of the Speedway project should urge the adoption of Senate amendment No. 21. The speed with which the Public Health Service is rushing the acquisition of these fireproof hospitals in the South, where they have plenty of wooden hospitals just as good as the one at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, coupled with the suggestion that the wooden hospital at Chicago will be sufficient for two years, might well cause apprehension that the $3,000,000 appropriated for the Speedway Hospital may, if that hospital is not acquired, be expended in the construction of additional fireproof hospitals elsewhere. The letter of the Secretary of the Treasury which so plainly pointed out that there was no need for additional hospitals for the Public Health Service ought to have been a sufficient argument to the Public Health Service to postpone the acquisition of hospital facilities. But such was not the case. With all possible haste they are condemning land in Norfolk on which to build a $900,000 hospital, preparing plans for building a $1,500,000 hospital at Dawsonsprings, Ky., the Secretary himself wants authority to buy land in the District of Columbia on which to build a $550,000 hospital, and already he has expended $140,000 for a fireproof hospital at Corpus Christi, Tex.

Mr. AYRES rose.

Mr. GOOD. No; I can not yield. At Dawsonsprings title has already been acquired to about 5,000 acres of land on which to build this hospital for the treatment of tubercular patients. I have asked the Rules Committee for a rule making in order an amendment to Senate amendment No. 21 providing that no part of the money appropriated by the act of March 3 shall be expended and no obligations incurred for hospital facilities until after a congressional investigation and report. A quorum being broken in the Rules Committee, the question is whether the House shall longer hold up this great appropriation bill until a quorum of the Rules Committee can be had in order to favorably report a rule making in order legislation that affects an appropriation of the last Congress.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Just for a question.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest——

Mr. GOOD. I yielded for a question.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. I want to ask the gentleman this: I voted with the gentleman before because the gentleman convinced me he was right. Now, what has happened since that time that convinced the gentleman that he was wrong? What has taken place to make the gentleman change his position since his last argument?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I have not changed my mind upon this subject, and if I have changed my position at all I believe the facts in the case that I have already detailed sufficiently justify it. Let me call the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. NICHOLLS] to the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury, over his own signature, approved the Speedway Hospital since the act of March 3. He disapproves it now. There is at least, therefore, high authority for any change that has come about in my own position. I will say to the gentleman that I have been forced to change my position in order to pass these appropriation bills. Unless I agreed to bring up the deficiency bill, objection would be made by the gentleman's side of the House to consider the sundry civil bill, carrying $604,000,000. This is the last day of the fiscal year. Unless we pass the sundry civil bill to-night, the various departments of the Government receiving their funds through the sundry civil appropriation bill will not have one dollar with which to transact business on to-morrow. I have attempted to secure unanimous consent to bring up the appropriation bill, and objection has been made on the gentleman's side of the House unless I would also agree to bring up the deficiency bill. The conference report on the deficiency bill has been agreed to; the only thing in dispute is Senate amendment No. 21. The Senate refuses to yield, and the only thing the House can do is to recede from its disagreement and agree to Senate amendment No. 21. Humiliated as I have been because of the failure of the Rules Committee to report out a rule, and actuated only by a desire to pass the appropriation bills within the limit of time, I have been forced to take this position. I believe, under these circumstances, the House should recede and concur in this amendment.

Certainly if it is necessary to replace the wooden hospitals in the South with concrete buildings, where hospital facilities are not needed, should not the same policy be followed in the acquiring of hospital facilities in the vicinity of Chicago, where everybody admits additional hospital facilites are needed. If a wooden hospital is too great a fire hazard in Kentucky, and Virginia, and Texas, and the District of Columbia in which to house our discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, is it too much to say that that kind of a hospital is too great a fire hazard if located in the city of Chicago? Inasmuch as we are unable to secure a rule that will tie up the entire fund and prevent the making of additional contracts, then I submit there is really no use in trying to have this department of the Government attempt the practice of economy in the expenditure of money for hospital facilities. Nothing that we can do, of course, will save the money that has already been expended or obligated for these hospitals in Texas, in Virginia, and in Dawsonsprings. My reading of the hearings before the Senate committee has convinced me that a prejudice exists by some one in the War Department against the Speedway Hospital, and I am inclined to think this prejudice extends also to the Treasury Department, though perhaps not for the same reason. But as to that I have no concern. My only purpose in offering this motion is to secure the enactment to-night of the sundry civil bill. On the floor of the House I promised the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] that if we were permitted to take up the sundry civil bill under unanimous consent and pass it I would then call up the third deficiency bill. The sundry civil bill has been disposed of with that agreement, and I now move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 21 and agree to the same. I feel I have been entirely justified in this course. While I regret, of course, that a rule could not be had tying up the entire appropriation contained in the act of March 3, I do not believe I would be further justified in asking the House to still further insist upon its disagreement in view of the entire situation.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the gentleman has abused the Rules Committee, can he give me a little bit of time?

Mr. GOOD. I have used all my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has only one minute remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. I can say all I want to say in that time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 134, nays 91, answered "present" 7, not voting 198, as follows:

YEAS—134.

Anderson	Esch	Lea, Calif.	Ricketts
Andrews, Md.	Focht	Little	Riddick
Andrews, Nebr.	French	Lonergan	Robsion, Ky.
Barbour	Garner	Luhring	Rodenberg
Barkley	Glynn	McArthur	Rose
Bee	Good	McGlennon	Rouse
Benham	Goodykoontz	McKeown	Rowe
Bowers	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, Ind.
Briggs	Green, Iowa	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Schall
Brooks, Ill.	Griest	MacCrate	Scott
Brooks, Pa.	Griffin	MacGregor	Siegel
Browning	Hadley	Magee	Sinnott
Burke	Hamilton	Mapes	Slemp
Campbell, Pa.	Haskell	Mason	Smith, Idaho
Cannon	Hawley	Miller	Smith, Ill
Chindblom	Hays	Minahan, N. J.	Smith, Mich.
Christopherson	Hernandez	Monahan, Wis.	Summers, Wash.
Classon	Hersey	Mondell	Sweet
Cleary	Hickey	Montague	Thomas
Coady	Hicks	Moore, Pa.	Thompson, Ohio
Cramton	Hoch	Moores, Ind.	Timberlake
Crowther	Holland	Morgan	Tincher
Cullen	Hudspeth	Mott	Towner
Currie, Mich.	Hull, Iowa	Newton, Minn.	Vestal
Curry, Calif.	Ireland	Newton, Mo.	Volgt
Darrow	Jefferis	Nolan	Volstead
Dempsey	Juul	Ogden	Wason
Denison	Kelley, Mich.	Parrish	Watson, Pa.
Dunbar	Kennedy, Iowa	Platt	Watson, Va.
Dupré	Kincheloe	Radcliffe	Webster
Dyer	Kinkaid	Rainey, J. W.	Williams
Echols	Kreider	Ramseyer	Wood, Ind.
Elliott	Layton	Reed, W. Va.	
Elston	Lazaro	Rhodes	

NAYS—91.

Alexander	Evans, Mont.	Lanham	Sears
Almon	Evans, Nebr.	Lankford	Small
Aswell	Ferris	Larsen	Smithwick
Ayres	Fisher	Lee, Ga.	Steagall
Bankhead	Foster	Lesher	Stephens, Miss.
Black	Gard	Lever	Stevenson
Bland, Mo.	Garrett	McDuffie	Strong, Kans.
Blanton	Goodwin, Ark.	McFadden	Sumners, Tex.
Box	Graham, Pa.	McPherson	Taylor, Ark.
Brand	Hardy, Tex.	Mays	Taylor, Colo.
Brinson	Hastings	Michener	Tillman
Byrnes, S. C.	Hayden	Nelson, Mo.	Venable
Byrns, Tenn.	Howard	Nicholls, S. C.	Vinson
Campbell, Kans.	Huddleston	Oliver	Walsh
Candler	Hull, Tenn.	Overstreet	Watkins
Clark, Mo.	Humphreys	Padgett	Weaver
Collier	Igoe	Park	Welty
Crisp	Jacoway	Quin	Wilson, La.
Dale	James	Ragsdale	Wingo
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Tex.	Raker	Woods, Va.
Dominick	Kitchin	Rayburn	Wright
Drane	Kraus	Romjue	Young, N. Dak.
Edmonds	LaGuardia	Rubey	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Bell	Burroughs	Harrison	Kearns
Booher	Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Wash.	

NOT VOTING—198.

Ackerman	Doremus	Johnson, Ky.	Morin
Anthony	Doughton	Johnson, Miss.	Mudd
Ashbrook	Dowell	Johnson, S. Dak.	Murphy
Babka	Dunn	Johnston, N. Y.	Neely
Bacharach	Eagan	Jones, Pa.	Nelson, Wis.
Baer	Eagle	Kahn	Nichols, Mich.
Begg	Ellsworth	Kelly, Pa.	O'Connell
Benson	Emerson	Kendall	O'Connor
Blackmon	Evans, Nev.	Kennedy, R. I.	Oldfield
Bland, Ind.	Fairfield	Kettner	Olney
Bland, Va.	Fess	Kiess	Osborne
Boies	Fields	King	Paige
Britten	Fitzgerald	Kleczka	Parker
Browne	Flood	Knutson	Pell
Brumbaugh	Fordney	Lampert	Peters
Buchanan	Frear	Langley	Phelan
Burdick	Freeman	Lehlbach	Porter
Butler	Fuller, Ill.	Linthicum	Pou
Caldwell	Fuller, Mass.	Longworth	Purnell
Cantrill	Gallagher	Luce	Rainey, H. T.
Caraway	Gallivan	Lufkin	Ramsey
Carew	Gandy	McAndrews	Randall, Calif.
Carss	Ganly	McClintic	Randall, Wis.
Carter	Garland	McCulloch	Reavis
Casey	Godwin, N. C.	McKenzie	Reber
Clark, Fla.	Goldfogle	McKiniry	Reed, N. Y.
Cole	Goodall	McKinley	Riordan
Connally	Gould	McLane	Robinson, N. C.
Cooper	Greene, Mass.	Madden	Rogers
Copley	Greene, Vt.	Maher	Rowan
Costello	Hamill	Major	Rucker
Crago	Hardy, Colo.	Mann	Sabath
Dallinger	Haugen	Mansfield	Sanders, La.
Davey	Heflin	Martin	Sanders, N. Y.
Dent	Hersman	Mead	Sanford
Dewalt	Hill	Merritt	Saunders, Va.
Dickinson, Mo.	Houghton	Moon	Scully
Dickinson, Iowa	Hulings	Mooney	Sells
Donovan	Husted	Moore, Ohio	Sherwood
Dooling	Hutchinson	Moore, Va.	Shreve
Sims	Stiness	Vaile	Wilson, Ill.
Sinclair	Strong, Pa.	Vare	Wilson, Pa.
Sisson	Sullivan	Walters	Winslow
Smith, N. Y.	Taylor, Tenn.	Ward	Wise
Snell	Temple	Webb	Woodyard
Snyder	Thompson, Okla.	Welling	Yates
Stedman	Tilson	Whaley	Young, Tex.
Steele	Tinkham	Wheeler	Zihlman
Steenerson	Treadway	White, Kans.	
Stephens, Ohio	Upshaw	White, Me.	

So the motion to recede and concur was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota (for) with Mr. SISSON (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. DOWELL with Mr. HERSMAN.

Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. WELLING.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I wish to withdraw that vote and vote "present."

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote "yea."

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

Mr. KEARNS. No. I just came into the Hall.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. KEARNS. I wish to be recorded as "present."

Mr. BURROUGHS. Mr. Speaker, I was not here in time to vote, but I will record my vote as "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. GOOD, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I also move to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report on the sundry civil bill was agreed to and move to lay that on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the same request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to the extension of remarks by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. Are they his remarks on this bill?

Mr. MASON. I decline to recognize the gentleman from Arkansas on that question, although I will recognize him on any other. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas reserves the right to object.

Mr. MASON. He did not do so in time.

Mr. WINGO. I was in the back of the Hall, and there was some confusion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he is entitled to reserve the right to object. The Chair put it quickly.

Mr. WINGO. Of course, if the gentleman will decline to state to the House what it is, I shall object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] at present, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] later.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL JULY 8, 1919.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 17.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Tuesday, the 1st day of July, 1919, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock, meridian, on Tuesday, the 8th day of July, 1919.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, in presenting this resolution I do it in the hope that the bills which passed the two bodies may be engrossed and signed before we adjourn to-night. In fact, they must be signed before we adjourn, and I hope that all gentlemen will remain here until the hour of adjournment, as the point of no quorum is likely to be raised at any time. I hope that if we all remain here the House may adjourn within an hour or an hour and a half at the latest.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman what he wants with this resolution? What is the reason for the resolution?

Mr. MONDELL. In order to secure an adjournment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know, but what do you want with an adjournment?

Mr. MONDELL. I supposed the gentleman from Missouri wanted an adjournment for a week.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I do not. I would like to have one for two or three or four months. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. That would please many of us, but unfortunately the public business requires attention, and a week seemed to be about the longest time that we could adjourn in good conscience at this time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why do you want to adjourn at all now? Is there not any business to be transacted?

Mr. MONDELL. I have no consuming desire to adjourn personally. I expect to remain here. For one thing I would not want the House to adjourn beyond the coming return to our shores of our dear President. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He will be here before that. He will be here before the week is up, or in 10 days.

Mr. MONDELL. Not long before the week is up; only long enough to get accustomed to the White House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is there no public business to transact? This House is not through with its business, is it?

Mr. MONDELL. The motion to adjourn will not be made until the House has completed its business and until the bills that have been passed shall have been signed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know; but that is not the question I asked of you. Have you no more business that you are going to transact at this session, or undertake to transact?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, yes; a very considerable amount of business. We have a very important piece of legislation, as the gentleman from Missouri knows, awaiting our return, reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, to enforce war-time and constitutional prohibition.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does it come in in two pieces or one?

Mr. MONDELL. I understand it is in tandem at present—three in one, as it were.

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

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER. A great many gentlemen have asked me the question, and I should like to ask the gentleman from Wyoming. He proposes to stay here and continue to transact business—such business as may come before the House—while the Senate is considering the treaty, I presume?

Mr. MONDELL. That is our present thought. Of course, that is for the House to determine after we get back and dispose of the matters that will require our immediate attention.

Mr. GARNER. I was just trying to ascertain when it is likely that there will be a recess—whether in the fall or in mid-summer?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman is seeking my opinion, I would say that I think the House will be quite busy for some considerable time after we reconvene.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAKER) there were—ayes 155, noes 54.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-six Members present, a quorum.

Mr. RAKER. I withdraw the point.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 134, nays 90, answered "present" 4, not voting 202, as follows:

YEAS—134.

Anderson	Denison	Hickey	McLaughlin, Mich.
Andrews, Md.	Dunbar	Hicks	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Andrews, Nebr.	Dyer	Hoch	McPherson
Barbour	Echols	Holland	MacCrate
Benham	Edmonds	Hull, Iowa	MacGregor
Bowers	Elliott	Humphreys	Mapes
Brooks, Ill.	Elston	Ireland	Miller
Brooks, Pa.	Esch	Jefferis	Minahan, N. J.
Browning	Evans, Nebr.	Johnson, Wash.	Monahan, Wis.
Burke	Focht	Juul	Mondell
Burroughs	Foster	Kelley, Mich.	Montague
Campbell, Kans.	French	Kennedy, Iowa	Moore, Pa.
Campbell, Pa.	Gard	Kinkaid	Moores, Ind.
Cannon	Garner	Kitchin	Morgan
Chindblom	Garrett	Kraus	Mott
Christopherson	Glynn	Kreider	Newton, Minn.
Classon	Goodykoontz	LaGuardia	Newton, Mo.
Cleary	Graham, Ill.	Layton	Nicholls, S. C.
Coady	Griest	Lea, Calif.	Nolan
Cramton	Hadley	Little	Ogden
Crowther	Hamilton	Lonergan	Platt
Cullen	Haskell	Luhring	Radcliffe
Curry, Calif.	Hawley	McAndrews	Rainey, J. W.
Darrow	Hernandez	McArthur	Ramseyer
Dempsey	Hersey	McFadden	Reed, W. Va.
Rhodes	Siegel	Thompson, Ohio	Watson, Pa.
Ricketts	Sinnott	Timberlake	Watson, Va.
Riddick	Slemp	Tincher	Webster
Robsion, Ky.	Smith, Idaho	Towner	White, Kans.
Rodenberg	Smith, Ill.	Vestal	Williams
Rose	Smith, Mich.	Voigt	Woods, Va.
Rowe	Summers, Wash.	Volstead	Young, N. Dak.
Sanders, Ind.	Sweet	Walsh	
Schall	Thomas	Wason	

NAYS—90.

Alexander	Dowell	Larsen	Rubey
Almon	Dupré	Lazaro	Scott
Aswell	Evans, Mont.	Lee, Ga.	Sears
Ayres	Ferris	Lesher	Small
Bankhead	Fisher	Lever	Smithwick
Barkley	Goodwin, Ark.	McDuffie	Stephens, Miss.
Bee	Green, Iowa	McGlennon	Stevenson
Black	Griffin	McKeown	Strong, Kans.
Bland, Mo.	Hardy, Tex.	Magee	Sumners, Tex.
Blanton	Hastings	Major	Taylor, Ark.
Box	Hayden	Mays	Taylor, Colo.
Brand	Howard	Michener	Tillman
Briggs	Huddleston	Nelson, Mo.	Venable
Brinson	Hudspeth	Padgett	Vinson
Byrns, Tenn.	Hull, Tenn.	Park	Watkins
Candler	Igoe	Parrish	Weaver
Clark, Mo.	Jacoway	Quin	Welty
Collier	James	Ragsdale	Wilson, La.
Crisp	Jones, Tex.	Raker	Wingo
Currie, Mich.	Kearns	Randall, Calif.	Wood, Ind.
Dale	Kincheloe	Rayburn	Wright
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Romjue	
Dominick	Lankford	Rouse	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Bell	Booher	Davis, Minn.	Harrison

NOT VOTING—202.

Ackerman	Fess	Longworth	Rowan
Anthony	Fields	Luce	Rucker
Ashbrook	Fitzgerald	Lufkin	Sabath
Babka	Flood	McClintic	Sanders, La.
Bacharach	Fordney	McCulloch	Sanders, N. Y.
Baer	Frear	McKenzie	Sanford
Begg	Freeman	McKiniry	Saunders, Va.
Benson	Fuller, Ill.	McKinley	Scully
Blackmon	Fuller, Mass.	McLane	Sells
Bland, Ind.	Gallagher	Madden	Sherwood
Bland, Va.	Gallivan	Maher	Shreve
Boies	Gandy	Mann	Sims
Britten	Ganly	Mansfield	Sinclair
Browne	Garland	Martin	Sisson
Brumbaugh	Godwin, N. C.	Mason	Smith, N. Y.
Buchanan	Goldfogle	Mead	Snell
Burdick	Good	Merritt	Snyder
Butler	Goodall	Moon	Steagall
Byrnes, S. C.	Gould	Mooney	Stedman
Caldwell	Graham, Pa.	Moore, Ohio	Steele
Cantrill	Greene, Mass.	Moore, Va.	Steenerson
Caraway	Greene, Vt.	Morin	Stephens, Ohio
Carew	Hamill	Mudd	Stiness
Carss	Hardy, Colo.	Murphy	Strong, Pa.
Carter	Haugen	Neely	Sullivan
Casey	Hays	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Tenn.
Clark, Fla.	Heflin	Nichols, Mich.	Temple
Cole	Hersman	O'Connell	Thompson, Okla.
Connally	Hill	O'Connor	Tilson
Cooper	Houghton	Oldfield	Tinkham
Copley	Hulings	Oliver	Treadway
Costello	Husted	Olney	Upshaw
Crago	Hutchinson	Osborne	Vaile
Dallinger	Johnson, Ky.	Overstreet	Vare
Davey	Johnson, Miss.	Paige	Walters
Dent	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parker	Ward
Dewalt	Johnston, N. Y.	Pell	Webb
Dickinson, Mo.	Jones, Pa.	Peters	Welling
Dickinson, Iowa	Kahn	Phelan	Whaley
Donovan	Kelly, Pa.	Porter	Wheeler
Dooling	Kendall	Pou	White, Me.
Doremus	Kennedy, R. I.	Purnell	Wilson, Ill.
Doughton	Kettner	Rainey, H. T.	Wilson, Pa.
Drane	Kiess	Ramsey	Winslow
Dunn	King	Randall, Wis.	Wise
Eagan	Kleczka	Reavis	Woodyard
Eagle	Knutson	Reber	Yates
Ellsworth	Lampert	Reed, N. Y.	Young, Tex.
Emerson	Langley	Riordan	Zihlman
Evans, Nev.	Lehlbach	Robinson, N. C.	
Fairfield	Linthicum	Rogers	

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. COLE with Mr. HERSMAN.

Mr. JONES with Mr. CARTER.

Mr. HAYS with Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. CARAWAY.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I would like to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I was not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LANDING OF THE PILGRIMS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following appointments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pursuant to House concurrent resolution No. 14, providing for the appointment of a joint special committee to confer with officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relative to the contemplated observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims, the Chair appoints as the four members on the part of the House: Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCARTHUR, Mr. DOREMUS, and Mr. WHALEY.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BABKA, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for to-day on account of official business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. CRISP, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies the papers in the case of E. F. Ellis, Sixty-fifth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

The SPEAKER. On the bill H. R. 3184, the water-power bill, the previous question has been ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the last amendment repealing section 18 of the river and harbor bill.

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

There was no demand for a separate vote on the other amendments, and they were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California demands a separate vote on the amendment repealing section 18 of the river and harbor bill of August 8, 1917.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAKER) there were 122 ayes and 8 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

On motion of Mr. ESCH, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD on this last amendment repealing section 18 of the river and harbor bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may correct the title to conform with the text.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman wants to extend his remarks on the Speedway Hospital matter?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RECESS.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess for 10 minutes.

AFTER THE RECESS.

The recess having expired, at 11 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m. the House was called to order by the Speaker.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment House concurrent resolution 17.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 4631. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River, at or near Blackmans Point, in said county and State;

H. R. 5227. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4226. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4630. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River, near the Texas & Pacific Railroad bridge, in said county and State;

H. R. 6176. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3478. An an act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. On what subject?

Mr. CRAMTON. On the subject of prohibition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request on behalf of my colleague [Mr. LAZARO].

Mr. WALSH. On what subject?

Mr. DUPRÉ. In regard to the meeting of the American Medical Association, where a very interesting article was presented by Dr. Alexander Lambert on the subject of war-time medical conditions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a brief statement of the work of this session of Congress up to date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, it is proper that as the Congress is closing the first period of the special session that a brief statement of the work accomplished should be made, and it affords me pleasure to make such a statement.

After having been in session 38 days the special session of the Sixty-sixth Congress has adjourned for one week, to enable Members to attend celebrations in honor of the returning soldiers, sailors, and marines on the Fourth of July, with the program of appropriation and legislation as outlined and contemplated for the closing period of the fiscal year carried out practically in its entirety.

There has been a saving of approximately $800,000,000 in the six great supply bills which were passed, compared with the amounts carried by the same bills as they failed in the closing hours of the Sixty-fifth Congress, and a saving of four hundred and fifty millions on the railroad deficiency bill, as compared with the estimates of the Railroad Administration, or a total reduction of one billion two hundred and fifty millions.

These savings were in the main on three regular supply bills and the railroad deficiency bill, as follows:

Army appropriation bill	$343,000,000
Navy appropriation bill	211,000,000
Sundry civil appropriation bill	247,000,000
Railroad deficiency (below estimates)	450,000,000

In addition to this extraordinary record of consideration and passage of appropriation bills the Congress has adopted the woman-suffrage resolution, has passed the daylight-saving repeal, the bill returning the wires to their owners, and a bill carrying an appropriation of $6,000,000 for vocational rehabilitation of disabled soldiers and sailors, as well as a number of other measures of general or local interest. The House has also passed the water-power bill.

The Committee on the Judiciary has reported a measure containing provisions for the enforcement of war-time and of constitutional prohibition, which will be taken up for consideration immediately upon the reconvening of the House on July 8. The other legislative committees of the House have been busily engaged in hearings on measures which will be brought to the attention of Congress in the near future.

The record up to date is all that could have been hoped for or expected. The House is well organized for work, and Mem-

bers are earnest and enthusiastic in their desire to work out the many important problems pending for solution in the best possible manner. They will return from their brief vacation prepared to carry forward a program of constructive legislation.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) in accordance with the concurrent resolution heretofore agreed to, the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 8, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a report of the Chief of the Bureau of Safety upon tests of the automatic train-control system of the National Safety Appliance Co. (H. Doc. No. 139), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. McKINLEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1812) making appropriation to compensate James M. Moore for damages sustained while in the service of the Government of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 95), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BEE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1853) to reimburse E. T. Thing and S. A. Thing for losses and damages sustained by them by the negligent dipping of their cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 96), 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. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 6950) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Wymore, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 6951) authorizing the return to the sender or the forwarding of undeliverable second, third, and fourth class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 6952) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Portage, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6953) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Hartford, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 6954) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the nature and habits of the fungi and bacteria causing the decay of pulp wood; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6955) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of New Oxford, Adams County, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6956) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Dallastown, York County, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6957) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Yoe, York County, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6958) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Jefferson, York County, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 6959) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Buda, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UPSHAW: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 15) requesting the President to appoint a special day of thanksgiving; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LaGUARDIA: Resolution (H. Res. 155) fixing salary of special messenger at Speaker's desk; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RODENBERG: Resolution (H. Res. 156) directing the Secretary of the Navy to investigate charges against the Bank of Quantico, Quantico, Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Resolution (H. Res. 157) to appoint a committee to devise plans and methods to provide the people an adequate supply of anthracite coal, properly distributed and at fair prices, and to suggest to the House of Representatives such legislation as may or shall tend to accomplish the end in view; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PARRISH: Resolution (H. Res. 158) authorizing the Speaker of the House to appoint a committee from the House to investigate the causes of the high cost of the necessities of life, the reason therefor, and those who have been and are profiteering in the sale of such necessities; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 6960) granting a pension to Katie B. James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6961) granting a pension to William L. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 6962) granting an increase of pension to Elias C. Minium; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6963) for the relief of Frank Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 6964) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Gloster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODYKOONTZ: A bill (H. R. 6965) granting a pension to Lydia Estep; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6966) granting a pension to Sarah J. Holley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 6967) granting a pension to James A. Cox; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6968) to permit the reenlistment of Omer Germain Paquet in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6969) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6970) granting a pension to Lindley Herrington; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6971) granting an increase of pension to George R. Elder; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6972) granting a pension to Hattie G. Parnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6973) granting a pension to Marion J. Morgan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAZARO: A bill (H. R. 6974) to reimburse the postmaster at Bayou Chicot, La., for money taken by burglars; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 6975) to correct the military record of Daniel Schneider; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6976) granting a pension to Louis F. Ursenbach; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 6977) granting an increase of pension to George G. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6978) granting a pension to Mary St. Clair; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6979) granting a pension to Patrick Lehan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6980) granting an increase of pension to John A. Kirkham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 6981) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Kellogg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6982) granting a pension to Annie E. Frost; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6983) granting a pension to James C. Claxton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6984) granting a pension to James F. Romines; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6985) granting a pension to Jesse W. Beam; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 6986) granting an increase of pension to George S. Jenkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6987) granting a pension to Margretta P. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 6988) granting an increase of pension to James M. Pollock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 6989) granting a pension to Ben Lanier Dunn; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Evanston, Ill., protesting against national holiday prize fighting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES: Petitions of citizens of the rural district of Clearwater, Kans., and citizens of Wichita, Kans., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the citizens of Mulvane, Kans., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition and urging the adoption of the Federal amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, to repeal tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEE: Petition of W. Simpson and others, of San Antonio, Tex., for the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Petition of the Union Army Veterans, of Mexico, Mo., asking that Congress pass certain pending pension legislation; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLEARY: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, to repeal tax on soda, ice cream, soft drinks, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., protesting against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of 51 citizens of De Kalb, Ill., favoring repeal of the tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of certain citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., requesting the repeal of the taxes on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of certain citizens of Warren County, Ill., requesting the repeal of the taxes on candy, ice cream, and soda fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Rock Island, Ill., requesting repeal of taxes now levied on medicines and dental preparations under section 907 of the revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS: Petition of 21 citizens of Taney County, Mo., urging repeal of tax on medicines, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 125 citizens of Fisk, Butler County, Mo., urging repeal of tax on soda water, ice cream, and similar articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERSMAN: Petition of the Fortuna Board of Trade, Fortuna, Calif., praying for the passage of legislation placing a high protective tariff on foreign-grown beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution adopted by the San Jose Chamber of Commerce, San Jose, Calif., praying for the passage of legislation placing a high protective tariff on foreign-grown beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES: Petition of citizens of Michigan asking repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring extension of patent rights to American inventors; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, resolutions of the Pittsburgh Conference of the United Evangelical Church, protesting against extension of liquor traffic to China by American dealers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of the fourth district of California, Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations, Santa Ana, Calif., with a membership of 625, of the Santa Ana Federation, indorsing the educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Needles Union Labor Council, Needles, Calif., urging Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petition of residents of Sioux and Dawes Counties, State of Nebraska, to repeal the so-called "stamp taxes" on certain necessaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Mitchell, Melbeta, Sumner, and Alliance, all in the State of Nebraska, asking for the repeal of the tax on candies, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of citizens of Newark, N. Y., relating to the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of the Sterling Engine Co., Buffalo, N. Y., favoring repeal of 10 per cent war tax on new motor boats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Gerhard Lang Council, No. 298, of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner school bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of the Texas Cotton Seed Crushers' Association, of Dallas, Tex., relating to cottonseed meal products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Mrs. L. F. Pease, Buffalo, N. Y., president of Cold Spring Woman's Christian Temperance Union, for enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Fairbanks Co., Buffalo, N. Y., for passage of H. R. 1342; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the council of the city of Pittsburgh, in favor of an aerial Postal Service station in that city; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of sundry citizens of Pulaski, N. Y., urging enforcement of prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, ice cream, etc., to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELL: Petition of sundry citizens of New York City, protesting against the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York City, protesting against the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATT: Petition of the International Order of Good Templars, for the full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: Petition of Laurel Lodge, No. 31, International Order of Good Templars, of Paterson, N. J., for the enforcement of the prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of citizens of Walton, Ky., asking for law for enforcement of war and prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Austin, Nichols & Co., to amend national prohibition bills so as to allow manufacture of flavoring extracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 4,000 citizens of New York, requesting the repeal of section 904 of the revenue bill of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of L. M. Williams, of Richmond, Va., relating to Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the executive committee of the Savings Bank Association of New York, in relation to the railroad situation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of residents of Albany, N. Y., favoring removal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Cohoes, Green Island, Troy, and Watervliet, N. Y., favoring enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Cohoes, N. Y., favoring rigid enforcement of all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHALL: Resolutions of the International Order of Good Templars, Sandstone, Minn., and citizens of Minneapolis, for the full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Plattsburg, N. Y., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of employees of the United States Navy Department urging legislation for the establishment of the 44-hour week; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. YATES: Petition of sundry citizens of Peoria, Ill., for the repeal of the luxury-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Council of Farms and Markets, Albany, N. Y., for appropriation to exterminate insect called European corn borer; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Parlor, N. S. G. S., relating to the treaty of Paris; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the United States Customs Inspectors' Association, of Chicago, Ill., concerning revised estimate for customs expenditures; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of S. Berg and 29 other citizens of Courtenay, N. Dak., for the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John A. Hoffman and 29 other citizens of Bismarck, N. Dak., for the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *July 8, 1919.*

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

Almighty God, we come to Thee with glad and brave hearts to face the challenge of our day. We have the assurance that Thy hand is upon us. Thou hast led our way. We know Thou hast held a great mission for us in the world's life. We come once more to commit ourselves to Thy guidance. We pray that we may register in the laws enacted here the highest ethical achievement of this God-fearing people, and that it may redound to the honor and glory of Thy name and the extension of Thy kingdom in the earth. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore (Mr. CUMMINS) took the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, June 30, 1919, when, on request of Mr. NELSON and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

AUTOMATIC TRAIN-CONTROL SYSTEM (H. DOC. NO. 139).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a report of the Chief of the Bureau of Safety, relative to tests of the systems and appliances for the automatic control of railway trains and appliances of the National Safety Appliance Co. of San Francisco, Calif., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America extending the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to be placed on the files of the Senate.

He also presented a joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America extending the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to be placed on the files of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3184) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties; to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto; to repeal section 18 of "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a resolution adopted at the Methodist centenary celebration in Columbus, Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the enforcement of prohibition, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the thirty-ninth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, expressive of the sentiment of organized labor in opposition to mob rule and lynchings, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of the Mid-City Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, favoring the acquisition by Congress of Mount Vernon, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. LODGE. I present certain resolutions passed by the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolutions are as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1919.

Resolutions in favor of Lithuanian independence.

Whereas the future prosperity and peace of the world depends upon a just and equitable settlement of the problems of the European war whereby each and every nationality, however small, be granted the liberty to determine its own destiny and the opportunity of living its own life; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America is recognized as an ardent exponent of the rights of the small nations; and

Whereas the people of Lithuania, by their heroic conduct and voluntary sacrifices in the Great War, have proved themselves worthy of the blessings of freedom: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the opinion of the General Court of Massachusetts that the ancient people of Lithuania ought to be free and independent, and that as a matter of elementary justice express provisions should be made at the peace conference for the purpose of granting and guaranteeing the complete independence of the Lithuanian people; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Representatives of the United States at the peace conference, and to the Senators in Congress from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted June 25, 1919.
In senate, adopted, in concurrence, June 27, 1919.
A true copy.
Attest:

ALBERT P. LANGTRY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. LODGE presented memorials of employees of sundry business firms in the State of Massachusetts remonstrating against repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Bunker Hill Lodge, No. 634, International Association of Machinists, of Charlestown, Mass., praying for the establishment of a 44-hour work week for employees of the Navy Department, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Lithuanian Alliance of St. Casimer, of Boston, Mass., praying for the independence of Lithuanians, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the City Council of Worcester, Mass., praying for an investigation into the high price of gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a memorial of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, which I desire to have printed in the RECORD. It is very short and is in favor of the enactment of a pending bill into law.

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

MILITARY ORDER OF THE LOYAL
LEGION OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMANDERY OF THE STATE OF KANSAS,
Leavenworth, July 2, 1919.

To the Congress of the United States:

Brig. Gen. Orpheus S. Woodward died June 26 at the National Military Home, Leavenworth, Kans., aged 84 years. He enlisted as a private in Company D, Eighty-third Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, was promoted step by step. He was wounded through the left arm at Malvern Hill, and lost right leg above the knee at the Wilderness.

He lived a patriot, battled as an American, and the record of his life is an added glory to our name and flag.

Congress, by law, promised him the same desert that was provided for the officers of the Regular Army. All his wrecked years, through all his uncomplaining needs, he dallied with old age and dulled his pains, down to his grave, full of the hope and belief that this promise of Congress would be fulfilled.

The few who remain, busy with their infirmities, turn their dimmed eyes toward your body which promised this and repeated the promise.

This paper has only the force of feeble old men yet lingerers by the clear grace of God.

The Congress is the one mighty power of all the earth which trooped 3,000,000 men across wide seas, through storms and night and over murder zones to punish the Hun for his breach of a promise to Belgium.

Capt. MOSES M. BECK,
United States Volunteers, Commander,
And the Sixty Surviving Volunteer Officers.

Official:
Capt. J. T. TAYLOR,
United States Volunteers, Recorder.