

of Wisconsin as a well read and very successful lawyer, who carefully prepared his cases, as well as a strong advocate, who could present his case in a forceful, logical way to a court or jury.

His direct, incisive style of argument, his use of the homely, trite phrases of the common people, made him popular with juries and in demand as a campaign speaker.

Senator HUSTING was a student, a great reader, with an accurate and retentive memory. When he entered the State senate he soon became prominent throughout the State as one of the leaders of that body.

During the period Senator HUSTING was in the State senate and largely through his aggressive championship, Wisconsin wrote more progressive legislation in the statute books than in any like period of time in the history of the State. Most of this legislation has stood the test of the highest courts and remains on the statute books of Wisconsin to-day as it was first written. Among the important acts of legislation which will always be associated with Senator PAUL O. HUSTING are laws conserving the natural resources of the State, State income tax, initiative and referendum, election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, workmen's compensation laws, laws protecting woman and child labor, 2-cent railroad-rate fare law, and the corrupt practices act.

Senator HUSTING took his seat in the United States Senate in 1914, being the first Senator from Wisconsin to be elected to the United States Senate by popular vote. Wisconsin is a strong Republican State, and at the time Senator HUSTING was elected to the Senate no other Democrat on the ticket was elected, which attests the popularity and high regard in which Senator HUSTING was held by the people of his native State. Senator HUSTING is one of the six Democrats that the people of Wisconsin have honored by electing to the United States Senate in the history of the State.

Entering the United States Senate a few months before the beginning of the European war, Senator HUSTING did not go through the probationary period which has almost become traditional in that dignified body but at once took an active part in the important legislation pending before the Senate. His speeches on the conservation of our water powers and other national resources, his speeches on the first revenue bill, and his ringing patriotic speeches in support of the President in all legislation leading up to and after war was declared gave him a high standing with his colleagues in the Senate.

He knew when he voted in favor of the declaration of war that he would antagonize many of his lifelong friends and political supporters, yet this did not swerve him in the least from doing what he believed to be his duty. Senator HUSTING's speeches on war measures were quoted and commented favorably upon by the press of the country and brought him into national prominence.

The splendid career of Senator PAUL O. HUSTING came to a sudden end October 21, 1917, by an unavoidable accident. While hunting he was killed by the accidental discharge of a gun in the hands of one of his companions.

In the death of Senator PAUL O. HUSTING the State of Wisconsin lost a courageous, manly son and the United States Senate a talented, fearless legislator.

In the brief time allotted me, I have only touched on a few of the many interesting events in the remarkable life of Senator HUSTING.

He was domestic in his tastes and made the parental home his abiding place, and the hearthstone ties were as endearing and bound him as closely when he reached manhood's estate as when he was a little child. His mother, father, brothers, and sisters idolized him, and he found it the greatest pleasure of his life to be with them.

When he was elected to the United States Senate he purchased a home in Washington, where he lived surrounded by the members of his family.

PAUL HUSTING, as he was known by his friends, was a man of the highest ideals, who possessed as great and as splendid a type of courage as any man I have ever met. At all times and on all occasions and on all questions, PAUL HUSTING had the courage of his convictions. He was an original thinker and possessed a strong, logical mind. He respected precedent and authority, but if it did not square with his conscience and stand the test of his logic he was not afraid to advocate ideas that were new or to stand for or prevent the discarding of ideas that were old, no matter if he stood alone and was opposed by an array of talent that impressed upon others absolute infallibility.

Senator HUSTING always had the self-confidence and courage to champion the thing he believed to be right. I once heard him quote after a fight in the legislature when he and his friends were outvoted these words from Lincoln:

"I am not bound to win, but I am bound to be true. I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to live up to what light I have.

I must stand with anybody that stands right; stand with him while he is right, and part with him when he is wrong."

When Gen. Grant lay upon his death bed a friend asked him what, in these final and suffering days as he looked back over his career, brought the greatest satisfaction to his mind. The friend may have expected the old commander to mention something he had done—his plan for the capture of Vicksburg, his scheme for reducing Richmond, his plea for the purely secular conduct of the public schools—but the reply went deeper; not any one deed but the lifelong purpose now sustained him, and he said: "I take chief pleasure in the fact that I have always had the will to do my duty."

PAUL HUSTING took pleasure in the fact that he always had the will to do his duty. He was a man such as the poet describes in these lines:

His life was gentle, and the elements  
So mix'd in him, that Nature might stand up  
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members desiring to do so may be permitted to print in the Record remarks on the life, character, and public services of Senator HUSTING.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that Members be permitted to extend in the Record remarks on the life, character, and public services of the late Senator HUSTING. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In accordance with the order heretofore entered, the Chair declares the House adjourned until to-morrow at 11 a. m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Monday, February 24, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

### SENATE.

MONDAY, February 24, 1919.

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

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

Almighty God, as we face the most serious problems that ever confronted mankind, the most difficult problems that were ever put with their tremendous burden upon the heart and mind of the lovers of Thy law, we pray that we may have the grace that cometh from Thee, that we may have the vision that only Thy power can open to us, that the spirit of truth and of righteousness may prevail in the earth, that we may be found among those who have the conscious leadership of the spirit of God. We bless Thee that our Nation is seeking the path of peace. We bless Thee that we are united in an effort to establish justice and righteousness in the earth. Do Thou lead us. Preserve us by Thy grace. Correct and change and mold and shape the public opinion of mankind that we may come at last upon the final conclusion that is in harmony with the will of God. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Beckham	Hardwick	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Calder	Henderson	Nelson	Smoot
Chamberlain	Johnson, Cal.	New	Spencer
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sterling
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sutherland
Curtis	Kellogg	Overman	Swanson
Dillingham	Kendrick	Owen	Thomas
Fernald	Kenyon	Page	Thompson
Fletcher	Kirby	Poin Dexter	Townsend
France	La Follette	Pomerene	Trammell
Frelinghuysen	Lewis	Ransdell	Walsh
Gay	McCumber	Reed	Warren
Gore	McKellar	Robinson	Williams
Gronna	McLean	Saulsbury	
Hale	McNary	Shafroth	
Harding	Moses	Sheppard	

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] is unavoidably detained on account of illness.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] is detained from the Senate by illness.



Mr. POMERENE. I desire to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is detained on account of illness.

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

#### ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION (S. DOC. NO. 412).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$6,666.68 required by the Department of State for salaries of envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to Bulgaria and Serbia, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5627) to fix the time of holding court in the Amarillo division of the northern district of Texas.

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

H. R. 15796. An act to enable the President to carry out the price guaranties made to producers of wheat of the crops of 1918 and 1919 and to protect the United States against undue enhancement of its liabilities thereunder;

H. R. 15834. An act to extend the time for the construction by Kratka Township of a bridge across the Red Lake River, in Pennington County, Minn.; and

H. R. 15950. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Halifax, in the State of North Carolina, to construct a bridge across the Roanoke River.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WALSH. I send to the desk a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana sent by wire. I ask that it be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

HELENA, MONT., February 22, 1919.

Hon. THOS. J. WALSH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

I am directed by resolution of the Montana State Legislature now in session to transmit to you the following resolution:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States passed a law enabling the President of the United States to carry out the guaranteed price for wheat produced in the year 1919 and to protect against undue enhancement in price; and

"Whereas the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives have reported an amendment to the guaranteed wheat-price bill providing that the guaranteed price shall be effective only until the 31st day of October, 1919, instead of until December 31, 1919, as the original law provides; and

"Whereas by the reduction of this limit of time of the guaranteed wheat price it will work great injustice and irreparable injury to the wheat producers of the State of Montana and that the producers of wheat in the State of Montana can not harvest and market their crops for the year 1919 within the limit now sought to be placed for the guarantee of wheat prices; and

"Whereas the limit of time, to wit, October 21, 1919, will enable wheat producers of the States situated in warmer climates to dispose of their wheat within the time limit proposed and thus receive the benefit of the guaranteed wheat price, and it will result in further unjust discrimination in favor of the States more favorably located as to climate conditions to the injury of the wheat producers in the State of Montana: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of Montana, the House of Representatives concurring, do protest against the changing of the time limit for guaranteed wheat prices to October 31, 1919, as being an unjust discrimination against the wheat producers of Montana; and be it further

"Resolved, That we most respectfully urge upon the Senators and Representatives of the State of Montana that they use every effort to defeat the reducing of the time limit of the guaranteed prices to the end that the wheat producers of the State of Montana and of the Northwest be given a fair and equal opportunity to compete with the wheat producers of other sections of the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Montana be directed to transmit by wire the resolution to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Montana at Washington and to the Speaker of the House of Congress and to the legislative assembly of the States of Washington, Idaho, Oregon, North and South Dakota, and Minnesota."

C. T. STEWART, Secretary of State.

Mr. WALSH. I present a further resolution of the Legislature of Montana, which I ask may be printed in the Record.

The resolution is as follows:

#### House joint memorial 5.

Memorial to Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to permit the honorably discharged soldier, marine, or sailor to retain in his possession such clothing as, under the provisions of paragraph 1165, Army Regulations, he is permitted to take to his home.

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

Your memorialists, the members of the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate and house concurring, respectfully represent:

Whereas under the provisions of paragraph 1165, Army Regulations, an enlisted man honorably discharged is permitted to wear one suit of uniform outer clothing from the place of termination of his active service to his home, which clothing will be returned within four months after termination of his active service, by mail under a franked label;

Whereas the soldiers, marines, and sailors who have been or are now in the service of the United States that the world might be made safe for democracy willingly went forth to defend the principles of freedom and right, knowing that they might at any time be required to make the supreme sacrifice;

Whereas these soldiers, marines, and sailors have taken much pride in their uniforms and wish the privilege of keeping them in their possession: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring). That we, the members of the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do hereby petition and earnestly pray the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to change the provisions of paragraph 1165, Army Regulations, and make it possible for an honorably discharged man to retain one suit of uniform outer clothing.

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of Montana to the Senate and to the House of Representatives of the United States, and that copies hereof be transmitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to the Senators and Representatives of Montana in Congress.

(Signed) O. W. BELDEN,

(Signed) W. W. McDOWELL,

Speaker of the House.

President of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 5, relating to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines retaining their uniforms after discharge, enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 11th day of February, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 12th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am receiving a great many telegrams with reference to the failure to appropriate for the Federal Employment Service. As a sample of those telegrams and as indicating the sentiment of a great many of our people, I ask that there may be read the telegram which I send to the desk, representing as it does a great many different organizations in my State.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., February 20, 1919.

WASHINGTON DELEGATION IN CONGRESS,  
Care of Hon. Wesley L. Jones, United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Seattle Soldiers' and Sailors' Placement Bureau, composed of representatives of following organizations, viz: Chamber of Commerce and Commercial Club, War Parents' Association, War Camp Community Service, County Council of Defense, Y. M. C. A., Elks, Jewish Welfare Board, Red Cross, Knights of Columbus, City Council, County Commissioners, Central Labor Council, Building Trades Council, Maritime Council, the Employees' Association American Legions of Liberty, the last named having membership of 7,500.

Returned soldiers and sailors are informed movement on foot to prevent appropriation by Congress of funds with which to operate Government Employment Service. We are sure failure of appropriation would be most unfortunate; in fact, would be a public calamity. We are in close touch with workers of Seattle Government employment office. It has accomplished and is accomplishing good work, and its continuance is necessary in the public interest. Our work of helping to place ex-service men in employment is done through the Government employment office. That branch of the employment work we know to be efficiently performed. We know of no available substitute for it. The records of the employment office show that the Seattle office has in the year 1918 found jobs for 124,000 men. Our work covers last 42 days. In that time 4,000 discharged soldiers and sailors have been placed in employment through the Seattle Government employment office. We respectfully urge you to use your best endeavors to insure the necessary congressional appropriation. Please submit this telegram to Appropriations Committee.

SEATTLE SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' PLACEMENT BUREAU.  
By HAROLD PRESTON, Chairman.

Mr. STERLING. I have here a number of telegrams relating to the same subject as the telegram just read at the desk. The telegrams are from State officials, farm bureaus, chambers of commerce, and chairmen of commercial organizations. I send them to the desk and ask that the telegram of the governor of the State be read, and that all the telegrams be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Secretary read as follows:

PIERRE, S. DAK., February 23, 1919.

Senator THOMAS STERLING,  
Washington, D. C.:

Mr. McCaffree, our immigration commissioner, has learned the Employment Bureau appropriation may fail. He feels this would have serious consequences. Our cooperation with the Federal Government in the Employment Service was in the main very satisfactory during war times, and it seems to me that it would be unfortunate to have the services discontinued at this time.

PETER NORBECK, Governor.



Mr. TOWNSEND. I send to the desk a telegram which I have received from the secretary of the Michigan State Senate relative to continuing the appropriation for the Federal Employment Bureau. I wish to state that I have received many other telegrams, one from the Detroit Chamber of Commerce, in favor of the continuation of this appropriation, and I have also received, I think, as many as a hundred telegrams in opposition to it. I present this as it comes from the State senate, and ask that it be read.

The telegram was read, as follows:

LANSING, MICH., February 21, 1919.

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

Michigan Senate to-day adopted resolution unanimously urging favorable action by Congress for Employment Service, which includes returning soldier boys' working reserve and junior section.

D. E. ALWARD, Secretary.

Mr. WARREN. Noting the telegrams that have already been filed, I desire to say that I have received a dozen such. There seems to be a propaganda of that kind. I have also received many letters from those who take the other side of the question. I ask that the letter, which I send to the Secretary's desk, may go into the RECORD, as it comes from the Business Men's Clearing House Co. and takes the other side of the question.

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

DENVER, COLO., U. S. A., February 4, 1919.

SENATOR FRANCIS E. WARREN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We note that you are a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and as we are advised that the United States Employment Service is asking an appropriation of several million dollars, you are no doubt investigating fully matters regarding the service. Accordingly we take the liberty of writing you in reference to same, and especially inasmuch as Wyoming is such a close neighbor to Colorado, and as our company has been serving numerous Wyoming firms for many years past.

We understand that one of the reasons that the United States Employment Service asks such a very large appropriation is in order that they may establish additional offices for the placing of technical, educational, and commercial employees, instead of devoting themselves largely to laborers, as heretofore. We have been placing technical and commercial employees throughout western United States for the past 16 years, and would like to draw your attention to the fact that in this particular field the work is to a small extent only the securing of employment for the unemployed. The work is almost entirely securing better positions and financial advancement to men already fairly well employed. Do you think it is a proper function of the Government to maintain bureaus at public expense the purpose of which will be largely to secure salaried advancement to employees?

Do you think the public would long approve of the Government spending several million dollars annually to maintain offices through which, for instance, a bookkeeper earning \$100 per month can secure, free of charge, assistance toward securing a position with some other employer paying say, \$140 per month, or through which a mine superintendent earning a salary of \$200 can secure a similar position with a larger company paying, say, \$250 per month? We know, from our long experience in the employment field, that a Government employment agency handling technical, educational, and commercial employees would necessarily become just such a bureau for securing advancement for men already employed, because, except for a small percentage, our applicants in these lines who are out of employment are either beginners or relatively undesirable employees. If the bureau were to endeavor to serve only the unemployed it could not at all meet the demands of employers in the technical and commercial field, who require experienced, capable men, already demonstrating their ability with some other employer.

We would also like to draw your attention to the fact that if the Government employment offices were to branch out in the field of technical, office, and commercial employees it would be necessary to operate the bureaus at a very heavy expense, and it would cost the Government a large amount for each man placed, as employees of this class can only be secured positions by the bureau submitting to the prospective employer complete typewritten reports upon the applicant's experience and qualifications, together with copies of reference letters which the bureau must have secured by writing to each of the applicant's previous employers. The bureau must employ to handle this work, at high salaries, trained technical men who can pass upon employees of this caliber and comprehend employers' needs. Expensive classification and investigation systems must be employed, as every employee in the technical and professional field has different qualifications and every position different requirements. Heavy telegraphic expenses are often necessary to negotiate the position. Will the public approve of these large expenditures to give employees such assistance?

We understand that the United States Employment Service asks the enormous appropriation that they have requested on the strength of the extraordinary numbers of men whom they state they are placing in positions monthly. May we respectfully suggest the advisability of your committee having a thorough check made to verify the results which the Government Employment Service claims to have accomplished?

For instance, we note in daily press statements that 44 State Government employment agencies report the placement of 99,077 men during one week in January. We can not but believe that this is a gross exaggeration. That would be an average of 2,251 per week per State, or 9,752 men placed in positions in one month by each State office. As stated above, we have had long experience in the employment business, have been serving large employers throughout the West, and have an office force of four department managers and seven clerks—nearly as large a force as the Government employment office has here—and if we place 125 to 150 men in definite, permanent positions in one month we have done well. To be sure, we are placing bookkeepers, salesmen, and technical men, while the Government agency has been heretofore han-

dling laborers; still the variance between 150 placements a month and 9,752 is out of proportion.

We question very much if it would be physically possible for the present working forces of the Government Employment Service, in the State of Colorado at least, to approximate the placement of 9,752 employees in definite positions in one month. What is more, with a large percentage of leading companies reducing their forces because of the end of the war, and employers endeavoring in every case possible to reemploy their former men who have been released from military service, we do not believe that anything like 9,752 engagements could have been negotiated in one month in Colorado at this time, and we understand that similar conditions prevail throughout the country.

We understand that the United States Employment Service bases its especial need for \$14,800,000 to continue its existence on the grounds of securing employment for returning soldiers, but may we respectfully draw to your attention the fact that an employment agency, either operated by the Government or by private firms, can only secure employment for returned soldiers or others if there is general prosperity—if the mines, mills, and factories are operating full force. If measures were adopted which would tend to increase industrial activity and thereby create a demand for employees, we venture to say that returning soldiers would not have any difficulty in securing employment without requiring the assistance of the Government or any other employment office, because employers everywhere are very anxious to reemploy their previous employees returning from military service if they can possibly do so, newspapers all over the country are running free want ads for returning soldiers, and many colleges, fraternal societies, and civic associations are maintaining free employment exchanges for soldiers. If the demand is created the soldiers will find employment quickly enough.

Yours, truly,

BUSINESS MEN'S CLEARING HOUSE,  
S. S. NEWBURY, President.

Mr. KELLOGG. I ask permission to present to the Senate petitions urging the maintenance of the wheat guaranty for the 1919 crop, which I wish to have referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In this connection I should like to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to the present condition.

There is a guaranty by the President, under a law of Congress, for the crop of 1919, which renders it absolutely impossible for private capital to handle the wheat crop of 1919. There is no appropriation or legislation authorizing it to be handled as it was during the last year by the Wheat Corporation or by the Government. With this Congress adjourned without taking any action on that question, the wheat crop will begin to be marketed in June, and there will be no one to buy it. I merely wish to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to that condition. Petitions are coming in from all over the country. People do not know what to do about making arrangements to handle the crop, as it can not be handled under present legislation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Minnesota that on Saturday last the House passed a bill designed to carry out the President's guaranty with respect to the wheat price established for 1919. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will meet at 3 o'clock this afternoon to consider that measure, and hopes to make an early report. I have no doubt of the enactment of the legislation at this session of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LODGE. I present a memorial of the Board of Trade of Williamstown, Mass., remonstrating against the United States entering into any agreement for a league of nations which will surrender in any degree our right and power of self-defense, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

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

WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS., February 20, 1919.

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Williamstown Board of Trade urges upon Senators and Representatives of Massachusetts in Congress that America should enter into no treaties which surrender in any degree our right and power of self-defense. No nation ever long maintained its freedom which trusted its defense to others. In particular we are unwilling to commit the safety and independence of our country to the decisions of a league of nations made up of our debtors and competitors. Free American has always been one of the greatest influences for world peace and our influence for peace will grow with our wealth and power, provided we maintain our freedom. If we give up our right and our ability to defend ourselves, our growing wealth will be a growing invitation to aggression and will tend toward war, not toward peace. Moreover, Congress has no constitutional right to abandon any part of its jurisdiction or to make a permanent cession of its power to other authorities, either foreign or domestic. The lesson of the war is that the old saying is untrue that it takes two to make a quarrel. One nation made a great war and many nations were needed to restore peace. Our greatest duty now is to strengthen the hands of peaceful nations.

E. PARMALEE PRENTICE,  
President.  
VANDERPOEL ADRIANCE,  
Vice President.  
E. HERBERT BOTSFORD,  
Secretary.  
FREDERICK E. MOORE,  
L. G. TREADWAY,  
P. J. DEMPSEY, Directors.



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

The resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 12.

Whereas there is now pending before Congress a measure known as the Kenyon bill, being Senate bill 5397, the intent of which is "To provide for the commencement or prosecution of public works in order to provide increased opportunities for employment during the period of demobilization and industrial readjustment, and for other purposes"; and

Whereas there is proposed the creation of a Federal board with power to cooperate with all Federal, State, and municipal agencies entrusted with the execution of any public work, and thereby endeavor to stabilize industrial and employment conditions during periods of extraordinary unemployment; and

Whereas the measure appropriates the sum of \$100,000,000, from which the proposed Federal board may make loans at a low rate of interest to begin or continue such Federal, State, or municipal works that may be temporarily embarrassed for want of funds; and

Whereas we believe such opportunities for immediate relief will materially assist in bringing about more uniform industrial and labor conditions: Now therefore be it

*Resolved*, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be memorialized and urged to use all honorable means to secure the enactment of Senate bill No. 5397.

Adopted by the house February 6, 1919.

SEYMOUR JONES,  
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 15, 1919.

W. T. VINTON,  
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that house joint resolution No. 12 is a true copy as passed by the house and senate on the dates indicated.

W. F. DRAYER,  
Chief Clerk of the House.

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

The resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 11.

Memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of an amendment to the bill introduced by Senator BANKHEAD in the United States Senate on December 4, 1918, known as S. 5088, also the same amendment to a bill introduced in the United States Senate by Senator SWANSON on December 5, 1918, known as S. 5098, also the same amendment to a bill introduced by Mr. SHACKLEFORD in the House of Representatives of the United States on December 12, 1918, known as H. R. 13354, and also to any other similar bills introduced in Congress, in order to provide a more equitable application of Federal aid for post roads in the sparsely settled States, and to provide a more reasonable time limit for the availability of such Federal aid.

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that,

Whereas there are pending in the Congress of the United States, bills known as S. 5088, S. 5098, and H. R. 13354, all of which provide for additional Federal aid for post roads under the terms of the act of Congress approved July 11, 1916, and commonly known as the Federal aid road act; and

Whereas section 6 of said Federal aid road act provides that the United States shall not cooperate in any road project in an amount greater than 50 per cent of the total estimated cost thereof; and

Whereas, although additional Federal aid for road building at the present time is highly desirable, nevertheless those States having large areas and relatively small populations will be unable to avail themselves of the benefit of this act as amended to provide additional Federal aid without a disproportionate burden of taxation;

Now, therefore, your memorialists urgently request that the said bills, and any other similar bills which may be introduced in the Congress of the United States, be so amended that section 6 of the said Federal aid road act will provide that in those States where the average population per square mile of area is 100 persons or more, based upon the census of 1910, the United States shall not cooperate in any road project in an amount greater than 50 per cent of the total estimated cost thereof; and that in those States where the average population per square mile of area, based on the census of 1910, is less than 100 persons, the share of the United States shall be increased one-fourth of 1 per cent for each person, or major fraction thereof, less than 100 per square mile; and furthermore

Whereas section 3 of said Federal aid road act provides that so much of the appropriation apportioned to any State for any fiscal year as remains unexpended at the close thereof shall be available to such State only until the close of the succeeding fiscal year; and

Whereas on account of the said provision of section 3 of said act local conditions existing in some States render it practically impossible to comply with the terms of the act;

Now, therefore, your memorialists also request that said bills now pending in Congress, and any other similar bills which may be introduced, be amended so that section 3 of the said Federal aid road act will provide that so much of the appropriation to any State for any fiscal year as remains unexpended at the close thereof shall be available to such State until the close of the second succeeding fiscal year; and, be it

*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be sent to each of the congressional delegation from the State of Oregon to the Congress of the United States, and to each body of said Congress.

Adopted by the house February 6, 1919.

SEYMOUR JONES,  
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 15, 1919.

W. T. VINTON,  
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that house joint memorial 11 is a true copy as passed by the house and senate on the dates indicated.

W. F. DRAYER,  
Chief Clerk of the House.

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

The resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALEM, OREG., February 22.

Senator GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,  
Washington:

The following memorial was to-day adopted by both houses of the Oregon Legislature:

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

*"We, your memorialists, the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives concurring, respectfully represent that—*

*"Whereas there are now thousands of idle and unemployed men in the State of Oregon, who are anxious for work, but who can not find anything to do for the reason that the Shipping Board has canceled the contracts for wooden ships, thus closing down the shipyards, logging camps, and lumber mills, which, in normal times in this State, furnished employment directly for 62 per cent of our labor and indirectly affect many of our collateral industries; and*

*"Whereas there is an urgent demand for wooden ships and schooners suitable for the lumber trade, which the wooden ships heretofore constructed are not fit for; and*

*"Whereas there is a good market and demand for lumber overseas, if ships adapted to that purpose could be secured in which to transport the same; and*

*"Whereas the north Pacific coast of the United States of America has the largest body of standing timber available to the markets of the Temperate Zone, and lumber manufacturing now is and always will be, by proper conservation, the greatest industry of this section of the United States; and*

*"Whereas if it is to be the policy of the Shipping Board to construct or own the great ocean tonnage of the United States, then we earnestly submit and rightfully demand that it provide means of transportation, suitable for lumber as well as other products; and*

*"Whereas we believe it to be more economical to change the specifications for wooden ships to lumber carriers, which are urgently needed, than to pay damages for cancellation of contracts for wooden ships, which can not be economically used; and we are assured that immediate use will be made of said lumber-carrying ships, when completed and thus keep our lumber industry in operation; and*

*"Whereas if this course were adopted at once, the serious unemployment problem of the North Pacific States would be solved and justice done to this part of the United States; and*

*"Whereas the timber of this section of the country has been found most desirable for wooden-ship construction and that particular industry rightfully belongs to the North Pacific States; and*

*"Whereas from 50 years' experience the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon confidently asserts that wooden ships are not only the most available but also economical for use as lumber carriers: Now, therefore, be it*

*"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Senate of the State of Oregon urges the Congress of the United States to take such action and provide such means as will carry into effect the purposes of the foregoing resolution in order that idle labor be reemployed and reconstruction facilitated; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the Senate of the State of Oregon be directed to forthwith transmit by wire a copy of this memorial to the President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to our Senators in Congress, and to the United States Shipping Board."*

JOHN W. COCHRAN, Chief Clerk.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I also present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALEM, OREG., February 22, 1919.

Senator GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,  
Washington, D. C.:

The following memorial was to-day adopted by both houses of the Oregon Legislature:

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

*"We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, the Senate concurring, respectfully represent this, that*

*"Whereas during the month of October and November, 1918, special Government purchasing agents, including the purchasing agent of the Southern Pacific Railroad, visited the different mills of the Western Oregon Tie & Lumber Association and requested them all run to their full capacity until June 1, 1919, as ties were vitally needed, either in war or in peace, and that the United States Railroad Administration would pay therefor the respective prices set forth in posters then issued and published: And*

*"Whereas said millmen responded to this appeal in good faith, and many of them contracted for logs and other material at then existing high prices to operate until June 1, 1919: And*

*"Whereas since said date said poster prices have been withdrawn and many orders issued have been canceled, and by order of the United States Railroad Administration said mills can only accept orders from the purchasing agent of the Southern Pacific Co., and said agent is now offering orders only at \$3 less per 1,000 feet than said original poster prices, and said mills, not being allowed to solicit or accept orders from other railroad companies, must now accept said price or close their mills: And*

*"Whereas at a meeting of said Western Oregon Tie & Lumber Association held at Albany, Oreg., on Saturday, February 15, 1919, at which were present over 60 owners of said tie mills, representing a daily production of 14,500,000 feet, board measure, ties, it*



was unanimously decided that under the present system it was impossible to operate without a loss, hence resolved that all mills of said association should cease operation at once: And

"Whereas there are already thousands of unemployed men in the State of Oregon by reason of the cancellation of Government contracts, which is creating a serious State problem to contend with and fostering the formation of organizations with Bolsheviki ideas, and this new tie condition will add many thousands more to the fast increasing army of unemployed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be requested to take such action at once as will put an end to United States Government action that continually adds to our serious condition of unemployment and provide some means by which the affairs of this Nation may approach reconstruction without such disastrous results.

"The State of Oregon is now considering a large bond issue to provide employment for idle labor caused by the condition hereinbefore enumerated, and earnestly feels that Congress should do the same: And be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Oregon be requested to transmit by wire at once a copy of this memorial to the President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators of Oregon in Congress, with the request that some action be taken at once.

W. F. DRAYER, Chief Clerk.

Mr. ASHURST. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of Arizona, relative to additional pay and allowances to honorably discharged soldiers and sailors, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

House joint memorial 1.

To Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,  
Hon. MARCUS A. SMITH, and  
Hon. CARL HAYDEN,  
Arizona Representatives in Congress:

To the honorable the SECRETARY OF WAR, GENERAL MARSHAL, and CHIEF OF THE GENERAL STAFF OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY,  
Washington, D. C.:

Your memorialist, the Fourth Legislature of the State of Arizona, respectfully represents that—

Whereas the majority of soldiers and sailors discharged from the United States Army and Navy are left penniless and without means of subsistence shortly after their discharge, and during this period of unemployment a majority of said soldiers and sailors can find no remunerative employment;

Wherefore your memorialist, the Fourth Legislature of Arizona, respectfully but urgently prays that upon their discharge all soldiers and sailors be given their uniforms, including overcoats, and that a check for \$200 be mailed within one week of said discharge to said soldiers and sailors at their home address.

Your memorialist further prays that the Congress of the United States pass legislation providing for an ocean-to-ocean highway along a route most suitable for military purposes, said highway to be constructed under the supervision of the Engineering Corps of the United States Army.

The governor of the State of Arizona is directed to mail an engrossed copy of this memorial to the parties concerned and a telegram setting forth in brief the objects herein shall be sent by the president of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Fourth Arizona Legislature to every State legislature now in session in the United States.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

February 10, 1919: Read first time and laid over one day.

Passed the house February 10, 1919, by the following vote: 31 ayes, — nay, — absent, 4 excused.

(Signed) A. C. PETERSON,  
Speaker of the House.  
(Signed) SAM B. BRADNER,  
Chief Clerk of the House.

February 11, 1919: Read by number and title and referred to the committee on militia of P. D.

Passed the senate February 13, 1919, by the following vote: 16 ayes, — nays, — absent, 3 excused.

(Signed) A. A. JOHNS,  
President of Senate.  
(Signed) L. F. SWEETING,  
Secretary of Senate.

Bill received in governor's office February 15, 1919, at 1.37 p. m.  
(Signed) P. R. MILNES,  
Secretary to Governor.

Approved February 18, 1919.  
(Signed) THOMAS E. CAMPBELL,  
Governor of Arizona.

Filed in the office of the secretary of the State of Arizona this 19th day of February, A. D. 1919, at 9.45 a. m.

(Signed) MIT SIMMS,  
Secretary of State.  
By R. E. MCGILLEN,  
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. ASHURST presented a petition of John F. Davidson, of Kingman, Ariz., praying for an appropriation for the reclamation and improvement of lands, which will provide employment for returning soldiers and sailors, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Tucson, Ariz., praying for Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HARDING. I present a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

House joint resolution 15.

Joint resolution relative to good roads for Ohio.

The senate committee in charge of the investigation of labor conditions asks for \$400,000,000 to prevent idleness by expending it upon public works. The master of industry states that he expects an era of industrial depression in the United States. The secretary of the American Federation of Labor says there will be bread lines in every industrial center before May 1; and the statesmen declare "the cloud of unemployment in a few months may engulf this country." The governors of the various States have expressed a willingness to cooperate in securing work for the unemployed. Gov. Cox has said: "I am ready to cooperate with any plan along lines which may be suggested by the Federal Government."

America needs roads. Ohio needs roads. The United States is paying a penalty of one-half billion dollars a year in the excessive cost of transportation of agricultural products alone because of this neglect of highways. At our present rate of work, two centuries will be required to improve our roads and a lifetime will not witness the improvement of more than 20 per cent. Roads are the life of a nation. Let us have roads. Let us stop working at this task in a "jitney" way. Let us stop working among the stars and get down to where the mud is.

America spends money for waterways. We built the Panama Canal. The Federal Government will spend \$1,000,000,000 for railroad improvements this coming year. We spent \$25,000,000,000 to lick the Huns. Why not spend some on ourselves?

Illinois has voted \$60,000,000 for roads. New York and Pennsylvania are each spending more than \$10,000,000 a year on road improvements.

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio:

First. That we are for lifting Ohio out of the mud.

Second. That we are willing to cooperate with the United States Government on a large plan for road improvement.

Third. That we request the United States Government to appropriate \$1,000,000,000 to be expended during the next five years on the roads of this country in a manner similar to the present plan for Federal aid.

Fourth. That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Ohio delegation in Congress.

CARL R. KIMBALL,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.  
CLARENCE J. BROWN,  
President of the Senate.

Adopted February 11, 1919.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
STATE OF OHIO,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Harvey C. Smith, secretary of state, of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 15, as adopted by the General Assembly of Ohio on the 11th day of February, 1919, and filed in the office of the secretary of state on the 19th day of February, 1919, and is now on file in this office and in my official custody.

Witness my hand and official seal at Columbus, Ohio, this 20th day of February, A. D. 1919.

HARVEY C. SMITH,  
Secretary of State.

Mr. WARREN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, favoring legislation to authorize the immediate construction of the Goshen Hole or High Line Canal, in the State of Wyoming, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
State of Wyoming, ss:

I, W. E. Chaplin, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of enrolled joint memorial No. 2, senate, Fifteenth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, being original senate joint memorial No. 2, has been carefully compared with the original filed in this office on the 19th day of February, A. D. 1919, and is a full, true, and correct copy of the same and of the whole thereof.

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

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 20th day of February, A. D. 1919.  
[SEAL.]

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

Senate joint memorial 2.

Memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, requesting Congress to provide for the immediate construction of the Goshen Hole Canal.

Whereas the construction of the Goshen Hole Canal, known also as the High Line Canal, in the Fort Laramie unit of the North Platte irrigation project, will place 180,000 acres of excellent farming land in Goshen Hole, Wyo., under irrigation, and the cultivation of such area will greatly assist in the production of food at a time when increased food production by the United States is made necessary by the unsettled conditions elsewhere; and

Whereas the construction of the Goshen Hole Canal will give an opportunity for employment to many of our returning soldiers, sailors, and marines, and the settlement and cultivation of the area to be reclaimed by the Goshen Hole Canal will give many veterans of the great war an opportunity to secure good homes and farms on the public domain; and

Whereas the United States Reclamation Service have determined and fixed the line of the Goshen Hole Canal and the acreage which will be reclaimed thereby, and have the plans for the necessary diversion dam at or near Guernsey, Wyo., completed, and only congressional action is needed to immediately start the construction of the Goshen Hole Canal; and



Whereas the honorable Secretary of the Interior of the United States has and is recommending to Congress the reclaiming of arid lands on the public domain for the purpose of giving and furnishing homes to returning soldiers, sailors, and marines: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to authorize and direct, by proper and appropriate legislation, the immediate construction of the Goshute Hole Canal; be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this memorial be sent to Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN, Hon. JOHN B. KENDRICK, and Hon. FRANK W. MONDELL, Representatives in Congress from the State of Wyoming.

T. G. POWERS,

President of the Senate.

E. J. SULLIVAN,

Speaker of the House.

Approved.

ROBERT D. CAREY,  
Governor.

FEBRUARY 19, 1919—12 noon.

Mr. MOSES presented petitions of the congregation of the First Congregational Church of Alton; of the Woman's Council of National Defense, of Milton; of Local Grange No. 204, Patrons of Husbandry, of Charlestown; and of Local Grange No. 1, Patrons of Husbandry, of Gilman, all in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the establishment of a league of nations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented resolutions adopted by Local Lodge No. 7, Switchmen's Union of North America, of Minneapolis; of Local Lodge No. 8, Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, of Minneapolis; of the League of Catholic Women (Inc.), of Minneapolis; of the Political Equality Club, of Minneapolis; of the Men's Club of the Church of the Redeemer, of Minneapolis; of the Twentieth Century Club, of Duluth, all in the State of Minnesota, and of the Church Peace Union of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, favoring the establishment of a league of nations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COLT presented resolutions adopted by the Sunday School of the Church of the Mediator, of Providence, R. I., of the Rhode Island Woman Suffrage Party, and of the Rhode Island Branch National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teachers' Association, favoring the establishment of a league of nations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alabama, relative to the nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals, in that State, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

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

THE STATE OF ALABAMA,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, William P. Cobb, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the pages hereto attached contain a true, accurate, and literal copy of senate joint resolution No. 55, adopted by the senate on February 14, 1919, and adopted by the house on February 17, 1919, as the same appears on file and of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State at the capitol, in the city of Montgomery, this 19th day of February, 1919.

[SEAL]

WM. P. COBB,  
Secretary of State.

Senate joint resolution 55.

Whereas no more important industrial activity or business enterprise of more far-reaching significance has ever been projected than the plants at Muscle Shoals designed for the production of nitrate from the air for use in agriculture and industry; and

Whereas the work has called for large expenditures in the construction of transportation facilities, the purchase of locomotives and other railway equipment, and the erection of modern and up-to-date buildings of the latest design and provided with the latest types of machinery; and

Whereas the demand for the product to be manufactured by the said plant is now more than ever in demand throughout the entire country, particularly by the agricultural interests; and

Whereas nitrate secured through artificial agencies can be supplied to consumers at a lower price than has heretofore been possible, thus enabling the production of larger crops and the reduction thereby of the high cost of living; and

Whereas the active operation of the plants at Muscle Shoals will afford an opportunity for the employment of thousands of skilled and unskilled laborers, and will thereby serve materially to reduce the problems of unemployment following demobilization of the armies of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of Alabama (the House concurring),* That the President and the Secretary of War and the Congress of the United States be memorialized not only to continue the nitrate development at Muscle Shoals in this State but also to make provision for all necessary enlargement and further development of such industry as may be necessary to the large interests involved.

2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the governor, under the great seal of the State of Alabama, to the President, the Secretary of War, and to the United States Senate, and the House of Representatives.

3. That copies also be forwarded separately to the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from Alabama.

Adopted by the senate February 14, 1919.

Adopted by the house February 17, 1919.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I also present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alabama, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

House joint resolution 49.

Whereas inasmuch as in normal times cotton is the one staple of commerce which brings more gold from foreign countries to America than any other one commodity, thereby turning the balance of the world's trade in favor of the United States, and giving cotton a national importance; and

Whereas the mills of Europe are the largest consumers of low-grade cotton, but, owing to war conditions, the spindles of those countries are practically without a supply; and

Whereas President Wilson in his last message to Congress declared "the war is over," and therefore there is no longer any necessity for retaining the restriction on exports and imports of commerce; and

Whereas the American merchant marine is now an established and assured fact and the slogan should be "American bottoms controlled by American citizens for American commerce": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring),* That we insist that our senatorial representatives in Congress take immediate steps to see that all embargoes on cotton be instantly removed; be it further

*Resolved,* That Congress be urged to provide immediately for the enlistment of American steel steamship lines between the Gulf and South Atlantic ports and all foreign ports for the promotion of American commerce, and at reasonable standardized rates; be it further

*Resolved,* That a cable to this end be sent to President Wilson; that a copy be also sent to the chairman of the United States Shipping Board and to the chairman of the War Trade Board and to each of our Senators and Representatives from Alabama.

Adopted by the house and senate February 7, 1919.

[SEAL]

Mr. BANKHEAD. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alabama, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

THE STATE OF ALABAMA,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, William P. Cobb, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the pages hereto attached contain a true, accurate, and literal copy of house joint resolution 27, by Mr. Faulk, adopted by the house and senate January 31, 1919, as the same appears on file and of record in this office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State at the capitol, in the city of Montgomery, this 4th day of February, 1919.

WM. P. COBB,  
Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 27.

Whereas Government ownership of railroads and other public utilities is contrary to the traditions and principles of our Government and people; and

Whereas experience has shown that the Government can not operate such public utilities as economically or as efficiently as private corporations; and

Whereas we believe that the interest of the people will be better subserved by a restoration of the railroads and other public utilities to their private owners: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Alabama (the Senate concurring),* That the Congress of the United States take prompt action looking to an immediate return of the railroads and other public utilities now operated by the Government to their owners, reserving such Government control thereof as may be necessary.

*Resolved further,* That a copy of this resolution, certified by the secretary of state, be sent to each the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Alabama.

Adopted by the house and senate January 31, 1919.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I also present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alabama with reference to an appropriation to combat and investigate the causes of "flu," which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF ALABAMA,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, William P. Cobb, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the pages hereto attached contain a true, accurate, and literal copy of senate joint resolution No. 30, adopted by the senate and house of representatives on February 14, 1919, as the same appears on file and of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State at the capitol, in the city of Montgomery, this 17th day of February, 1919.

[SEAL]

WM. P. COBB,  
Secretary of State.

Senate joint resolution 30.

Whereas our country and the known world are being visited by an awful and death-dealing disease commonly called the "flu"; and

Whereas the medical world admits its ignorance of the causes and the cure for the "flu": Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate of Alabama (the House concurring),* That the Congress of the United States be asked to appropriate the sum of \$250,000 to investigate and, if possible, to perfect a specific for the elimination of "flu."

*Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the senate February 14, 1919.

Adopted by the house February 14, 1919.

Mr. KING. I present a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Utah Associated Industries, of Salt Lake City, Utah, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.



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

SALT LAKE, UTAH, February 10, 1919.  
Senator WILLIAM H. KING,  
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Utah Associated Industries protest against continuation of United States Employment Bureau. Believe the purpose for which it was created no longer exists. Trust you will use your influence against allowing appropriation of \$15,000,000, which, we understand, they ask for. Pat Moran, State chairman employment bureau, agrees with us that bureau should close. Letter follows.

UTAH ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES.  
A. C. REES,

Mr. KENDRICK. I present resolutions adopted by the Industrial Club of Cheyenne, Wyo., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our National Government, as a war measure, has seen fit to take over the telephone, telegraph, and cable system; and Whereas without further legislation these systems will be turned back to private ownership at a time and under conditions inimical to the best interests of patrons and owners alike: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Industrial Club of Cheyenne, That it is the sense of this organization that our Senators and Representative in Congress be urged to use their best endeavors to procure by congressional action the continuance of governmental control for such reasonable time as will enable Congress to pass remedial legislation; and be it further—

Resolved, That while neither commending nor criticizing public ownership, we feel that careful investigation should be undertaken in order that fair legislation may prevail; and be it further

Resolved, That an expression of our views be forwarded to our Representatives in Congress.

Mr. GAY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Monroe, La., praying for Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

#### LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a statement proceeding from Ex-President Taft, dated Stockton, Cal., February 21, on the subject of the league of nations.

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

WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT SAYS PUBLIC MIND FAVORS LEAGUE—DECLARES IT WAS THE HOPE OF STEP TO PREVENT FUTURE WARS THAT BUOYED UP PEOPLES DURING AWFUL STRAIN OF FIGHTING—POINTS TO SUCCESS OF CONGRESSES OF LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE.

[By William Howard Taft.]

STOCKTON, CAL., February 21.

Six of the congresses of the League to Enforce Peace out of the nine projected have been held. At the New York congress there were registered from New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, West Virginia, and Maryland 2,935 delegates, who attended the half dozen sessions of the congress and took part in the proceedings. At the Boston congress there were 3,740 registered delegates from the six New England States. New Hampshire sent 200 and Connecticut 200. At the Chicago congress there were 3,200, and at the Minneapolis congress there were 2,400 from Minnesota, the two Dakotas, and Montana.

The two congresses on the Pacific coast, one at Portland and the other at San Francisco, have been even better attended than the first four. Audiences of from 3,000 to 4,000 attended constantly upon the six sessions, culminating in a labor meeting in the great auditorium of San Francisco with at least 10,000 enthusiastic listeners. The delegates were a fine body of men, representing all classes in the community. There were clergymen and other professional men, bankers and business men, farmers, and an excellent representation of organized labor.

#### HALF MILLION FOR PROPAGANDA.

The attendance of the delegates at the sessions was constant and continued throughout. At State caucuses organization of active propaganda by the State associations was perfected. Each State was asked to contribute a fixed quota toward a fund of \$500,000 to spread propaganda. The league officers think the full sum will be secured.

In addition to sessions of the congress, chamber of commerce luncheons, meetings of women's clubs, and clerical conventions have been addressed by speakers of the league. The newspapers of each city have devoted much space to the sessions, and the speeches and everything has been done to challenge the attention of the people to the league of nations and the critical importance to this country and the world that we shall enter and make effective the great covenant of Paris for world peace.

#### FAVORED IN PUBLIC MIND.

Observation justifies the belief that the public mind favors the plan and does not recoil at the proposal that this country shall bear its share of the burden needed to give a bite to the league. Explanations of the proposed plan and operation of the league, especially in the execution of the treaty of peace, the stabilizing of the new republics and the prevention of war between these republics and the countries out of which they have been carved, as well as between one another, are listened to and followed with an attention that shows intense interest.

Everywhere the inquiry is, "What is the league of nations?" The man in the street thinks it is something to prevent war without knowing how. He is in favor of it without knowing why, except for its object. He is glad to hear of its proposed machinery.

Labor is in favor of it without qualification. The American Federation of Labor has declared in favor of a league of nations in several successive annual conventions. The labor commissions sent abroad have brought back to the wage earners on this side of the Atlantic

knowledge of the attitude of their brethren in England, France, and Italy toward a league of nations. The labor groups of those nations demand a real league, one that shall furnish a substantial defense against future wars.

It was the hope of this which buoyed them up in the awful strain of the war. It was the promise of this in the addresses and speeches of the President during the war that stiffened their morale. It was this promise repeated by the American labor and socialist commissions sent abroad under Government auspices that confirmed the feeling that America would be found the most insistent on a real league with "a bite" in it.

#### REGARDED AS BEST COMPROMISE.

It is this confidence thus engendered which has led the plain peoples of our allies to welcome the President with such heartfelt enthusiasm. The definite announcement of the covenant of Paris has given greater zest to the congresses. The League to Enforce Peace has given its whole-hearted support to the covenant as agreed upon by the 14 nations. The league does not contend that the covenant is perfect, or that it might not be made stronger and more effective, but it accepts it as the best compromise that could be secured by unanimous agreement.

It believes that if the covenant can be incorporated in the treaty of peace it will serve to clinch the great purpose of the war and will be the greatest step forward toward the maintenance of peace ever taken in recorded history. It believes that the burdens assumed by each nation in the league are light and infinitesimal as compared with the losses to be sustained in another war.

#### MONROE DOCTRINE STRENGTHENED.

The league believes that the Monroe doctrine instead of being endangered is strengthened by the covenant, one of whose great purposes is to extend the doctrine to the whole world. If the restriction of that doctrine that foreign nations shall not buy their way into new territorial and political power in the Western Hemisphere is not sufficiently prescribed in the covenant, the league believes it can easily be secured as an addition to the treaty before it is signed.

The league believes that the covenant creates no supersovereignty and that it does not restrict the just sovereignty of the United States. That just sovereignty is the same sovereignty it should accord to other nations, to wit, complete freedom of national action limited by international law and international morality and international justice. The covenant is a mere partnership agreement by which united action is secured to maintain this kind of national sovereignty for each member of the league and prevent the sovereign power of lone nations from being used to impose its arbitrary will upon another.

#### HAVE SMALL VISION, HE SAYS.

The league believes that those who oppose this league of nations on the ground that we should maintain the now impossible attitude of isolation from the rest of the world and avoid so-called entangling alliances have a small vision of the proposed place for our great Republic in the family of nations. They may be properly said to be small Americans in the narrow view that they take of America's world responsibilities with her enormous opportunities for helping mankind and the small risk and burden she will assume in entering the league and covenant now proposed. The league believes it to be a perversion of the purpose of the Federal Constitution, which, as John Marshall, its great interpreter, adjudged, was framed to make a nation with all the usual national powers to prevent its concert with other members of the family of nations to avoid war and secure peace.

The league believes that the covenant is not the mere consummation of an academic theory in normal times of peace which may be rejected to be taken up leisurely in some future time, but that it is the condition precedent of any satisfactory ending of the war. It believes that without this covenant for peaceably settling differences between the defeated peoples and the dozen new nations now to be carved out of the old empires to hem in Germany from future schemes of conquest the present chaos in the sphere of war will be worse confounded.

#### WOULD LACK WORLD PRESTIGE.

The league believes that unless the United States with its pure and acknowledged democracy, its disinterested purposes and its great potential power, does not join the covenant, the concert of the other powers will not have the world prestige and strength needed to clinch the purpose of the war and preserve peace and keep Germany down, and that the result will be a recurrence of the old balance of power and its disappointing results.

The league believes that it would be a tragedy in the history of civilization if the Senate can be induced by the protests and narrow views of a small number of Senators who have expressed themselves to defeat this grand covenant of peace, the unanimous agreement of the representatives of 14 nations, facing not a theory, but a real and a fateful crisis for the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I also ask to be permitted to insert in the RECORD a statement, entitled "America Should Back Wilson," against the proposition of the letter of Mr. George Bernard Shaw.

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

#### AMERICA SHOULD BACK WILSON.

"The influence of party politics and balance of power diplomacy on the peace conference is producing a reactionary combination of the present European war governments with the American republican opposition against the American democratic government and the European oppositions; and as, in view of the electoral weakness of the latter, Mr. Wilson, as a great man, standing for a great idea, must depend on sheer intellectual and moral superiority without regard to election figures, it is important that America should wake up to this situation, and not leave her President in the position of a prophet with less honor in his own country than in Europe, on which he has made a tremendous impression."

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. KENDRICK, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 5305) to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-



stock products, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 754) thereon.

Mr. KING (for Mr. SHAFROTH), from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 4479) for the protection of the water supply of the town of Sunnyside, Utah, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 755) thereon.

#### EXHIBITION OF RED FLAG.

Mr. WALSH. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, the bill (S. 5207) to declare unlawful the exhibition of a red flag, and to fix a penalty therefor; and I submit a report (No. 753) thereon. As the subject matter is deemed exceedingly urgent by a number of Senators, I shall ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. First, however, I ask that the report may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the report, as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5207) to declare unlawful the exhibition of a red flag, and to fix a penalty therefor, having considered the same, report favorably with the following amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"SECTION 1. It shall be unlawful for any person to advocate or advise or to write or with intent to forward the purpose hereinafter mentioned to print, publish, sell, or distribute any document, book, circular, paper, journal, or other written or printed communication in or by which there is advised the overthrow, by force or violence, or by physical injury to person or property, or by the general cessation of industry, of the Government of the United States or of all government.

"SEC. 2. That the display or exhibition at any meeting, gathering, or parade, public or private, of any flag, banner, or emblem symbolizing or intended by the person or persons displaying or exhibiting the same to symbolize a purpose to overthrow, by force or violence, or by physical injury to person or property, or by the general cessation of industry, the Government of the United States or all government is hereby declared to be unlawful.

"SEC. 3. Every document, book, circular, paper, journal, or other written or printed communication in or by which there is advocated or advised the overthrow, by force or violence, or by physical injury to person or property, or by the general cessation of industry, of the Government of the United States or of all government, or in or by which there is advocated or advised the unlawful use of force or violence or physical injury to or the unlawful seizure or destruction of persons or property as a means toward the accomplishment of economic, industrial, or political changes, is hereby declared to be nonmailable and shall not be conveyed in the mails or delivered from any post office or by any letter carrier: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to authorize any person other than an employee of the Dead Letter Office, duly authorized thereto, or other person upon a search warrant authorized by law, to open any letter not addressed to himself.

"SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful, with intent to forward the end in or by the same advocated or advised, to import or cause to be imported into the United States or any place subject to its jurisdiction any matter declared by section 3 of this act to be nonmailable, or with such intent to transport or cause to be transported any such matter from one State to another or to any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"SEC. 5. Whoever shall use or attempt to use the mails or the Postal Service of the United States for the transmission of any matter declared by section 3 of this act to be nonmailable or who shall otherwise violate any provision of this act shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, while this is a report on the bill introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New], and generally referred to as "the red-flag bill," it is intended as well to meet the evil to redress which a bill was some few days ago introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones], and it may be considered as a report upon both of those bills. Briefly, Mr. President—

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GORE. I wish to make an inquiry. My attention was called to the report after the reading of it had begun. Is this a bill that has just been reported from a committee?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; from the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GORE. Has any request been preferred with respect to its consideration?

Mr. WALSH. I want to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. GORE. I did not hear the entire reading of the report at the desk, and I will have to object to the consideration of the bill to-day, because I wish to examine the report.

Mr. WALSH. Then I give notice that at the conclusion of the morning business to-morrow morning I shall ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill.

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

#### LANDING OF THE PILGRIMS.

Mr. THOMPSON. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 227) creating a committee to consider arranging for the celebration of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims. I call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the joint resolution.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That a joint commission, consisting of two Senators, Members of the Sixty-sixth Congress, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and four Members elect to the House of Representatives of the Sixty-sixth Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth Congress, is hereby created,

whose duty it shall be to confer with officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or any political subdivision thereof, and with officers of any organizations or societies, and with individuals, relative to any contemplated observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth, Mass. Said commission shall report within 60 days after the Sixty-sixth Congress convenes, with its recommendation as to appropriate legislation for participation by the Government of the United States in the celebration of this historic event.

The expense of said commission shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

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

#### COURT ACCOMMODATIONS IN SACRAMENTO, CAL.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I report back from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds the bill (H. R. 204) for fitting up quarters in the Federal court building in the city of Sacramento for the accommodation of the northern district court of California and its officers, and I ask unanimous consent, because it is an emergency measure, that it may be at once taken up.

Mr. POMERENE. Will it likely lead to any discussion?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Not at all. It is the endeavor to provide quarters for the district court in the city of Sacramento. They have absolutely none at the present time. They sometimes meet in a hotel, sometimes in the court room of the superior court, sometimes in the capitol. The United States grand jury that recently indicted the I. W. W.'s there had to meet wherever they could at different places at different times.

Mr. POMERENE. If it does not lead to discussion, I will not object.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I report back the bill favorably without amendment and ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized, empowered, and directed to cause to be provided and constructed in the post-office building in the city of Sacramento, Cal., quarters such as he may deem necessary and proper for the district court of the northern district of California, and its officers, at a cost not to exceed the sum of \$60,000.

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

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 5658) to authorize the acquisition and operation by the United States of the Cape Cod Canal; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 5659) granting an increase of pension to William C. Markward (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

#### THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. RANDELL. I send to the desk a joint resolution which I ask to have read, after which I ask for its immediate consideration. I invite the attention of the Senate to this joint resolution. It is quite important.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 228) amending a provision of the urgent deficiency appropriation act, approved June 15, 1917, extending the time in which the authority granted the President of the United States thereunder may be exercised, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the paragraph of the emergency shipping fund provision of the urgent deficiency appropriation act approved June 15, 1917, which reads "All authority granted to the President herein or by him delegated shall cease six months after a final treaty of peace is proclaimed between this Government and the German Empire" be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows: "All authority granted to the President herein, or by him delegated, shall cease 18 months after a final treaty of peace is proclaimed between this Government and the German Empire."



Mr. RANDELL. Just one word of explanation to the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana if this is a report from the committee this morning?

Mr. RANDELL. No, sir; it is not a report from the committee. The matter was discussed in the committee, and we all agreed that there should be some extension of time for the President to dispose of the great fleet, costing about two and a half billion dollars, that we are now constructing. Under the law all of his authority to manage or dispose of this fleet under the provisions of the emergency deficiency appropriation will cease six months after the declaration of peace; and the joint resolution is simply to extend the time for a further period of 12 months, so that Congress will have ample opportunity to legislate.

Mr. SMOOT. I wanted to get the legislative situation. I understand that the joint resolution has not been reported from the committee.

Mr. RANDELL. It has not been referred to the committee, I will say.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I do not think it is in order. If this is a joint resolution, I will say to the Senator, under the rules it must go to a committee first. If it were a concurrent resolution or a Senate resolution, the Senator could ask for its consideration; but a joint resolution is the same as a bill, and it ought to be introduced and referred to a committee.

Mr. RANDELL. We sometimes consider even bills without referring them to committees. If the Senator thinks this must be referred, I do not object to its going to the Committee on Commerce. I am sure they will report it out immediately. I believe the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] knows how important this matter is.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington wanted to interrupt the Senator to say that he had no recollection of this being discussed in the committee with a view to acting upon it. I probably was not there when the matter was up. I have no recollection that it was so discussed.

Mr. RANDELL. I do not think the Senator was there. It was discussed rather fully in an executive session when Mr. Whipple, the attorney for the Shipping Board, was there; but if there be any objection to considering it now, it can be referred to the Committee on Commerce. I do not want to press its consideration without giving the committee a chance to consider it.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it go to the committee.

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

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. KELLOGG submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$60,000 to enable the Secretary of the Interior to pay the amounts assessed against tribal and allotted lands of the Indian reservations of Minnesota, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WALSH submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,200 to pay Dennis M. Kerr for extra services to the Committee on Pensions during the third session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed.

#### SEIZED ALIEN PROPERTY.

Mr. THOMPSON. I submit a resolution asking for information from one of the departments, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 462) was read, was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Alien Property Custodian be directed to furnish for the information of the Senate a description of the different kinds of property taken into custody by him, its estimated value, the names and addresses of the former owners of the property seized, and the disposition made of said property.

#### THE EXECUTIVE JOURNAL.

Mr. HITCHCOCK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 464), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved*, That the entire Executive Journal from the end of the last session of the Fifty-seventh Congress, the date to which said proceedings have already been printed and published by order of the Senate, to the end of the Sixty-fourth Congress, be printed and published under direction of the Secretary of the Senate, with a suitable index to each volume, and that 250 copies be printed.

*Resolved further*, That the injunction of secrecy be removed therefrom.

#### TRADING WITH THE ENEMY.

Mr. CALDER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 463), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

*Resolved*, That the Alien Property Custodian be, and is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate of the United States the following information as provided for under section 6 of the act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917: A detailed report of all proceedings had under such act up to and including February 15, 1919; such report shall contain a list of all persons appointed or employed, with the salary or compensation paid to each, and a statement of the different kinds of property taken into custody and the disposition made thereof. Said report shall recite the name and address at the time of their designation or appointment of such persons as clerks, investigators, accountants, attorneys, auctioneers, salesmen, or administrators, and all persons employed or designated to in any manner represent him in any capacity whatsoever, either with or without pay, and shall further recite the fact as to whether such person or persons were selected from list of eligibles supplied by the Civil Service Commission. Such report of said custodian shall give the item of moneys received both at private and public sales in such detail as to identify each separate parcel of property so sold and a list as of the above date of such other properties as shall have been formally surrendered to him or seized by him.

#### AMENDMENT OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE ACT.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 5555) to amend the war-risk insurance act. It involves a matter of very urgent and immediate necessity. If it provokes debate, I shall, of course, withdraw it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill named by him. Is there objection?

Mr. POMERENE. Is this matter going to require some discussion?

Mr. THOMAS. If it does, I shall withdraw it. It is to amend the war-risk insurance act, which is very necessary, as outlined in a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, which I thought I would have read for the edification of the Senate. I was requested by the director of the bureau to bring this matter up to-day, if possible. If it takes any discussion, I will withdraw it.

Mr. POMERENE. With the understanding that it is not going to take any discussion, I shall not object.

Mr. THOMAS. As I have stated, if it does I will withdraw it. The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 402 of the war-risk insurance act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 402. That the director, subject to the general direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall promptly determine upon and publish the full and exact terms and conditions of such contract of insurance. The insurance until converted shall be payable only to a spouse, child, grandchild, parent, brother, or sister, and also during total and permanent disability to the injured person, or to any or all of them: *Provided*, That in the case of converted insurance, the permitted class of beneficiaries shall include in addition to the foregoing an uncle, aunt, nephew, or niece. The insurance shall be payable in 240 equal monthly installments. Provisions for maturity at certain ages, for continuous installments during the life of the insured, or beneficiaries, or both, for cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values, dividends from gains and savings, and such other provisions for the protection and advantage of and for alternative benefits to the insured and the beneficiaries as may be found to be reasonable and practicable, may be provided for in the contract of insurance, or from time to time by regulations. All calculations shall be based upon the American Experience Table of Mortality and interest at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, except that no deduction shall be made for continuous installments during the life of the insured in case his total and permanent disability continues more than 240 months. Subject to regulations, the insured shall at all times have the right to change the beneficiary or beneficiaries of such insurance without the consent of such beneficiary or beneficiaries, but only within the classes herein provided. If no beneficiary within the permitted class be designated by the insured, either in his lifetime or by his last will and testament, or if the designated beneficiary does not survive the insured, the insurance shall be payable to such person or persons within the permitted class of beneficiaries as would under the laws of the State of the residence of the insured be entitled to his personal property in case of intestacy. In the case of converted insurance, if no person within the permitted class survive the insured, there shall be paid to the estate of the insured an amount equal to the commuted value of the installments remaining unpaid, calculated at the rate of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent interest; but, if one or more such persons shall survive the insured and shall have died before receiving all of the installments payable, there shall be paid to the estate of the last surviving person within the permitted class an amount equal to the commuted value of the installments remaining unpaid, calculated at the rate of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent interest."

Sec. 2. That a new section is hereby added to Article IV of such act to be known as section 405 and to read as follows:

"Sec. 405. That the Bureau of War Risk Insurance is hereby directed to set aside out of the premiums collected on the insurance converted under this article such a reserve fund, calculated on the basis of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent interest, as may be required, under accepted actuarial principles, to meet all liabilities under such insurance; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to invest the said reserve fund, or any part thereof, in farm-loan bonds issued by the Federal land banks or in interest-bearing securities of the United States."

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

Mr. THOMAS. I ask that the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury concerning the bill be inserted in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.



The matter referred to is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, February 7, 1919.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am inclosing herewith a tentative draft of a bill amending the war-risk insurance act. It provides for the enlargement of the permitted class of beneficiaries of converted insurance and directs the setting aside of a reserve fund for such insurance.

In my opinion, the early passage by the Congress of a bill similar in effect to that inclosed is of such vital importance to the success of the bureau in administering the provisions of the war-risk insurance act authorizing the conversion of insurance heretofore granted that I earnestly request that you give it the earliest possible attention. The reasons for requesting the legislation proposed may be thus briefly stated:

1. The setting aside of an insurance reserve: Section 402 of the act authorizes the inclusion in the insurance contract of provisions for "dividends from gains and savings, and such other provisions for the protection and advantage of and for alternative benefits to the insured and the beneficiaries as may be found to be reasonable and practicable." This and other provisions of the act make it clear that Congress expected that the contracts of converted insurance to be issued should make provisions for dividends substantially similar to those usually found in life insurance policies issued by private companies. It is also reasonable to infer that Congress expected that the gains and savings out of which these dividends were to be paid should, as in the case of private insurance companies, be realized from interest on reserve and savings in mortality. Hence, the Secretary of the Treasury should invest the reserve fund obtained from premiums on converted insurance in such a manner as to realize interest in excess of the basic rate of 3½ per cent upon which the reserve is calculated. This action could probably be taken by the Secretary without receiving additional authority from the Congress, but the importance of the proposed action is so great, affecting as it must the work of the bureau through half a century, and the sums involved are so large that it would be unwise to proceed without receiving the express direction of the Congress. I am advised that the success of the plan to continue the insurance of our soldiers in converted form depends largely upon the step proposed to be taken.

The considerations which lead me to think that the Congress should direct the establishment and maintenance of such a reserve fund may be set forth more specifically as follows:

(a) In receiving level-rate premiums for converted insurance from the soldier in the earlier years of the insured's life the Government takes from him more money than necessary to cover the cost of the protection granted to him during those years. This excess or reserve morally and equitably belongs to the insured and is held by the Government for his benefit. It is in a sense a trust fund, which the Government should use not for its own expenses but for the benefit of the insured. Moral obligation, as well as sound insurance practice, requires the Government to invest this reserve fund in such a way as to secure the highest interest obtainable consistent with safety.

(b) By using such a reserve fund for the purchase of farm-loan bonds issued by the Federal land bank an interest return substantially equal to 4½ per cent could be secured with perfect safety. At the same time one of the Government's most admirable economic agencies would be aided.

(c) The history of fraternal insurance organizations which failed to provide in early years a reserve fund shows what would be the effect of a failure on the part of the Government to set aside a reserve to support the converted insurance granted under the war-risk insurance act. If premium receipts should be applied in payment of current claims under matured insurance, with no setting aside of a reserve, the amount of the appropriations that would be required of Congress would at first, relatively speaking, be misleadingly small and would later become inordinately large. In short, sound economic theory, as well as the considerations of simple justice mentioned in (a) above, require the maintenance of a reserve.

2. Enlargement of permitted class of beneficiaries: Section 402 provides that in case the permitted beneficiaries of the insured die before the insured, or before they have received all of the 240 installments payable after his death, the installments remaining unpaid shall be forfeited to the Government, only the reserve value, if any, being payable to the estate of the insured. This was a wise and fair provision in the case of war-time term insurance. As the Government was giving to the insured the extra cost of insurance due to war hazards, there was no unfairness in declaring that it would not pay if the soldier's immediate dependents should have failed, but the same considerations do not apply to the converted insurance carried by the soldier under peace-time conditions, and for which he pays in full. It is only reasonable that the soldier who pays in full for his insurance should be given a wider selection of beneficiaries among his relatives, and it is but simple justice that he should receive in full the insurance he pays for without fear of forfeiture in case no person within the permitted class survives him. The proposed bill attached hereto enlarges the class of permitted beneficiaries so as to include uncles, aunts, nephews, and nieces of the insured. It further provides that if no such person within the enlarged class of beneficiaries survives the insured, the commuted value of the installments remaining unpaid shall become a part of the estate of the insured, but if the surviving beneficiaries within that class die before receiving all of the installments payable, then the commuted value of the unpaid installments shall become payable to the estate of the last surviving member of the permitted class. It is to be noted that the amount payable in such cases to the estate of the insured or of the last surviving beneficiary is the commuted value of the unpaid installments, and not merely the reserve of the policy, which alone is payable under the existing provisions of the act.

I am satisfied that the legislation proposed is entirely consistent with the purpose of the act and essential to the successful administration of those provisions requiring the conversion of the annual-term insurance into other forms of insurance suitable to the peace-time needs of insured soldiers and sailors. This opinion is supported by the advice of the best insurance experts in this country, who, after careful study during many weeks of all the problems involved, and having special regard for the best interests of the men in the military and naval service, have incorporated some of the provisions of the proposed legislation in the recently completed policy forms for converted insurance. If these policies are to be issued as drawn and the work of conversion thereunder to begin, it is necessary for the Congress to pass the legislation proposed, and it is respectfully requested that this be done at the earliest possible day.

Sincerely, yours,

CARTER GLASS, Secretary.

Hon. F. M. SIMMONS,  
Chairman Committee on Finance,  
United States Senate.

# AMERICAN FIELD OF HONOR.

Mr. SPENCER. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 5313, being calendar No. 667, which gives the Secretary of War the authority to acquire and maintain a cemetery in France for the reception of bodies of American soldiers who have died there and whose parents or relatives do not desire their bodies brought home.

Mr. POMERENE. I ask whether the bill is likely to lead to any discussion?

Mr. SPENCER. I think not. If there is any discussion, I will withdraw the request. I believe there will be no objection to the consideration and passage of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That, subject to the laws relative to national military cemeteries within the United States, so far as such laws may be applicable and subject to the permission of France by treaty or otherwise, a commission shall be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, in the name of the United States, a suitable plot of land in France, preferably on or near one of the important battle fields where American troops were conspicuously engaged, and there to establish a national cemetery, to be known as the American field of honor, and to properly prepare said plot of land for use as such, and thereafter to care for, preserve, and maintain the same.

Sec. 2. That in said field of honor, in section 1 of this act provided for, may be buried, and shall only be buried, the remains of officers and members of and persons accompanying or serving with the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who have died or hereafter shall die while serving with the overseas forces during the present war with Germany or during any period of occupation immediately subsequent thereto; and the Secretary of War is hereby directed to cause the remains of each of the persons aforesaid to be buried in said field, or in such other place in the United States, as he shall select, unless the nearest relative of the deceased shall otherwise request, when he will dispose of said remains in accordance with the provisions of existing law.

Sec. 3. That for the purchase of the land and the original cost of the preparation thereof for use as a national cemetery as in the first section of this act provided, and for the cost of transfer of remains and the interment thereof in said cemetery or elsewhere as in the second section of this act provided, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$ \_\_\_\_\_, or so much thereof as may be necessary therefor.

Sec. 4. The commission referred to in section 1 of this act shall consist of three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House of Representatives appointed, respectively, by the Vice President and the Speaker of the House, who will become the permanent board to administer the cemetery and its maintenance. Vacancies shall be filled as in its original organization.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I move to strike out section 3, concerning the appropriation, which is entirely unnecessary. All that is intended is to give the Secretary of War the power to arrange for such a cemetery, and no appropriation is necessary at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before we vote on that, I do not quite understand the situation. How can the Secretary of War procure real estate in France without some money with which to do it?

Mr. SPENCER. If I may answer the Senator, the bill provides that the Secretary of War, subject to the permission of the Government of France, by treaty or otherwise, may take up the question of the acquisition of the cemetery. Of course we can not get any land in France without the consent of the Government of France.

Mr. REED. We can get land in France in which to bury our soldiers if the French Government consents, but it does not follow that they will donate the land. Is there any arrangement for donation?

Mr. SPENCER. I will answer the Senator. It has been intimated that the French Government will donate the land. A communication from France to that effect would seem so to show; but if the land is not donated, all that this bill would do would be to allow the Secretary of War to take up the question of obtaining land for a cemetery in France; and if money was needed to purchase it, then further legislation would be necessary. This bill carries no appropriation.

Mr. REED. It will carry no appropriation if the Senator's motion is agreed to.

Mr. SPENCER. I understand that the amendment has been agreed to striking out section 3, providing for the appropriation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; that is the pending question.

Mr. REED. That is the pending question.

Mr. SPENCER. I understood it had been agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay this matter a moment. I want this ground secured. I want some spot sacred to this cause to be procured. I do not think we ought



to expect a donation. If France should donate the land we will not then have paid out our money; but if France should give her permission, and it should be necessary to buy the ground, I think the money ought to be on hand.

The dead ought to be provided for. They ought not to sleep in Flanders fields in unknown graves. I intended to introduce and had written a bill providing for a cemetery in France, but I learned that one had been prepared and introduced; and I see no reason for cutting out this appropriation. I take it the money will not be spent unless the ground is obtained.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, what amount is proposed?

Mr. REED. The amount in the bill is \$500,000; is it not?

Mr. LODGE. No; it is left blank.

Mr. THOMAS. The original bill provides for that.

Mr. REED. What is the motion of the Senator?

Mr. SPENCER. The motion that I made was to strike out section 3, concerning the matter of appropriation. No definite appropriation is included in the bill as reported by the committee. If I may say to the Senator, there is a large appropriation for cemeteries in the general military bill. It may well be that that will be available and for preliminary purposes entirely sufficient; and it was for that reason that it did not seem to me necessary at this time to insert the appropriation. I did want to get the authority for the Secretary of War to commence proceedings for the acquisition of this cemetery.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to get the authority for the Secretary of War to commence the proceedings and to commence them in a practical way. To send a man out to acquire land, and give him nothing to acquire it with, seems to me a very peculiar proceeding.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that at this time it is impossible to know how many soldiers will likely be buried there? Nine-tenths, if not more than that, of the soldiers' relatives will want their bodies shipped here; and it seems to me to be very appropriate that no amount should be specified now, because we do not know how many will be buried there. It may be that none of the relatives will want to have the soldiers buried in foreign territory. For that reason, I do not believe the Senator's position is sound.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have no official information upon the subject; but I am credibly informed that the French Government, or some high French officials speaking for the Government, have made the announcement that a cemetery for the burial and care of the American dead will be furnished by the Government of the French Republic.

Mr. REED. If that is the settled fact, I have nothing to say.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, I could not go that far. I have been informed that such is the case, and I saw a statement in the press dispatches sometime last week to that effect.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I take it that this money will not be used unless it is necessary. There is a motion pending, I believe. The motion is to strike out the section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's motion would have precedence.

Mr. REED. I move to amend, then, by inserting in the blank the sum of \$500,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I was not able, owing to the confusion, to hear all of the bill as it was read. Do I understand that this interferes in any way with the order which I understand has been issued, or at least the information which has been sent out, to the effect that the friends or relatives of the boys who were killed in France may have the bodies of those boys returned here?

Mr. SPENCER. It does not interfere with that. The bodies of those who died in France, and whose relatives desire those bodies to be brought back home, will be brought back home, under the provisions of this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] There seems to be one "aye" and one "no." The Chair votes "aye," and the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing a commission to acquire and maintain a cemetery in France in the

name of the United States for the reception and interment of the bodies of American officers and men who lost their lives in connection with the European war, and for other purposes."

Mr. REED subsequently said: A few moments ago, I am sure, the Senate acted inadvertently. Section 3 of the bill called up by the Senator by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire a cemetery in France was before the Senate. The Senate amended section 3 by practical unanimity, and then immediately the Chair put the vote on the motion which was pending of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] to strike out section 3, after it had been amended. There were only a few votes, and I am sure the Senators who voted "aye" did not understand that they were voting to strike out the section. I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and all the votes are reconsidered back to the consideration of the bill in the Senate.

Mr. REED. Now the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] can withdraw his motion to strike out section 3.

Mr. SPENCER. I do withdraw it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? If not, the motion is withdrawn.

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

#### LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Saturday next, March 1, at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], I shall address the Senate on the proposed league of nations and the foreign policy of this Government.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Wednesday of this week I shall seek an opportunity to address the Senate upon the proposed league of nations.

#### ARMY COURTS OF APPEAL.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an article taken from the New York World of yesterday, Sunday, the 23d instant, relative to a provision in the pending Army bill.

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

The joint resolution introduced by Senator McKELLAR providing for the appointment of as many reviewing boards as may be necessary to examine the records and revise the judgments of 22,000 courts-martial ought to receive the approval of Congress without delay. It is a tardy recognition by Congress itself of its own shortcomings.

These boards will constitute Army courts of appeal. They will be made up of officers who have not acted at any of the trials. Their members will be named by the President, and with him will remain the power to set aside or mitigate their findings, "to the end that even and exact justice shall be done in each case."

Convictions have been the rule with general and special courts-martial and most of the sentences have been severe. In 14 months these courts acquitted only 2,900 defendants out of 27,000. Outside of the death penalty, prescribed in many cases, but, it is said, not inflicted, punishments have ranged from imprisonment at hard labor for 40 years downward, the average being extremely high. In addition, there were dishonorable discharges and loss of citizenship.

Such reviews as there have been of these trials have been altogether perfunctory and in most instances prejudiced. Senator McKELLAR's resolution provides for appeals as a matter of right and gives assurance that they will be heard by disinterested officers. Civil law protects the accused at every stage of his prosecution. If we forget its precepts in our relation with the soldier, no matter what his offense may be, we enroll ourselves with the despots of militarism.

#### RECREATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 3219, to provide a charter for the Recreation Association of America.

Mr. KING. I object.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If I had seen the Senator from Utah, I would not have asked unanimous consent. [Laughter.]

Mr. KING. I regret that the Senator did not see me.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am sorry that the Senator was present. I think he is the only person who objects to the consideration of the bill.

#### VENTILATION OF SENATE CHAMBER.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a matter which I think is of importance to the Members who sit in this Chamber.

The air which we breathe comes through a dark, damp tunnel, three or four hundred feet long, and is brought into this Chamber, I am satisfied, filled with impure bacterial life. I believe it has contributed to the mortality of men in this body during the last 10 or 12 years that I have been a Member here. I want to put into the RECORD the number of those deaths. Thirty-six Senators have died, since I have become a Member



of this Chamber, while in the service; 23 others have died shortly after retiring from their Senatorial service; making altogether 59 Senators who have died since I became a Member of this body. I think it is very striking and very significant.

I believe that the health of the Members of this body is seriously affected by the air we are compelled to breathe. It would be perfectly easy to have a small pipe go into the open air, with a high-pressure fan, and run by an electric current, which would furnish all of the air this Chamber needs. It would not require a 10-foot tunnel but merely a 2-foot pipe under a high-pressure fan to furnish all the air that is necessary, and clean air, dry air, and air free from infection.

I ask for the adoption of the following:

*Ordered*, That the Superintendent of the Capitol be, and hereby is, directed to take under advisement the question of the ventilation of the Senate Chamber, and to take such steps as in his judgment may be necessary and adequate to provide at all times an equable temperature and a sufficient supply of pure, fresh air, directly from the outside air, avoiding the use of the present tunnel.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think the chief thing from which we suffer in the Senate is "hot air," and it does not come from very long pipes, either.

Mr. KENYON. May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma what has become of the committee which was appointed some years ago on that very subject? Does the Senator know?

Mr. OWEN. I suppose they are all dead.

I should like to have inserted in the Record a list of Senators who have died and to whom I have referred, if there be no objection.

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

SENATORS WHO HAVE DIED DURING THEIR TENURE OF OFFICE SINCE DECEMBER 16, 1907.

Stephen R. Mallory, Florida, December 23, 1907.  
Asbury C. Latimer, South Carolina, February 20, 1908.  
Redfield Proctor, Vermont, March 4, 1908.  
William Pinkney White, Maryland, March 17, 1908.  
William James Bryan, Florida, March 22, 1908.  
William Boyd Allison, Iowa, August 4, 1908.  
Martin N. Johnson, North Dakota, October 21, 1909.  
Anselm J. McLaurin, Mississippi, December 22, 1909.  
Samuel Douglas McEnery, Louisiana, June 28, 1910.  
John Warwick Daniel, Virginia, June 29, 1910.  
Jonathan P. Dolliver, Iowa, October 15, 1910.  
Alexander Stephen Clay, Georgia, November 13, 1910.  
Stephen B. Elkins, West Virginia, January 4, 1911.  
Charles A. Hughes, Jr., Colorado, January 11, 1911.  
William P. Frye, Maine, August 8, 1911.  
Robert L. Taylor, Tennessee, March 31, 1912.  
George S. Nixon, Nevada, June 5, 1912.  
Weldon B. Heyburn, Idaho, October 17, 1912.  
Isidor Rayner, Maryland, November 25, 1912.  
Jeff Davis, Arkansas, January 3, 1913.  
Joseph F. Johnston, Alabama, August 8, 1913.  
Augustus O. Bacon, Georgia, February 14, 1914.  
William O. Bradley, Kentucky, May 23, 1914.  
B. F. Shiveley, Indiana, March 14, 1916.  
Edwin C. Burleigh, Maine, June 16, 1916.  
James P. Clarke, Arkansas, October 1, 1916.  
Harry Lane, Oregon, May 23, 1917.  
Paul O. Husting, Wisconsin, October 21, 1917.  
Francis G. Newlands, Nevada, December 24, 1917.  
James H. Brady, Idaho, January 13, 1918.  
William Hughes, New Jersey, January 30, 1918.  
Robert F. Broussard, Louisiana, April 12, 1918.  
William J. Stone, Missouri, April 14, 1918.  
Benjamin R. Tillman, South Carolina, July 3, 1918.  
Jacob H. Gallinger, New Hampshire, August 17, 1918.  
Ollie M. James, Kentucky, August 28, 1918.

SENATORS WHOSE TERMS OF SERVICE EXPIRED SINCE DECEMBER 16, 1907, AND WHOSE DEATHS OCCURRED SINCE THE TERMINATION OF THEIR SERVICE.

T. C. Platt, New York, March 6, 1910.  
A. B. Kittredge, South Dakota, May 4, 1911.  
J. M. Terrell, Georgia, November 18, 1912.  
James Gordon, Mississippi, November 27, 1912.  
Frank O. Briggs, New Jersey, May 8, 1913.  
Henry M. Teller, Colorado, February 24, 1914.  
W. A. Massey, Nevada, March 5, 1914.  
John Kean, New Jersey, November 4, 1914.  
W. S. West, Georgia, December 22, 1914.  
William M. Kavanaugh, Arkansas, February 21, 1915.  
Nelson W. Aldrich, Rhode Island, April 16, 1915.  
J. W. Stewart, Vermont, October 29, 1915.  
J. C. Burrows, Michigan, November 16, 1915.  
William Warner, Missouri, October 4, 1916.  
H. B. Burnham, New Hampshire, February 8, 1917.  
J. B. Foraker, Ohio, May 10, 1917.  
John W. Kern, Indiana, August 17, 1917.  
J. R. Thornton, Louisiana, December 28, 1917.  
C. W. Fulton, Oregon, January 27, 1918.  
Isaac Stephenson, Wisconsin, March 15, 1918.  
J. B. McCreary, Kentucky, October 8, 1918.  
Eugene Hale, Maine, October 28, 1918.  
George T. Oliver, Pennsylvania, January 22, 1919.  
Total, 23.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I ask that the order which I have submitted be agreed to.

The order was agreed to.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have read a very short news item contained in the Washington Star of Saturday, February 22. I ask to have it read as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

OKUMA DISCUSSES "RIGHTS"—JAPAN, HE SAYS, AS OF BIG FIVE, SHOULD DEMAND "EQUALITY."

TOKYO, February 21.

Count Okuma, speaking in the House of Peers in reference to the league of nations to-day, said:

"The United States and Great Britain are conjointly the leading nations of Anglo-Saxon civilization. For consummating the league nothing more important is to be done than the removal of racial discrimination. Japan is now among the five great powers and fully entitled to demand equality in all respects.

"Much will depend upon Japan's delegates at the peace conference to give practical efficiency to this most important problem, not only for Japan but for the practicability of the league."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope the Members of the Senate will simply be advised by this.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Record an article from the New York Times of February 24, entitled "A league of despots." It is an article upon the general subject of the league of nations, and particularly upon the subject of the speech made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 24, 1919.]

A LEAGUE OF DESPOTS.

Senator REED sounds high and clear the note of alarm. Little attention did he give in his Senate speech to miserable interrogatories about the fate of the Constitution and the Monroe doctrine under the league of nations. His mind was fixed upon the all-embracing and awful menace of the league as a conspiracy of monarchs and despots against this land of liberty. "Shall we surrender with the pen what Washington gained by his sword?" Shall we accept government "partly by the people and partly by kings and emperors?" A victor in the war, shall we emerge from the strife "a mere constituent State of a league dominated by European monarchies and Asiatic despots"? Great Britain is an empire, Italy a monarchy, Japan "a monarchy of despotism," France a republic, the United States a republic. "Three monarchies and two republics. Who will control it, I ask again?"

When Senator REED concluded his speech Senators from both sides of the Chamber crowded around him for handshaking and congratulations. Applause upon the floor was redoubled in volume by the enthusiasm of the galleries. Five minutes of tumultuous demonstration set the seal of senatorial and popular approval upon the Missouri Senator's impassioned denunciation of President Wilson's attempt to put the United States in vassalage to the kings of effete Europe and the despots of burnt-out Asia. We should despair of our country if such a speech as this, an eloquent warning against the forfeiture of our liberties, delivered in the Senate on the anniversary of Washington's birth, and adorned with the customary invocation of the memories of Concord Bridge, Lexington, and the con-skin caps of the embattled farmers, should call forth only that cold and perfunctory applause which might mark the conclusion of an expository address upon the Post Office appropriation bill.

If this be in fact a league of despots that Mr. Wilson has helped to contrive, every American will feel that something ought to be done about it. But does Mr. REED believe in his heart that the American people will be much moved by his speech against the league of nations? Will they take his word for it that the league is compounded of European kings and Asiatic despots, or will they calmly consider the facts? There is a British Empire, made up of self-governing dominions. The United Kingdom is a monarchy where the people's rule is as little hampered as it is in our own Republic. Mr. Lloyd George is the despot we have to fear there. France as a sister Republic gets exceptional treatment from Mr. REED. Italy, however, is a monarchy, and Sonnino is the man against whom suspicion must be directed. The Asiatic despot must be the Emperor of Japan. He would be astounded, and his people with him, to hear himself so described. But stay. There is a despot, a real one, if we mistake not the sole relic of feudal absolutism on earth—the Negus of Abyssinia.

If that fierce African potentate is to be reckoned with, then there is point and force in Senator REED's speech against the league—otherwise not, decidedly not. Respect due to the senatorial toga forbids us to describe this speech as fustian, but in solemn truth was it not, for all the applause it received from its Washington audience, where all audiences are proverbially "against the administration," was it not a pompous battering down of an open door? Mr. REED's picture of the league of nations shows this Republic helplessly enmeshed in the snares of a hostile band of monarchical conspirators. But Missouri schoolboys know that in every one of the countries that will be our fellow members—we make exception of Abyssinia and her illustrious Negus—the affairs of Government are in the hands of a Parliament and a ministry. The peoples of those lands are self-governing. Do we stand in such fear of democracies that we must refuse to join them in an earnest effort to establish the reign of peace and justice on earth?

If this be a true picture that Senator REED holds up to our view, if the nations who are to be our partners in this undertaking are harboring those covert designs against our rights and liberties as a sovereign State which he imputes to them, then their ill will and their knavish plots will be an imminent peril to us whether we form a league or not, and obviously a far greater peril without the league than with it. A covenant with them would give us some protection. If we must beware of that as a dangerous entanglement, then we should cease our demobilization and make instant preparation for creating and maintaining a permanent military establishment of not less than 4,000,000 men, and instead of a paltry Navy equal to England's, we must have three times



her sea power. With all the world plotting our overthrow, masking malignant designs behind a pretended friendship, we must put ourselves in readiness for defense. The next gale that sweeps from Missouri will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms.

The American people are an uncommonly sensible folk. We take occasion to record here our firm belief that they will refuse to be scared by Senator REEB's horrendous conjuration of anointed European Kings and whiskered Asiatic despots. But let the Senator beware of misjudging the sentiments of his countrymen upon one important matter. They have a horror of war. They are going to accept the league of nations unless he and Mr. BORAH and Mr. POINDEXTER have a better guarantee of peace. What do they propose?

#### OIL AND GAS LANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. On Saturday the Chair sustained the point of order to the conference report on Senate bill 2812. Having charge of the matter on behalf of the conferees on the part of the Senate, I requested at that time that it be recommitted to the conferees. I ask whether an order is necessary requesting a further conference with the House on the matter. The House having acted upon the conference report and having approved it, a situation has arisen under the rule of the Senate which requires some action apparently on behalf of the Senate, so that the report may be again considered by the House.

I ask unanimous consent that the matter be corrected by the Senate by having the report referred back to the managers on the part of the Senate and that they ask the House for a further conference upon Senate bill 2812.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who made the point of order, is not in the Chamber.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin intended exactly what I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not doubt it. I have no reason to think otherwise.

Mr. HARDWICK. I suggest to the Senator that the proper procedure is that he move that the Senate insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the bill and ask for a further conference, and that the Chair name the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. PITTMAN. Under the rule apparently it was referred back to the same conferees. The rule is peculiar to this body. I simply ask unanimous consent that it be corrected in that way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks this is the proper procedure as a new one, that the Senate request a further conference with the House and respectfully request the House to recede from its agreement to the conference report and to appoint, if necessary, conferees.

Mr. PITTMAN. In view of the ruling of the Chair, I move, with the permission of the Senate, that the Senate further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the House and ask for a further conference and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. There was no disagreement to the amendment of the House. The Senate bill and the House bill had the same identical wording as to the provision of the conference report that went out on a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada did not quite catch the opinion of the Chair. If this is satisfactory, the Chair will put it this way, that the report be rereferred to the same conferees on the part of the Senate. We have no right to ask the House to do anything, and we will just stop at that. Let the House take such steps as it will.

Mr. PITTMAN. I certainly do not desire this measure to fail in conference by reason of the peculiar rule of this body, and unless some message is sent to the House there will be no basis for action there.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There will be the order of the Senate that requests a further conference with the House. That will go to the House. Without question, the Chair does not think the Senate could ask the House to take any step. It must determine for itself what it will or will not do.

Mr. PITTMAN. Then that course will be agreed to by unanimous consent if there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so entered, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] conferees at the further conference on the part of the Senate.

#### DISCHARGED SICK AND DISABLED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. FRANCE. I ask to be relieved from serving upon the conference committee on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House bill 13026, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines. I find it impossible to serve, and I ask that the Senator from Wisconsin

[Mr. LENROOT] be substituted in my place, and that the House be so notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Is there further morning business? [After a pause.] It is closed.

#### SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN.

Mr. POMERENE. I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 415, referring the petition of Henry Ford, contesting the election of Truman H. Newberry, as a Senator from Michigan, to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and authorizing said committee to take possession of the ballots, pool books, tally sheets, and documents, and to make investigation and take all necessary proceedings relating to said contest.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. POMERENE. I move that, notwithstanding the objection, the Senate proceed to consideration of the resolution.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	Johnson, Cal.	New	Smoot
Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Spencer
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sterling
Culberson	Kellogg	Overman	Sutherland
Cummins	Kendrick	Page	Thompson
Curtis	King	Penrose	Townsend
Dillingham	Knox	Pollock	Trammell
Fernald	La Follette	Pomerene	Underwood
France	Lenroot	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Lewis	Reed	Walsh
Gay	McCumber	Robinson	Warren
Hale	McKellar	Shafroth	Watson
Harding	McLean	Sheppard	Weeks
Hardwick	McNary	Simmons	Wolcott
Henderson	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	
Hitchcock	Moses	Smith, S. C.	

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

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the motion of the Senator from Ohio, under Rule VII. Paragraph 3 of that rule reads as follows:

3. Until the morning business shall have been concluded, and so announced from the Chair, or until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the calendar shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer, unless by unanimous consent; and if such consent be given the motion shall not be subject to amendment and shall be decided without debate upon the merits of the subject proposed to be taken up. *Provided, however,* That on Mondays the calendar shall be called under Rule VIII, and during the morning hour no motion shall be entertained to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the calendar, except the motion to continue the consideration of a bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject against objection as provided in Rule VIII.

Then Rule VIII provides the order of business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What has the Senator from Ohio to say?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, of course I assume the Senator from Utah has the right to make the point of order, if he desires, on account of Calendar Monday, but we have been going on, and, notwithstanding that rule, on several Mondays have proceeded to the consideration of other matters. I am not entirely clear in my own mind as to the point which has been raised, whether or not we are entitled to proceed at this time. This is a matter which has been before the Senate from time to time. It represents in its present form the unanimous opinion of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which reported it out, and I have been hoping we could get it disposed of. If the Chair is of opinion that the point is well taken, of course there is nothing for me to do. I recognize the fact that the rules are made to prevent business rather than to expedite business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair sees no way to avoid the rule. It seems to be perfectly plain that when Senators want to call it into effect it can be used. The Chair has knowledge that on at least half a dozen Mondays no attention has been paid to it, but it is the rule, and the Chair will have to sustain the point of order.

Mr. POMERENE. Then I give notice that I shall call up the resolution to-morrow morning, and I hope we will proceed with the calendar.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I call for the regular order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the Post Office appropriation bill.

#### PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS—CONFERENCE REPORTS.

Mr. WALSH submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to



certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors 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 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 17, 22, 25, 26, 28, and agree to the same.

T. J. WALSH,  
REED SMOOT,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*  
J. A. KEY,  
SAM R. SELLS,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

The report was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4723) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 3, 4, 9, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"The name of Robert J. Erwin, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

And the House agree to the same.

T. J. WALSH,  
REED SMOOT,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*  
J. A. KEY,  
SAM R. SELLS,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

The report was agreed to.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 15796. An act to enable the President to carry out the price guaranties made to producers of wheat of the crops of 1918 and 1919 and to protect the United States against undue enhancement of its liabilities thereunder was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The following bills were read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 15834. An act to extend the time for the construction by Kratka Township of a bridge across the Red Lake River, in Pennington County, Minn.; and

H. R. 15950. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Halifax, in the State of North Carolina, to construct a bridge across the Roanoke River.

#### THE CALENDAR.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for the regular order, which, I understand, under the rule is the calendar under Rule VIII.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order being called for, the Chair is of the same opinion as that rendered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], that the right to the immediate consideration of a report of a committee of conference only rises at the time of its presentation to the Senate, when, if there is objection, the question shall be immediately put and decided without debate. That is what the presentation means. If it is not then put and then decided, it is subject to all the other rules of the Senate. This being Calendar Monday, the Chair holds that until the hour of 1 o'clock to-day the calendar must be called.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that in the consideration of the calendar under Rule VIII, we proceed with the bill which was under consideration when the Senate passed from that order of business the last time the calendar was up for consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator state where that was?

Mr. SMOOT. I have just asked the Secretary if he could name the number. My old calendar has been misplaced. I think it is order of business 554.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Unless I can obtain unanimous consent to consider order of business 549, which will only take a moment, I must object.

Mr. SMOOT. Then we had better begin at the beginning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first business on the calendar will be announced.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) to appropriate \$3,000,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to prosecute the work of eradicating the southern cattle tick was announced as the first business on the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) authorizing the President to appoint two additional Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was announced as next on the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over.

The bill (S. 1725) to stimulate the production of food upon private and public lands within reclamation projects, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over.

The next business on the calendar was (S. Res. 91) extending the authority of and provision for the committee appointed under S. Res. 92, Sixty-third Congress, first session, to investigate the charges of alleged attempts to influence legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over.

The bill (S. 23) granting to the State of Nevada 7,000,000 acres of land in said State for the use and benefit of the public schools of Nevada and the State university of the State of Nevada was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 90) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution goes over.

The bill (S. 3311) to increase and expedite the supply of munitions of war was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 1795) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 951) to provide for the sinking of artesian wells, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 758) to increase the productive agricultural area of the United States by the reclamation of arid and swamp lands was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERMAN in the chair). The bill goes over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 132) to amend section 14 of the food-control act by increasing the guaranteed minimum price of wheat for the crop of 1918 from \$2 to \$2.50 per bushel was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution goes over.

The bill (S. 4185) to require the Commissioner of Education to devise methods and promote plans for the elimination of adult illiteracy in the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask that that bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask that calendar numbers from 332 to 368, both inclusive, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Being objected to, they will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3260) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Wilbur F. Lawton was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill goes over.



The bill (S. 4459) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask that that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill goes over.

The resolution (S. Res. 249) to print the article entitled "The Electoral College and presidential suffrage" as a Senate document was announced as next in order.

Mr. HARDWICK. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution goes over.

#### PHILIPPINE SCOUTS.

The bill (S. 2933) for the relief of the Philippine Scouts was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask that that bill go over.

Mr. CUMMINS. Did any Senator object to the consideration of that bill?

Mr. KING. I objected to its consideration, but I will withdraw my objection if the Senator from Iowa desires that I shall do so.

Mr. CUMMINS. The bill has already once passed the Senate, has it not, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

Mr. KING. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection of the Senator from Utah is withdrawn. The question is on proceeding to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2933) for the relief of the Philippine Scouts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been heretofore read.

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

#### BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 4221) for the relief of private owners of lands within or near the Bitter Root National Forest, Mont., was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let that bill go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 4366) to amend section 5 of an act entitled, "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes," approved June 23, 1913 (38 Stat. L., pp. 4, 75), was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 3269) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. Armonstrong was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill goes over.

#### AMERICAN SHIPPING PROBLEM.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, in accordance with the announcement made by me several days ago, I wish briefly to discuss the American shipping problem.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. RANDELL. Yes; for a question.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not want to object to the Senator proceeding under the rules, but the Senator is proceeding to address the Senate during the morning hour, and I wish to inquire if he can not wait until we get through with the calendar, so far as is possible before the hour of 1 o'clock, in order that some important bills on the calendar may come up for consideration? Under the rule a Senator, I presume, will only be permitted to speak five minutes on each bill. I do not wish to make an objection of that character, but I thought the Senator might take the floor on any other bill after 1 o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, when the Senator has spoken for five minutes under the rule, I shall call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has several minutes left.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, in order to be accommodating to my colleague, I will yield the floor now and resume at the end of the morning hour. I do that with the understanding that I may be recognized at that time. If that is agreeable, I will yield the floor, as I desire to be accommodating. I wish to say, however, before withdrawing, that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] gave notice on Saturday that he would address the Senate on the league of nations this morning, and

I understand that when I conclude my brief address on the shipping problem he will speak on the subject to which he has referred.

#### DISTRICT PROBATION SYSTEM.

The bill (H. R. 10591) to amend and reenact "An act for the establishment of a probation system for the District of Columbia" was announced as next in order, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When this bill was last under consideration the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] offered an amendment, which is now pending, and which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 10, after the word "each," it is proposed to insert "one of which assistant probation officers shall serve for one year only"; and on line 11, after the words "per annum," to insert "who shall serve for one year only."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it was agreed by the proponents of the measure that the amendment just read should be accepted. On the following page are two other amendments of the same character, made necessary in order to make the bill conform to the amendments just named. I shall offer those amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah, which has been stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 8, after the word "each," it is proposed to insert "one of which assistant probation officers shall serve for one year only"; in line 9, after the words "per annum," to insert "who shall serve for one year only"; and in line 12, after the word "years," to insert "with the exception of one assistant probation officer and one stenographer and typist, who shall be appointed for one year only," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc., That an act for the establishment of a probation system for the District of Columbia, approved June 23, 1910, be amended and reenacted by striking out of section 1 of said act the following words: "and one assistant probation officer at a salary of \$1,200 per annum," and in lieu thereof insert the following: "and two assistant probation officers at a salary of \$1,200 each, one of which assistant probation officers shall serve for one year only, and one stenographer and typist at a salary of \$1,200 per annum, who shall serve for one year only," so that section 1 of said act when so amended shall read:*

*"That the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in general term may appoint one probation officer, at a salary of \$1,800 per annum, and as many volunteer assistant probation officers, male or female, as occasion may require; and that the police court of the District of Columbia may appoint one chief probation officer at a salary of \$1,500 per annum, and two assistant probation officers at a salary of \$1,200 each, one of which assistant probation officers shall serve for one year only, and one stenographer and typist at a salary of \$1,200 per annum, who shall serve for one year only, and as many volunteer assistant probation officers, male or female, as occasion may require.*

*"All such probation officers and assistants shall be appointed for a term of two years, with the exception of one assistant probation officer and one stenographer and typist, who shall be appointed for one year only, and may be removed by the respective courts appointing them. All such volunteer probation officers shall serve without compensation, and shall have such powers and perform such duties as may be assigned to them by said courts."*

*That section five of said act be amended by striking out of said section the words "five thousand dollars," and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "eight thousand dollars," so that said section when so amended shall read:*

*"Sec. 5. That the chief probation officer of each court shall be entitled, for himself and his assistants, to a room in the building occupied by that court, and all necessary stationery and supplies for the transaction of the business of his office; and all the probation officers except volunteer officers shall be entitled to their necessary expenses in performing the duties of their office, under the direction of the court, the amount of the expense for such stationery, supplies, and expenses to be fixed and allowed by the court upon proper vouchers submitted to it by the probation officers, and accounts duly verified by their oaths; and for the purpose of this act there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$8,000, one half to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendments offered by the Senator from Utah.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 3379) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange public coal lands for private coal lands in certain cases was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let that bill go over.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.  
The bill (S. 2898) to provide for the erection of a public building at Knoxville, Knox County, Tenn., was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask that that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1930) for the relief of Elizabeth T. Wells was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1857) for the relief of Patrick McMahon was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3602) for the relief of John L. O'Mara was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 121) creating a commission to report a plan for the adoption of the national budget system was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that joint resolution go over. Nothing can be done with it in the House at this stage of the session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

#### APPOINTMENTS TO STAFF CORPS.

The bill (S. 4891) making certain officers of the Army eligible for appointment as chief of staff corps and departments was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will inquire if there is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs present?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What is the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. It is the bill making certain officers of the Army eligible for appointment as chief of staff corps and departments. I desire to have some member of the committee briefly state what change in existing law is provided for in the bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, as I understand, under the old system chiefs of the staff corps were limited to permanent members of the respective staff corps, and this bill makes eligible additions to the Staff Corps, which has been so far exhausted that the chance for selection is limited.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand it is a war measure.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice the Secretary of War, in a letter to the chairman of Committee on Military Affairs, dated August 29, 1918, states as follows:

In the application of present statute, which limits the field of selection for the heads of staff corps or departments to permanent members of that department and officers of the Army with rank above that of major who shall have served creditably for not less than four years by detail in the staff corps or department, the President finds himself embarrassed by the small number of officers from whom to select the heads of the staff corps and departments.

The successful prosecution of this war demands that he should be not hampered or limited in his choice of the most efficient agencies to carry on the war.

I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if there is really any need of this legislation now that the war is over?

Mr. WARREN. There was a necessity for it and there will be again, provided there is not some reorganization; but the plan now is to provide for an entire reorganization. I think no harm would come from allowing the bill to go over, and I will object to its passage.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understood the Senator from Wyoming objected to the bill.

Mr. WARREN. I asked that it be passed over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 4892) to amend section 4 of chapter 5 of an act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, approved July 9, 1918, and to make said amendment retroactive, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

#### TRANSFERS OF LAND BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS.

The bill (S. 4893) transferring the tract of land known as Craney Island from the jurisdiction of the War Department to the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department and transferring the tract of land known as Fishermans Island from the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department to the jurisdiction of the War Department was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the military reservation known as Craney Island, now under the control and jurisdiction of the War Department, lying on the western side of the Elizabeth River in Norfolk County, Va., and bounded by the waters of the Elizabeth River, Craney Island Creek, Thoroughfare Creek, and James River, be, and the same hereby is, transferred to and placed under the control and jurisdiction of the Treasury Department for the use of the Public Health Service; and that the sandspit or island called Fishermans Island or Linen Bar, now under the control and jurisdiction of the Treasury Department, situate, lying, and being in the county of Northampton off the point of Cape Charles, between the Atlantic Ocean and Chesapeake Bay, in the eastern district of Virginia, about 12 miles south of Cape Charles City and about 1½ miles from Cape Charles Light, containing 225 acres, more or less, above high-water mark, be, and the same hereby is, transferred to and placed under the control and jurisdiction of the War Department for use for military purposes.

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

#### BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 4852) to create an executive department in the Government to be known as the department of aeronautics, and for the appointment of a secretary of aeronautics and an assistant secretary, and providing for appropriations for said department, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask that that go over. It is only intended as a war bill, and for one year thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4637) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4637.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Notwithstanding the objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Notwithstanding the objection; and I desire to say a few words about this bill. As I understand, we proceed under the five-minute rule in such cases.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill under these circumstances debatable?

Mr. KING. It is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to proceed to the consideration of the bill just named. [Putting the question.] By the sound, the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4472) providing for the sale of public lands for the purpose of using the proceeds arising therefrom in the construction of roads and other permanent improvements in national parks was announced as next in order.

Mr. LENROOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### SURVEY, ETC., OF UNENTERED PUBLIC LANDS.

The bill (S. 4947) to provide for a survey and classification by the Secretary of the Interior of all unentered public lands of the United States and all unused, cut-over, logged, and swamp lands and other unused lands of the United States, with a view to disposing thereof to honorably discharged soldiers and sailors and others, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been heretofore read in full. The Secretary will state the amendments of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to ask a question in relation to this bill. My calendar has not the bill in it. Does it provide an appropriation for the survey of these lands?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One million dollars.

Mr. SMOOT. One million dollars for the survey?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is to reduce it from \$2,000,000 to \$1,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish we had more time to consider it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were, on page 2, line 11, after the words "privately owned," to strike out the comma; in the same line, after the word "cut-over," to strike out the comma; on page 3, line 7, after the word "owned," to strike out the comma; in line 8, after the word "logged," to strike out the comma; and on page 4, line 22, to strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, with a view to providing legitimate avenues of sustenance and maintenance for the soldiers and sailors of the United States who shall return to the United States and to private life



at the end of the present war in which the United States Government is engaged, and with a view to maintaining in a stable condition the economic interests of the United States and encouraging food production, agriculture, industry, and commerce and affording employment for the millions of returned soldiers and sailors and no longer needed munitions workers and shipbuilders and others employed in war industries at the conclusion of the aforesaid war, and for the general welfare and development of the country, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed forthwith to make or cause to be made a comprehensive survey and classification of all unentered public lands of the United States Government, and of all irrigable, as well as unirrigable, lands of the public domain, and of all privately owned cut-over and logged lands in the United States which are now idle, unoccupied, and unproductive, and of all privately owned swamp or overflowed lands in the United States now unused and unproductive, and of all other totally unused and unprofitable lands of the United States privately owned or a part of the public domain which, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, might be reclaimed and put to productive use, with a view to ascertaining the area, location, nature, and possibilities of all such lands and any other waste lands susceptible of reclamation, settlement, and cultivation, in order to determine what may be necessary to bring them under cultivation and to put them to productive uses, and the amount of money and what methods may be necessary therefor; and he is further authorized and directed to make careful investigation of possible plans and methods of bringing the different classes of all such lands under settlement by returned soldiers and sailors of the United States and industrial laborers out of employment at or before the conclusion of the aforesaid war, and the best methods and terms of making public lands of the United States available therefor, and the best methods and terms for acquisition by the United States of all such privately owned cut-over, logged or overflowed lands or other unused privately owned lands, and what would be proper, appropriate, and generous terms of disposition of any or all thereof to returned and honorably discharged soldiers and sailors of the United States and to former munitions workers and others employed during all or any part of said war at war industries, and to citizens of the United States in general. That the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate thoroughly all of the aforesaid subjects and everything connected therewith and the policy of encouraging all such persons to settle on some of such lands and to engage in agriculture, horticulture, farming, and live-stock raising, and to ascertain what amount of capital it would take therefor and how it should be furnished and upon what terms. In doing so the Secretary of the Interior shall use and have at his disposition and under his control the General Land Office and all of its officials and employees, the Reclamation Service and all of its officials and employees, the Geological Survey and all of its officials and employees, and any other agency of the United States Government which, upon his request, the President of the United States may designate or direct to aid him in any of the aforesaid work, and in addition thereto the Secretary of the Interior may employ for such length of time as he may see fit any person or persons, agencies, or instrumentalities not connected with the United States Government, and such other employees as he may deem necessary; and upon the completion of all thereof, which is hereby directed to be done as soon as reasonable and possible, the Secretary of the Interior shall, as soon as feasible, make full report of all thereof and of all of his work thereunder to the Congress of the United States, which report shall be accompanied by such recommendations as may be proper and as he may see fit to make, and by the submission of any scheme or plan for the disposition, settlement, and cultivation of such lands as aforesaid that he may devise and recommend, together with an estimate by him of the probable cost thereof.

Sec. 2. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions hereof there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States otherwise unappropriated, the sum of \$1,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended under the direction and control of the Secretary of the Interior and under rules, regulations, and plans to be by him made and promulgated. With the aforesaid report to the Congress the Secretary of the Interior shall make to the Congress report of how much money herein appropriated was expended and how expended.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

#### BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 4894) to amend the one hundred and eighteenth article of war and to authorize the calling into service of dismissed or discharged officers was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator reporting this bill if that is not a war measure pure and simple; and, if so, what is the use of enacting it into law, now that the war is over?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the object of the bill is shown by the communication from the Secretary of War. It is stated, at the conclusion of it, that the War Department is anxious that the immediate consideration of this bill be had, as it is of the utmost importance that such men be kept with the oversea forces rather than returned to this country. I think the importance of it has very largely disappeared. At the same time, I do not believe that it will do any harm to pass it.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice that the Secretary of War makes this statement in the report:

The War Department is anxious that a speedy consideration of this bill be had, as it is of the utmost importance that such men be kept with the oversea forces rather than returned to this country. The commanding general of the American Expeditionary Forces has requested that the War Department exercise as much haste as possible in order to prevent the returning of these men.

Evidently there is no reason now why those men should not return; and if that is the case it seems to me it is useless to pass the legislation.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not think it is very important now.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator object to having it go over?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it may just as well go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4946) to permit organizations, units, and detachments of the military forces to sell kitchen by-products, waste, and garbage from their messes and to permit the Government to be the purchaser thereof was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 829) to authorize the employment of Federal prisoners on public roads within the State was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4931) to insure a supply of coal for munition works, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4990) to repeal a proviso of paragraph 3, section 1, of an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, and further amending said act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4857) authorizing an Army account of advances for Army appropriations, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, that is emergency legislation. Let it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### AMENDMENT OF ARTICLES OF WAR.

The bill (H. R. 13037) to amend the fiftieth article of war was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes that article 50 of section 1342 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved August 29, 1916, be amended to read as follows:

ART. 50. Mitigation or remission of sentences: The power to order the execution of the sentence adjudged by a court-martial shall be held to include, inter alia, the power to mitigate or remit the whole or any part of the sentence.

Any unexecuted portion of a sentence adjudged by a court-martial may be mitigated or remitted by the military authority competent to appoint, for the command, exclusive of penitentiaries and the United States Disciplinary Barracks, in which the person under sentence is held, a court of the kind that imposed the sentence, and the same power may be exercised by superior military authority; but no sentence approved or confirmed by the President shall be remitted or mitigated by any other authority, and no approved sentence of loss of files by an officer shall be remitted or mitigated by any authority inferior to the President except as provided in the fifty-second article.

When empowered by the President so to do, the commanding general of the Army in the field or the commanding general of the territorial department or division may mitigate or remit, and order executed as mitigated or remitted, any sentence which under these articles requires the confirmation of the President before the same may be executed.

The power of remission and mitigation shall extend to all uncollected forfeitures adjudged by sentence of a court-martial.

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

#### BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 4605) to protect the insignia of the Young Men's Christian Association, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4523) to transfer the tract of land known as the Lighthouse Reservation, at North Point, Md., from the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce to the jurisdiction of the War Department, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### AMENDMENT OF CIVIL-RIGHTS ACT.

The bill (S. 4970) to amend the first paragraph of section 302 of the act entitled "An act to extend protection to the civil rights of members of the Military and Naval Establishments of the United States engaged in the present war," approved March 8, 1918, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to amend paragraph 1 of section 302 of the act entitled "An act to extend protection to the civil rights of members of the Military and Naval Establishments of the United States engaged in the present war," approved March 8, 1918, so as to read as follows:

That the provisions of this section shall apply only to obligations of a person in the military service, originating, as to those who were in the military service on March 8, 1918, prior to the said date, and, as to those



entering military service subsequent to the said date, prior to the date of entry into the military service, and secured by mortgage, trust, deed, or other security in the nature of a mortgage, upon real or personal property owned by such person at the commencement of the period of the military service and still owned by him.

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

#### RECREATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

The bill (S. 3219) to incorporate the Recreation Association of America was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let that go over.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not object to the consideration of that bill. It is simply to give to this Recreation Association the right to incorporate in the District of Columbia. They can not be given a charter under the general law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If that is the case, I withdraw the objection.

Mr. LODGE. It is a purely charitable organization.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand it to be a District of Columbia charter.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is it, exactly.

Mr. LODGE. That is all.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, this morning I objected to this bill being taken up for consideration because, as I understood, it was a direct charter from the Federal Government. I know that a number of efforts were made to secure such charters for various proposed corporations, and I objected to those measures. If this is a mere application of the District law, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That Grenville Clark, New York City; Henry P. Davidson, New York City; Mrs. E. P. Earle, Montclair, N. J.; Mrs. Thomas A. Edison, West Orange, N. J.; Robert Garrett, Baltimore, Md.; C. M. Goethe, Sacramento, Cal.; J. M. Hankins, Birmingham, Ala.; William Kent, Kentfield, Cal.; Gustavus T. Kirby, New York City; G. M. Landers, New Britain, Conn.; Joseph Lee, Boston, Mass.; J. H. McCurdy, Springfield, Mass.; R. D. Maury, Memphis, Tenn.; Walter A. May, Pittsburgh, Pa.; John T. Pratt, New York City; Harold H. Swift, Chicago, Ill.; Robert Lassiter, Charlotte, N. C.; together with such persons as they may associate with themselves, their successors, are hereby created a body corporate of the District of Columbia, by the name of the Recreation Association of America.

Sec. 2. That the objects of the corporation shall be to promote play, playgrounds, and public recreations; but it is not authorized to acquire, either by purchase or lease, any place or property for use for play, playgrounds, or public recreations for which it receives any net profits for admission thereto or participation in the privileges thereof.

Sec. 3. That the corporation hereby formed shall have perpetual succession, shall have a common seal, shall maintain an agent at Washington, D. C., upon whom process may be served, and shall have power to sue and be sued in its corporate name. It shall have power in its corporate name to take and hold by bequest, devise, gift, purchase, or lease, either absolutely or in trust for any of its purposes, such real and personal property as shall be necessary for corporate purposes; to convey or encumber such property, and to invest or reinvest any principal, and deal with and expend any part thereof or the income therefrom; to have officers and conduct its business and hold its meetings within and without the District of Columbia and in the several States and Territories of the United States. The persons named in the first section of this act, or a majority of them, shall have power to adopt a constitution and by-laws for the government of the corporation and to fix thereby the quorum necessary for the transaction of corporate business at such number as they shall see fit, and generally to do all such acts, including the establishment of regulations for the election of associates and successors, as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act and promote the purposes of such corporation.

Sec. 4. That a meeting of the incorporators, their associates, or successors shall be held once in every year after the year of incorporation at such time and place as shall be prescribed in the by-laws, when the annual reports of the officers and executive boards shall be presented and members of the executive board elected for the ensuing year. Special meetings of the corporation may be called upon such notice as may be prescribed.

Sec. 5. That a copy of the constitution and by-laws and of all amendments thereto shall be filed with the Congress when adopted, and on or before the 1st day of April each year said corporation shall make and transmit to the Congress a report of its proceedings for the year ending December 31 preceding, including in such report the names and residences of its officers and a full and itemized account of all receipts and expenditures.

Sec. 6. That the corporation may acquire by gift all the assets of the existing Playground and Recreation Association of America and defray and provide for any debts or liabilities to the discharge of which said assets shall be applicable. The corporation shall have no power to issue certificates of stock or declare or pay any dividends or otherwise distribute to its members any of its property or the proceeds therefrom or from its operations. On dissolution of the corporation otherwise than by act of Congress, the property shall escheat to the United States.

Sec. 7. That all members and officers of the corporation and of its governing body may reside in or be citizens of any place within the United States.

Sec. 8. That Congress reserves the right to repeal, alter, or amend this act at any time.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I see that this bill is subject to the objection which I had in mind, and I object to its consideration.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make that objection. As I started to say before, this is a bill to allow these people to incorporate in the District of Columbia. The bill is rendered necessary only to enable them to avoid the provisions of the District of Columbia general act requiring residence. The association that it is proposed to incorporate is for purely charitable purposes. It is engaged in the work of establishing municipal playgrounds and recreation places for the poor of the country. It is in every State, and when the war came there was turned over to it the work of the camp community recreation. It did a great deal of that work, entering into every State for this very beneficent purpose. It is an advantage to have a charter from the District of Columbia, but the officers and directors are not all residents of the District of Columbia. In fact, it is necessary to have them in other States. This is to enable them to incorporate here and get rid of the provision of the general incorporation act of the District of Columbia by removing the qualification of residence.

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

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Why could we not amend the general incorporation act of the District so that the directors would not be limited to the District but could be selected from any part of the country?

Mr. THOMAS. I think it would not be wise to enact such a provision into the general law.

Mr. LODGE. That would not be wise as a general law. These exceptions have been made before for other associations formed exclusively for charitable and beneficent purposes. There are also some real Federal charters, such as the one granted to the National Academy of Sciences. It seems to me that an organization for such beneficent purposes as this deserves this slight encouragement—for that is what it is—and this slight assistance to the prosecution of its work at the hands of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We have had experience with this sort of thing. There was a recreation society, an improvement society, which enabled the German Alliance to slip through. I object to the bill and bills of its character.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, notwithstanding the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Baird	Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Henderson	Moses	Smoot
Beckham	Hitchcock	New	Spencer
Borah	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sterling
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Overman	Swanson
Colt	Kenyon	Page	Thomas
Curtis	King	Polindexter	Thompson
Fernald	Kirby	Pollock	Trammell
Fletcher	La Follette	Pomerene	Wadsworth
France	Lenroot	Ransdell	Walsh
Frelinghuysen	Lewis	Robinson	Warren
Gay	Lodge	Saulsbury	Watson
Gore	McCumber	Shafroth	Weeks
Gronna	McKellar	Sheppard	Williams
Hale	McNary	Sherman	Wolcott
Harding	Martin, Ky.	Simmons	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 13277.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 13277) 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, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendment.

Mr. HARDWICK. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered and disposed of before other amendments shall be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### THE AMERICAN SHIPPING PROBLEM.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I desire to present to the Senate a problem so vast in its extent and importance, and so urgently demanding solution, that I do not hesitate to take a



little time to discuss it, even in these hurried days of an expiring Congress. If I can do no more than to impress on my colleagues the supreme importance, the extraordinary difficulty, and the pressing urgency of this problem my time will have been well spent.

The problem which I wish to present to you is this: What shall we do with the great and constantly growing Government-owned merchant marine under the control of the Shipping Board?

The Shipping Board now owns 44 per cent of the ocean-going merchant marine of the United States over 500 gross tons. In a few months it will own half. When the ships already launched and now being completed in the wet basin have been delivered, it will own 54 per cent. When the ships now on the ways have been launched and delivered, it will own 67 per cent. When all the ships now under contract by the Shipping Board have been delivered—assuming that in the meantime there is no further private construction—more than 70 per cent of the ocean-going tonnage under the American flag of more than 500 gross tons will be owned by the Shipping Board.

In order that the Senate may have the figures before it, I beg leave to submit some tables which the Shipping Board has within a few days furnished me. (See Table A.) In brief, they show that the Shipping Board owned on February 12, 1919, 657 ships of an aggregate dead-weight tonnage of 3,582,900 tons. They show that there have been launched but not yet delivered 1,784,800 dead-weight tons, and that there are on the ways under construction 3,874,093 dead-weight tons. They show that if the present building program is carried out, even taking into account cancellations during the past few weeks of approximately two millions and a quarter of tonnage found unsuitable for commercial needs, the Shipping Board will own in 1920 a total of 14,525,522 dead-weight tons of merchant shipping. These figures compare with a total American merchant marine (excluding the Great Lakes fleet) in 1914 of 5,045,766 tons gross register, or approximately 7,000,000 dead-weight tons. In addition to the ships which the Shipping Board will own, there are now approximately 1,049 ships under the American flag of 500 gross tons or over, with an aggregate dead-weight tonnage of 4,473,338, making a grand total under the American flag in 1920, exclusive of Great Lakes ships and ships under 500 gross tons, of 18,998,960 dead-weight tons—practically 19,000,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

Mr. RANDELL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I merely wish to get clear in my mind the Senator's statement that there were American-owned ships in 1914 of something like 7,000,000 tons. I think it ought to be made clear that that was coastwise shipping under our flag, but that our overseas shipping at that time did not surely amount to much over 1,000,000 tons.

Mr. RANDELL. The Senator is entirely correct. That included the coastwise shipping, but did not include the very large and important shipping on the Great Lakes. We had a very, very small number of ships in the overseas service in 1914. We actually carried at that time a fraction under 10 per cent of our commerce under the American flag. I am glad to have the suggestion made by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

Mr. RANDELL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator's statement would seem to indicate that our total increased tonnage would be somewhere in the neighborhood of 11,000,000 tons.

Mr. RANDELL. A total of about 11,000,000 tons; that is, exclusive, I will say, of the Great Lakes commerce. Including the tonnage on the Great Lakes, it would be considerably more.

Mr. CALDER. I am speaking now of our new tonnage.

Mr. RANDELL. As to new tonnage, the figures furnished to me by the Shipping Board are as follows:

Owned by the Shipping Board, 657 ships of 3,582,966 tons; under contract for the Shipping Board, in the wet basin, 367 ships of 1,784,800 tons; on the ways, 679 ships, aggregating 3,874,093 tons; under contract, 1,069 ships, aggregating 7,525,263 tons, making a total in the wet basin, on the ways, and under contract of 13,188,156 tons. But from that we must deduct the cancellation of 271 ships, aggregating 2,245,600 tons.

So we have now under contract, on the ways, and in the wet basin a balance of 1,844 ships, aggregating 10,942,556 tons. If we add to this the tonnage now owned by the Shipping Board, assuming that there will be no more cancellations and that we will go ahead with the ships now building and now under contract, the Shipping Board will have a total at the end of 1920 of 14,525,522 tons.

I should like to add that the total steam tonnage under the United States flag not owned by the Shipping Board is estimated at 1,049 ships, with an aggregate dead-weight tonnage of

4,473,338 tons; so that the estimated tonnage in 1920, aside from possible private construction in the meantime, is 3,550 ships, aggregating 18,998,960 dead-weight tons.

Mr. CALDER. That is exclusive of the Great Lakes?

Mr. RANDELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. CALDER. Does that equal the total ocean-going shipping that Great Britain had prior to the war?

Mr. RANDELL. Not quite. England had about 20,000,000 gross tons at the outbreak of the war. I have the exact figures.

The total steam tonnage owned by the United Kingdom at the outbreak of the war, as shown by a report on Ocean Shipping, Document 2112, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, was 19,235,705 gross tons.

Mr. CALDER. So that when this shipping is completed in the United States we will have within 300,000 tons the same tonnage Great Britain had before the war.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think we must keep in mind the difference in classification. Under our estimates we used dead-weight tons.

Mr. RANDELL. Theirs is gross tons.

Mr. FLETCHER. Theirs is gross tons.

Mr. RANDELL. The Senator from Florida is entirely correct. The British tonnage would be considerably greater if we calculated it in dead-weight tons rather than in gross tons.

Mr. CALDER. The excess is about 25 per cent, I believe.

Mr. RANDELL. Something more than that; somewhere in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 per cent.

Mr. CALDER. Will the Senator's remarks to-day deal with the question of surplus ocean-going vessels when this program is completed?

Mr. RANDELL. I do not intend to cover that point. I shall try to explain what ships we have, the necessity for those ships, and what we are to do with them. I wish to invite the attention of the Congress to the very important problem before us of \$2,500,000,000 worth of ships without any program to handle them—man them—for at this time we have nothing that would be called a real program.

I wish further to say that within six months from the declaration of peace there will be no authority in anyone to manage and dispose of this great fleet unless the resolution I introduced this morning be adopted, because under the law as it now exists the President, who has sole authority to construct ships, to commandeer ships, to build new ones, to operate them, to dispose of them, will be shorn of all his power within six months after the declaration of peace with Germany.

The figures which I have read to you lead to two startling conclusions. The first is that from the purely quantitative point of view, looking only at the objective of securing an aggregate amount of tonnage under our flag commensurate with the maritime interests of the United States, the problem of the American merchant marine is solved. In the year immediately preceding the European war—the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914—less than a tenth of the water-borne foreign trade of the United States was carried in American vessels; more than 90 per cent was carried in foreign vessels. Soon after some shipping experts made a calculation of how large a merchant marine the United States would require in order to carry on its own vessels 60 per cent of its water-borne foreign trade. It was estimated that from six to ten million gross tons—8,500,000 to 14,000,000 dead-weight tons—would be required. The figures seemed far beyond the widest range of possibility. The National Foreign Trade Council, in a report published early in 1916, made this not too sanguine forecast:

At a time when predictions are freely made that the United States will become the world's banker and acquire the greatest share of the world's foreign trade, a shipping in the foreign trade of from 6,000,000 to 10,000,000 gross tons would appear not an excessive goal to be attained 10 or 20 years hence.

Ten or twenty years! Within five years from the day on which this hesitating prediction was ventured, we will have under our present program a Government-owned merchant marine larger than the outside limit set by the National Foreign Trade Council, to say nothing of the privately owned merchant marine under the American flag.

I said that the figures which I read to you lead to two startling conclusions. The first I have given you—that from the purely quantitative point of view the problem of the American merchant marine is solved. The second conclusion is, that the problem of what to do with the Government-owned merchant marine of the United States has now become the dominating factor affecting the future of the whole American merchant marine. In solving it let us remember that our magnificent Navy can never prove a real success in war without the cooperation of a large number of merchant ships manned by loyal, well-trained seamen.



As we deal wisely or unwisely with this problem, so will we determine the future of America upon the seas. We have proven during the past year that we as a Nation have the resources and the energy, and that our workmen have the perseverance, to create a fleet of 14,000,000 dead-weight tons of shipping. Have we as a Nation—have our statesmen and our business men, our merchants, our seamen, our trained officers—the patience and the expert knowledge to turn this emergency fleet, this powerful and triumphant instrument of war, into a serviceable and permanent instrument of American commerce? The fleet will be there for our use. Are we going to let it rust and decay for lack of ability to use it? Are we going to be compelled to sell it to foreigners who know how to use it better than we do? Or will we rise to this great national occasion? It is a question which challenges the Nation as it has seldom been challenged before.

In bringing this question before the Senate I do not wish to exaggerate the potency of a governmental policy. I do not believe that a mere act of Congress can create a merchant marine. Why is it that England and the Scandinavian countries and Holland have been able to people the seas with their ships, while France, Italy, and the United States have been relatively second-rate maritime powers, and their merchant ships strangers in the ports of the world? What is it that determines the size of a nation's merchant marine? Not money; not population. The United States is more populous than Great Britain and wealthier than Norway and Denmark and Sweden and Holland combined. Not subsidies. France has subsidized her merchant marine for years, and it has hardly grown. By spending between two or three billion dollars we can build 14,000,000 tons of ships, but merely building ships does not give us a merchant marine. The limit of a nation's merchant marine is not the number or wealth of its population, not the billions its government is willing to devote to subsidy or construction. The limit of a nation's merchant marine lies in the number of trained, alert, resourceful shipping men whom it can call to its service—the number of men, from manager to clerk, from captain to deck hand, on whose watchful, persevering, and competent work the success of a shipping venture depends.

That is the secret of a nation's maritime greatness. That is why England could successfully operate, before the war, nearly 20,000,000 gross tons of shipping, while we, who had the greater population, including our Great Lakes and river tonnage, could only operate about 8,000,000 gross tons. That is why Norway has a merchant marine of nearly 2,000,000 gross tons, while Italy, with 14 times the population, has only a million and a half. Unless men of ability and character and perseverance go into the shipping business, and unless they devote their energies to operating ships rather than to appealing for subsidies and special privileges, nothing that Congress can do will ever build up a merchant marine.

I am not asking, therefore, for a legislative panacea, a governmental substitute for the skill and knowledge and perseverance of the expert shipping man. My point is that the Government is now the principal shipowner of the United States, and that it can not shift the responsibility of deciding what it shall do with its ships. What shall we do with the 14,000,000 tons of shipping we shall own in 1920? If we adopt a policy that deters men of ability and character from going into the field, our investment of two to three billion dollars will have been largely wasted. If we adopt a policy that attracts such men to enter the field, our future as a great maritime nation is assured.

It was the thought that these problems in all their magnitude were before us, that they required not only the expert attention of specialists but the sound, informed judgment of our men of commerce, industry, and labor, and that so far as appeared no concerted thought was being applied to their solution, that induced me to issue a call for a national merchant-marine conference, to be held in Washington on January 22 and the days immediately following, at which the future of our merchant marine could be fully and freely discussed. The meetings were successful beyond our best expectations. Leaders in the shipbuilding and shipping world, representative merchants, bankers, labor leaders, and public officials gave the conference the benefit of their experience and judgment. More than that, a permanent organization, to be known as the National Merchant Marine Association, was formed, with the stated purpose to "advocate the establishment and upbuilding of an American merchant marine." This association, at its organization meeting, created a council, to consist of representative men from agricultural, commercial, and labor circles, and broadly representative of all classes of our citizenship.

The enthusiasm and patriotic purpose displayed at this conference were most gratifying. Those who attended the conference will, I believe, agree with me, however, that the recom-

mendations made by the speakers were for the most part general rather than specific. They dealt—and I say this in no spirit of criticism—with principles rather than with concrete programs. There were a great many more questions put to the conference than there were answers given. Even the address of the representatives of the Shipping Board merely enumerated, in a manner that was most enlightening, the difficult problems that confronted the board, but did not offer any definite manner in which they could be solved. I will enumerate a few of the unanswered questions that were put to the conference. How large a merchant marine shall we build? Shall it be large enough to carry not less than two-thirds of our foreign commerce? Is it worth while to continue our present policy of building two and a half billion dollars' worth of ships, under contracts made during the stress and rush of war emergency, at present high prices for labor and material, or shall we endeavor to cancel some of these contracts and stand the contractor's claim for damages? How shall we operate this merchant marine? Shall we keep it, or sell it, or lease it? If private initiative does not establish permanent lines of fast cargo and passenger ships where our commerce requires them, shall the Government establish such lines and operate them at a loss until the trade is built up, or shall the Government subsidize private lines to carry on these lines?

Shall the Government lease its ships under a form of charter in which the wages of crews are paid by the Government, so that the private owner is not prejudiced by the higher level of American wages? Or shall private companies be allowed to man the vessels, paying only the wages of our foreign competitors, the Government making up the difference by enrolling the seamen in the Naval Reserve and paying them as much as is necessary? How shall we administer whatever policy is necessary? Shall the executive functions of the Shipping Board—the construction and operation of ships—be taken away from the board and placed in a department of transportation, with a Cabinet officer at its head, this department to have jurisdiction over transportation on land, by water, and in the air? None of these questions has yet been satisfactorily answered.

Nevertheless the conference has had one important result, a result to which I hope my remarks to-day will contribute. It has encouraged those who have the welfare of our commercial life at heart to focus their minds intensively on this subject. Before long I hope the council of the association may be in a position to present to Congress and to the Shipping Board the result of its study on the subject. I hope it will not be the only body that will do so. Chambers of commerce, associations interested in foreign trade, organizations representing farmers, workmen, consumers, representatives of seamen and their officers, students of transportation and foreign trade, writers in the press and the magazines, men representing every possible interest and every conceivable point of view should be giving this problem constant study. Congress will need all the light it can get. And more important yet, the country needs light and information and education, for without popular support no shipping policy can successfully endure.

I think it may assist the study and discussion, which I hope will ensue, to enumerate, briefly, some of the possible solutions of the problem of the disposition of the Government-owned merchant marine. But first I want to clear up several points on which I fear there is a rather widespread misunderstanding.

In the first place, I want to point out to you an extremely serious aspect of the situation, and one which I fear the public hardly realizes. We have not much time in which to seek a solution of the problem. We will soon be forced to legislate. There is a general impression in many quarters that the shipping act extends the power of the Shipping Board to operate ships until five years after the end of the war. This is a complete misapprehension. The shipping act passed on September 7, 1916, authorized the formation of one or more governmental corporations whose life was limited to five years after the termination of the war, and these corporations were, under certain very limited conditions, authorized to operate ships. But the merchant fleet which the Shipping Board has built up is not being and can not be operated under this act. The restrictions are so numerous as to render operation under this act impracticable. The ships which have been built since the outbreak of the war have been operated under the emergency shipping fund section of the deficiency appropriation act of June 15, 1917, which provides that—

all ships constructed, purchased, or requisitioned under authority herein or heretofore or hereafter acquired by the United States shall be managed, operated, and disposed of as the President shall direct.

In managing and operating these vessels the Shipping Board is acting under authority delegated by the President by Executive order under this act, and not under authority conferred



by Congress in the shipping act. And the emergency shipping fund section of the act of June 15, 1917, provides that—

all authority granted to the President herein or by him delegated shall cease six months after the final treaty of peace is proclaimed between this Government and the German Empire.

Six months after the proclamation of ratification of the peace treaty—perhaps nine months from now, almost certainly within a year—the Shipping Board will have a merchant fleet of from five to six million tons on its hands, with no power to operate it and no power to dispose of it, unless the Congress has by that time adopted further legislation or unless the ships have by that time been disposed of.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. RANDELL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Louisiana is discussing a very important phase of the shipping situation. The condition of the legislation and the statutes to which he has referred of course have an important bearing on the problem which confronts us in the determination of our shipping policy. Those laws must be first considered, as the Senator has suggested. I want to put, however, this inquiry: The ships have been built and are now operated, so far as they are operated, and controlled in pursuance of the provisions of the appropriation act to which the Senator has referred. I think it is true at the same time that the shipping act provides for the creation of a corporation; and the corporation, which is known as the Emergency Fleet Corporation, has been formed in pursuance of the shipping act.

Now, inasmuch as the President must dispose of these ships, and his power ceases under the act within six months after the declaration of peace, would there be any reason why, if the ships have not been disposed of, or if the joint resolution which the Senator has introduced this morning is not enacted into law and no steps are taken to handle these ships, the President could not transfer all the ships then in the possession of the Shipping Board, all contracts, all yards, and everything that has been built up under the appropriation to which the Senator refers, to the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and that corporation be empowered to function as the shipping bill provides?

If it comes to that, if we in the meantime do not decide upon a policy, and if there is no further legislation, it seems to me that the President would have authority under the appropriation act to transfer all shipping facilities, all ships, and everything that has been built up under the appropriation act to the Emergency Fleet Corporation, which would then, having certain powers and authority granted by the shipping act, be able to operate, charter, and otherwise manage ships for the period mentioned in the shipping act; to wit, for five years after the declaration of peace.

I merely suggest that thought as a possible way out of the difficulty in case we are unable to get further legislation. I do not mean, however, to minimize the importance of Congress taking some definite steps, either by the adoption of the joint resolution which the Senator from Louisiana has submitted or by some other legislative process, in order that we may determine fully just what course we are to pursue with reference to continuing the building of ships and with reference to the handling, disposition, and operation of the ships, if necessary, which we shall have in the meantime built.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has raised a very interesting question. One difficulty with his suggestion occurs to me at once. Assuming that it is possible to turn the ships and property over to the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and then to have the Fleet Corporation control them under the shipping act, the problem would by no means be solved. The shipping act gives authority to operate ships only under very limited conditions, so limited as to render operation under the act impracticable. And it gives no authority at all to dispose of ships. So that the Shipping Board would be seriously hampered in its management of the fleet. Moreover, under section 5, subsection a, corporations, under the act, are forbidden to acquire ships "then engaged in the foreign or domestic commerce of the United States" unless the owner intended to withdraw them from such trade. That seems to exclude acquisition of the ships now operated by the Shipping Board. But there is, I think, a broader answer to the Senator's question. I doubt if a correct interpretation of the intent of Congress would justify turning this emergency fleet over for management under the shipping act.

The Senator will recall that the shipping act, which was approved on September 7, 1916, was really not a piece of the emergency war legislation. It was very carefully thought out and a very wise attempt on the part of Congress to make at

least a start in building up an American merchant marine. In section 13 an appropriation was made of \$50,000,000 for starting the program. Section 11 authorized the Shipping Board to organize one or more corporations in the District of Columbia "for the purchase, construction, equipment, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels in the commerce of the United States."

Then it provided, as I have already said, that—

At the expiration of five years from the conclusion of the present European war the operation of vessels on the part of any such corporation in which the United States is then a stockholder shall cease and the said corporation stand dissolved.

It was intended that we should go ahead under that law and produce really beneficial results toward building up an American merchant marine; but when we entered into the great war Congress deemed it wise to enlarge the power, not of the Shipping Board directly, but of the President, and in the urgent deficiency appropriation act approved June 15, 1917, appeared this provision:

The President may exercise the power and authority hereby vested in him, and expend the money herein and hereafter appropriated—

That was money for building, requisitioning, and acquiring ships in any way he could—

through such agency or agencies as he shall determine from time to time: *Provided*, That all money turned over to the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation may be expended as other moneys of said corporation are now expended. All ships constructed, purchased, or requisitioned under authority herein, or heretofore or hereafter acquired by the United States, shall be managed, operated, and disposed of as the President may direct.

Under the terms of this act, which I believe appropriated directly \$250,000,000, and under the terms of other appropriation acts carrying out the provisions included therein, the Shipping Board, appointed by the President to carry out the authority herein and subsequently conferred, has expended or obligated itself to expend about \$2,500,000,000; and my information from the Shipping Board and its attorneys is that this board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation have been functioning, not under the original shipping act, but under the authority of the provisions of the urgent deficiency appropriation act of June 15, 1917.

Paragraph 10 of this provision of that act reads as follows:

All authority granted to the President herein, or by him delegated, shall cease six months after a final treaty of peace is proclaimed between this Government and the German Empire.

If the board is functioning under this act and subsequent appropriation acts and has obligated this country to an expenditure of \$2,500,000,000, and if all this power and authority is going to cease six months after the declaration of peace, it seems to me imperative that we should extend the time within which the President can operate.

Let me remind you, sir, that in the administration of the railroads the Director General is given 21 months after the declaration of peace in which to close up the affairs of the Government's operation of the railroads. It is possible that the suggestion of the Senator from Florida is correct, and that if the President should turn over to the Shipping Board the management, control, and disposition of this great fleet it could function under the original shipping act; but I do not believe it. I do not think that act ever contemplated such a thing as a fleet of \$2,500,000,000 worth of ships. Bear in mind that it carried an appropriation of only \$50,000,000, and we never intended it to go the extent of acquiring, operating, or disposing of a great fleet costing \$2,500,000,000. The only wise thing for us to do, Mr. President, is to pass, and pass speedily, the joint resolution I introduced this morning, extending the time for the President to exercise his authority from 6 months to 18 months, and to some extent place our great merchant marine on terms of parity with the Railroad Administration.

For the railroads Congress has under existing law 21 months after the peace treaty in which to frame a policy, and even this the Director General thinks is not enough. For shipping we have only 6 months. I have this day introduced a joint resolution extending this period for 18 months and shall urge its immediate adoption.

In the second place—and this remark is addressed especially, to the shipowners of the United States—we must rid ourselves of the delusion that the merchant-marine problem of the United States can be solved by merely repealing the seamen's act. The impression has been sedulously fostered that the seamen's act is responsible for all our maritime woes.

This is an important business matter when we have \$2,500,000,000 worth of property and no one is giving the least attention to it; no one is trying to legislate for it; no one is trying to prepare for taking care of that wonderfully valuable asset. We should give it attention; it is ridiculous that we have not done so before now, and I insist that the country shall know



that this matter is being brought before the Senate, at any rate. I will do my part if some of the other Senators will not do theirs; but the country shall understand that this matter ought to be legislated upon.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. RANDELL. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. WEEKS. Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana will recall that something more than six months ago a proposition was made for a general reconstruction policy, in which the shipping matter was specifically considered. An attempt was made at that time to get Congress to take up this subject, but the resolution providing for doing so is still in the committee with an impossibility of getting it out.

Mr. RANDELL. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts did attempt something of that kind; and I wish for one to say that I am very sorry Congress did not take it up. I think we have been very remiss in not doing so, but it is not too late to make a start now. Simply because we have not done it in the past is no reason why we should not do it now. We can pass the joint resolution I have introduced giving the President a longer period in which to operate through the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the Shipping Board. Instead of having all functions cease in 6 months let them operate for 18 months, if necessary, and that will still be 3 months less than the Railroad Administration has been given in which to operate the railroads.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. RANDELL. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. CALDER. I will ask the Senator from Louisiana if it is not the business of the Shipping Board to make some recommendations on this subject? Are they not required to do so under the law?

Mr. RANDELL. I rather think that they should have made their recommendations; and I know that a resolution was passed not so very long ago by the Committee on Commerce, of which the Senator from New York is a distinguished member, requesting the board to submit to us plans. But I wish to say, in defense of the Shipping Board, that I have talked to a great many people about this question. To allude to a matter to which I referred awhile ago I invited all patriotic Americans to attend a conference in this city to discuss this very subject and suggest plans to Congress. We had about 150 of the most thoughtful men of this Nation at that conference, but not a single man there suggested anything that seemed to me like a real wise, thoroughgoing solution of the problem. I will say we are studying it, but no one as yet has worked out a plan, and therefore I do not like to criticize the Shipping Board for not having developed a plan when no one else seems to have been able to develop one. I believe they are going to present their ideas before very long; I have understood they were; and I sincerely hope they will.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator, is it not their business to do that? Was not the Shipping Board created for that purpose?

Mr. RANDELL. Yes; they were created very largely for the purpose of trying to build up the American merchant marine; but the Senator must bear in mind that when that act was passed in 1916 we were not in this great world war, and we gave the Shipping Board only \$50,000,000. No one contemplated at that time that we would take on this enormous ship-building program of \$2,500,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

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

Mr. RANDELL. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to suggest to the Senator that this large amount of money that we have appropriated, and to which he has referred, was not given the Shipping Board, but was given the Emergency Fleet Corporation. As a matter of fact, the Shipping Board has had very little, if anything, to do with this expenditure or the use of it. They have had abundance of time to study the problems in connection with shipping and planning for American shipping; they have had an opportunity to do that during the last two or three years and to determine what would be a wise policy for this country. It is the Emergency Fleet Corporation that has been building the ships we have now.

Mr. RANDELL. The suggestion of the Senator is largely correct. It was brought out here, while he was absent from the Chamber, that this money was all turned over to the President under the urgent deficiency appropriation act of June 15,

1917, and that he had authorized the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation to expend the money; but, with all due deference, I think the Shipping Board has had a most difficult problem. It has done, I believe, the very best it could do; and I do not think we ought to criticize it. I know that, as one humble Senator, I have been trying very hard for a year or two to study this problem; I have tried as hard as I ever tried to do anything in my life, and I have not been able to reach any conclusion which is at all satisfactory to myself. I have talked to a great many people. Now, in further answer, I should like very much to see the Shipping Board suggest a program, and I believe they will suggest one; but do not let us be too hard upon them.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

Mr. RANDELL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. CALDER. I trust the Senator will pardon me for saying that I believe he has given more study to this subject than almost any man in the country—

Mr. RANDELL. Oh, I do not know about that.

Mr. CALDER. And I know that he has tried very hard to work out a solution; but it has seemed to me, I will say to the Senator, that the trouble with the Shipping Board comes from the fact that not a single member of the Shipping Board has had any experience in these great transportation problems, and therefore they do not bring to the subject a knowledge of the whole problem. If we had men on the board who had knowledge of the shipping business, perhaps we would have had some plan here before this time.

Mr. RANDELL. Commissioner Donald, the acting chairman of the board for the past several months, has done nothing but attend to shipping all his life. He is an experienced shipping man. They have as the director of operations Mr. Rosseter, who, I understand, is one of the finest shipping men in the United States. He is certainly one of the brightest men I ever met. They had associated with them for a good while Mr. P. A. S. Franklin, of New York, who is also a very able shipping man. I do not mean that these two men, Rosseter and Franklin, were members of the board, but they were certainly associated with the Shipping Board. The Shipping Board have had the benefit of their advice and assistance; and they have had the assistance of other shipping men, let me say.

Mr. CALDER. I will say that there is no doubt about Mr. Franklin's capacity. He has had nothing whatever to do, however, with the Shipping Board, except to help operate the fleet during the war out of New York. Mr. Rosseter is, indeed, one of the best-equipped men in the country on this subject; but he is only a subordinate, and has been with the Emergency Fleet Corporation but a very few weeks. Mr. Donald knows something about shipping, but in a very small way. Indeed, he has seemed to lack really great capacity in its most important work, which, I agree with the Senator from Louisiana, is the most important problem facing this Nation to be solved at the present time.

Mr. RANDELL. The Senator has made a very wise criticism. He has suggested that much better men might have been gotten, men who knew far more about shipping. But would it be amiss if I were to ask him whom he would have put on that board, whom he would have gotten that knew so much about shipping, when it is borne in mind that we have so few shipping men in this Nation? We have not been a maritime people. The Senator must admit that it is quite difficult to get trained shipping men who are also first-class business men.

Mr. CALDER. I would have appointed Mr. Ferguson, president of the Newport News Shipbuilding Corporation, who, I think, would have gladly accepted the job if he could have had the authority. I would have appointed Mr. Franklin. I would have appointed Mr. Rosseter. I would have appointed those three men—one a great shipbuilder and two great transportation men—and then I believe by this time we would have had a plan that was working.

Mr. RANDELL. I am very glad to have the benefit of the Senator's suggestions. They seem wise, and if any vacancies occur in the board I have no doubt that they will have due weight in filling the next vacancies.

When I was interrupted, Mr. President, I was preparing to say that some people think the seamen's act is responsible for all our maritime woes. Those who are taken in by this propaganda generally forget what the seamen's act is about. It abolishes that form of involuntary servitude known as arrest and imprisonment for desertion. It requires that 65 per cent of the crew must be able seamen. It requires that 75 per cent of the crew must be able to understand the orders of the officers. It establishes standards of safety at sea recommended by the international convention of safety at sea. Are not these reasonable and meritorious provisions? As a practical question,



we must accept the seamen's act. Members of both parties in this body have expressed the opinion to me that it can not be repealed without a struggle that would carry us far beyond the time during which we must reach a solution of the problem, perhaps never.

The third point to which I wish to call your attention is that under statutes now in force the Shipping Board itself has complete power to adopt a policy for the disposition of two and a half billion dollars' worth of ships and contracts without even consulting Congress. The emergency shipping fund legislation of 1917 authorized the President not only to manage or operate ships acquired by the United States, but to dispose of them, and this authority the President has delegated to the Shipping Board without reservation. One word in an appropriation act, that single word "dispose," gives a body of five men power over two and a half billion dollars' worth of property and contracts, a power they can exercise without even consulting Congress. I mention this without at all implying that I have any reason to believe that the Shipping Board will attempt to exercise this power. I am certain that they must appreciate, as we all appreciate, that the question what we shall do with the Government-owned merchant marine of the United States is a national question, one which Congress, as representative of the people, must decide. I mention it merely to show how unsatisfactory is our legislation on the subject at present, and how important it is that permanent legislation of a satisfactory character be soon adopted.

What then are the possible alternatives before the country today? They range all the way from complete Government ownership and operation, through various stages and forms of joint ownership or control, to complete and untrammelled private ownership and operation. I will enumerate as many of them as have come to my attention.

First. Complete Government ownership and operation. This means that not only the ships, but docks, wharves, and terminals, are owned by the Government; that the Government employs the crews, equips and repairs the ships, buys the ships' stores and bunker fuel, books the freight and passengers, loads and discharges the cargo—in short, substitutes itself in every sense for the private shipping company. This is the method by which the Roumanian Government and the Belgian Government, in connection with their national railroad systems, operated ships before the war. It means Government operation in the same sense that the Government is operating the post office. The Shipping Board has never in its history gone into the shipping business in this sense.

Second. Ownership and operation through a public corporation controlled by the Government, with or without minority representation of private interests. This is the method by which the War Department operates the Panama Railroad & Steamship Co.; it holds almost all the capital stock, appoints the directors, and thus controls completely the management of the corporation. The Lloyd Brasileiro, controlled by the Brazilian Government, and the Russian volunteer fleet, controlled before the war by the Government of the Czar, are further examples. The United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation is a corporation of this character; all its stock is held by the United States and is voted by the Shipping Board. It has not, however, operated ships, even during the war, in the complete sense above described, since it has not itself booked freight or passengers or handled cargoes, but has employed private agencies for that purpose.

Third. The vessels may be owned by the Government and manned and equipped by it, but private shipping agencies may be employed on a commission basis to operate the vessels; that is, to book the freight, handle the cargo, arrange for bunkering and docking, and perform the other duties incidental to commercial ship operation for Government account. This means that the private shipping agency bills the Government for all expenses and losses of the voyage, and accounts to it for all earnings. This is really operation for Government account, but it has the advantage of utilizing the existing shipping companies and placing their expert knowledge in particular trades at the Government's disposal. The Shipping Board was itself manning and operating in this sense at the beginning of the year close to a hundred ships, with an aggregate dead-weight tonnage of over 600,000 tons.

Fourth. The Government can retain the ownership of the vessels and employ the private companies, not only to attend to the commercial management of the ships but to man and victual them. Under this arrangement the operating agent acts as "ship's husband," to use a technical shipping term. He employs the crew, buys the stores, keeps the ship in repair—sub-jects, of course, to the owner's supervision as to major repairs—buys the bunker fuel, finds employment for the ship, directs her

movements, and collects the freight money. But he acts in all these matters solely as agent of the Government; all expenses are charged against the Government, and all earnings go to the Government. The operating agent gets a fee for his services in manning the vessel and a commission on the freight as compensation for the commercial management of the ship. At the same time the Government reserves the right to direct the voyage and to specify the cargo.

Fifth. The Government can retain the ownership of the ships and man and victual them and keep them in repair and time charter them to shipping companies at a fixed monthly rental. This is technically known as a "time charter, Government form." The charterer under this form of charter pays for the bunkers, port charges, loading and discharging of cargo, while the Government pays crews' wages and stores. The charterer books the freight and all earnings of the vessel go to him. If the voyage is profitable, he gains; if it is unsuccessful, he loses. In either case he pays the fixed rate of hire to the Government. In this respect this arrangement is fundamentally different from the method of operation for Government account described above. On the other hand, the charterer is freed of all concern with the cost of labor and supplies, since the Government pays and feeds the crews.

Sixth. The Government can retain the ownership of the vessels, but turn them over to private companies under what is known as a bare-boat charter. Under this form of agreement the charterer pays all the expenses of operation and maintenance of the vessel—he employs the crew, feeds them, pays for bunkers, insures the vessel; in short, acts in every respect as if he were the owner of the vessel. He of course pays a monthly rental to the Government for the use of the vessel, but keeps whatever the vessel earns above this rental to meet his operating expenses and for profits.

Under either of the last-mentioned plans the difficult question will arise for decision, What is to be the rate of hire under the charter? Shall the Government lease the vessels in the open market for what they will bring, or shall it fix each year or from month to month an arbitrary rate, depending upon the freight market and the costs of operation, accurately determined? Shall it retain any degree of control of operation, or over voyages, cargoes, and freight rates, or shall it leave these to the operation of the law of supply and demand? Shall it carry the insurance in its own fund, or shall it leave the charterers to place insurance with marine insurance companies? Shall it restrict the lease to American companies, or shall it dispose of some of the vessels to foreign firms?

Seventh. Title to all the vessels could be placed in a large corporation, which would issue stock to private individuals, in order to obtain the proceeds for the purchase, the Government guaranteeing a minimum return on the stock and participating in any profits above a certain figure; or, as a modification of this plan, smaller corporations could be formed under similar guaranties to specialize in particular trades or to engage in the tramp shipping business.

Eighth. The vessels could be sold on terms of payment and at prices sufficiently low to attract purchasers, and be permitted to operate without Government participation. Under this heading could be included all the projects that have been suggested by which the operation of American ships in competition with foreign ships could be assisted by the Government. It includes schemes of direct subsidy, of preferential tariff duties on goods imported in American bottoms, of preferential railroad rates for goods exported in American bottoms, of special exemptions from taxes, tonnage dues, canal tolls, and so forth, and postal and admiralty subventions. Or, again, it has been suggested that the vessels be sold to private companies at such low prices and easy terms as to amount virtually to a subsidy. The ideal underlying this group of plans is the one so persuasively urged by Commissioner Donald, of the Shipping Board—a number of small shipping companies, not concentrated in New York and San Francisco, but distributed among the smaller communities, especially the South Atlantic and Gulf ports, so that the sense of ownership among these communities should develop a sentiment favorable to shipping.

Ninth, and finally. Combinations could be made of several of the above plans. For instance, an ingenious proposal has been made that as many vessels should be sold at, say, the present British cost of construction as will find a market among American purchasers, and that the remainder be assigned to such companies as purchase ships, and in proportion to their purchases for operation the companies pooling the earnings of their own ships with the earnings of the Government's ships assigned to them and paying the Government a share of the aggregate earnings of the pool proportionate to the amount of tonnage which the Government contributes. In this way the



same incentive for efficient management would exist in the case of ships operated for the Government as in the case of ships privately owned.

This enumeration will serve to show that the problem is not a simple one. It can not be solved by debating the abstract merits or demerits of Government ownership or private ownership. Those who believe in Government ownership must stand ready to say what form of Government ownership they desire. Those who are in favor of disposing of the ships to private companies must make up their minds under what kind of arrangement such disposition would be practicable. We need programs, not speeches. We need facts, not theories. And we need them soon. I repeat what I have already said, the problem is immensely difficult, it is pressingly urgent, and as yet almost no progress has been made in arriving at a reasonable and practicable solution.

No physician ever treated a disease successfully until it was first diagnosed correctly. I have tried faithfully to diagnose the case of American shipping. All true patriots who love their own country best and wish it to have a genuine United States merchant marine are cordially invited to join hearts, brains, and hands in a sincere, earnest effort to find and apply the remedy.

TABLE A.—United States merchant marine.

[Excluding tugs and all Great Lakes ships as of Jan. 31, 1919.]

	Ships.	Tons dead-weight.
Owned by Shipping Board.....	657	3,582,966
Under contract for Shipping Board:		
In wet basin.....	367	1,784,800
On ways.....	679	3,874,093
Contracts.....	1,069	7,525,263
Total.....	2,115	13,188,156
Less cancellations.....	271	2,245,600
Balance.....	1,844	10,942,556
Total Shipping Board tonnage at end of 1920.....	2,501	14,525,522
Total steam tonnage under United States flag not owned by United States Shipping Board.....	1,049	4,473,338
Estimated tonnage in 1920 (aside from possible private construction).....	3,550	18,998,860
DETAIL OF SHIPS OWNED BY SHIPPING BOARD.		
New steamers.....	556	3,067,927
Ex-German steamers.....	58	340,976
Ex-Austrian.....	6	35,236
Great Lakes and others.....	37	138,827
Total.....	657	3,582,966

Mr. LEWIS obtained the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. LEWIS. Yes, Mr. President; I yield to the Senator from Arkansas, knowing that he understands certain Senators desire to be present, as I expect to refer to them, and the Senator desires to conform to that custom.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Henderson	Martin, Va.	Simmons
Baird	Hitchcock	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Johnson, Cal.	New	Smoot
Borah	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Spencer
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Overman	Sutherland
Colt	Kendrick	Page	Thomas
Culberson	Kenyon	Pittman	Thompson
Cummins	King	Polindexter	Townsend
Curtis	Kirby	Pollock	Trammell
Dillingham	Knox	Pomerene	Underwood
Fernald	Lenroot	Ransdell	Wadsworth
France	Lewis	Reed	Walsh
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Robinson	Watson
Gay	McKellar	Saulsbury	Weeks
Gore	McLean	Shafroth	Williams
Hale	McNary	Sheppard	Wolcott
Harding	Martin, Ky.	Shields	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] has the floor.

## LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I first express my very great appreciation of the messages sent to me by a number of Senators stating that they are necessarily engaged in committees

this Monday afternoon and can not return to the floor of the Senate at this moment but will later do me the compliment of their personal presence. I appreciate this, yet I can not say that they lose anything, as much as I would be glad to have them hear all my views. I am wholly conscious of the result of a malady that occasionally seizes me, and of late has been very merciless to me, leaving me physically where I can be of little entertainment. I can but present in a rather dry manner a few facts on the grave subject before us. These I hope will serve as a suggestion of views of one Senator to his colleagues.

Mr. President, we have, sir, at this time entered upon a discussion of the document termed the constitution of the league of nations. Sir, at the outset one would think that at a time like this any man in America could advance to a discussion of that grave question in a spirit qualifying him impartially to judge the thing as it is and to refrain from coloring it with personal animosity or political prejudice. But, sir, I deplore to have to confess that had there been a stranger from another world whose spirit in spectral form in the gallery of this Senate could have heard the attacks made on the project, he could have believed that he had returned to the Roman forum, to the senate of that imperial country, and that some Cataline by the name of Taft or Wilson was being arraigned by a Cicero on the charge of betraying his country to its enemies and for delivery of his native land to its foreign foes.

What, sir, is the thing of which we speak? It is, as we understand it, the presentation of a plan that has for its professed object the devising of some system of universal peace to mankind. Does that suggest an offense against civilization? Has there ever been a time when that holy dream has not been the consummation prayed for by all mankind? Was there ever a theme nobler or one note in the music of patriotism more sublime? Can we not chant the joyful refrain:

"Long have I sought this day."  
And prayed to know the way.  
To take calm peace by the hand  
And lead it to a bleeding land.

If, sir, by any fair method the result may be had, shall we spurn it because the path to the mansion is not paved as we would have chosen? Let us concede that neither the steps leading to the result, nor the final work can appeal to all men alike nor find favor in every mind. Also let it be understood that the supposed weakness or error in a design may not be due to any inherent vice in the proposal, nor, sir, owing to any frailty in the completed proposition. Differences presenting themselves against any proposal can be due to the varying attitude of each human mind as it presents a standard to itself of a specific remedy which it sees most appropriate for that particular felt evil. Each devised solution, though appearing just to its authors, may be most unfit to the situation. Our individual view is as likely to be wrong by the standard of another mind as the joint proposal before us is to any mind.

Therefore, sir, let us at the outset dismiss the feeling that because we may differ from the wisdom of a document that this difference in itself establishes that the document must be wrong, and we unquestionably must be right.

The question before us ever repeats itself—what is the thing sought to be done? What is it all for? Sir, we have seen from the panorama of present time the greatest war civilization has recorded in all its annals. To the horror of the contemplation there arises the startling fact that 7,000,000 of earth's men have been sent to their graves by the shot and stroke of mortal brother, and 14,000,000 more hobble through life but a shattered part of their former selves, while those who depend upon them for bread and sustenance lean now upon a broken staff, and that sinking to earth hopeless. All through the world now will be seen these miserable victims dragging their way on life's road, their legless bodies leaning painfully on crutch or staff, and their pitied fellows just beyond who now are to catch at life's existence by their armless sleeves. Then to the horror of our sight we behold those whose blindness will forever gaze darkened to the skies; those sightless ones who will have to feel with trickling fingers the faces of their beloved to know their own. This legion of dying, helpless, useless, and suffering millions are to be a charge on the Christianity and charity for generations yet unborn.

Does not this in itself suggest the justice and the morality of some effort on the part of mankind for a remedy that such curse and desolation might not ever be repeated again?

If we shall advert to the material losses, to the money waste, then, sir, know that there is \$180,000,000,000 of the earnings of 10 generations of mankind gone to ashes in the nowhere. All melted in the fires lighted by men for the consuming of their fellows—in the name of war!

We need not pause to moralize from the standard of war upon the right or wrong of the issues which justify these unholy



sacrifices. We speak of the condition. We are now told by proclamation that this present horror is at an end; that the war of devastation of lands and destruction of humanity has been halted, and that we are to make peace.

Mr. President, the great Webster, when beholding his country moving to secession of States, seeing the deluge of blood that was to gush from the bleeding wounds of the sons of the States and reflecting upon what the flag of the Union meant in all the sacrifices made to establish it and hold it up as an ensign of freedom and justice, exclaimed his prayer to God that no future children of the Union should ever be brought to where they would ask the miserable interrogatory, "What is it all for?"

Yet here in this assembly that man of but Christian belief, that man of but humane emotion, that man of but the throbbing brotherly kindness must, as he broods on the horrors and destructions of world war, ask in the name of all we speak of as God, "What is it all for?" Where has civilization been benefited or improved, where mankind elevated or advanced, justice vindicated in her temple, or the laws of God or the creeds of Christ fulfilled in this bloody inheritance?

Sir, if there are those who be moved to overcome such monster evil, shall they be held here or elsewhere as offensive to the wisdom of man or statesmanship of country? "The head and front of their offending" is but that they seek the fulfillment of the celestial proclamation of the Master, "Peace on earth, good will to men."

Mr. President, in different forms at different times the compact we speak of as treaties for peace have been undertaken by those who sincerely sought some avenue through which there could be an escape from holocausts which all of us have lately beheld and no tongue can adequately describe. These efforts have produced no peace nor brought us deliverance from wars.

Each age has but added increased machinery for dealing death and multiplied inventions for destruction of communities. This proclamation before us is to offer relief—to at last pledge men to preserve mankind from murder done in the name of civilization and liberty. We have listened, sir, to many speeches upon this floor on the subject of the contents of the document, particularly since the proclamation of the so-called constitution. Despite the desire of the President that debate be deferred for reasons of his own, eminent Senators felt they owed the obligations to their constituencies and to themselves to express their opposition. This they did with expressions of ridicule and condemnation. Such naturally justified others in bringing forth reply. I am one of those who, to do justice to the truth of the situation, speak of the thing as I see it, and this in opposition to the views of many.

These Senators who have assumed, sir, to oppose this proposition have invariably placed their opposition upon the ground that this remedy proposed as the league for peace would involve us in the affairs of Europe; also entangle us with nations of the Asiatic world, and thus withdraw us forever from the integral sovereignty of our independent Republic. Sir, I appreciate the meaning of the Republic of the United States. It has been the pride of its fathers and remains the glory of its sons.

I heard my distinguished friend, the eminent Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], in a speech yesterday, to be referred to by his friends with admiration and by his opponents with confusion, speak opposing this design. In the long line and progression of matter presented by him he recited fifty and more of the European wars which have transpired since the foundation of this country. At the conclusion of each description the able Senator would exclaim, "And not an American in it." I ask, has it come in this era of life that there exists a man who could contemplate the loss of all those lives, the devastation of all those lands, the demolition of all their homes, the widowing of all those wives, the bereaved mothers without children, and not feel that the "dam'd manner of their taking off" is not of concern to civilization and feel that if we could lay our hands against it ever being repeated we owe to do so not only unto ourselves but unto the thing we profess and call religion? Surely these slaughtered are our fellow mankind. In their death and agony they are our brothers in misery and war.

Mr. President and my fellow Senators, you will recall where Victor Hugo in *Les Misérables*, tracing the movement of Jean Valjean, locates him where he seeks refuge in a little church from the pursuing Inspector Javert.

The little worship house is hidden in the brushes. Nothing can be seen but the gleam of the altar light upon the sacred place where this little curé counts his rosary in the shadowed precincts. Jean Valjean is seen as he crouches behind a pew in the rear. The holy man, beholding the image, says: "Come up. Come in." Jean, shrinking, replies: "You say for me to come up and come in your house, not knowing me nor how wretched

is my condition?" Then the holy man of God says: "This is not my house; this is the house of Christ, and, besides, before you spoke, I knew you." "Knew me?" asks Jean. "Yes," replies the priest; "when I saw that you were wretched I knew you were my brother."

And shall we in America—

Light again the fires of hell to weld anew the chain  
On that red anvil where each blow is pain.

Sir, unto these of every land in such wretchedness we feel their misery as we must feel the agonies of those of our brothers. I say to my eminent friend from Missouri that these agonizing brutalities and this unmeasured result of misery to Europe brought unto this our land two things—their fleeing descendants who sought refuge to us as an asylum and the misery of their poor forced them to be dependents upon us. For that if there were not another reason, it can be seen how their interest is ours, and for the cause which they suffer we may speak.

Mr. President, because of every effort in the form of an individual treaty for peace with separate countries having failed, there has been resort to an association of ideas, and in this resort some formation of a plan designated "a league of nations." It is this constitution for a league, sir, that is being here at this time presented. It is this that is assailed, condemned, abhorred—indeed, sir, as though it were a compact for the dissolution of the Union and a decree for the ostracism of its men and the death of its children.

Mr. President, we must pause to note that this constitution was not the work of Woodrow Wilson individually. If there be a man who fancies that for partisan reasons or personal perversity mere opposition to it is justified because it was from the hand of Woodrow Wilson, let him recall wherever he is that this work appears to have been the work of representatives of 14 great countries. That there were 14 represented in the deliberations, and that when the result came forth it carried that which is not borne by many documents of the whole world—the unanimous vote and acclaimed decision of all the convention of delegates.

Now, sir, the judgment of these men that some of us impeach by our opposition may be wrong, but we flatter our vanity and lay proud unction to our soul when we conclude that any individual here is superior in wisdom or higher in patriotism than all those combined who there were the representatives of the political intelligence of the earth.

Then, sir, we move at once to the specific objection urged by the eminent Senators opposing the policy expressed in the constitution of the league. Meaning, of course, no invidious distinction as against others who have spoken, I choose the eminent Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the equally eminent Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] as pronouncing more fully the viewpoints of the objectors and as comprehensively sufficient that we may allude to them, sir, in their analysis as the representatives of the attack, particularly so in the position taken by them personifying the fundamental objections urged.

It is first contended, sir, that the constitution, so called, and the doctrine on which it is based violates the fundamental theory of the fathers of our Government. To sustain that contention the Senators bring forth the declarations of George Washington. On Saturday, a most appropriate and sacred day, the memorial of George Washington, February 22, the Senator from Missouri, voicing that which was also spoken with great capacity by the Senator from Idaho, took refuge for his attack in the provisions of that great message known as Washington's Farewell. From this he assumed a justification for his condemnation of the plan now before the Senate.

Time and time again there has been presented to this body, all that Washington has said on the point urged. Equally, time and time again it has been pointed out what he meant, each contending side differing from the other in the construction claimed.

We need not pause, sir, to remark the difference in time and condition of the then and the now, nor observe on how isolated we were, how separate we were, how weakened was our State. We can, however, note that the admonition of Washington was against an arrangement with foreign lands that would be political. A relation by which the identity of our country at home would be merged in the political relations and obligations politically of the land abroad.

He likewise, sir, inveighed against coalitions by our country with some one country in Europe. This, if done, could awaken the animosities of the other countries of Europe and turn them against us for that we had combined against them by joining some one either as an exhibition of our favoritism to one country of Europe or as our expression of our enmity to the other. But there never is any expression from the Nation's first



master of Government against this Nation taking any course anywhere for the peace of itself or of the world, nor for both in harmony with the relations of men. To the contrary, he specifically invited his countrymen to contemplate those relations that would produce the "harmony of intercourse of the world."

Former Secretary of State Richard Olney, in the Atlantic for May, 1898, produced a letter of Washington to his friend defining his own meaning of the clause in his Farewell Address. Says Mr. Olney (p. 9582 of the article entitled "International Isolation of the United States"):

That Washington was of the opinion that the regimen suited to the struggling infancy of a nation would be adapted to its lusty manhood is unsupported by a particle of evidence. On the contrary, there is authority of the highest character for the statement that he entertained an exactly opposite view, and "thought that a time might come when, our institutions being firmly consolidated and working with complete success, we might safely and perhaps beneficially take part in the consultation held by foreign States for the common advantage of the nations."

Mr. President, then Thomas Jefferson is resorted to. Jefferson, who is the author of the expression "entangling alliances," which frequently is imputed to Washington. We are constantly advised that Jefferson admonished us against alliances which were entangling. This is true, and if such, sir, were contemplated in the plan before us, in the spirit that Jefferson and Washington opposed, there would be no man of any political party on this floor advocating this measure.

I respectfully assert that the eminent Senators have in many instances in their condemnation been wrong in their premises. In other instances wrong in the conclusions they drew from right premises. I charge that in other instances, where their premises were correctly stated from the documents, the conclusions they drew were violent and unjustified by any just judgment that should follow the expression and definition of terms in the instrument. I make bold, first, to declare the situation and position of both Washington and Jefferson on the fundamentals of our Government involved in the construction of the document.

Mr. President, I ask your consideration a moment as to what Washington and Jefferson really meant and what each would have done under conditions like these controlling us. If the eminent Senators, Mr. BORAH and Mr. REED—for whom we have so great a respect that we hesitate to differ from them and so great an affection that we find it painful at any time to oppose them—shall really seek to know what Washington or Jefferson would have done, in order that they may follow at this time their guidance, I beseech their attention and that of their allies in this body.

I invite consideration to expressions of Thomas Jefferson, that all may see that he was not encrusted against advance. I am anxious that all may know that this apostle of democracy was not a worshiper of a fetish in the doctrine of *non movere*. He was for change upon changed conditions. I assert it never could have been the idea of Thomas Jefferson that the country would not develop, or that in its advancing conditions new remedies would be found for new arising evils. I deny that he was such a slave of the ancients that he would have denied the progress of the modern.

No man respects the fathers, I hope, more than I. I recall the admonition of the prophet in the Holy Scripture proclaiming, "Remove not the ancient landmarks thy fathers have set." But I condemn the thought there shall ever be decreed that we must ever be "ruled by the ashes from their sceptered urns." I speak for the Government of the sons as well as for the creed of the fathers. I demand advanced government for advanced people. I call down condemnation on those who put tombstones and sepulchers as blocks in the path of growing progress. Hear what Mr. Jefferson said in writing to Elbridge Gerry January 26, 1799:

I am not for raising hue and cry against progress—to go backward instead of forward, to look for improvement, to believe that government, religion, morality, and every other science were in the highest perfection in ages of the darkest ignorance, and that nothing can ever be devised more perfect than what was established by our forefathers.

Apropos, sir, of the change of our institutions, says the same philosopher writing to Samuel Kerchival July 12, 1916:

Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence and deem them, like the Ark of the Covenant, too sacred to be touched. They ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than human and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment. I knew that age well. I belonged to it and labored with it. It deserved well of its country. It was very like the present, but without the experience of the present, and 40 years of experience in government is worth a century of book reading, and this they would say themselves were they to rise from the dead. I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions. I think moderate imperfections had better be borne with, because, when once known, we accommodate ourselves to them and find practical means of correcting their ill effects. But I know also that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind.

Now, sir, I have asserted, and I wish to vindicate my assertion, that neither of these eminent fathers would have been opposed to a policy that would have made for peace—not even opposed an alliance to secure such blessing—and I dare say, and offer here my thought, that neither would have been against the proposition such as that now brought before this body under the conditions surrounding us.

I call attention, sir, in reading from Prof. Latané—his review of American foreign policy—page 10—where he makes clear the real meaning of Washington, when he called attention to what Washington said in the declaration:

"Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course . . ." says Washington—

Quotes Prof. Latané.

Speaking of what Washington said in his farewell message on alliances:

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Continues the professor:

It will be observed that Washington warned his countrymen against permanent alliances. He expressly said that we might "safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies." Further than this, many of those who are continually quoting Washington's warning against alliances not only fail to note the limitations under which the advice was given, but they also overlook the reasons assigned. In a succeeding paragraph of the farewell address he said:

"With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress without interruption to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes."

When, Mr. President, in the order of any evolution of government has a land ever reached where it was in the "command of its own fortunes" so supremely, so sublimely, as this land of Washington's, this our United States of to-day!

The eminent Senator from Missouri drew an inspiring picture by an epic of oratory in his peroration of Saturday describing the glory with which this country had endowed itself in the service it had done to other countries. He recited how it was our American soldiers and marines that saved England and rescued France when those lands were at the mercy of the German invader. Sir, there never could be greater proof of what command she has of herself, the thing that Washington sought to acquire, than that she could contribute such force of salvation to save the wreck of the Old World. That our Republic in her own strength crossed 3,000 miles of sea carrying her soldiers and equipment, and with these sons of the New World saved the fathers of the Old World to their children and gave to civilization a democracy for their future preservation.

Then, Mr. President, we pause to see, sir, what would the Washington and Jefferson of the olden day have done in this day? Sir, during the brief interval of peace following the treaty of Amiens in 1801, Napoleon undertook the establishment of French power in San Domingo. Fortunately for America the expedition failed. It was Mr. Jefferson who then wrote and then said:

The day that France takes possession of New Orleans fixes the sentence which is to restrain her forever within her low-water mark. It seals the union of two nations, who in conjunction can maintain exclusive possession of the ocean.

What two nations, I ask, does the writer then mean? Says Mr. Jefferson:

From that moment we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and Nation.

Surely, if there were an entangling alliance to make an arrangement for peace, Jefferson could never have been the first to suggest such an "alliance" and such a "marriage with England," with her navy, and this for the preservation of this our new America. Yet, he continues:

We must turn all our attentions to a maritime force, for which our resources place us on very high grounds.

Then, sir:

Monroe was later sent to Paris to support Livingston, and he was instructed by Jefferson, "in case there was no prospect of a favorable termination of the negotiations," to avoid a rupture [with France] until the spring, and "in the meantime enter into conferences with the British Government, through their ambassador at Paris, to fix principles of alliance and leave us in peace until Congress meets." Jefferson had already informed the British minister at Washington that if France should, by closing the mouth of the Mississippi, force the United States to war, "they would throw away the scabbard." Monroe and Livingston were now instructed, in case they should become convinced that France meditated hostilities against the United States, "to negotiate an alliance with England and to stipulate that neither party should make peace or truce without the consent of the other." Thus, notwithstanding his French proclivities and his warning against "entangling alliances," the author of the immortal Declaration of Independence was ready and willing in this emergency to form an alliance with England.



We, too, well know that "the unexpected cession of the entire Province of Louisiana to the United States" was the only thing that avoided the culmination of that project.

I do not bring these things to the attention of eminent Senators who do me the flattering compliment to attend me, on the theory that it is all new to them, or can now be first information. I do so to invite their attention to the fact that in cases like the one we have before us, the exceptional condition which is now ours and commands or calls for the action we contemplate, would have been the rule of action with them. I ask, sir, that you note that the rule which we see that they would have had in their day for peace, is but the rule we now in our day invoke. Then, I ask the able Senators who call up the spirits of Washington and Jefferson, does the present plan proposed by Wilson run counter to the theory which the fathers would have had, under the same circumstances, to that now proposed? We must answer, no; not at all, sir.

Where, now, I ask the Senators, do they find their justification for their very first contention that there is in this league a violation of the Monroe doctrine? What do eminent Senators mean when they present this theory as being one which Mr. Jefferson approved in the conduct of Mr. Monroe, but which would be violated by the proposal of President Wilson?

Stated in terse terms, the doctrine known as the Monroe doctrine—much misunderstood generally, but, of course, in a body like this, with much information upon the subject, perfectly comprehended—had no further or other purpose than to say to the European monarchies, "You shall not establish your governments upon the Western Continent." Let thoughtful men dismiss from their minds that this was a solicitude only for the people of South and Central America. If, sir, we find a fire lighted in these galleries above and surrounding us and we know the chance is that it may be readily extinguished, it may be that we will have no concern for the fate of those who will sit here below. But if we know it will leap its barriers and consume these walls and lick up this parquet, we turn at once to extinguish it by any means at our hand. Sir, it was out of fear for this Government of the United States that were governments established to the south of us that were monarchies, and supported by their imperial armies and navies, they soon could move their batteries upon us, to the extinguishment of the Republic we had founded here.

Secretary Hamilton Fish, in a report to President Grant, as to a European nation taking Cuba, said that the United States "opposes the creation of European dominion on American soil, or its transfer to other European powers." It is unnecessary to multiply examples, for all are applications of the foundation principle of the Monroe doctrine, that we must provide for our peace and safety. "It is doubtless true," said Mr. Webster in his speech on the Panama mission, in April, 1826, "that this declaration must be considered as founded on our rights, and to spring mainly from a regard to their preservation."

The theory was that we should do everything to help prevent the success of these kingly forces establishing their form of government upon this continent, which we felt and believed had been dedicated to the experiment of free republics. The holy alliance of Prussia, Austria, and Russia then threatened its domination in the South American lands. It was then that Britain, through George Canning, her premier, in his interposition with Rush, our United States minister, proposed the possible peril and got the declaration of opposition. The danger was forced to the attention of our own President. Then the doctrine was promulgated as one for our own self-preservation, which we call the Monroe doctrine, after the name of our then President—*nomen venerabile et gentibus clarum*.

Mr. President, we pause here to reflect, Why should we, the democracy, wish to abandon the Monroe doctrine? What in the world has the United States to gain by any conception of a spirit of surrendering this doctrine? Why should the present Democratic administration wish to do so? Sir, it has been the theme of our discourse in speech; it has been the delight of our praise in platform; it was the creature of our doctrines; it has been the charge and trust of our keeping. Under Polk and Lincoln we advanced to its maintenance with the lives of our sons; under Cleveland we asserted it successfully as against Britain; and from Wilson there will not be found a declaration that was opposed to it. All to the contrary. What purpose would Wilson have to violate it? The man who would voluntarily destroy the principle of it and establish the privilege of monarchies to slay Republics, kill liberty, and overthrow freedom would go down to such ignominy and odium that no tongue could describe, no charity palliate. Sir, there are those who impute to this man Wilson a pride of conduct and a conceit of personality so overweening that he will neither hear advice nor listen to

counsel. Surely these will not then regard him such a fool as to visit upon himself a fate so far removed from what they say he harbors—of being renowned in the esteem and perpetuated in the hearts of his countrymen—as to do the thing that strikes his political death knell. Will he do such a thing? Should he be accused of it? His reply must be, in the words of the prophet to the Lord, "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do such a thing?"

We turn to see, sir, what Wilson said, and we find his address to this body on January 22, 1917, at which time, it will be recalled, he suggested the propositions that have now culminated in some form of peace proposition. Then said the President:

I am proposing, as it were, that the nations should with one accord adopt the doctrine of President Monroe as the doctrine of the world; that no nation should seek to extend its polity over any other nation or people, but that every people should be left free to determine its own polity, its own way of development, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little along with the great and powerful.

I am proposing that all nations henceforth avoid entangling alliances which would draw them into competitions of power, catch them in a net of intrigue and selfish rivalry, and disturb their own affairs with influences intruded from without.

Continuing, he said to the Senate:

There is no entangling alliance in a concert of power.

This seems the view Mr. Jefferson held when he proposed a concert of powers—for peace. Now, then, Mr. President, we can understand what is meant by article 10 of this convention for a league of peace; sir, if I mistake not, we can summon from our now directed thought the spirit that penned it. It reads:

#### ARTICLE 10.

The high contracting parties undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all States members of the league. In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the executive council shall advise upon the means by which the obligation shall be fulfilled.

Will eminent men whose profession has been the comparison of statutes and decisions fail to observe that almost the exact language of the distinguished President to the Senate on January 22, 1917, is incorporated in the spirit of article 10? And I ask any Senator who shall with reflection read these articles if he will not see that that article has more than all other the object of the Monroe doctrine as its care and solicitude?

Now, how stand we? Heretofore, Senators, our country alone has constituted the sponsor of the doctrine, pledging its honor, and time and time again tendering its power to enforce it—against whom? Against those who now have agreed to become parties by literal word to its enforcement. Instead now, sir, of having America alone as the sponsor of the doctrine we call the Monroe doctrine, by the genius of the mind that directed our affairs, we have the world as a guarantor of the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. President, let me ask the able Senators, for their contemplation—would this question, Senators, have been left open? Do you fancy, Senators, that Britain would have left it open, or even in doubt, and this even were we to concede that our own land had not protected with the safeguard prohibiting external aggression? Would Britain have allowed the nations of the earth to possess the balance of power in commerce and in colonies in the Western Hemisphere through seizing any part of Central or South America? It was Canning, her minister, who delighted to exclaim that he "called in the New World to balance the old"; he, the British premier, took credit to himself as being one of the authors of the system. What object would Britain have, sir, in not preserving the Monroe doctrine, when, were she to open the gates to its violation, every rival of hers in Europe would colonize their people and governments in South America to her loss, which she must pay?

I propound to you the next query—the corollary to the first: Would Spain and Italy and France, with the children of their hearts' blood and bone and life of their nations making up the nationalities of these South and Central American lands, sitting at this council table, be content to surrender them to the inroads and invasion of their commercial rivals—once their military conquerors? Ah, what profit, eminent Senators, can you conceive that any nation in council at the European peace table could have for yielding the Monroe doctrine? Sir, I am unable to contemplate a theme upon which such thought could be predicated. Let us dismiss the haunting as "a thing on which dreams are made."

Then, Mr. President, we turn to treat the form of this document—the form so violently denounced or so satirically ridiculed. Having referred to the fundamentals upon which the eminent Senators made their arguments opposing the principle of this constitution, I now, sir, turn to note the comments on the composition.



I know, sir, that here and there we hear that this was a product of Gen. Smuts, of South Africa, or Lord Cecil of England. Mr. President, I only mention this that I might parenthetically advert to one thought. We observe, sir, that Britain is so proud of this document that she delights to have it advertised that one of her sons was one of its creators. Along comes Italy and professes that Cavour, in his first fulmination for a united Italy, is really the sponsor of much of the phrase that brings these nations together in some harmonious compact. Still more interesting it is to find that Germany steps up and claims, in behalf of her fathers of the revolution of 1848, the theory as one born in the compact for the confederation of the South German States. It is only here in America that we note the absence of a spirit willing to give credit to its own for the splendor of his contribution. I know not what motives animate the heart of the man that can be content to discredit his own countryman, that he may give the credit elsewhere, merely that it might tend, sir, in some way to detract from the greatness the world accords to one of his own public servants. I only know I can not envy his standard or praise his envy.

But I heard the eminent Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], as he closed a feature of his general comment, condemn the whole document. "Among other things," said the able Senator, "it savors of the odor of Trotzky"—Trotzky, the contemptible, because of the means he has adopted for government, of murder and destruction. The eminent Senator would have us know that such in itself to his mind produced a suggestion, sir, of internationalism. He read a treatise of Trotzky that approved a plan of this spirit. Because of such, the Senator would have us believe the document unworthy; two features being sufficient to the able Senator from Idaho. One was the enforced peace; the other was the combination with the world to enforce it. These were malodorous because approved in principle by Trotzky, as the Senator affirms.

Sensors, hear me. I trust the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] pays me now particular audience. If my eminent friend from Idaho shall tender Trotzky and his low standing to make contemptible any of the elements of this compact, I tender the senior Senator from Massachusetts, the Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, and his high standing, to give it respectability. I read the speech of the Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, the Senator from Massachusetts, the now leader of the opposition, on this compact very early in its age. Indeed, it is when it was literally in its chrysalis, before it took its full shape and wings of life. I beseech you to hear me. I read the speech of Senator LODGE, delivered in the city of Washington on May 16, 1916.

I quote from the proceedings of the League to Enforce Peace, a gathering at the Capital.

Said the Senator:

It is well, in understanding any great work—and the work of this league is a very great work, indeed—to know precisely where we stand, and I have been glad to learn that the league has laid down as a principle that it is not engaged in attempting to bring the war in Europe to an end; that its work lies beyond that war, for I have a somewhat deep impression that when the peace we all hope for comes it will not be brought about by expeditions from the United States nor by mass meetings and resolutions, no matter how admirable such resolutions may be. The United States has led the world in the matter of arbitration. From the day of the Jay treaty of 1794 and the Pinckney treaty of 1795 down to 1912, 84 arbitration treaties had been negotiated by the Executive of the United States, 83 had been ratified by the Senate, and only 1, the treaty of 1897 with England, rejected. I think that is a remarkable record. We have carried the principle of voluntary arbitration to its limit, and it is well to recognize that it has a limit, because when we undertake to put into treaties for voluntary arbitration questions which no nation, when the stress comes, will submit to arbitration, we do not advance the cause of peace, but quite the reverse, for we do vast mischief by making treaties which we know in our hearts we are not prepared to carry out when the time comes.

The limit of voluntary arbitration has, I think, been reached. Much has been achieved by it. It has taken out of the range of arms a large mass of questions which once were causes, frequently of war, constantly of reprisals, and by the general consent of civilized mankind has put them before a tribunal and had them there decided. If we have reached the limit of voluntary arbitration, what is the next step? I think the next step is that which this league proposes, and that is to put force behind international peace.

We may not solve it in that way, but if we can not solve it in that way, it can be solved in no other.

I trust that we have entered on the path that will lead us to the upbuilding of our national defense both in the Army and in the Navy. I hope this not only to make our peace secure, but because we as a Nation shall find it very difficult to induce others to put force behind peace if we have not force to put behind our own peace. I know—and no one, I think, can know better than one who has served long in the Senate, which is charged with an important share of the ratification and confirmation of all treaties—no one can, I think, feel more deeply than I do the difficulties which confront us in the work which this league undertakes. But the difficulties can not be overcome unless we try to overcome them. I believe much can be done. Probably it will be impossible to stop all wars, but it certainly will be possible to stop some wars and thus diminish their number. The way in which this problem is to be worked out must be left to this league and to those who are giving this great question the study which it deserves. I

know the obstacles. I know how quickly we shall be met with the statement that this is a dangerous question which you are putting into your agreement; that no nation can submit to the judgment of other nations—

One would imagine that were one of the orations of the last week, Mr. President—

and we must be careful at the beginning not to attempt too much. I know the difficulties which arise when we speak of anything which seems to involve an alliance. But I do not believe that when Washington warned us against entangling alliances he meant for one moment that we should not join with the other civilized nations of the world if a method could be found to diminish war and encourage peace.

Continuing, said the Senator:

It was a year ago that in delivering the chancellor's address at Union College I made an argument on this theory: That if we were to promote international peace at the close of the present terrible war, if we were to restore international law as it must be restored, we must find some way in which the united forces of the nations could be put behind the cause of peace and law. I said then that my hearers might think that I was picturing a Utopia, but it is in the search for Utopias that great discoveries have been made. "Not failure, but low aim, is the crime."

This league certainly has the highest of all aims for the benefit of humanity, and because the pathway is sown with difficulties is no reason that we should turn from it.

I say, "Plato, thou reasonest well."

Mr. President, it is an interesting thing at this time, sir, to find in a speech of the very able Senator from Massachusetts as complete a defense of this constitution of the league as could be given from anyone, anywhere. So, sir, from his eminent intellectuality we can draw much confidence and great consolation. Every objection which has been put forth by eminent Senators opposing it—and for the first, that it would be an alliance which violates the precept of Washington—is denied by the eminent and learned Senator who now opposes it. Every objection upon the ground of using force to establish peace is opposed and controverted by the able Senator. Every opposition to our lending ourselves to other nations to enforce peace for all the world is met by the Senator and overcome, while he advocates the cooperation of force as a thing wholly just. Finally, the theory of the league of nations is the acme of his splendid oration so late as only 1916; and to the youth of the great college which had honored him, and which he honored by his learning, teaching them of the lessons of government; he there proposed, as the *ultima thule* of human aspirations for peace and happiness, this league of nations. Therefore, Mr. President, I am not moved seriously by the mere fact that there may be something in it which my eminent friend, the Senator from Idaho, thinks meets the approval of Trotzky. I appeal from Trotzky to Lodge!

Mr. President, this brings us then, sir, to the detailed objections; and only a few of them will I take up, sir. Only those of large pretension—those on which Senators opposing say the document can not stand and by which it must fall. I fancy that the President of the United States will set forth with great clearness the reasons for many of the provisions. None are perfect. None can be. That there will be many emendations, many changes from the composite and individual minds which will assemble around this conference table, we must expect. The Constitution of the United States came forth finally—as Gladstone said, "the greatest work struck off at one time by the mind of men"—but seven years elapsed before it reached the point that the country would take it as acceptable, and then but by a real minority, instead of a majority, of its countrymen, and the meaning of its terms disputed over ever since.

Yet we know how it was brought about and finally how only it was accepted. It will not be presumed that a document such as this before us—with its importance, its significance—could have come forth in a state of absolute perfection, and thus bear within itself the exception to every rule of human conduct of a similar kind that has prevailed since life wrote its records.

But we take first the position, made much of and with great force by the Senators and lately advanced by the eminent Senator from Missouri, referring to the voting strength.

The able Senator from Missouri laid his hand upon what he felt was a defenseless weakness in the document—one which, according to his heart's conviction, involved us in a consequence of surrender and destruction. The Senator called attention to the fact that the executive council is made up of five, and that in this council of five the United States had but one vote.

Mr. President, if this executive council had for its authority the privileges of the league, and it could pass wholly and completely upon the destinies of the United States so far as she will have then ventured in this arrangement, I, too, would pause to consider what would be the effect of the numerical majority. The eminent Senator from Missouri says this clause puts us in the peril of the power of kings. That we would be under the dictate of kings—kings!—and that these emperors and monarchs, with all of their natural aversion to our institu-



tions, would be inimical to our welfare, and enemies to our interests, and for the baleful power of kings we must be on guard and beware their edict in this league.

Kings, sir? I pause. Where are they? Yonder in Britain the thing called the Crown is as impotent as the picture of it upon the sands, sir, that is washed by a receding and incoming tide. As little voice has the King to his people in direction as the smallest infirm mayor of a city in our land. The royal prerogative which was once a thing before which we quailed, and finally disdained, has ceased of its existence. More of democracy, in justice let it be admitted, than is found in the land of Britain, we know not of in America!

Italy? So impotent was her King that when he dared utter a voice against a mere commanding general of the army marching against the German Emperor a revolution surrounded his gates. For an hour it seemed as if his life would be hazarded to the fury of the mob, and there were not found any of his people who would lift an arm to preserve the King at such moment.

In Greece a humble citizen from a small island, called Venezilos, overthrew the royal power and blocked its mouth to silence; while in Russia we have beheld what has happened to one called the Czar. Truly we can exclaim as to monarchs Shakespeare's apostrophe to the rose—

What's in a name;

A rose by any other name would smell as sweet.

A king by any other name would be as useless.

Kings! How we glorify our spirit of proud democracy of republican America, from whence came the edict that hurled kings at the feet of the peasant and melted their scepter before the eyes of their countrymen, who beheld it with joy, and rejoiced over it in praise!

We remember Richard II, replying to the question asking "Where is the Duke with his power?" says:

For God's sake let us sit upon the ground  
And tell sad stories of the death of kings—  
How some have been deposed;  
Some poisoned by their wives; some sleeping killed;  
All murdered.

\* \* \* \* \*

Cover your heads, and mock not flesh and blood  
With solemn reverence. Throw away respect,  
Tradition, form, and ceremonious duty;  
For you have but mistook me all this while.

Why, sir, we would not wish them dead as men but as kings; and I wish my eminent friends to contemplate for a moment how impotent they are. We heard the able Senator from Missouri, in one of his characteristic and magnificent outbursts in this body a short time ago, contending against the plan of the league, offer the fact that every monarch was cousin by blood; another an uncle by relation; others bearing so close affinity that we could never hope for them to be otherwise than in conjunction with each other, as against republics and our country. Yet, in the face of that, he saw one uncle topple another from the throne, another uncle turn his batteries upon his relation, and how five went down to nothingness; how, as against their own blood, not the kings spoke, but their people against and over them. Then the people's war overthrew crowns, toppled emperors, and by their will, their voice, their decree, drove royalty to hiding, as refuge from death or salvation from the fury of revolution. Democracy, like justice, is at last abroad in the land. It is from the United States it speaks its warning and extends its power.

Oh, sir, we need not fear the name of a king; we need not be afrighted. The mere suggestion of a scepter need not alarm the soul of the quiet. And the American in the presence of kings is now the tranquil monarch.

Then, Mr. President, we pause to reflect, that if the able Senator from Missouri be correct in assuming that there is a disposition on the part of those who make up this council to be inimical to the welfare of the United States and its justice, or that they wait in the end to execute some vengeance which the Senator fears lurks within them and could all be executed within the power granted in this particular clause, then, sir, I say we are undone now. For if these nations are in this disposition and mettle for our destruction, we destroyed our land when we entered into the conclave with them in the allied council of war with only one vote to their five. Or we are now trembling in the balance of destruction when we sit in the allied council of peace with the same proportion—of voice and authority.

Surely, it must be apparent to all that if their attitude of heart be such as the eminent Senator feels then there is nothing we can do or undo that could avoid the vengeance which their hearts brood against us and now hangs like a fate to descend upon our head. It does not require a voting trust to give them the disposition, and no lack of it would relieve them of their

inclination. They have the power jointly there to outvote us in everything now, and had it while the war proceeded, under the allied control. If their actions have not invited confidence or do not justify it, let us cease all intercourse with them as being unworthy and dangerous.

Mr. President, I ask the able Senators who have assailed this document to contemplate this thought: If the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Idaho be correct in their construction, what think they of France and of Italy and the other nations sitting down and adopting a system which as against each of them in its voting proportions could be equally as destructive in operation as the Senators assume could operate against us? As this is plainly true, would these trained diplomats have put themselves in such a trap? Would they have adopted it? Would they have entered into it? Therefore you must see that the construction is not a probable one. That the danger summoned up as possible for us must be impossible for any.

I now ask you who is it has a right to vote? The able Senators are correct when they use the expression taken from the definition of those who are to be represented in the council—"self-governing countries," colonies, dominions. What is the meaning of the word? Evidently Britain had in mind India as a colony; Canada is known by the name "Dominion"; and Britain herself designated as "country." But our able friend, the Senator from Idaho, reads in this document where every country or a colony which in itself merely governs itself would have a right to cast its individual vote. The able Senator from Missouri, complimenting the Senator from Idaho—and rightfully well he might—paid tribute to the alacrity of his genius in bringing forth an article from the London Times, in which article it is assumed that it is the contention of Britain that each of these little independencies is to be treated as a country, and as such have the right of a vote. Of course were this true the majority of voting powers would appear with Britain. I beg to say to the able Senator from Idaho he misread the article. If he will but look at it, he will see that neither his own construction nor that of the Senator from Missouri is at all justified. Let me invite him to his correction. Says the London Times:

It is again a source of legitimate pride to Englishmen that article 19 in the covenant might almost be taken as an exposition of the principle animating the relations of Great Britain with India and the Dominions.

Then, says the Senator from Idaho, seeking to accent this provision, "Listen to this language"—

That the dominions are in this document recognized as nations before the world is also a fact of profound significance in the history of these relations.

My able friend, in the haste of his investigation, or possessed so completely by his opposition to the document in general, neglected to note what is article 19, referred to by the Times. Article 19, which the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Idaho would have you believe conveyed this separate vote as "nations" to these colonies of Britain, has nothing whatever to do with votes, nor, indeed, with the lands to be included in the league. Article 19 refers to those countries from the enemy, not from the allies, those who are not in the league now. We see what article 19 means when we read it:

#### ARTICLE 19.

To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in the constitution of the league.

Surely, Mr. President, I hope there will be applied some principle to these colonies that will recognize them as self-governing when it can be done; and to their people the right of human beings deserving of the care and the charity of mankind. But it must be quite apparent, sir, that the fear both eminent Senators had that the expressions of the London Times meant to give a construction to this document to mean that those who are to have individual votes which would, as Senators assumed, have given a majority of votes against the United States in every possibility is all based on a wrong assumption of premises. It is now seen that the reading by both Senators and construction was the result of a complete misapprehension.

Sir, who are those who really have the vote? I come to the position taken by the Senator from Missouri—most effective, if true; most alarming, if right; must convincing, if just. It is that in the final vote of the league this Nation would stand in the league from the beginning in the minority, and, as such, would be impotent. I will pass the phase of the preliminary construction of the league. I now assume for basis of argu-



ment that the league is formed. Will it be assumed that the United States of America will ever tolerate this league to be formed without also incorporating in it the countries—the "self-governing countries"—of South America? Will it be possibly assumed that we could ever think of having them omitted? Is it not obvious that as we protect them under the doctrine called the Monroe doctrine we would as a first step in the course of that guaranty place them where by their voice and vote they could protect themselves? Would not this be our first act as a benefit to them and service to ourselves? Even were we indifferent to them being in, they would come in on their own situation under the constitution of the league as "self-governing countries," within the definition of "countries, dominions, and colonies." This is plainly without a doubt. Sir, is there an American who would assume that our President could even concede in thought, far less by vote, that such a possibility of their being omitted ever could exist? We need only answer by recalling his pledges to them made in his Mobile (Ala.) speech.

Yet, I will accept the view expressed by both eminent Senators—Mr. BORAH from Idaho and Mr. REED of Missouri—wrong, as I think I am able to manifest them, in this reading of the constitution, to be—I will accept it as though the reading were correct. I will assume that Britain voted each of the nations in the council, or if not, then each of her colonies; yet there stands the United States of America, and the 11 countries upon her own continent, with all of their destinies wrapped and intertwined with the fate of this American Hemisphere—I ask where would their vote be, sir? With everything that Britain could command in the main council, we would, with these countries of our hemisphere, have nine to five on every European policy. The United States, Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Peru, Uruguay, Paraguay, Cuba, against Britain, France, Italy, Spain, Japan, or against Britain, India, Canada, Australia, and South Africa, or as against all in any unit against the Western Hemisphere—they 10 to the United States, South and Central America, 15.

Mr. REED. Where from?

Mr. LEWIS. The South American countries. I assume, sir, it would not be possible to bar them from admittance to the league.

Mr. REED. They are not in the league now.

Mr. LEWIS. Ah, sir, I call the able Senator's attention to the fact that it is not the council, as he has assumed in all his arguments, that sits upon these admissions and destinies of countries. They are the mere board of directors, now arranging for the first stockholders of the concern. After that primary organization the company as formed is to admit the applying members. The eminent Senators made their error of conclusion in assuming that it was the council who settled the destinies and the fates of admission or rejection of States. I reply, read the document; it provides that it is the league which votes the policies, not the committee on first membership—the executive council. It is only the league, as we shall see in a moment. I will not concede for a moment that our country would sit in the council or the league and, admitting members of the league, omit the South American countries, "self-governing," under the very stable standard they have prescribed, of allowing "any self-governing State to the league by two-thirds vote of the league members." Therefore it must be apparent, sir, that we need only consider the Western Hemisphere as being true to itself, for us to know that every vote of such country will be for its own preservation; certainly never for its destruction.

It is the old royalties of Europe that have threatened to overrun these lands. It was these old kingdom lands that tried to capture and conquer South America. Shall it be ever presumed that these countries would now vote to surrender themselves to their ever ancient foes? Certainly impossible. When this, then, brings us justly to contemplate their number—eleven—and then the number of the colonies which Great Britain could bring in under the definition—six—there is not one instance where the majority would not be so great and overwhelmingly in our behalf that there could not be a possibility of the danger of our being ever outvoted by the British Empire on any question of our prime concern that the Senators from Missouri and Idaho so deeply fear.

Now, sir, we take the second test proposed by the contending Senators. The Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Idaho say, "Now, here sits Japan, here is the policy of the United States of Japanese exclusion as against Japanese immigration. These countries of the league council—England, France, Italy, and Spain—say the Senators, could vote with Japan, could vote out the policy of exclusion by the United States

of citizens often necessary for her welfare—is at once voted away."

Why, Mr. President, apart from the interest that the continents of the Western Hemisphere, including all South and Central American lands, would have in protecting themselves against the invasion of the Asiatic millions, behold the colonies of Great Britain, which opposing Senators say will vote as units in the league. There are the four Australias, South Africa, British Columbia—all by their laws declared for the same policy of exclusion as that prevailing in the United States. All these, as "in all beseeching ranks march one way." Sir, will these be found voting against the laws and policies they have passed and which to-day are the preservation of their existence, the policy of their sovereignty? Will their mother, Britain, be found voting against her children on so vital a necessity and drive them to a severance from the Empire and in commercial union with America? It would hardly be conceived that such mad course can be presumed. Only by indulging these phantoms of imagination, so far from possible realities, can we entertain the fears of the alarmed Senators. And now I turn for a moment to another theme of great anxiety to the opposing Senators.

The able Senators say, in the voice of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]: "These nationalities, who can not speak our tongue, will sit in judgment as to the size of our Navy and our Army." "The Constitution provides such privilege," says the Senator, and on this charge calls down perfidious damnation on its presumed operation. Where is the evidence for such verdict; where the fact for such judgment? Why, the prescription is that the armaments are to be reduced or are to be established according, sir, to the necessity of each State, as that State shall manifest such—I prefer to read the exact words:

The high contracting parties recognize the principle that the maintenance of peace will require the reduction of national armaments—

First—

To the lowest point consistent with national safety—

Sir, who determines that? The country itself knows what is consistent with its own national safety. It is the sole and only judge. We would be the sole and supreme judge of what was consistent with our national safety, and the voice to express and assert it.

And—

Second. To the enforcement, by common action, of international obligations, having special regard to the geographical situation and circumstances of each State.

The State itself is the judge of its special "geographical situation" and of its particular circumstances. Only when each State has determined this status for itself does the action of the league begin. First, the State's own people must approve, or, as the constitution says, "when adopted." That is when the limitation suggested is adopted by the country to which the limitation is proposed, and the adoption only follows the fullest home consideration and decision. Then, only then, can the league enforce the decision of each State made with each other. This reciprocal and interdependent relation brings each to a common point of reduction proportionate to each other and to the necessity of each.

Now, I propound to the Senators this query for their contemplation: If I am not right, Britain has given her navy up to the other four countries of the executive council to limit and control. This you know she would never do. These lands have been her ancient foes; may be again. If I am not right, America can destroy the British Navy with the votes of South America alone, or with six votes in addition to her own. If the Senators be right in their contention that Britain and France and Italy and Japan could sit alone in their sovereign judgment and decide on our Navy and our Army, then Spain, with a memory of the days of Wellington; Italy, with the history of her conflict with England; France, with the specter of Napoleon and Waterloo and lately Fashoda—these Governments, with our one vote, could destroy the British Navy by reducing it by their votes as against hers, to such a minimum as to make it useless to her necessities. All this could never be, and could never be thought in the mind of any. That is why you find in this expression the specific language that I have very little doubt, Mr. President, was the word of Britain. If I may assume to use the colloquial yet very expressive term of the Senator from Missouri, this was where Britain was "on the job." The apt words of the Senator apply here, I fancy, more than to any other phrase found in this whole document, for we read—

Having special regard to the geographical situation and circumstances of each State.



Then, sir, you will see that each State is, under this document, specifically its own judge as to its circumstances and peculiar situation, and only by that construction, sir, will Britain be able to have the navy of such supremacy that she feels necessary to her welfare and one that we present to our people concerning our Navy as necessary for their adoption. The construction of the able Senators who have opposed this document, if well taken, would mean the death of the navy of any one of the countries of the executive council at the vote of the other four. Can any of us think that the trained diplomats of the Old World would have allowed language, far less provisions of agreement, that could be construed to do such a thing? Do you think the United States, with her late experiences, would have tolerated a document of that kind, or a construction that was possible of that nature? The United States is not represented by men who would commit national murder of their land and political suicide of themselves. So the able Senators must see that the charge they have made and the danger they express—that this league, by the specific votes of this council, could dictate our Army and Navy by their voice, without ours—was without foundation in the document itself; is without reason in any declaration of words or paragraph of authority. To these fears we cry "Avaunt."

Now, sir, say the Senators, there is the feature of arbitration, which, as they charge, compels us to arbitrate those things to which a sense of honor and a sense of right ought never to yield. I beseech the Senators to recall that the specific words of arbitration are very much after the form of words which have been debated here on this floor in connection with arbitration treaties tendered in the administration of President Taft. We find, Mr. President, that arbitrable questions are wholly left as follows:

The high contracting parties agree that whenever any dispute or difficulty shall arise between them which they recognize to be suitable for submission to arbitration and which can not be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy.

Reserving, sir, that thing which has been discussed, and which the eminent Senator from Pennsylvania who listens to me [Mr. KNOX], as the late great Secretary of State, has so often had occasion to recur to here in his arguments, because of his own experience. That question that was discussed on the floor of the Senate so often, and no doubt was in the mind of the writer of this document, that there were certain questions of national honor or sovereign policy which could not be arbitrated. Others which should only be submitted to arbitration by the voluntary will of certain nations of the world. Therefore, sir, instead of the fear expressed by the eminent Senator, that this arbitration of our difficulties will be left perforce to our common enemies, and those of antagonism to dictate to us, the fact appears clearly upon the document that it is left by the words, by the terms of the bond, to the honor and the sense of the Nation itself as to whether it shall choose the method of arbitration or some other disposition for that particular grievance or dispute. It is a voluntary arrangement, except as to matters that could bring on war. As to the latter the league offers solution to prevent war, by prescribing a court for the solution of the dispute.

This whole paragraph we take from The Hague treaties:

Mr. President, it must be plain, sir, that the eminent Senators have read this document in a mystifying light that has greatly confused them.

The able Senator from Missouri strikes a responsive chord and makes a severe impress by his emphasis on the charge that he would have you accept that this league, under the terms of this document, could enter with its power and interfere in local contests. He cites two possible illustrations most commanding at the present time to the attention of two very kindly great people of our own land. One, the Pole who was striving for liberty for his country; the other, the noble, patriotic Irishman that has dreamed of an Irish republic since the foundation of his generation. Sir, the able Senator asserts that under this document, lands such as these, Poland and Ireland, in their struggle for political equality, could be set upon, overreached, overrun by the league forces on the charge of internal disputes, and because of such little lands, struggling within, could be made the victims of force. That by such power of the league these little lands could be throttled to silence against their revolt. If this charge is apparently justified I confess the evil, and one to be a cause of veto of the league. If there is in all the document one clause, yea, one word, to summon this accusation I will surrender my defense. I now ask the able Senators to reflect on the language that the specific words in the document are "external aggression." Only under external aggression can the league have any jurisdiction. Does any man of reflection pause for a moment to ask himself why the word

"external" was added? If any form of aggression without or within was to be the privilege of the jurisdiction of this league the word "aggression" alone would have been there. It would have covered all. The word "external" was added to make it impossible that there should ever arise, in the mind of any living man, the apprehension that the internal conflicts of a people however aggressive should ever be the subject or privilege of the jurisdiction of these powers.

And, Mr. President, in the clause of the paragraph that the able Senator from Missouri attacked so fiercely, reading that in any matter that gave promise of war was a "subject of concern to the league," in which he saw evils from his vision, I invite the lawyers to the consideration of the construction. When it came to that the league reserved no power at all, no privilege of active conduct. They say to themselves that it is a matter of concern upon which they assume to offer counsel. This, as we in the United States have done time and time again to any land on the Western Continent and to many lands in Europe, yet in so doing we never have assumed to intrude our force in order to execute our friendly counsel, and we can readily appreciate what effect the counsel of this body would have with its suggestions. Let us reflect on them and their operations in the course of human action among nations. It suggests the possibility of friendships with the interceding friend or the commercial or political opposition of the interceder. The expression or reservation, sir, that war is a matter of concern to it, the league, and that it would seek to ameliorate and avoid it by accessible means, is as natural as that we would seek to extinguish a light conflagration advancing toward us, which might mean, sir, ultimately a fire of universal destruction. But the fear expressed by the able Senator that it meant that these great nations would forcibly seize these little ones and literally throttle their life and suppress their existence by the despotism of their power, I respectfully urge, has no foundation in any line or letter of the document now before this assemblage. "Beware of the wraith sent to the stage to frighten the players."

Now, Mr. President, I offer proof of my construction. I offer proof that my learned friend from Missouri will have to accept as conclusive. I commend the test I present to the Senator from Idaho, and call up his historical information, to say nothing of his acumen, to justify the illustration I tender. I say that if it be true that anything in this document—anything in the paragraph read—would allow any land—America, France, or Britain—or any combination of lands to suppress the internal dissensions in Ireland or Poland or elsewhere, then by the same authority, Britain would have realized that such power also would have meant the privilege of Russia or Japan to enter into India and interfere in her internal revolts, and summons all the forces of the league. That France, long with her eye "avaricious with hope" in the dream of eastern possession, would have had the privilege to enter into England's colony of Egypt. Do you fancy that Britain ever would have had a document here, sir, that would have allowed any outside nations to enter into any colony of hers for the purpose of suppressing revolts and lending themselves to the dispute one way or the other—on ground of maintaining order? This she knows might mean, sir, the destruction of her sovereignty over them. For the new intruder could by its presence convert them to itself and appropriate them to its own uses, as England did with Egypt, under privilege of "restoring order," France in Algiers, the United States in the Philippines. The answer springs to our lips—never!

Well, sir, as it would not be allowed to apply to colonies of Britain against her, it can not apply to any country, by Britain or France, against us. It does not give, sir, to any the power to do that with any land which Britain could not in our land, and which Britain would not allow from us or any other in her land. So let us have done with this invented terror. Sir, common logic and common sense advise us of its impossibility. In the document not a line or a sentence can be read by the flicker of imagination to justify the accusation.

Mr. President, I must move on. I know that this long analysis of the charter is burdening, but of that I must take the responsibility. The necessity is that two industrious, able assailants in two days' occupation thundered against its walls. I must expose how invincible it is even after assault.

Mr. President, in the concluding features of this analysis I have but this following thought to offer on this section: It is to say that it must have been in the minds of those who framed this provision of this document that wherever it was apparent to those directing or about to threaten an unjust war that they would bring upon themselves the collective forces of those who would suppress their unjust attacks; these would restrain themselves nor dare proceed further upon it. Let me



ask, Does anybody imagine that Germany would have entered upon the war—unholy invasion—she did, had she known that these forces that finally overcame her were ready to combine to vanquish her if she ventured upon the course of universal destruction? The hasty yielding by her when she felt the unconquerable power of their combination answers the question. This applies to explain the provision. It is the text of Job, saying—

How forcible are right words.

Mr. President, after all, sir, it is public opinion. Public opinion, stimulated by public conscience, will guide the construction of the document. Public opinion, inspired by public virtue, will sustain this league in what it shall undertake, or it will overthrow and defeat it in any attempt against the equities of men or the rights of countries. It will appeal to public opinion before ever it assumes to execute any policy, and on this judgment it will advance or withdraw.

You will remember, Senators, that Joseph Alison, writing in 1840 from Possel House, Glasgow, dilating upon Guizot and his history of European civilization, says:

The one great error of Napoleon was in assuming that government could be conducted by prescription, forgetful after all that it is the opinion of mankind—first through the intellectual man and then by restraining the thoughtless or defiant man, which, after all, is the director of all actions on earth—that make for the true advance of men.

So here, too, sirs, as to this, as to all other great tasks, it will be the public opinion of mankind in which all of this will be construed and executed, or judged and defeated. On this rock must we build our house, if the storm is not to destroy it.

Mr. President, I now advert to the text advanced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], which I regard of such great significance that I can not permit it to remain in the state he left it. The able Senator from Idaho concluded his masterly oration by creating the issue of "nationalism." He would have left the country to understand that there was now an issue against the democracy, of "nationalism" created by those who oppose this covenant, and that those who espouse it in the spirit of democracy were opposed to home nationalism. Of course, the Senator knew that no issue can be so fascinating to the creator of ideals, or so fitting to popular appeal, as one's own country. We still refrain:

Breathes there a man with soul so dead,  
As never to himself hath said,  
This is my own, my native land.

Mr. President, I will draw no political party line here in this discussion. Yet, sir, I can not allow my eminent friend, the Senator from Idaho, to leave that discussion where it drew one—one to be designated "internationalism," or world citizenship, against nationalism or home citizenship. Yet if there is to be such, democracy shall not be charged with being guilty of home abandonment. I must remind the Senator that it was not democracy that hurled this country into Asia and in the name of "world duty" and "trustee for civilization" took possession of the Philippine Islands and established an American government there, and thus gave Asia the right to demand reciprocity to come into America with her citizens for that we had gone into Asia with our people. It was not democracy that went into China and put its army at the demand of a foreign nation there for their protection, having our Americans killed by murderous Chinese. Then later assumed jurisdiction over the railroads of China to divide them among American and English financiers under the name of the "open door," more justly designated as the "dollar diplomacy," and by such arousing the hatred of China against the United States and creating the suspicions of Japan against anything American. It was not democracy that plunged the United States into the affairs of Europe at Algeiras in the European convention of 1905 and for the first time in our career as a Nation brought the United States to the hazard of war with Spain, France, and Germany—for the vanity of the United States, establishing the "balances of the Old World," and the right of kings to filch the little land of Morocco. Sir, we, the democracy endured it. We raised no voice against our Government in matters with foreign nations after the acts were done. Like patriots our theory again was that of Decatur, "My country, may you be right; but right or wrong, my country." The democracy, in common with all our land, is now paying the price of these violations in billions of lost money and in the death of thousands of her children.

Let not the able Senator from Idaho fancy he can delude the public mind in drawing that issue against the spirit of democracy. The people remember—and ever will they be reminded "Lest we forget." Still, sir, less justified was the eminent Senator in the effort to conjure up by the name of Roose-

velt the issue "nationalism." I invite my learned friend to recall his history. I rejoice in the exquisite apostrophe he paid to the man—the distinguished ex-President. Its language was of beauty which will not be excelled, and in tribute, let none desecrate by denying its deserts. But I will not allow him to summon Roosevelt dead and raise up his valiant spirit in this historic shade as a justification of the doctrine of nationalism, nor to cast him upon a pedestal as the apostle statue that stood for America only, and by that make the issue of homeland only—as creed of Republican Roosevelt as against "world citizenship"—to be charged as the aspiration of a democracy. I dare assert that the returning spirit of Theodore Roosevelt would exclaim, as he would have in life—in the words of the human to the royal artist—"paint me as I am."

I recall to every one sitting around that it was Theodore Roosevelt who demanded in behalf of his country and to the ear of the whole world that our United States, merely because the neutrality of Belgium was violated, and before a citizen of this land was ever assailed or a dollar of property attacked, should send our armies in millions and our navies in squadrons and rush ourselves, unprepared as we were, in the war of Europe, that we might avenge what he denounced as the brutalizing of Belgium.

Nationalism—the issue for Roosevelt? Let it not be forgotten that the character of his life, as extending itself into the world affairs, and ever summoning the United States as avenging angel in behalf of Christianity and justice for mankind everywhere, was voiced by his historian in the exquisite eulogy of Senator LODGE upon the dead patriot when he closed his epitome in behalf of that distinguished scholar, soldier, and statesman—patriot and President—saying—

In all his last days the thoughts which filled his mind were to secure a peace which should render Germany forever harmless and advance the cause of ordered freedom in every land and among every race.

See what it was the ex-President said as his view, his hope, his demand, as to a league of peace of the world. On that great project he spoke and wrote more than once with no uncertain sound. On the 1st of January, 1915, he published a book entitled "America and the World War." He had been thinking closely and carefully over the problems created by the war, and he presented the results of his reflection for the serious consideration of his fellow countrymen. In the chapter significantly headed "An International Posse Comitatus," he says, at page 123:

I earnestly hope that we shall ourselves become one of the joint guarantors of world peace under such a plan as that I in this book outline, and that we shall hold ourselves ready and willing to act as a member of the international comitatus to enforce the peace of righteousness as against any offender, big or small. This would mean a great practical stride toward relief from the burden of excessive military preparation. It would mean that a long step had been taken toward at least minimizing and restricting the area and extent of possible warfare. It would mean that all liberty-loving and enlightened peoples, great and small, would be free from the haunting nightmare of terror which now besets them when they think of the possible conquest of their land.

Again, in the same volume, in his chapter on "Preparedness Against War," while denouncing Mr. Bryan's peace treaties with fierce emphasis and almost "a damnable reiteration," he proceeds to say, at page 202, that—

international peace will only come when the nations of the world form some kind of league which provides for an international tribunal to decide on international matters, which decrees that treaties and international agreements are never to be entered into recklessly and foolishly, and when once entered into are to be observed with entire good faith, and which puts the collective force of civilization behind such treaties and agreements and court decisions, and against any wrong-doing or recalcitrant nation.

In the chapter headed "Utopia or Hell?" he concedes that the project of a league of nations may for a time be a Utopian vision, but suggests the hopeful possibility that "after the war has come to an end the European contestants will be sufficiently sobered to be willing to consider some such proposal, and that the United States will abandon the folly of the pacifists and be willing to cooperate in some practical effort for the only kind of peace worth having, the peace of justice and righteousness."

My proposal—

He says—

is that the efficient civilized nations, those that are efficient in war as well as in peace, shall join in a world league for the peace of righteousness. This means that they shall by solemn covenant agree as to their respective rights which shall not be questioned, that they shall agree that all other questions arising between them shall be submitted to a court of arbitration, and that they shall also agree—and here comes the vital and essential point of the whole system—to act with the combined military strength of all of them against any recalcitrant nation, against any nation which transgresses at the expense of any other nation the rights which it is agreed shall not be questioned, or which on arbitrable matters refuses to submit to the decree of the arbitral court.



In his final chapter, summing up the argument, at page 253, he says:

It is because I believe our attitude should be one of sincere good will toward all nations that I so strongly feel that we should endeavor to work for a league of peace among all nations rather than trust to alliances with any particular group. \* \* \* The prime necessity is that all the great nations should agree in good faith to use their combined warlike strength to coerce any nation, whichever one it may be, that declines to abide the decision of some competent international tribunal. Our business is to create the beginnings of international order out of the world of nations as these nations actually exist. We do not have to deal with a world of pacifists, and therefore we must proceed on the assumption that treaties will never acquire sanctity until nations are ready to seal them with their blood.

More than a year after the publication of this volume the ex-President produced another, taking his title from a phrase used by the heroine in George Borrow's "Lavengro," "Fear God and take your own part." At page 410 of this book he reproduces the following passages from his address before the Noble Prize Committee, May 5, 1910:

Something should be done as soon as possible to check the growth of armaments, especially naval armaments, by international agreement. No one power could or should act by itself, for it is eminently undesirable from the standpoint of the peace of righteousness that a power which really does believe in peace should place itself at the mercy of some rival which may at bottom have no such belief, and no intention of acting on it.

Finally, it would be a master stroke if those great powers honestly bent on peace would form a league of peace, not only to keep the peace among themselves, but to prevent, by force if necessary, its being broken by others.

The supreme difficulty in connection with developing the peace work of The Hague arises from the lack of any executive power, of any police power to enforce the decrees of the court. Each nation must keep well prepared to defend itself until the establishment of some form of international police power competent and willing to prevent violence as between nations. As things are now, such power to command peace throughout the world could only be assured by some combination between those great nations which sincerely desire peace and have no thought themselves of committee aggressions. \* \* \* The combination might at first be only to secure peace within certain definite limits and certain definite conditions, but the ruler or statesman who should bring about such a combination would have earned his place in history for all time and his title to the gratitude of all mankind.

This volume was published in February, 1916.

Here, sir, as to the creed of the Republican masters—and of the Roosevelt as he spoke, we have the law and the prophets—and as he spake he will be judged.

Mr. President, I have done with this analysis. Feebly have I performed the task assigned me. Yet I have assumed to point out the particular peaks upon which Senators mounted and the promontories upon which they stood from which they proclaimed to the valleys below the desolation and destruction of their land. I have assumed to show that their foundation was not mountain tops of truth, but hills of false echo.

I dare assume that I have demonstrated, if not to the conversion of men about me, then to the satisfaction of public conscience how infinitely wrong the able Senators were in their construction. Wrong in their premises when right in conclusions, and wrong in the conclusions when right in premises. On that false foundation all their baleful philosophy of opposition was built.

Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho demands that the people be given the opportunity to decide. I answer yes, it will be so; the people shall decide. This document will not be approved nor brought here in any form for verdict without the voice of the people being heard upon it and of it. I will have the eminent Senator from Idaho understand that there never can be permitted by me, that through his great force, the impression to go abroad, that the democracy intended this as a secret charter to be forced in a star-chamber proceeding. It will be before the Senate. Before this it will receive the consideration and audience of the people. The people will pass on the merits of this project for peace as they pass on every similar document of its purport heretofore presented in the form of a treaty. This will be through and by their Senators speaking on this floor, the voice of their constituents. But, sir, this undertaking and covenant will have that superior advantage of the voice of the distinguished champion of its birth who will do as he has done in every other measure he has found in his heart to advocate for the welfare of his countrymen. He will go to his people with the proofs of his sincerity, with the truth of his cause, with the result that has ever followed his appeal to his fellow citizens—the approval of his undertaking, as they have ever approved whenever he has gone to them with that which he has demanded in the name of humanity for mankind and justice for country.

Knowing that He cometh as one  
To serve the broken—they ever cry:  
"Make way for the friend, He cometh  
For the cause of truth and the righteousness of men."

Senators, it is now for our country to make her decision. It is to the white paths of peace or the black plains of war.

And when my country comes to the final judgment, let her not come blindfolded with the scarf of delusion. Let her behold herself in her now new relation to the world. The to-morrows greet her as the accepted friend to each or as the enemy of all. This, my beloved land, with her brow crowned with the glory of her unparalleled achievement, her body radiant with the blaze of fame's immortal star, is now never again to be the separated land from all the world's conflicts. This America is now an island with the Bering Sea at the north, with maddened Russia frenzied in hatred of us threatening at its icy doors. The Atlantic on the east, whose tides boom the summons to every ancient European grudge or national rivalry to sate itself at first advantage. On the Pacific the mysterious lands of the mystic East brood in silent meditation as to their course in retaliation for the long affront against their people and indignity of years against their nation. At the south the Panama Canal and the Gulf that widens to a sea, echo in their every singing wave the doubt and suspicions of South and Central America against the professed friendships of the United States.

Mr. President, our to-morrows approach heavily upon us with the burdens of uncertainty. Let us not be deceived in the security that we are exempt from the inheritances which from the dawn of time have befallen those who march in rivalry to overcome by superiority their rival nations. For us there is but one of two fates decreed. It is to be victor or victim. We will live in the brotherhood of peace, tranquil in the family fraternity of nations through interchange of benefits and blessings; or we will live the life of one threatened by the powerful, hated by those who fear us, and the object of hoped-for destruction by those who long for the day of power to execute their hidden vengeance. Sir, Japan and China can be one in common grievance on the east, while the new Russia and the Germanic lands may be a union of purpose with a kindred hatred waiting revived strength to avenge it upon us. In Europe abides those commercial rivalries that can leave our former battle field allies indifferent to the results that our avowed enemies may attempt upon us. Our America is now more imperiled in her future than has been her lot since her Republic sprung to life. Only to herself can she look with sure confidence. Only within herself can she find complete security. She must choose to trust herself wholly and abide in her own strength without aid and without friends, or trust herself wholly to abide in the friendships of Christian people and in the protecting love of godly nations.

If, sir, we are to be wholly alone and separate from the earth's companionships, then our country must prepare for armies and navies of a volume that shall make us supreme against any land and every foe. But these shall swell the debt of the Nation to where it will exhaust the rich and beggar the poor, and awaken a discontent to burst forth in internal daily dissensions, provoking in the end civil revolutions. We must dwell on our new changed conditions; we must measure with the fleets of the sea knitting us to every shore of every land; the air woven into a canopy of death or in curtains of life by the shuttle weavings of the aeroplane. We must reckon with the depths of the sea knotted into traps of destruction by the gyrating maneuvers of the submarine, and sight with new vision the engines of destruction encompassing us about from every hidden vantage. From all this we must see that the peace our country seeks of the earth for mankind is not for others only. It is also for ourselves.

Let our country behold itself as the light of truth reveals us—in danger! True, we can overcome it all and be victors through all. We can prepare now to empty every home of its first born; we can smite the tears from every mother's heart and wring with agony the soul of every wife. More, we can consign every boy to the fate of a cripple—and many to the horrors of sightless eyes and a hopeless life. We can empty the treasuries of the cities and make barren the farms. We can leave our country a graveyard for her dead children—stricken by her own hand—and turn our churches of God into the mourning houses where the walls of the desolate will cry unto Heaven to consign the creators of their desolation to the depths of hell. All this we can have, that we may boast of military glory and the vanquishing by world murder of every foe.

Or, sirs, we can salute the regenerated earth in the new spirit with which our children reincarnated it with their sacred bodies, still sanctifying the soil that is their distant grave. We can join in friendship that surrenders no right nor yields one privilege of a just people. We can proclaim that so long as mankind will be true to us we can covenant to be just and fair to it. That we submit every national grievance to the adjustment of a Christian spirit by the balances of right and



wrong among honest people. That we will join all who equally join us in casting aside the iron instruments of death which murder men and pauperize lands—and in their place put the pulpits of Christ and the world courts of justice. Then we can declare, by the sacred memory of the dead who fell that their loved ones should live, that war and death shall end and love of man and the life of the world begin—all consecrated anew to justice on earth and God in heaven.

Which shall it be? The holy voice again proclaims to mankind in the morn of the twentieth century as it cried out in the night of the first, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve." We reply, "For us and our house we serve the Lord." So, sir, when we are gladdened by the sight of the new army bearing banners, streaming with the ensign, "Peace on earth, good will to men," our hearts will be quickened to joy and our lips break in praise that the first evangel to bring the glory of the newborn age and lead the rejoicing processions of the redeemed earth was our United States of America—thank God!

At the conclusion of Mr. LEWIS'S speech there was prolonged applause on the floor and in the galleries.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A final word from the Chair. The occupants of the galleries are acting like Bolsheviks. They have been acting in that way for two or three days. The Chair has let you applaud those who point with pride and those who view with alarm. It is over. The rules of the Senate are going to be enforced. Orders are going to be issued by me that the next time there are manifestations of either approval or disapproval to clear the galleries, and I will see whether there is any law in America at least.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this is no time to attempt any extended discussion, and I invoke the attention of the Senate for just about two minutes.

If the Senator from Illinois is correct in his diagnosis of this document, then the chief thing the world has hoped to obtain from it is not in it. The chief thing the world has been told we would get from this league is the disarmament, or to a large extent the disarmament, of nations. The Senator from Illinois, who assumes to be the spokesman for the administration, tells us there is not a word in this document to limit the size of any army, that that is left to the judgment of the Nation. In other words, it is left exactly where it is now. If that is the case, the chief argument for the league has been withdrawn and the chief reason for its existence does not appear to exist.

There are many things I could call attention to, but let it not be forgotten that is the construction now given.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. HARDWICK. I ask that the reading of the District of Columbia appropriation bill be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 13277) 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 Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 1, after line 2, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

That the following sums are appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia to the extent that they are sufficient therefor and the remainder out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, but the amount to be paid from the Treasury of the United States shall in no event be as much as one-half of said expenses, in full for the following expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, except amounts to pay the interest and sinking fund on the funded debt of said District, of which amounts one-half is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, namely:

And to insert:

That one half of the following sums, respectively, is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, in full for the following expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, namely:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "General expenses," on page 2, line 13, before the word "each," to strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$5,000," and, in line 15, after the word "salary," to strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$5,000," so as to make the clause read:

Executive office: Two commissioners, at \$5,000 each; engineer commissioner, so much as may be necessary (to make salary \$5,000); secretary, \$2,700; 3 assistant secretaries to commissioners at \$1,600 each; clerks—1 \$1,500, 3 at \$1,400 each, 1 \$1,200, 1 (who shall be a stenographer and typewriter), \$1,200, 1 \$840, 2 at \$720 each; 2 messengers at \$600 each; stenographer and typewriter, \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 22, after the word "Government," to strike out "\$1,200" and insert "\$1,500," so as to make the clause read:

Veterinary division: Veterinary surgeon for all horses in the departments of the District government, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 10, after the word "necessary," to strike out "\$1,500" and insert "\$1,800," so as to make the clause read:

Building inspection division: Inspector of buildings, \$3,000; assistant inspectors of buildings—principal \$2,000, one \$1,500, one \$1,400, 10 at \$1,200 each; fire-escape inspector, \$1,400; temporary employment of additional assistant inspectors for such time as their services may be necessary, \$1,800; civil engineers or computers—one \$2,000, one \$1,500; clerks—chief \$1,800, one \$1,050, one \$1,000, one (who shall be a stenographer and typewriter), \$1,000, one \$900; messenger \$600; assistant inspector, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 13, after the words "Executive Office," to strike out "\$126,190" and insert "\$124,790," so as to make the clause read:

In all, Executive Office, \$124,790.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 22, after "\$600," to insert "storekeeper, \$900," and in line 25, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$39,450" and insert "\$40,350," so as to make the clause read:

Care of District Building: Assistant superintendent, \$2,000; chief engineer, \$1,600; three assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; electrician, \$1,400; two dynamo tenders, at \$875 each; four firemen, at \$840 each; three coal passers, at \$600 each; electrician's helper, \$840; eight elevator conductors, at \$600 each; laborers—two at \$660 each, two at \$500 each; two chief cleaners (who shall also have charge of the lavatories), at \$500 each; 33 cleaners, at \$240 each; matron, \$600; storekeeper, \$900; chief watchman, \$1,000; assistant chief watchman, \$660; eight watchmen, at \$600 each; pneumatic-tube operator, \$600; in all, \$40,350.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 25, after "\$900," to strike out "inspector, \$1,200" and insert "two inspectors, at \$1,200 each," and on page 6, line 3, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$13,100" and insert "\$14,300," so as to make the clause read:

License bureau: Superintendent of licenses (who shall also be secretary to the automobile board without additional compensation), \$2,000; clerks—two at \$1,400 each, two at \$1,200 each, one \$1,000, one \$900; two inspectors, at \$1,200 each; inspector of licenses, \$1,200; assistant inspector of licenses, \$1,000; messenger, \$600; in all, \$14,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 3, to insert:

Section 1 of the act of Congress approved June 19, 1878, entitled "An act to create a revenue in the District of Columbia by levying a tax upon all dogs therein, to make such dogs personal property, and for other purposes," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"That there shall be levied a tax of \$5 each per annum upon all dogs owned or kept in the District of Columbia, said tax to be collected as other taxes in said District are or may be collected."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 16, before the word "bailiffs," to strike out "three" and insert "four," and in line 20, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$48,420" and insert "\$49,620," so as to make the clause read:

Collector's office: Collector, \$4,000; deputy collector, \$2,000; chief clerk, arrears division, \$2,000; cashier, \$1,800; two assistant cashiers, at \$1,500 each; bookkeeper, \$1,600; four bailiffs, at \$1,200 each; clerks—four at \$1,400 each, eleven at \$1,200 each, four at \$1,000 each (including one transferred from assessor's office), five at \$900 each, one \$720; clerk and bank messenger, \$1,200; two messengers, at \$600 each; in all, \$49,620.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 6, after "\$1,500," to insert "inspector of claims, \$1,800," and in line 9, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$21,420" and insert "\$23,220," so as to make the clause read:

Office of corporation counsel: Corporation counsel, \$4,500; assistants—first \$2,500, second \$2,500, third \$2,000, fourth \$1,800, fifth \$1,500, sixth \$1,500; inspector of claims, \$1,800; clerk and stenographer, \$1,400; stenographer and typewriter, \$1,200; two stenographers, at \$900 each; clerk, \$720; in all, \$23,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for the Office of Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets, on page 8, line 4, after the word "markets," to insert "and offices," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That the commissioners each year in the annual estimates shall report to Congress the assignment of the foregoing market masters, assistant market masters, watchman, and laborers to the various markets and offices.

The amendment was agreed to.



The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 20, to strike out:

Public Utilities Commission: For salaries (including inspector of gas and meters, \$2,000; assistant inspectors of gas and meters, one \$1,200, two at \$900 each; messenger, \$600); in all, \$33,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$4,000 per annum;

And insert:

Public Utilities Commission: Executive secretary, \$4,000; accountant, \$3,000; traffic engineer, \$3,000; assistant accountant, \$2,000; statistical clerk, \$2,000; inspectors—one \$1,800; one \$1,600, one \$1,400; inspector of gas and meters, \$2,000; inspector of electric meters, \$1,800; assistant inspectors—one \$1,200, two at \$900 each; clerks—two at \$1,400 each, two at \$100 per month each for seven months; two messengers, at \$720 each; in all, \$31,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 14, after the word "commission," to strike out "\$53,000" and insert "\$51,240," so as to make the clause read:

In all, Public Utilities Commission, \$51,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 4, after the word "hire," to strike out "\$300" and insert "\$600"; and, in the same line, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$11,340" and insert "\$11,640," so as to make the clause read:

Department of Insurance: Superintendent of insurance, \$3,500; deputy and examiner, \$2,000; statistician, \$1,700; clerks—one \$1,200, two at \$900 each; stenographer, \$840; temporary clerk hire, \$600; in all, \$11,640.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 4, after "\$1,000," to strike out "one \$900, seven at \$840 each" and insert "eight at \$900 each"; in line 6, before the word "each," to strike out "\$720" and insert "\$840"; in line 7, before the word "each," to strike out "\$600" and insert "\$720"; in line 8, after the word "copyist," to strike out "\$600" and insert "\$720"; in line 9, after the word "cataloguers," to strike out "one \$840, one \$720, two at \$600 each" and insert "four at \$840 each"; in line 10, after the word "one," to strike out "\$900" and insert "\$1,000"; in line 11, after the word "one," to strike out "\$720" and insert "\$840"; in the same line, after the word "one," to strike out "720" and insert "\$900"; in the same line, after "\$900," to strike out "6 at \$600 each, 5 at \$540 each," and insert "11 at \$720 each"; in line 12, after the word "collator," to strike out "\$600" and insert "\$720"; and, in line 18, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$64,620" and insert "\$69,460," so as to make the clause read:

Free Public Library, including Takoma Park branch: Librarian, \$4,000; assistant librarian, \$1,800; chief circulating department, \$1,500; director of children's work, \$1,500; children's librarian, \$1,000; supervisor of school work, \$1,200; librarian's secretary, \$1,000; Takoma Park branch librarian, \$1,000; chiefs of divisions—order and accessions \$1,200, industrial \$1,200; reference librarian, \$1,200; chief, catalogue department, \$1,200; assistants—1 \$1,000, 1 in charge of periodicals \$1,000, 8 at \$900 each, 7 (including 1 for the Takoma Park branch) at \$840 each, 6 (including one for Takoma Park branch) at \$720 each; copyist, \$720; classifier, \$900; shelf lister, \$1,020; cataloguers—4 at \$840 each; stenographers and typewriters—one \$1,000, 1 \$840; attendants—1 \$900, 11 at \$720 each; collator, \$720; 4 messengers, at \$600 each; 10 pages, at \$420 each; 4 janitors, at \$600 each, one of whom shall act as night watchman; janitor of Takoma Park branch, \$480; engineer, \$1,200; fireman, \$720; workman, \$600; library guard, \$720; 2 cloakroom attendants, at \$360 each; 6 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$69,460.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 21, after the word "buildings," to insert "and playgrounds"; and, in line 22, after the word "librarian," to strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$5,000," so as to make the clause read:

For substitutes and other special and temporary service, including the conducting of stations in public-school buildings, and playgrounds, at the discretion of the librarian, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses," in the item of appropriation for printing, checks, books, law books, books of reference, periodicals, stationery, etc., on page 14, line 7, after the word "cement," to increase the total appropriation from "\$42,500" to "\$45,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 5, after the word "division," to insert "assistant superintendent of the street-cleaning division," and, in line 8, after the words "health officer," to insert "chief of the bureau of preventable diseases," so as to make the clause read:

Telephones may be maintained in the residences of the superintendent of the water department, sanitary engineer, chief inspector of the street-cleaning division, assistant superintendent of the street-cleaning division, inspector of plumbing, secretary of the Board of Charities, health officer, assistant health officer, chief of the bureau of preventable diseases, chief engineer of the fire department, superintendent of police, electrical inspector in charge of the fire-alarm system, one fire-alarm operator, and two fire-alarm repair men, under appropriations contained in this act. The commissioners may connect any or all of these tele-

phones to either the system of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. or the telephone system maintained by the District of Columbia, as in their judgment may be most economical to the District.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 18, after the word "matter," to strike out "\$18,000" and insert "\$14,000," so as to make the clause read:

For postage for strictly official mail matter, \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 8, after the word "District," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$6,000," so as to make the clause read:

For judicial expenses, including procurement of chains of title, the printing of briefs in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, witness fees, and expert services in District cases before the Supreme Court of said District, \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 16, after the word "bodies," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$6,225," so as to make the clause read:

For purchase and maintenance, hire or livery, of means of transportation for the coroner's office and the morgue, jurors' fees, witness fees, removal of deceased persons, making autopsies, ice, disinfectants, telephone service, and other necessary supplies for the morgue, and the necessary expenses of holding inquests, including stenographic services in taking testimony, and photographing unidentified bodies, \$6,225.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, perhaps some Senators are interested in this bill who probably are not aware that it is being considered. There are very few Senators here.

Mr. HARDWICK. The bill is the unfinished business, if the Senator please.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know it is, but I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	France	McKellar	Sheppard
Bankhead	Hardwick	Martin, Ky.	Sherman
Beckham	Henderson	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Johnson, Cal.	Nelson	Smoot
Calder	Jones, Wash.	New	Spencer
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Norris	Sterling
Colt	Kenyon	Nugent	Sutherland
Cummins	Knox	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	La Follette	Pomerene	Weeks
Dillingham	Lewis	Shafroth	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only 39 Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. PAGE, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WILLIAMS answered to their names when called. Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. REED, Mr. KING, Mr. McNABY, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. KIRBY entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. KING. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], all of whom are engaged in the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan]. He is paired with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 19, line 25, after the word "labor," to strike out "not to exceed \$4,000," so as to make the clause read:

District Building: For fuel, light, power, repairs, laundry, mechanics, and labor and miscellaneous supplies, \$35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 5, after the word "measure," to strike out "\$100" and insert "\$200," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets: For purchase of small quantities of groceries, meats, provisions, etc., including personal services, in connection with investigation and detection of sales of short weight and measure, \$200.

The amendment was agreed to.



The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 5, to insert:  
Office of the assessor: For lithographing and binding office maps, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 10, after the word "market," to strike out "\$1,500" and insert "\$1,800," so as to make the clause read:

For maintenance, repair, and lighting of fish wharf and market, \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Improvements and repairs," on page 21, line 20, after the word "available," to strike out "for the same purposes and under the same conditions, respectively," and in line 21, after "1920," to insert "and for such items of work as can be completed within the total amount herein reappropriated," so as to make the clause read:

Construction of suburban roads: Any unexpended balance of the appropriation contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919 for "Construction of suburban roads" is reappropriated and made available during the fiscal year 1920, and for such items of work as can be completed within the total amount herein reappropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 5, after the word "Georgetown," to strike out "\$40,000" and insert "there is appropriated such sum as is necessary for said purposes," so as to make the clause read:

To carry out the provisions contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914 which authorizes the commissioners to open, extend, or widen any street, avenue, road, or highway to conform with the plan of the permanent system of highways in that portion of the District of Columbia outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown, there is appropriated such sum as is necessary for said purposes, to be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 13, after the word "vehicles," to insert "used in connection therewith," so as to make the clause read:

Repairs to suburban roads: For current work of repairs to suburban roads and suburban streets, including maintenance of motor vehicles used in connection therewith, \$250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the reading of this bill, but I must return to my office on some other matters; and the chairman of the committee has very kindly consented that I might at this time present, or notify the committee that I intend to present, an amendment to the bill and say a few words.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me a moment, I did not intend to convey that impression; but, of course, I shall be glad to make any arrangement that the Senator wishes. We have a general agreement that amendments other than committee amendments are not to be offered until we complete the consideration of the committee amendments.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Under those circumstances, if the Senator will permit me simply to make an explanation of what I intend to propose—

Mr. HARDWICK. Why, certainly.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will not urge a consideration of the amendment at this time.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator might offer it and let it be pending.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes; that is what I shall do.

I think in appropriations that we have made for hospitals throughout the country for the Army and the Navy—very elaborate expenditures involving millions of dollars—we have, in a large measure, lost sight of the needs here at home. There are in this city a number of private hospitals, among which are the Providence Hospital, the Garfield Hospital, and the Emergency Hospital; and only recently the situation in regard to the support of these hospitals by the Government has been brought to my attention in a very tragic way.

A member of my family, only on Sunday, was taken to one of these hospitals, and an operation which was wonderful and magical was performed at that hospital. Had it not been for the accommodation which that hospital afforded there would have been a very sad result. I was somewhat interested in the fact that that hospital was available, and made some inquiry as to what the Government gave toward its support; and I found that each year we made an appropriation of \$26,000 for maintenance—I refer to the Emergency Hospital—and that already there is a deficit of \$100,000. I investigated further, and I found that the Providence Hospital, an excellent institution, and the Garfield Hospital, another large hospital here, only receive \$19,000 each.

This city has increased largely in population during the war. There are estimated to be about 200,000 employees of the Gov-

ernment here. These hospitals take care of the indigent and charitable cases; and here, right in the home of the Government, the seat of the Government, where we live, we are only appropriating a few paltry thousands of dollars for the maintenance of the hospitals, notwithstanding the increase in the population; and yet we are building sanatoriums and hospitals all over the country for the Army.

Surely, Mr. President, we can at least appropriate an additional few thousand dollars this year for the assistance of our city hospitals. I am going to offer an amendment, which I hope will be considered by the chairman of the committee and accepted, increasing the annual appropriation for maintenance of the Providence Hospital from \$19,000 to \$30,000, an increase of \$11,000; increasing the appropriation for the Garfield Hospital from \$19,000 to \$30,000, an increase of \$11,000; and increasing the appropriation for the Emergency Hospital from \$26,000 to \$40,000, an increase of \$14,000.

I have no exact basis for these increases. I have simply made them even figures; but I do know that in increasing the present appropriations 50 per cent we are only in a small measure making provision for the increased expenses of those hospitals by reason of the increase of salaries, cost of food, and other maintenance.

I offer the amendment and ask that it may be printed and considered by the committee when that item is reached.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator if these hospitals have not also increased their charges for operations and for rooms within the last two or three years?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not know. I paid the bill that I had to-day and it was a very small charge for the conveniences afforded and what was accomplished on last Sunday.

Mr. SMOOT. I asked the question because I have been told that the increases in the charges of the hospitals here have been on the same basis as the increased expense of supplies and labor. I do not know, of course, as to that.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I can not inform the Senator of the comparison; but I do know that on the floor that I visited there are several wards where there are charity patients, and that there are very few pay patients in that hospital, although there are conveniences for private patients; and I am very glad there are, because for the protection of our own families, the citizens here who can afford to pay, they should have those conveniences.

Mr. SMOOT. Perhaps the Senator having the bill in charge can tell whether there has been an increase in the charges of these hospitals.

Mr. HARDWICK. The clerk of the committee informs me that he thinks not.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I have made some inquiry about that; and I think it is true that the charges for rooms and attendance have increased somewhat, but not in proportion to the increase in the expenses.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me for a minute, the clerk of the committee misunderstood my question; and I think perhaps there have been some increases in the charges of the hospitals. Let me say to the Senator, for his own consideration while his amendment is pending, that if he will examine the provisions of this bill he will find that we gave an increase of a million dollars to the Gallinger Hospital, which is for the poor people of this city.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Gallinger Hospital is not yet built. I am simply asking for a 50 per cent increase in the appropriations for maintenance of these three very worthy hospitals.

Mr. HARDWICK. We will consider it when we get to the part of the bill which deals with hospitals.

SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN—CORRECTION.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have here a copy of the New York World of February 24, which has an editorial which I think does great injustice to the chairman of one of the Senate committees, the Chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The article is entitled, "No show for Henry Ford." It reads as follows:

Through lack of vigor in pressing the matter upon the attention of the Senate Senator POMERENE, of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, has directly helped to defeat an investigation of the senatorial election last November in Michigan. Prompt action was imperatively demanded for the safeguarding of the ballots, if nothing more, in the Ford-Newberry contest.

It is now too late to preserve intact the records upon which a thorough and conclusive investigation must be based. In some counties they have already been destroyed. It was to be foreseen that this would happen. Ample warning was given when the grounds for Henry Ford's contest were first laid before the Senate.



To the specious plea that the present Senate had no right to conduct an investigation into the election of a Member of the next Senate it should have been sufficient to insist that at least the integrity of the ballots should be safeguarded for later inspection. This has not been done, and the blame is with Mr. POMERENE and his committee.

Mr. President, I am an humble member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I wish to say that I am sorry to see that a paper as able and accurate as the New York World really is would fall into such a grievous error.

The chairman of the committee, Mr. POMERENE—and I am an humble member, as I said, of that committee—proceeded in the matter of the Ford-Newberry contest with all the celerity that the chairman of a committee could, and it is a great injustice to him and to the committee to say that injustice is about to be done because the committee failed to proceed.

I wish to say here that the chairman of the committee showed as much energy in this matter as any chairman has shown in any matter since I have been a member. In fact, Mr. President, the chairman continually assembled the committee, and when a majority did not appear he would telephone and send notes and messages to the Members of the Senate who are members of the committee urging them to come before the committee and hold a meeting.

If any Member of the Senate or any chairman has ever shown diligence on any matter, it has been the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections with respect to the Ford-Newberry contest. I trust this will be sufficient, because I do think an injustice has been done to the chairman of the committee. He moved with all the celerity, promptitude, and dispatch that one man could possibly display.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ASHURST. I am through. I will yield the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say that there is also a correction which ought to be made in the statement found in the World, wherein it says that the ballots have not been preserved. There is no one in the Senate who does not understand that the ballots are preserved. They are now in the charge of the court. I think a great metropolitan paper ought to know that fact which has been stated here in the Senate.

#### LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that a week from to-day, if I can obtain the floor, I shall submit some observations on the constitution of the league of nations.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13277) 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 reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Sewers," on page 25, line 7, after the word "sewers," to insert "including the purchase of one motor field wagon at not to exceed \$2,000, and the maintenance of motor vehicles," so as to make the clause read:

For suburban sewers, including the purchase of one motor field wagon at not to exceed \$2,000, and the maintenance of motor vehicles, \$100,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice under the head of "Sewers" there is a provision for the purchase of a motor truck not to exceed \$2,000. Here the Senate committee inserted for the purchase of one motor field wagon, not to exceed \$2,000, and the maintenance of motor vehicles, and the amount appropriated is not changed. I ask the Senator from Georgia if that is necessary. It was considered by the House committee; after an estimate had been made for this particular item the House decided that it was not necessary.

Mr. HARDWICK. The District Commissioners insisted that it was necessary. I think I can find the testimony. I think possibly they insisted on \$3,000, and we cut the amount a little.

Mr. CURTIS. They estimated \$3,000 and said that that amount was necessary; that it would save a great deal of time, and they would substitute this motor wagon for horses and wagons.

Mr. HARDWICK. They claimed that it would be right economy and asked to have it inserted, and we thought it better to put it in.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator from Kansas say that for the suburban sewers there has not been an automobile in the past?

Mr. CURTIS. The testimony was that they are using horses and wagons now on most of the work.

Mr. SMOOT. If they are, I think it is more than likely that they ought to change, because that is a very expensive way of carrying both men and material to the suburban sewers of the District. If that is the case I think the House made a mistake in not putting it in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKellar in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Streets," on page 27, after line 6, to insert:

For disposal of city refuse during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, in addition to any amounts now available, \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to investigate conditions affecting the existing contract for the collection and disposal of ashes in the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, with a view to determining whether any adjustment should be made in the compensation paid, or to be paid, thereunder and to adjust the same if the facts disclose the necessity for such adjustment: *Provided further*, That additional compensation, if any, paid as authorized herein shall not exceed the sum of \$22,000 for the year. And the said commissioners are further authorized, if in their opinion such action shall be to the best interests of the District of Columbia, to hereafter conduct any or all of the operations involved in the collection and disposal of city refuse of every kind as municipal functions, and for that purpose to purchase or lease the necessary plants, buildings, and land, to purchase or hire horses and horse-drawn vehicles, passenger-carrying and other motor-propelled vehicles, equipment, and machinery, and to employ expert and other personal services, and labor, and to pay traveling, maintenance, incidental, and contingent expenses: *Provided*, That products arising from such operations conducted as authorized herein may be sold and the proceeds arising therefrom shall be repaid to the then current appropriation for the collection and disposal of city refuse: *Provided further*, That any or all operations herein authorized to be conducted as municipal functions may be put into effect as such upon the expiration of any of the existing contracts for the collection and disposal of city refuse or upon the failure of any of the present contractors to properly perform the work covered by their contracts: *Provided further*, That it shall be unlawful for any employee of the District of Columbia engaged in the removal of garbage, ashes, miscellaneous refuse, dead animals, or night soil, or for any employee of a contractor doing such work for the District of Columbia, to accept any gift, except from his employer, in money or any other thing of value for any service performed in connection with the removal of city refuse as hereinbefore described; and it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation, except such employer, to pay or offer to pay, any money or to make any gift to any such employee for such service; that any person violating the provisions of this paragraph shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon conviction, be fined in a sum of not less than \$5 nor more than \$40 for each such offense.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to say to the Senator having the bill in charge that when it gets into conference I trust that he and the other conferees on the part of the Senate will insist upon this appropriation remaining in the bill. It is a perfect disgrace to the District of Columbia the way the refuse and the ashes have been handled under the contract system. It got so bad here in the District that ashes would not be removed and refuse would not be called for unless a person telephoned, and in many cases it was distinctly intimated that hereafter if they were to be removed at all the men who called were to have some kind of remuneration for doing it, or, in other words, it has been intimated unless they were well paid by tips the ashes and refuse would remain in the back yards of the houses in the District until the owners or occupants of those houses changed their minds as to the past policy.

If there is anything that needs remedying it is the handling of ashes and the city refuse in the District of Columbia. I trust that the Senator having the bill in charge and the conferees on the part of the Senate will insist that this provision shall remain in the bill, and if the House conferees do not agree to it let us have it brought back to the Senate.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will say to the Senator that the subcommittee which investigated this question and the District Commissioners are in thorough accord with the view expressed by the Senator from Utah, that this is an absolutely necessary reform in District affairs. While, of course, the Senate conferees must go in free, I think I can assure the Senator, as far as my personal attitude is concerned, that I shall be inclined to insist upon the amendment very strongly.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARDWICK. I offer an amendment to the text of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 26, beginning with line 25, the Senator from Georgia, on behalf of the committee, moves to strike out that line and lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 27, and strike out the word "further" after the word "Provided," in line 4, in the following words:

*Provided*, That any proceeds received from the disposal of city refuse or garbage shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the United States and the District of Columbia in equal parts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 25, after the word "months," to strike out "twenty-two" and insert "twenty-four"; on page 30, line 12, after the word "month," to insert "storekeeper, at \$100 per month"; and in line 16,



after the words "in all," to strike out "\$45,980" and insert "\$48,680," so as to make the clause read:

For salaries: Supervisor, \$2,500; inspector of playgrounds, \$1,200; clerk (stenographer and typewriter), \$1,200; to be employed not exceeding 10 months—24 directors of playgrounds or recreation centers at \$75 per month each, assistant director at \$60 per month, general utility man at \$60 per month; to be employed not exceeding seven months—three assistant directors at \$60 per month each, four assistant directors at \$50 per month each; to be employed not exceeding four months—five guards or swimming teachers at \$60 per month each; to be employed not exceeding three months—four assistant directors at \$60 per month each, 22 assistants at \$50 per month each; to be employed 12 months—22 watchmen at \$50 per month each, clerk (who shall be a bookkeeper) at \$75 per month, storekeeper, at \$100 per month; for services of extra directors at not exceeding 35 cents per hour, \$800; for services of extra watchmen at not exceeding 25 cents per hour, \$600; in all, \$48,680.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 16, to insert:

For necessary expenses to keep open school playgrounds and athletic fields not otherwise provided for during the summer months, and on days when there was no school sessions, including toilet facilities in school buildings adjacent thereto, all of which during such time are hereby placed under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, including pay for services, which shall not exceed in any case \$3 per diem, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 3, after the word "pools," to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$5,000," so as to make the clause read:

For supplies, installing electric lights, repairs, maintenance, and necessary expenses of operating five swimming pools, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 4, after the word "playgrounds," to strike out "\$83,980" and insert "\$108,680," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for playgrounds, \$108,680, to be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Electrical Department," on page 33, line 21, after the word "items," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$7,000," so as to make the clause read:

For extension and relocation of fire-alarm system, including purchase of new boxes, purchase and erection of necessary poles, cross arms, insulators, pins, braces, wire, cable, conduit connections, posts, extra labor, and other necessary items, \$7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Public Schools," on page 34, line 3, after the word "one," to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$3,250," and in line 10, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$62,520" and insert "\$62,770," so as to make the clause read:

Officers: Superintendent, \$6,000; assistant superintendents—1 \$3,500, 1 \$3,250; director of intermediate instruction, 13 supervising principals, supervisor of manual training, and director of primary instruction, 16 in all, at a minimum salary of \$2,200 each; secretary, \$2,000; financial clerk, \$2,000; clerks—1 \$1,600, 1 \$1,400, 1 \$1,200, 3 at \$1,000 each, 1 (to carry out the provisions of the child-labor law) \$900; 2 stenographers, at \$1,000 each; messenger, \$720; in all, \$62,770.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 19, after the word "School," to strike out "\$1,800" and insert "\$2,000," and in line 21, before the words "per annum," to strike out "\$1,800" and insert "\$2,000," so as to make the clause read:

Assistant principal of the Central High School, \$2,000: *Provided*, That said assistant principal shall be placed at a basic salary of \$2,000 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for 5 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 2, after the word "School," to strike out "\$1,800" and insert "\$2,000," and in line 3, before the words "per annum," to strike out "\$1,800" and insert "\$2,000," so as to make the clause read:

Assistant principal, who shall be dean of girls of the Central High School, \$2,000: *Provided*, That said assistant principal shall be placed at a basic salary of \$2,000 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for 5 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 13, before "\$1,400," to strike out "Assistant director of primary instruction" and insert "Director of primary instruction for the colored schools"; and in line 15, after the word "the," to strike out "assistant director of primary instruction" and insert "director of primary instruction for the colored schools," so as to make the clause read:

Director of primary instruction for the colored schools, \$1,400: *Provided*, That the director of primary instruction for the colored schools now in the service of the public schools, or hereafter to be appointed, shall be placed at the basic salary of \$1,400 per annum, and shall be entitled to an increase of \$50 per annum for 5 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 21, before the word "of," to strike out "Assistant directors" and insert "Directors for the colored schools"; in line 24, after the word "the," to strike out "assistant director of penmanship" and insert "director of penmanship for the colored schools"; and on page 36, line 1, before the word "director," to strike out "an assistant" and insert "a," so as to make the clause read:

Directors for the colored schools of music, drawing, physical culture, domestic science, domestic art, kindergartens, and penmanship, 7, at \$1,300 each: *Provided*, That the director of penmanship for the colored schools, who shall be an instructor in the normal school and a director in the grades, shall be placed at a basic salary of \$1,300 per annum, and shall be entitled to an increase of \$50 per annum for 5 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 5, before "\$1,300," to strike out "assistant supervisor of manual training" and insert "supervisor of manual training for the colored schools," so as to make the clause read:

Supervisor of manual training for the colored schools, \$1,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 2, after the word "teachers," to strike out "\$1,738,950" and insert "\$1,739,350," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for teachers, \$1,739,350: *Provided*, That no part of said appropriation or any appropriation herein, shall be used for the payment of any teacher to give instruction in the German language, or for the purchase of any books for use in such instruction.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 22, after the word "schools," to insert "and playgrounds"; in the same line, after the word "and," to insert "directors, officers"; in line 23, after the word "schools," to insert "and playgrounds"; and in line 24, after the word "be," to insert "directors, officers," so as to make the clause read:

Vacation schools and playgrounds: For the proper care, instruction, and supervision of children in the vacation schools and playgrounds, and directors, officers, supervisors, teachers, and janitors of vacation schools and playgrounds may also be directors, officers, supervisors, teachers, and janitors of day schools, \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 6, after the word "principals," to strike out "supervisor and assistant"; in line 7, after the word "training," to insert "supervisor of manual training for the colored schools"; in line 12, after the word "departments," to strike out "director and assistant"; in line 13, after the word "instruction," to insert "director of primary instruction for the colored schools"; in line 14, before the word "directors," to strike out "assistant"; and in line 15, after the word "directors," to insert "for the colored schools," so as to make the clause read:

Longevity pay: For longevity pay for director of intermediate instruction, supervising principals, supervisor of manual training, supervisor of manual training for the colored schools, principals of normal high and manual training high schools, the assistant principal of the Central High School, the assistant principal (who shall be dean of girls) of the Central High School, principals of grade manual training schools, heads of departments, director of primary instruction, director of primary instruction for the colored schools, directors and directors for the colored schools of drawing, physical culture, music, domestic science, domestic art, kindergartens, and penmanship, teachers, clerks, librarians and clerks, and librarians, to be paid in strict conformity with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, as amended by the acts approved May 26, 1908, May 18, 1910, and June 26, 1912, \$450,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 6, after the word "For," to insert "officers"; in line 8, after the word "and" where it occurs the second time, to insert "officers"; and in line 9, after the word "be," insert "officers," so as to make the clause read:

Night schools: For officers, teachers, and janitors of night schools, including teachers of industrial, commercial, and trade instruction, and officers, teachers, and janitors of night schools may also be officers, teachers, and janitors of day schools, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 14, after the word "schools," to insert "and the chief medical and sanitary inspector for the schools," so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses, including furniture and repairs of same, stationery, printing, ice, purchase and repair of equipment for high-school cadets, and other necessary items not otherwise provided for, including an allowance of not exceeding \$300 per annum for livery of horse or not exceeding \$360 per annum for garage for each the superintendent of schools, the superintendent of janitors, the two assistant superintendents, the director of primary instruction, the school cabinet-maker, the general secretary of community centers, the supervising principal in charge of the white special schools, and the supervising principal of the colored special schools, and the chief medical and sanitary inspector for the schools, and including not exceeding \$3,000 for books, books of reference, and periodicals, \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.



The next amendment was, on page 48, line 3, after the word "facilities," to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$50,000, of which sum \$3,000 shall be available for the removal and recreation of portable schools," so as to make the clause read:

Buildings and grounds: For the construction and erection of portable schools, including necessary grading, improvements, and toilet facilities, \$50,000, of which sum \$3,000 shall be available for the removal and recreation of portable schools.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 5, to insert:

For the purchase of additional ground adjoining the Dunbar High School, \$99,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Policemen and firemen's relief fund," on page 54, after line 2, to strike out:

To pay the relief and other allowances authorized by law, a sum not to exceed \$218,724.36 is appropriated from the policemen and firemen's relief fund.

And to insert:

To pay the relief and other allowances authorized by law, including \$68,410.87, due pensioners of the police and fire departments which was duly authorized during the fiscal years 1911 to 1915, inclusive, by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in accordance with law, a sum not to exceed \$287,135.23 is appropriated from the policemen and firemen's relief fund: *Provided*, That no person shall directly or indirectly take, receive, or agree to receive, at any time any money, property, or other valuable consideration whatever, from any person for obtaining, procuring, or aiding to obtain or to procure, any back pension under the provisions of this act or any previous act, and every person who directly or indirectly offers to give or gives any money, property, or other valuable consideration whatever for procuring or aiding to procure any such back pension under the provisions of this act or any previous act, shall be guilty of misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof in police court shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000, or imprisonment in jail not exceeding 12 months, or both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Fire department," on page 55, line 19, after the word "engine," to strike out "house" and insert "houses," so as to make the clause read:

Miscellaneous: For repairs and improvements to engine houses and grounds, \$16,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 11, after the word "halyards," to insert "cost of installation and maintenance of telephones in the residences of the fire marshal and the superintendent of machinery," so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses, horseshoeing, furniture, fixtures, oil, medical and stable supplies, harness, blacksmithing, gas and electric lighting, flags and halyards, cost of installation and maintenance of telephones in the residences of the fire marshal and the superintendent of machinery, and other necessary items, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 23, to insert:

For one concrete and frame drill tower to be erected adjacent to No. 8 engine house, on North Carolina Avenue, between Sixth and Seventh Streets SE., on land owned by the District of Columbia, to be immediately available, \$10,368.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 4, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$72,150" and insert "\$82,518," so as to make the clause read:

In all, \$82,518.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Health Department," on page 61, line 3, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$25" and insert "\$30"; in line 4, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$25" and insert "\$35"; and, in line 11, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$8,500," so as to make the clause read:

For necessary expenses of inspection of dairy farms, including amounts that may be allowed the health officer, assistant health officer, chief medical inspector in charge of contagious-disease service, and inspectors assigned to the inspection of dairy farms, for maintenance by each of a horse and vehicle at not to exceed \$30 per month, or motor vehicle at not to exceed \$35 per month, for use in the discharge of his official duties, and allowances for such other inspectors in the service of the health department as the commissioners may determine, of not to exceed \$15 per month for maintenance of a motorcycle each, or of not exceeding \$25 per annum for the maintenance of a bicycle each, for use in the discharge of their official duties, and other necessary traveling expenses, \$8,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 21, to insert:

For one motor ambulance at a cost not exceeding \$2,500, and for equipping, maintaining, and operating the same and keeping it in good order, \$600; in all, \$3,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 62, to insert:

To aid indigent persons who are suffering from tuberculosis to obtain adequate sanitarium and hospital care, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 3, to insert:

For the enforcement of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to cause the removal of weeds from lands in the city of Washington, D. C., and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended by an act to provide for the abatement of nuisances in the District of Columbia by the commissioners of said District, and for other purposes, approved April 14, 1906, \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 21, to insert:

For clinical examination, advice, care, and maintenance of children under 6 years of age, under a contract to be made with the Washington Diet Kitchen by the health officer of the District of Columbia, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Emergency fund," on page 66, line 25, after the word "commissioners," to strike out "\$8,000" and insert "\$10,000," so as to read:

To be expended only in case of emergency, such as riot, pestilence, public insanitary conditions, calamity by flood or fire or storm, and of like character, and in all cases of emergency not otherwise sufficiently provided for, in the discretion of the commissioners, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Courts and prisons," on page 68, after line 11, to insert:

Courthouse, District of Columbia: For fitting up the top story and basement of the courthouse of the District of Columbia suitable for occupancy by the office of the recorder of deeds, including expenses of moving said office, and material and labor, and for each and every item incident thereto, to be immediately available, \$19,800, said work and the expenditures authorized hereunder to be under the direction and supervision of the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds.

Mr. HARDWICK. I offer an amendment to the amendment reported by the committee to correct a mistake in the name of the building.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on page 68, in line 12, it is proposed to strike out the word "courthouse" and insert in lieu thereof the words "court of appeals building," and in line 13, after the words "of the," to strike out the word "courthouse" and insert "court of appeals building."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Charities and corrections," on page 70, after line 3, to insert:

For purchase and equipment of motor ambulance, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, after line 5, to strike out:

For the maintenance of one motor ambulance, \$600.

And to insert:

For the maintenance of two motor ambulances, \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under subhead "Reformatories and Correctional Institutions," on page 71, after line 17, to insert:

For purchase of apparatus for operating room, including Lumbard's airway, gas oxygen apparatus, and electric ether suction apparatus, \$350.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 16, after the word "harness," to strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$3,000," so as to make the clause read:

Transportation of prisoners: For conveying prisoners to Washington Asylum and Jail, including salary of driver, not to exceed \$840, and purchase and maintenance of necessary horses, wagons, and harness, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 17, after the word "Jail," to strike out "\$194,475," and insert "\$195,825," so as to make the clause read:

In all, Washington Asylum and Jail, \$195,825.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical Charities," on page 74, line 24, after the word "Charities," to strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$45,000," so as to make the clause read:

For care and treatment of indigent patients, under a contract to be made with Freedmen's Hospital by the Board of Charities, \$45,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, after line 10, to insert:

*Provided*, That in case the National Homeopathic Hospital, with its present facilities, is unable to enter into a contract with the Board of Charities for the care of indigent patients, said board is authorized to spend so much of the amount appropriated in this paragraph as may be necessary to provide for the care of indigent patients in other existing hospitals in the District of Columbia.



So as to make the clause read:

For care and treatment of indigent patients, under a contract to be made with National Homeopathic Hospital Association by the Board of Charities, not to exceed \$10,000: *Provided*, That in case the National Homeopathic Hospital, with its present facilities, is unable to enter into a contract with the Board of Charities for the care of indigent patients, said board is authorized to spend so much of the amount appropriated in this paragraph as may be necessary to provide for the care of indigent patients in other existing hospitals in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 12, after the word "Charities," to strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$7,000," so as to make the clause read:

For care and treatment of indigent patients under a contract to be made with Georgetown University Hospital by the Board of Charities, \$7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 15, after the word "Charities," to strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$7,000," so as to make the clause read:

For care and treatment of indigent patients under a contract to be made with George Washington University Hospital by the Board of Charities, \$7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 17, after the word "to," to strike out "\$603,590" and insert "\$1,500,000: *Provided*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to enter into contracts and otherwise incur obligations for the purposes above mentioned within the limit of cost hereby fixed," so as to make the clause read:

GALLINGER MUNICIPAL HOSPITAL: For continuing the construction of the Gallinger Municipal Hospital in accordance with the provision for that purpose in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1918, \$100,000; and the limit of cost of said hospital and accessory buildings is increased from \$500,000 to \$1,500,000: *Provided*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to enter into contracts and otherwise incur obligations for the purposes above mentioned within the limit of cost hereby fixed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under subhead "Child-caring Institutions," on page 78, after line 15, to insert:

For temporary shelter, including maintenance and rent, \$7,000; resident superintendent, \$1,200; resident trained nurse, \$800; resident matron, \$900; clerk, \$1,000; and janitor, \$720; in all, \$11,620: *Provided*, That the money herein provided for rent shall be used for renting a building from the Government if practicable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 22, after the word "Guardians," to strike out "\$207,200" and insert "\$218,820," so as to make the clause read:

In all, Board of Children's Guardians, \$218,820.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under subhead "Temporary Homes," on page 81, after line 23, to insert:

NATIONAL LIBRARY FOR THE BLIND: For aid and support of the National Library for the Blind, located at 1729 H Street NW., to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, after line 3, to insert:

COLUMBIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE: To aid the Columbia Polytechnic Institute for the Blind, located at 1808 H Street NW., to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 1, after the words "Assistant superintendent," to strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$1,800," and, in line 6, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$30,900" and insert "\$30,700," so as to make the clause read:

Reformatory: Assistant superintendent, \$1,800; chief clerk, \$1,200; assistant clerk and stenographer, \$1,000; steward, \$1,500; captain of day officers, \$1,200; 6 instructors, at \$1,200 each; 10 day officers, at \$900 each; captain of night force, \$1,080; 6 night officers, at \$720 each; parole officer, \$1,200; overseer, \$1,200; in all, \$30,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 21, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$152,900" and insert "\$152,700," so as to make the clause read:

In all, \$152,700, which sum shall be expended under the direction of the commissioners.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Water Service," subhead "Water Department," on page 91, line 2, after the word "work," to strike out "not to exceed \$400,000 of the amount" and insert "so much as may be," so as to make the clause read:

For continuing the extension of and maintaining the high-service system of water distribution, laying necessary service and trunk mains for low service, and purchasing, installing, and maintaining water meters on services to such private residences and to such business places as may not be required to install meters under existing regulations as may be

directed by the commissioners, said meters at all times to remain the property of the District of Columbia; to include all necessary land, machinery, buildings, mains, and appurtenances, and labor, and purchase and maintenance of horses, wagons, carts, and harness necessary for the proper execution of this work, so much as may be available in the water fund during the fiscal year 1920 after providing for the expenditures hereinbefore authorized.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, after line 5, to insert:

That on and after July 1, 1920, all users of water furnished through the water supply and distribution system of the District of Columbia, including all departments, branches, and agencies of the United States and the Government of the District of Columbia, shall be required to pay for all water so furnished, at rates determined by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and approved by Congress. Payments for said water shall be made by officers of the United States and the District of Columbia, respectively, in charge and control of all buildings and plants of the United States and the government of the District of Columbia from any appropriations available for said purpose. All such payments shall be made to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia, who shall deposit same in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the water fund. Said commissioners shall submit with their estimates to Congress at the beginning of its session December, 1919, and annually thereafter, a schedule of proposed water rates.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 92, to insert:

That from and after July 1, 1919, jurisdiction over and control of the Washington Aqueduct and its appurtenances in the District of Columbia, State of Maryland, and State of Virginia, including land, reservoirs, structures, and all water rights, water power, and flowage rights appurtenant thereto; over the Conduit Road; over the filtration plant and its appurtenances, and over all United States water mains in the District of Columbia, shall be vested in the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who are hereby created agents of the United States for said purpose, and who are hereby granted all the powers in connection therewith now exercised by the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army. The Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army shall, on said date, transfer to said commissioners all property and records now in their possession connected with said works, together with all appropriations and balances of appropriations on that date available for said works, which said appropriations and balances shall be expended under the direction of said commissioners for the purposes for which they were made.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I wish to make a point of order to this provision. It proposes general legislation on an appropriation bill. I have discussed the matter with the chairman of the subcommittee, and I understood that he considered the point good.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a general law on the subject of the aqueduct?

Mr. RANDELL. There is. I have it before me.

Mr. HARDWICK. There is a general statute of the United States fixing the control of the aqueduct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HARDWICK. The point of order is good.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in section 2, page 93, line 12, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "98,200," so as to make the clause read:

That the services of draftsmen, assistant engineers, levelers, transitmen, rodmen, chainmen, computers, copyists, overseers, and inspectors temporarily required in connection with sewer, street, street cleaning or road work or construction and repair of buildings and bridges, or any general or special engineering or construction work authorized by appropriations may be employed exclusively to carry into effect said appropriations when specifically and in writing ordered by the commissioners, and all such necessary expenditures for the proper execution of said work shall be paid from and equitably charged against the sums appropriated for said work; and the commissioners in their annual estimates shall report the number of such employees performing such services, and their work, and the sums paid to each, and out of what appropriation: *Provided*, That the expenditures hereunder shall not exceed \$98,200 during the fiscal year 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, page 97, line 21, after the word "receipt," to insert:

*Provided*, That this section shall not be construed to amend, alter, or repeal the Executive order of December 3, 1918, concerning the transfer of office material, supplies, and equipment in the District of Columbia falling into disuse because of the cessation of war activities.

So as to make the clause read:

SEC. 7. That the commissioners and other responsible officials, in expending appropriations contained in this act, so far as possible shall purchase material, supplies, and equipment, when needed and funds are available, from the various services of the Government of the United States possessing material, supplies, and equipment no longer required because of the cessation of war activities. It shall be the duty of the commissioners and other officials, before purchasing any of the articles described herein, to ascertain from the Government of the United States whether it has articles of the character described that are serviceable. And articles purchased from the Government, if the same have not been used, shall be paid for at a reasonable price not to exceed actual cost, and if the same have been used, at a reasonable price based upon length of usage. The various services of the Government of the United States are authorized to sell such articles to the municipal government under the conditions specified, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed to amend, alter, or repeal the Executive



order of December 3, 1918, concerning the transfer of office material, supplies, and equipment in the District of Columbia falling into disuse because of the cessation of war activities.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator allow that amendment to be passed over for a moment, until I can see just the connection it has with the section?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over temporarily.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 99, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 8. The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to appoint a commission of five members, three of whom shall be selected from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and one from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and one from the engineering department of the District of Columbia, whose duty it shall be, under the direction of the Secretary of War, to make full investigation of the sources of water supply from rivers and streams in the proximity of the city of Washington, with the view to increasing the water supply of the District of Columbia, and to furnishing hydroelectric power, and to report their findings and recommendations to the Secretary of War at the earliest practicable time, said report to be accompanied by data and other information as to such sources of supply, together with estimates of the probable cost of a project or projects for the transmission of water sufficient to augment the present water supply of the District of Columbia commensurate with present and future needs, including the territory embraced within the jurisdiction of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and Federal military reservations contiguous to the District of Columbia. Such report shall be submitted to Congress by the Secretary of War with his recommendation. And for the purposes herein authorized there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended by and under the direction of said commission upon vouchers to be approved by the Secretary of War, and a detailed statement thereof shall accompany the commission's report.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 100, after line 11, to insert:

SEC. 9. That all of the provisions of the act of Congress approved September 7, 1916, entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," are hereby extended to employees of the Government of the District of Columbia so far as they may be applicable, except to those members of the police and fire departments of the District of Columbia who are pensioned or pensionable under the provisions of the District of Columbia appropriation act approved September 1, 1916; and there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$5,000, said amount to be set aside as a separate fund in the Treasury to be known as the District of Columbia employees' compensation fund, which fund, including all additions that may be made to it, is hereby permanently appropriated for the payment of such compensation under the terms of said act of Congress approved September 7, 1916, that the commission provided for in said act shall award to employees of the Government of the District of Columbia, which awards shall be paid in the manner now provided by law for the payment of the general expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia. And the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall submit annually to Congress, through the Secretary of the Treasury, estimates of appropriations necessary for the maintenance of this fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I ask that we return now to the committee amendment that we passed over just a moment ago.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I asked that the committee amendment, on page 97, go over. After reading the section itself, I think the amendment is a proper one. On reading the amendment alone, without the section, it seemed to me that it had just the reverse effect of what was intended; but I find, on reading the section, that it is all right.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 36, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$1,200."

Mr. PENROSE. That is for teachers' salaries. I think it ought to be explained.

The SECRETARY. Also, in line 15, strike out "\$950" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,150"; in line 17, strike out "\$800" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000"; in line 18, strike out "\$750" and insert in lieu thereof "\$950."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator modify that amendment by changing the "\$950" to "\$1,000," in line 8 of the amendment, and the same in line 10, and in line 12, so as to make those salaries \$1,000 in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. It simply changes the \$950, that has just been read by the Secretary, to \$1,000.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas has talked to me about amending the amendment in that way. I entirely concur with his views about the matter and will accept that alteration of the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On line 18, where it reads "class 3, 543 at \$750 each," it is now proposed to make it "\$1,000"; and, on line 19, strike out "\$750" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000"; and, on line 20, "class 1, 90 at \$750 each," strike out "\$750" and insert "\$1,000."

Mr. JONES of Washington. And on line 17, too.

The SECRETARY. On line 17, the Senator from Pennsylvania moved to strike out "\$800" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000."

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is all right, then—and in line 15.

The SECRETARY. On line 15, the Senator from Pennsylvania moved to strike out "\$950" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$1,150."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think, myself, that ought to be \$1,000, so as to make it the same as the others.

Mr. PENROSE. Yes; I will accept that.

The SECRETARY. On line 15, strike out "\$950" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000."

Mr. PENROSE. And even that is less than the estimates, I understand.

The SECRETARY. Also, on page 37, line 1, strike out "\$900" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,100," and, on line 2, change the total in accordance with the amendments.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate at this unseasonable hour by speaking in behalf of this meritorious amendment. My attention has been forcibly called to the situation in Pennsylvania, outside of the District of Columbia. Unless some measure of justice is accorded to the school-teachers, we will not have any school-teachers left. As is well known, they are now earning very much less than a number of people in occupations requiring very much less intelligence; and I ask to have inserted in the Record the statement of the Grade Teachers' Union as to why teachers' salaries should be raised. I do not ask to have the chart printed, but only the brief.

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

#### GRADE TEACHERS' UNION—WHY TEACHERS' SALARIES SHOULD BE RAISED.

1. Because the future of America depends upon efficient education. Efficient education depends not upon the school building, the textbook, nor the equipment, but upon the teacher. Do we realize what the school-teacher means to the country? Are the fruits of victory to slip away because we are niggardly? Do you expect to get more than you pay for in any other market? The future of America depends upon her education. It was an inspiring message that Commissioner Finley, of the New York Department of Education, brought back from France less than a year ago, "The advice which France out of her physical anguish but unabated aspiration sends to us from her 'scholastic front'":

"Do not let the needs of the hour, however demanding, or its burdens, however heavy, or its perils, however heartbreaking, make you unmindful of the defense of to-morrow, of those disciplines through which an individual may have freedom, through which an efficient democracy is possible, through which the institutions of civilization can be perpetuated and strengthened. Conserve, endure taxation and privation, suffer, and sacrifice to assure those whom you have brought into the world that it shall be not only a safe but also a happy place for them."

2. Because she earns it.  
3. Because she should be self-supporting. She can't do this on less than a living wage. This is shown by summary of expense budgets:  
60 per cent of teachers in debt (debts incurred through illness).  
30 per cent receive financial help.  
50 per cent do extra work.  
50 per cent support or partially support dependents. Jennie Doe pays \$44 board, \$30 room rent; total \$74 a month, or \$888 a year. This does not allow for wash, carfare, doctor's bills, dentist's bills, travel, books and magazines, or college work. How can the present minimum be made to cover these expenses? School-teachers are not living on their salaries. They are obliged to do night work, odd jobs on Saturdays, and work during the summer. A teacher must be an inspiration. Can drudgery plus worry equal inspiration?

DATA FURNISHED BY THE UNITED STATES NAVY DEPARTMENT.

TABLE 4.—Salaries paid in the navy yards.

Trade:	Annual salary.
Blacksmiths.....	\$2,396.16
Radio electricians.....	2,321.28
Masons, stone and brick.....	2,146.56
Carpenters.....	2,059.20
Welders.....	2,046.72
Plasterers and plumbers.....	1,996.80
Electricians.....	1,996.80
Canvas workers.....	1,896.96
Mechanics.....	1,722.24
Upholsterers.....	1,697.28
Chauffeurs.....	1,372.80
Gardeners.....	1,297.92
Common laborers.....	1,297.99
Sewers.....	1,148.16
Charwomen.....	873.60
Teachers <sup>1</sup> .....	630.64
Washington's minimum for teachers.....	750.00

<sup>1</sup> Salary of teachers used for comparison is the average annual salary of all teachers, urban and rural, based on data gathered in 1913 by the Bureau of Education.



The minimum-wage commission for industrial workers has found \$16 a week (\$832 per year) the minimum that a single woman can live on.

4. Because other more remunerative occupations are depleting the teachers' training schools and drawing from the rank and file of trained teachers. Data from the whole country prove this. The Washington Normal School has enrolled one-third of the usual number this year. About 250 new appointments have been made in the schools since October. Ninety per cent of these vacancies occurred because teachers resigned to accept better-paid positions.

5. Because men are not attracted to the profession and men are needed.

6. Because teachers have always been underpaid. Even raising salaries 100 per cent is not paying for value received. Comparing teachers' pay in Washington with teachers' pay in other cities is not fair. They should be compared to other employments. Teachers everywhere are underpaid. Because under normal conditions salaries such as asked for in this amendment should be paid. This is only just. At the present time a bonus should be added to this increased basic to meet the emergency in living conditions.

"Autocracy may pin its faith to the enlightenment of its favored classes, but democracy stands or falls with the intelligence of all the people."

*Estimates for the fiscal year to end June 30, 1920—Public schools.*

#### TEACHERS.

For.	Appropriated, 1919.	Estimated, 1920.
For 2,635 teachers at minimum salaries, as follows: For 2,163 teachers at minimum salaries, as follows: NOTE (by board of education).—This is an increase of 128 teachers.		
Principal of the Central High School.....		
Principal of the Central High School.....	\$3,000	\$3,500
Provided, That the principal of the Central High School now in the service of the public schools or hereafter to be appointed shall be placed at a basic salary of \$3,500 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for 5 years. NOTE (by board of education).—An increase of \$500. The great responsibilities resting upon this official justifies the increase requested. The provision restores to the principal of the Central High School the right to longevity pay for service. This privilege is enjoyed by all other teachers in the school system of the District of Columbia and was enjoyed by the principal of the Central High School previous to the fiscal year 1916-17.		
Assistant principal of the Central High School.....	1,800	
Provided, That said assistant principal shall be placed at a basic salary of \$1,800 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for 5 years.		
Assistant principal of the Central High School.....		2,800
Provided, That said assistant principal shall be placed at a basic salary of \$2,800 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for 2 years. NOTE (by board of education).—An increase of \$1,000. The importance of this position demands that an increased salary be available to secure the services of the best qualified person for the work. The longevity period is shortened from 5 to 2 years.		
Principals of normal, high, and manual-training high schools, 8, at \$2,500 each.....	20,000	
Principals of normal, high, and manual-training high schools, 8, at \$3,000 each.....		24,000
Provided, That the principals of normal, high, and manual-training high schools, other than the Central High School, now in the service of the public schools, or hereafter to be appointed, shall be placed at a basic salary of \$3,000 per annum, and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for 5 years. NOTE (by board of education).—An increase of \$4,000. The work performed by these school officers justifies the basic salary of \$3,000 requested. The provision restores to the principals of high and normal schools longevity pay for service. This privilege is enjoyed by all other teachers in the school system of the District of Columbia and was enjoyed by these principals previous to the fiscal year 1916-17.		
Assistant principal, who shall be dean of girls of the Central High School.....	1,800	
Provided, That said assistant principal shall be placed at a basic salary of \$1,800 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for 5 years.		
Assistant principal, who shall be dean of girls of the Central High School.....		2,800
Provided, That said assistant principal shall be placed at a basic salary of \$2,800 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for 2 years. NOTE (by board of education).—An increase of \$1,000. The importance and responsibilities of this office justify the increase requested. The longevity period is shortened from 5 years to 2 years.		
Directors of music, drawing, physical culture, domestic science, domestic art, kindergartens, and penmanship, 7, at \$1,500 each.....	10,500.00	
Provided, That the director of penmanship, who shall be an instructor in the normal school and a director in the grades, shall be placed at a basic salary of \$1,500 per annum, and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for 5 years.		
Directors in charge of white schools and directors in charge of colored schools of music, drawing, physical culture, domestic science, domestic art, kindergartens, and penmanship, 15, at \$2,000 each.....		30,000.00
Provided, That the directors in charge of white schools and directors in charge of colored schools of music, drawing, physical culture, domestic science, domestic art, kindergartens, penmanship, and assistant supervisor of manual training shall be placed		

*Estimates for the fiscal year to end June 30, 1920—Public schools—Contd.*

#### TEACHERS—continued.

For.	Appropriated, 1919.	Estimated, 1920.
at a basic salary of \$2,000 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for 5 years. Provided, That for the year ending June 30, 1920, the directors in charge of the white schools and directors in charge of the colored schools of music, drawing, physical culture, domestic science, domestic art, kindergartens, penmanship, and assistant supervisor of manual training shall each receive the salary of his class next above his present salary. NOTE (by board of education).—Seven directors are increased in basic salary \$500 each. Seven assistant directors are given the title directors in charge of colored schools, which is more descriptive of the character of their work, and are increased in basic salary \$700 each.		
Assistant director of primary instruction.....	\$1,400.00	
Provided, That the assistant director of primary instruction now in the service of the public schools, or hereafter to be appointed, shall be placed at the basic salary of \$1,400 per annum, and shall be entitled to an increase of \$50 per annum for 5 years. NOTE (by board of education).—It is proposed by the board of education to include this school officer in the group with the supervising principals, and it has been so requested previously in these estimates.		
Assistant directors of music, drawing, physical culture, domestic science, domestic art, kindergartens, and penmanship, 7, at \$1,300 each.....	9,100.00	
Provided, That the assistant director of penmanship, who shall be an instructor in the normal school and an assistant director in the grades, shall be placed at a basic salary of \$1,300 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of \$50 per annum for 5 years. NOTE (by board of education).—It is proposed by the board of education to include this group under the title of directors in charge of the colored schools and assistant supervisor of manual training with the group of directors, and it has been so requested previously in these estimates.		
Assistant supervisor of manual training.....	1,300.00	
NOTE (by board of education).—This officer is included in the group of directors as indicated in the note immediately preceding.		
Heads of departments in high and manual-training high schools in group B of class 6, 12, at \$1,900 each.....	22,800.00	
Heads of departments in high and manual-training high schools in group C of class 6, 14, at \$2,800 each.....		\$39,200.00
NOTE (by board of education).—An increase of \$16,400. A new group (group C) with a salary of \$2,800 is proposed for heads of departments. Two additional heads are requested, at \$2,800 per annum each.		
Normal, high, and manual-training high schools, promoted for superior work, group B of class 6, 21, at \$1,900 each.....	39,900.00	
Normal, high, and manual-training high schools, promoted for superior work, group C of class 6, 28, at \$2,800 each.....		78,400.00
Provided, That teachers shall be promoted from group B of class 6 to group C of class 6 under the same condition hitherto provided for in promotion from group A, class 6, to group B, class 6. Teachers now in group B of class 6 are hereby placed in group C of class 6. NOTE (by board of education).—An increase of \$38,500. A new class (class C) is proposed for teachers promoted for superior work at a salary of \$2,800 per annum. Seven additional teachers are requested in this group in accordance with authority granted by existing legislation.		
Teachers of normal, high, and manual-training high schools promoted for superior work, group B of class 6, 150, at \$2,300 each.....		345,000.00
Provided, That teachers promoted from group A to group B of class 6 shall be placed at a basic salary of \$2,300 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for 3 years.		
Provided, That promotion from group A, class 6, to group B, class 6, shall be without examination from the group of teachers who have reached the maximum of group A, class 6, upon the recommendation of the superintendent of schools, approved by the board of education.		
NOTE (by board of education).—The establishment of a group B with a minimum salary of \$2,300 is requested.		
Group A of class 6, including 7 principals of grade manual-training schools, 334, at \$1,000 each.....	334,000.00	
Group A of class 6, including 7 principals of grade manual-training schools and 5 assistants to the director of primary instruction in the white schools, and the director of primary instruction in the colored schools, 208, at \$1,400 each.....		291,200.00
Provided, That teachers of group A, class 6, including 7 principals of the grade manual training schools, and 5 assistants to the director of primary instruction in the white schools and the director of primary instruction in the colored schools now in the service of the public schools or hereafter to be appointed, shall be placed at a basic salary of \$1,400 per annum, and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for 8 years.		
Provided, That for the year ending June 30, 1920, teachers of group A, class 6, including 7 principals of grade manual-training schools, and 5 assistants to the director of primary instruction in the white		



Estimates for the fiscal year to end June 30, 1920—Public schools—Contd.

## TEACHERS—continued.

For.	Appropriated, 1919.	Estimated, 1920.
schools, and the director of primary instruction in the colored schools, shall each receive in his class the salary next above his present salary.		
<i>Provided</i> , That an employee transferred from another position in the service of the board of education to the position of principal of grade manual training school shall not suffer a decrease of salary by such transfer.		
<i>NOTE</i> (by board of education).—An increase of the basic salary of group A from \$1,000 to \$1,400 is requested. It is proposed to include in class 6, the assistants to the director of primary instruction in the white schools and the director of primary instruction in the colored schools.		
Class 5, 133, at \$950 each, including vocational and trade instructors.....	\$129,200.00	
Class 5, 292, at \$1,400 each, including vocational and trade instructors, teachers of seventh and eighth grades, model teachers in grades below the seventh grade, and in kindergartens, teachers of manual training, drawing, physical culture, music, domestic science, domestic art in the graded schools.....		\$408,800.00
<i>NOTE</i> (by board of education).—A basic salary of \$1,400 per annum is requested for the teachers of this class. Seventh-grade teachers, model teachers, are included in this class. This class is also opened to teachers of manual training, drawing, physical culture, music, domestic science, and domestic art in the graded schools by promotion from other classes.		
Class 4, 507, at \$800 each.....	405,600.00	
Class 4, 428, at \$1,200 each, including teachers of the fifth and sixth grades, kindergarten principals, teachers of manual training, drawing, physical culture, music, domestic science, domestic art in the graded schools, and teachers not otherwise provided for.....		513,600.00
<i>NOTE</i> (by board of education).—A basic salary of \$1,200 per annum is requested for the teachers of this class. Kindergarten principals, teachers of manual training, drawing, physical culture, music, domestic science, and domestic art in the graded schools, are included in this class. This class is also opened to teachers not otherwise provided for by promotion from other classes.		
Class 3, 543, at \$750 each.....	407,250.00	
Class 3, 542, at \$1,200 each, including teachers of third and fourth grades and teachers not otherwise provided for.....		650,400.00
<i>NOTE</i> (by board of education).—A basic salary of \$1,200 per annum is requested for the teachers of this class.		
Class 2, 364, at \$750 each.....	273,000.00	
Class 2, 379, at \$1,200 each, including teachers of the first and second grades, and teachers not otherwise provided for.....		453,800.00
<i>NOTE</i> (by board of education).—A basic salary of \$1,200 per annum is requested for teachers of this class.		
Class 1, 90, at \$750 each.....	67,500.00	
Class 1, 95, at \$1,200 each, including kindergarten assistant teachers, and teachers not otherwise provided for.....		114,000.00
<i>NOTE</i> (by board of education).—A basic salary of \$1,200 per annum is requested for the teachers of this class.		
<i>Provided</i> , That all teachers herein provided for shall be entitled to the full amount of any increased compensation granted for the fiscal year 1919, regardless of the increase herein made.		
<i>Provided</i> , That all teachers herein provided for shall be entitled to the full amount of any increased compensation granted for the fiscal year 1920, regardless of the increase herein made.		
Special beginning teacher in the normal school.....	800.00	1,200.00
<i>NOTE</i> (by board of education).—A change of the basic salary of this teacher to \$1,200 is requested, in order that the salary may be in keeping with the new salaries requested for class 4, with which class this position has heretofore been equal.		
In all, for teachers.....	1,728,950.00	2,958,700.00
<i>Provided</i> , That no part of said appropriation or any appropriation herein shall be used for the payment of any teacher to give instruction in the German language or for the purchase of any books for use in such instruction.		Repeat for 1920.
The salaries appropriated herein for teachers of classes 1, 2, and 3 during the fiscal year 1919 shall be in lieu of the present basic or initial salaries for such classes, and the present rates of longevity increases of pay for the said classes shall apply to the basic or initial salaries appropriated herein: <i>Provided</i> , That for the year ending June 30, 1919, each of the teachers in said classes shall receive placing in the class to which assigned so that each teacher shall receive in addition to the basic salary herein provided a longevity increase which shall be equal to the longevity increase which is next above that received June 30, 1918.		
The salaries appropriated herein for teachers, clerks, and librarians in all classes during the fiscal year 1920 shall be in lieu of the present basic or initial salaries		

Estimates for the fiscal year to end June 30, 1920—Public schools—Contd.

## TEACHERS—continued.

For.	Appropriated, 1919.	Estimated, 1920.
for such classes, and the present rates of longevity increases of pay for the said classes shall apply to the basic or initial salaries appropriated herein: <i>Provided</i> , That for the year ending June 30, 1920, each of the teachers, librarians, and clerks in said classes shall receive placing in the class to which assigned, so that each teacher shall receive in addition to the basic salary herein provided a longevity increase which shall be equal to the longevity increase which is next above that received June 30, 1919.		
The first year of service for all teachers hereafter appointed in the graded schools shall be probationary.....		Repeat for 1920.

## VACATION SCHOOLS AND PLAYGROUNDS.

For the proper care, instruction, and supervision of children in the vacation schools and playgrounds, and directors, supervisors, teachers, and janitors of vacation schools and playgrounds may also be directors, supervisors, teachers, and janitors of day schools.....	\$12,000.00	\$18,000.00
--	-------------	-------------

*NOTE* (by the board of education).—An increase of \$3,000 is requested to continue work already begun and to enlarge the scope of the vacation schools.

	Estimated, 1920.	Expended, 1918.
Salaries.....	\$18,000.00	\$6,285.25

Librarians and clerks at minimum salaries, as follows:

10 librarians in high and normal schools in class 5, at \$840 each; 25 clerks in class 4, at \$720 each; in all.....	28,560.00	
10 librarians in high and normal schools in class 5, at \$1,400 each; 38 clerks in class 4, at \$1,200 each; in all.....		59,000.00

*NOTE* (by board of education).—An increase of \$31,040. It is recommended to place the 10 librarians in class 5, at \$1,400 each. This recommendation is made because these employees perform services of the greatest value to the school system, and act practically in the capacity of teachers in the directing of the study of pupils in the high and normal schools.

10 additional clerks at \$1,200 are requested for assignment to the offices of the supervising principals and to assist in the general offices.

The increased demand for clerical employees, owing to the extension of the Federal departments, makes it necessary for the board of education to be able to offer better salaries than those now at its command, in order to secure competent clerical assistance. The fact that the board of education transacts a great volume of business with a small clerical force makes it important that the individuals employed shall be efficient.

## LONGEVITY PAY.

For longevity pay for director of intermediate instruction, supervising principals, supervisor and assistant supervisor of manual training, principals of normal, high, and manual training high schools, the assistant principal (who shall be dean of girls) of the Central High School, principals of grade manual training schools, heads of departments, director and assistant director of primary instruction, directors and assistant directors of drawing, physical culture, music, domestic science, domestic art, kindergartens, and penmanship, teachers, clerks, librarians and clerks, and librarians, to be paid in strict conformity with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, as amended by the acts approved May 23, 1908, May 18, 1910, and June 25, 1912.....	\$400,000.00	
For longevity pay for director of intermediate instruction, supervising principals, supervisor and assistant supervisor of manual training, principals of normal, high, and manual training high schools, the assistant principal (who shall be dean of girls) of the Central High School, principals of grade manual training schools, heads of departments, directors of primary instruction in the white schools, and director of primary instruction in the colored schools, directors in the white schools and directors in the colored schools of drawing, physical culture, music, domestic science, domestic art, kindergartens, and penmanship, teachers, clerks, librarians and clerks, and librarians, to be paid in strict conformity with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of		



Estimates for the fiscal year to end June 30, 1920—Public schools—Contd.

## LONGEVITY PAY—continued.

For.	Appropriated, 1919.	Estimated, 1920.
Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, as amended by the acts approved May 26, 1908, May 18, 1910, and June 26, 1912, \$400,000.....		\$500,000.00
NOTE (by board of education).—An increase of \$100,000. The amount appropriated for 1919 will be inadequate for the proper demands upon this fund. The amount given is the result of a computation based upon the longevity now in force. The amount appropriated for 1918 was \$500,000.		
	Estimated, 1920.	Expended, 1918.
Longevity payments.....	\$500,000.00	\$467,868.79

## ALLOWANCE TO PRINCIPALS.

For allowance to principals of grade-school buildings for services rendered as such, in addition to their grade salary, to be paid in strict conformity with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906.....	\$35,000.00	\$35,000.00
	Estimated, 1920.	Expended, 1918.
Allowance to principals.....	\$35,000.00	\$35,844.00

## NIGHT SCHOOLS.

For teachers and janitors of night schools, including teachers of industrial, commercial, and trade instruction, and teachers and janitors of night schools may also be teachers and janitors of day schools.....	\$40,000.00	\$50,000.00
NOTE (by board of education).—An increase of \$10,000 is requested for the extension of this most valuable work.		
	Estimated, 1920.	Expended, 1918.
Salaries teachers and janitors..	\$50,000.00	\$47,660.01
For contingent and other necessary expenses, including equipment and purchase of all necessary articles and supplies for classes in industrial, commercial, and trade instruction.....	3,000.00	6,000.00
NOTE (by board of education).—An increase of \$3,000 is requested owing to the extension of the work and the increased cost of materials.		
	Estimated, 1920.	Expended, 1918.
Hauling.....	\$100.00	\$24.54
Equipment and material.....	5,900.00	2,742.88
Repairs.....		110.29
Total.....	6,000.00	2,867.71

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I am not opposed to liberal pay for any public servant, least of all for the school-teachers; but in behalf of the committee I must submit that we have already made as liberal increases as we felt the condition of the Treasury justified.

Mr. PENROSE. Why does the Senator stop at the school-teachers?

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will bear with me a moment, I will state that I think the salaries of the teachers are at least commensurate with the other salaries in all other departments of the Government. Last year we increased the salaries in the lower grades; in class 3 from \$650 to \$750; in class 2 from \$600 to \$750; in class 1 from \$550 to \$750 each, a total increase for 936 teachers of \$124,000. Besides that we gave them \$120 a year flat increase. Then we have increased this year the figures still further so that these three lower classes are increased up to \$800 from \$750.

Mr. CURTIS. No.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am mistaken.

Mr. CURTIS. There has been no increase.

Mr. HARDWICK. But we gave \$240 increase last year to each one of these, and that is the same rate of increase we have given Government employees in every bureau and every division. Two hundred and forty dollars is the basis established, and I understand that exactly the same rule is applied to all other departments of the Government. Besides that, these teachers share in the longevity fund with a maximum of \$125 a year, which costs the District government in round numbers \$500,000 a year.

I concede that the teachers of the District—in fact, the teachers of the United States—are not paid in comparison with other professions and vocations what they ought to be paid, but the District teachers, I believe, are better paid than the school-teachers of any other city of its size in the country. We feel like we have provided for them as liberally as the conditions of our finances would permit.

Personally I am in sympathy with the Senator from Pennsylvania or any other Senator who thinks that these teachers ought to have more liberal pay; but we also must remember there is some obligation we owe to the Treasury, and it will not do to dispose of those obligations by saying we have been liberal even to the point of lavishness in other matters, and therefore we ought to be a little more liberal in this matter.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to ask him whether the teachers are not underpaid to an extent more than any other class of Government employees?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will answer the Senator in two ways. I think all over this country very few teachers, taken as a rule, get as much as bricklayers and carpenters throughout the United States. I am not speaking of the pay in the District of Columbia. I believe that if the Senator will compare what the teachers receive in the District of Columbia with what they receive in Philadelphia, for instance, or Pittsburgh, he will find that they are liberally paid.

Mr. PENROSE. I stated when I rose that my attention was originally called to this matter by the efforts being made in Pennsylvania to raise the salaries of school-teachers, throwing an additional burden on the State of many millions of dollars.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think there is merit in the Senator's proposition.

Mr. CURTIS. May I call the Senator's attention to the fact that there is a shortage of over 100,000 school-teachers in the United States because of the low salaries paid?

Mr. HARDWICK. And a less shortage in the District than almost anywhere else.

Mr. CURTIS. They are a good many short in the District.

Mr. HARDWICK. No; I think the District schools are pretty well supplied.

Mr. CURTIS. The superintendent of schools stated to the committee that a great many teachers have left the service here during the last year and others would have left but for the fact that they had families here that they were helping to support. Some of the teachers who are getting \$750 with \$240 added and with \$125 for longevity have been teaching for 20 years or more.

Mr. HARDWICK. Let me ask the Senator from Pennsylvania or the Senator from Kansas, either one, if they have estimated how much additional expense it would entail on the Government?

Mr. PENROSE. I do not care how much it costs.

Mr. HARDWICK. We ought at least to know that.

Mr. PENROSE. In an act of justice like this the cost is a minor matter. I should like to read, if the Senator will permit me, a statement from the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Claxton. He says:

Teachers are now paid less for their work than any other class of workers, and the increase in their pay in the last few years has in no wise been in keeping with the increase in pay of other workers or with the increase in the cost of living. While the cost of living has increased approximately 80 per cent, the salaries of teachers have increased only about 12 per cent.

Many of the better teachers are leaving the schools, and their places are taken by men and women of less native ability, less education and culture, and less training and experience.

Many of the places are not filled at all. As an inevitable result, the character of the schools is being lowered just at a time when it ought to be raised to a much higher standard. The only remedy is larger pay for teachers.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am in thorough sympathy with the proposition, but I am trying to draw a distinction. While that is true about the country as a whole it is less true about teachers of the District than almost anywhere else. The teachers of the District of Columbia are getting exactly the same increase that we are giving other employees of the Government.



Mr. PENROSE. The Senator asked me how much this would cost. I discover that I have a memorandum here. It would cost less than \$400,000. We squander that amount on some ridiculous project in a few seconds here almost any morning.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am afraid the Senator is all too correct about that, but that is hardly a justification for other expenditures.

Mr. PENROSE. It is a redeeming feature.

Mr. POMERENE. I hope the Senator having charge of the bill will withdraw his objection to the amendment. The compensation of those who are doing common labor on the streets and elsewhere in various sections of the country is higher for what they do than the pay of the teachers in our public schools. There is not anyone who comes nearer to the child than the teacher save perhaps the mother, and it often happens that the teachers are the only mothers some of the children have, and I think—

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment, so that the Senator may not misunderstand this matter, of course the Senator knows we have already increased these salaries just as much as any other employees.

Mr. POMERENE. I understood that, and I am not finding any fault with the committee on account of that.

Mr. HARDWICK. We have not felt authorized to go beyond that.

Mr. POMERENE. I think you are authorized to go beyond that. I have such a very high regard for the work the teachers are doing and the influence they have on the children of the several communities, I think we ought to make these salaries so large as to make it attractive to the best young women and young men we have in the country. I am in entire accord with the amendment which the Senator from Pennsylvania has proposed and I hope it will be accepted.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to make a suggestion.

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. As a member of the committee and as a member of the subcommittee that had charge of this bill, in view of what has been said in reference to the action of the committee heretofore I do not think it is out of place for me to say that the subcommittee was divided three to two in reference to a proposition along this line, the two being for the raise and three being against it. I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be agreed to. I think the teachers ought to have more. It is true we may be raising the pay of these teachers a little more than we have raised others, but the trouble is their compensation has been much lower than that of other employees in the District of Columbia, and this is bringing them more upon a parity with the other employees, though it will not bring them to a parity with other employees.

I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator from Georgia permit me on that point?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. These boys, who are so useful to us in our labors, under the present legislative appropriation bill, if the Senate is in continuous session, will receive \$1,140 a year, more than many of these deserving teachers. All of us have had our attention called to cases where pupils out of school during the war began to earn much larger salaries than the teachers were receiving who taught them. Yet it seems to me to be a most commendable feature of the situation that the most of these men and women have stuck to their post notwithstanding the temptation of larger salaries in the work of the War Department and other departments. They have continued in their profession of teaching and were not induced by larger salaries to abandon their post of duty.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There is very little hope held out to teachers in the way of advancement here. There was one teacher who appeared before the committee and made one of the most intelligent statements which was presented to the committee. She has been in the service for 18 years, and she gets \$1,000 and can not get any more as long as she stays in that class of work.

I think the provision with reference to school-teachers ought to be changed, and while it is too much to hope, the District of Columbia really ought to be a model and furnish an incentive to the other sections of the country by paying this class of employees what their services are reasonably worth. In my judgment there is no class of employment that deserves better compensation than the school-teachers of the country.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I suggest to the Senator that those who train the mind and character of the youth of the country surely ought to get somewhere near approaching the salary paid to the dog catcher in the District of Columbia?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not want to take any further time.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not feel like accepting the amendment in behalf of the committee, especially as my associates who voted with me are not present. In their absence I do not feel authorized to accept it. In justification of the action of the committee I want to say that this is exactly the same increase in the District of Columbia that we gave every other employee of the Government, and while teachers as a rule in this country are very much underpaid, personally I believe as a rule in the District of Columbia they are much better paid than they are in most other places.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will permit me, from the hearings before the Senate subcommittee—

Mr. HARDWICK. What year?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. This year, page 127, I find a list of salaries filed.

Mr. HARDWICK. Filed by the superintendent?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Filed by the superintendent, Mr. Thurston. I find that the elementary minimum salary in Washington is \$750. That takes no account, of course, of—

Mr. HARDWICK. No; not of the longevity pay or of the \$240 bonus.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There is longevity pay in many of the other cities.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not know.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But it takes no account of the \$120 bonus.

Mr. HARDWICK. Not the \$240 carried in this bill, which is \$240 above the basic salary referred to by the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Nor does it take into account all the probable increases that have been made due to the same conditions in the other cities with which comparisons were instituted. I merely wanted to call attention—

Mr. HARDWICK. I am familiar with the statement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wanted to call the attention of other Senators to it if the Senate will give me the time to do it.

Mr. HARDWICK. I have no objection.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The elementary minimum salary in Washington is \$750; in Cleveland, Ohio, \$920; in Jersey City, N. J., \$900; in Berkeley, Cal., \$900; Butte, Mont., \$1,000. I had occasion just a day or two ago to note the salaries paid in 1916 to the men who swept the streets in New York City. Their salaries were raised that year to \$880, that being more than the minimum salary which we pay to the teachers here. I hope the Senator will accept the amendment.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am not going to argue it any further.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I wish to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Is the \$240 provided for as a bonus to be added to the salaries as they appear here?

Mr. HARDWICK. The \$240 is to be added to the figures here, which would make the salaries here much more liberal than they appear on a casual investigation.

Mr. PENROSE. Will not the Senator accept the amendment and let it go to conference?

Mr. HARDWICK. All right; I will do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I offer the following amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 21, after line 15, insert:

Damages and payment for ground on account of condemnation proceedings: To pay Thomas W. and Alice M. Keller for ground taken and damages on account of condemnation proceedings in square No. 2833 in the city of Washington, \$3,820.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senate has passed on this item a good many times, always favorably, and therefore I am authorized to accept it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I offer the following amendment.

The SECRETARY. After line 2, page 76, the item reads:

For emergency, care, and treatment of and free dispensary service to indigent patients under a contract or agreement to be made with Eastern Dispensary and Casualty Hospital by the Board of Charities, \$25,000.

The Senator from New Jersey moves to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$40,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I offer a further amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 75, beginning in line 18, the clause reads:

For care and treatment of indigent patients, under a contract to be made with Providence Hospital by the Board of Charities, \$19,000.

In line 20 the Senator from New Jersey moves to strike out "\$19,000" and insert "\$30,000."

The amendment was agreed to.



Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I also offer the following amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 75, line 23, strike out "\$19,000" and insert "\$30,000," so as to read:

For care and treatment of indigent patients under a contract to be made with Garfield Memorial Hospital by the Board of Charities, \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PENROSE. I have an amendment to offer. I offer the following amendment relating to the two-platoon system in the fire department.

The SECRETARY. On page 55, after line 17, insert:

*Provided*, That from and after the passage of this act the officers and members of the fire department of the District of Columbia shall be divided into two bodies, or platoons, by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, which shall be designated as a day force and a night force. The said day force and night force shall alternate on tours of duty once or more every two weeks.

That one force shall be at liberty at all times except as otherwise provided in section 4 of this act.

That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are directed to appoint a sufficient number of men and officers in addition to the existing force to carry out the objects of this act.

That in case of serious conflagration or other great emergency to protect public safety, the chief engineer or other officers having charge of such fire-fighting force shall have full authority to summon and keep on duty any or all members of such fire-fighting force while such condition continues.

That, except as herein provided, the provisions of this act shall not act as a repeal of any act or acts, or part or parts of any act or acts, and shall not annul, modify, or affect any city ordinance, or part or parts thereof, relating to the salaries, annual leave, or vacation, sick or disability leave of absence of the officers and members of the fire-fighting force of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARDWICK. I make a point of order against the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. STERLING. On page 3, line 1, I move to strike out the figures "\$1,200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,800," so as to read:

Storekeeper, \$1,800.

Mr. HARDWICK. I make the point of order against the amendment. It is not estimated for.

Mr. STERLING. I think the Senator from Georgia is mistaken in that respect. It is estimated for. The estimate is not as high as the amendment, but still the estimate is higher than the amount provided in the bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. I make a point of order on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the estimate?

Mr. HARDWICK. The estimate is \$1,500 and the amendment \$1,800.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. STERLING. I wish to offer another amendment. In line 1, page 3, after the word "storekeeper," I move to strike out "\$1,200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,500."

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 101, after line 11, it is proposed to insert:

That for the purpose of examining into the question of the adoption of a zone system for the construction of buildings in the District of Columbia a commission, to be composed of three citizens of the District of Columbia to be selected by the President of the United States, the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds of the District of Columbia, and the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia be, and is hereby, authorized and constituted; and there is hereby appropriated, payable one-half from the revenues of the District of Columbia and one-half out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of carrying out the said examination and for the employment of all necessary personal services in connection therewith, which said sum is to be disbursed, on vouchers approved by the commission, by the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, who shall be the secretary and act as the executive of said commission; and said commission shall report the result of its work, together with its recommendations, to Congress at its next session at as early a date as possible.

That a commission advisory, to be composed of three Members of the Senate to be selected by the President of the Senate and three Members of the House of Representatives to be selected by the Speaker of the House, is hereby authorized and constituted to counsel and advise the commission constituted by section 1 hereof, at the request of said commission.

Mr. HARDWICK. I make the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CALDER. I hope—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I think, perhaps, the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations labored under a misapprehension as to the character of my amendment in regard to the platoon system. I understand that that system is in force now, and it is simply desired that the matter shall be regulated

by law. The amendment does not propose to increase the appropriation bill one penny. I was going to appeal to the Senator's better instincts at this late hour of the evening to allow the matter to go to conference.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let me suggest to the Senator in charge of the bill that my recollection is that we had a law passed only a year or two ago providing for this system, but leaving it to the discretion of the District Commissioners.

Mr. HARDWICK. But this amendment will change the law, and is, therefore, subject to the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know that; but we have appropriated every dollar of the money that will be required for this purpose. The only difference, as I understand, between this amendment and the law is that the amendment makes it obligatory upon the Commissioners of the District to carry out the double platoon system, while the present law leaves it discretionary, and yet we appropriate the money which would enable it to be carried out.

Mr. PENROSE. They have enough men for this purpose, and it is the system in every first-class fire department in the country.

Mr. HARDWICK. I have no doubt this is a good proposition and has all the merits for which the Senator from Pennsylvania contends, and will be certain and easy of adoption; I know very little about the amendment, and, personally, I should like to oblige the Senator; but, acting on behalf of the committee, I must insist upon the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to correct the statement I made a moment ago. I have since been informed that the matter to which I referred has not actually been enacted into law. The House of Representatives, however, has passed a provision which made it mandatory on the commissioners to provide for the double-platoon system, while the Senate has provided that it be made discretionary. The matter has now been in conference for several months. It has not yet, however, become a law. I was mistaken in reference to that.

Mr. President, I think it is due that I should say to the conferees with reference to the school-teachers' amendment, which was adopted, in view of my support of that amendment—and I know other Senators feel the same way, and they are very earnest about the matter—that I hope the conferees will strenuously insist upon the amendment.

Mr. HARDWICK. The conferees will do their very best about each one of these matters.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The matter will be considered when it comes in from the conference.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HARDWICK. I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary have authority to correct the totals in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. HARDWICK, Mr. SMITH of Arizona, and Mr. CURTIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House further insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2812) to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain, agrees to the further conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FERRIS, Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, Mr. RAKER, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. SINNOTT managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

#### POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I desire to make a very short statement with reference to the conference report. The conferees have reported the Post Office bill back to the Senate substantially as it was passed by the Senate, with one exception: The Senate



inserted in the bill during its pendency in the Senate a provision that the Postmaster General might in his discretion contract for certain tube service in the city of New York, and added a provision that he should not remove the machinery of the tube company, that is, the heavy machinery, such as boilers, engines, and compressors that were in the basement of the building. I thought this a very reasonable provision, and the Senate conferees insisted upon it as long as it appeared that there was a possibility of getting an agreement.

I am sorry that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] is not present. He has no objection whatever to the report, but he did desire to make a brief statement to the Senate with reference to the provision to which I have alluded. As I have already stated, the bill otherwise is substantially as it passed the Senate without any changes, except in very minor matters, such as correcting the phraseology of the bill. That is all I care to say now about the report and I hope the Senate will adopt it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if he will not allow this report to go over as the unfinished business? I will assure the Senator that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] has no desire to speak at length upon the report; but, as the Senator from Alabama has stated—and I know it to be a fact—the Senator from Massachusetts desires to make a statement upon this report touching the pneumatic-tube question.

Mr. LODGE. My colleague has just telephoned me that he is coming right over from his office.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am very glad to hear the Senator from Massachusetts will be here.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Alabama will remember that I promised him I would try to get in touch with the Senator from Massachusetts after he left the Chamber.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am sorry that the Senator from Massachusetts is not present, but I understand he will be here in a moment.

#### PATENTS AND PATENT RIGHTS.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, while the Senator from Alabama is waiting, may I ask him for a moment's time in order that I may ask unanimous consent to report a bill and have it considered?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no objection.

Mr. KIRBY. From the Committee on Patents I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 5265) authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to accept and administer for the benefit of the public and the encouragement of industry, inventions, patents, and patent rights, and for other purposes. I should like to have the bill considered at this time. I do not think there will be any opposition to it.

This is the purpose of the bill: Certain persons in the different departments of the Government have made inventions or have perfected inventions while they were at work for the Government. Nobody is authorized to administer such patents or really to take out the patents. Under this bill, as proposed, the Federal Trade Commission can take out such patents, which are voluntarily transferred by the inventor—there is no compulsion about it—to the Federal Trade Commission, and can administer them, if it seems to be for the public good, and give the inventor whatever seems to be right or such amount as may be agreed upon with him for his invention. It is entirely a voluntary arrangement.

The Federal Trade Commission is mentioned because under the administration of the patent law as affecting the rights of aliens it has developed that a great many things have been administered to advantage by the Federal Trade Commission. They have an organization in that commission under which they can handle this matter satisfactorily. The Commissioner of Patents thinks it is all right; the Bureau of Standards thinks it is the proper thing to do; the Secretary of the Interior has recommended the bill; and the Committee on Patents have recommended it. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. The bill applies, as I understand the Senator, to patents and inventions made during the war for war purposes?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes; by persons in the departments. It will also apply to other patents. The bill is not limited to patents growing out of the war, although that is the chief purpose of it.

Mr. LODGE. Does it apply to patents of all kinds?

Mr. KIRBY. It could apply to outside patents.

Mr. SMOOT. I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I suggest that the bill be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection having been made, there is no use in having the bill read. The bill will go to the calendar.

#### POST OFFICE 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. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Alabama that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] made known his desire that if the conference report came up he wanted to have a little time to make a statement in regard to it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand he is coming right over.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Very well. I was absent for a few moments and was not aware of that fact.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think perhaps it is well for me to state that the Post Office appropriation bill as it came over from the House contained provisions making certain advances in salaries and reclassifications permanent. The conferees struck out the permanent feature of that provision and made the advances temporary. That is about the only change that has been made in the bill in addition to those to which I have already called attention.

Mr. WEEKS entered the Chamber.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I have an appropriation bill ready for consideration, and I ask the Senator if he will not allow me to make that the unfinished business, and then when the Senator from Massachusetts returns to the Chamber I will move to lay it aside in order that the Senator from Alabama may take up the conference report on the Post Office appropriation bill?

Mr. WEEKS obtained the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Will my colleague yield to me for a moment before he proceeds?

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts has been absent from the Chamber—

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Massachusetts is right behind the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. Yes; he has just come in. I understood that there was a tacit agreement that when the Senate passed the District bill we would adjourn.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know anything about a tacit agreement.

Mr. PENROSE. I was assured by some gentleman in authority to that effect.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not an authority at all, but—

Mr. PENROSE. Apparently not.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator says "apparently not." I do not know who is in authority, but I do know that I am one who voted in a Democratic caucus—not a conference, but a caucus—to hold night sessions and stay here to make up a quorum, and tacit agreements are not sufficiently binding on me to overcome my sense of obligation to that agreement. We may not be able to get a quorum, but we have only seven days remaining of the session, and I think some of us ought to try to do a little business.

Mr. PENROSE. I am sorry the Senator from Colorado has introduced partisanship at the close of a harmonious session, during which we have been treating these public questions according to the high standards of patriotism.

Mr. THOMAS. I know the Senator has—he always does—but I am incapable, perhaps, of that.

Mr. PENROSE. I am surprised to know that we have to invoke a Democratic caucus to spur on our deliberations, particularly before the arrival of the President in Washington. It seems to me ordinary courtesy would have required that the caucus should have been postponed until conference could be had with him.

There is no quorum here, certainly; a number of Senators on this side of the Chamber were told that we would adjourn; some of them have gone; and now to compel the Senator from Massachusetts—he can speak for himself, but I wish to hear him, and I can not remain—to speak at this late hour is cruelty.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not wish to inflict any cruelty upon either men or animals.

Mr. PENROSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLETCHER in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.



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

Bankhead	Jones, Wash.	New	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Kendrick	Nugent	Smoot
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Overman	Spencer
Fletcher	King	Owen	Sutherland
France	Kirby	Page	Swanson
Gay	La Follette	Pomerene	Thomas
Hardwick	Lewis	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Henderson	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Weeks

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] are detained by illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 25, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, February 24, 1919.

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

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

O Lord God, our Heavenly Father, without whom nothing is strong, nothing holy, increase our faith and confidence in Thee, that Thou being our ruler and guide we may fulfill all the duties and obligations of the hour to the best of our knowledge and ability; and Thine be the praise, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 22, 1919, and the Journal of the proceedings of Sunday, February 23, 1919, were read and approved.

### AMENDING FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to file a conference report on the bill S. 5236, an act amending sections 7, 10, and 11 of the Federal reserve act, and section 5172 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to be printed under the rule.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, 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 to the bill (H. R. 13306) permitting any person who served in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in the present war to retain his uniform and personal equipment and to wear the same under certain conditions.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution extending until July 1, 1920, the effective date of section 10 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment the bill (H. R. 13306) to authorize the payment of allotments out of the pay of enlisted men in certain cases in which these payments have been discontinued, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution extending until July 1, 1920, the effective date of section 10 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the river and harbor bill.

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

H. R. 13462. An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I may ask unanimous consent to consider it this afternoon, if it meets with the approval of the House.

The SPEAKER. But there are two or three other conference reports that have now been printed under the rule,

### FIXING TIME FOR HOLDING COURT IN AMARILLO DIVISION, TEX.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 15675) to fix the time for holding court in the Amarillo division of the northern district of Texas.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to consider the bill H. R. 15675.

Mr. JONES. And I also ask, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent that the bill S. 5627, a similar bill, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the Senate bill be considered in lieu of the House bill.

Mr. MANN. Let the Senate bill be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5627) to fix the time of holding court in the Amarillo division of the northern district of Texas.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That hereafter the terms of the district court of the United States in the Amarillo division of the northern district of Texas shall be held at Amarillo, Tex., on the third Monday in April and the second Monday in September of each year.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the Senate bill being substituted for the House bill?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The bill H. R. 15675 was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. JONES, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

### PAYMENT OF DISCONTINUED ALLOTMENT OF SOLDIERS.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the House bill providing for the payment of allotments to soldiers where allotments are to be continued was unanimously reported by the committee, unanimously passed the House, unanimously reported by the Committee on Military Affairs in the Senate, unanimously passed the Senate, has come over here this morning with one or two immaterial amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that we take it up this morning, unanimously agree to the amendments, and unanimously pass it. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to take the bill H. R. 13306 from the Speaker's table and agree to the Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, what is the meaning of the first amendment?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I thought it was corrected at the time, but the House bill misspelled the word "rescission," and the Senate spells it properly, "rescision."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate amendments were agreed to was laid on the table.

### DAM ACROSS SAVANNAH RIVER.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13394) to extend the time for the completion of the dam across the Savannah River by authority granted to Twin City Power Co. by an act approved February 29, 1908, as amended by act approved March 1, 1916.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby granted for the extension of the time allowed to the Twin City Power Co. to construct its dam across the Savannah River authorized by an act of February 29, 1908, as amended by act approved March 1, 1916, until three years from the date fixed in the amending act for its completion, to wit, February 28, 1922.

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

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

Section 1, line 4, after the word "tension" insert the words "to February 28, 1922."

Section 1, line 5, after the word "construct," strike out the words "its dam" and insert in lieu thereof the word "dams."

Section 1, line 7, after the word "by," change the word "act" to the word "acts."

Section 1, line 7, after the word "approved," insert the words "June 3, 1912, and."

Section 1, line 8, after the word "sixteen," strike out remainder of said line and also line 9, up to the word "February."

Amend the title to read as follows: "A bill to extend the time for the completion of the dam across the Savannah River by



authority granted to Twin City Power Co. by an act approved February 29, 1908, as amended by acts approved June 3, 1912, and March 1, 1916."

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended.

On motion of Mr. VINSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### HOSPITAL FACILITIES FOR DISCHARGED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 13026 be taken from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title, as follows:

H. R. 13026. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged, sick, disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. For the present, Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### SUNDY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 16104.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 16104.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 16104, with Mr. GARNER 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. 16104, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16104) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Vocational rehabilitation: For an additional amount for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the 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, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding to be done at the Government Printing Office, law books, books of reference, and periodicals, \$1,500,000, which shall be in addition to the sum of \$2,000,000 appropriated in the said act: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation in excess of \$5,000 per annum, not more than 20 persons shall be employed at rates of compensation in excess of \$3,000 each per annum, and not more than 30 persons shall be employed at rates of compensation from \$2,500 to \$3,000, inclusive, per annum.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Of course, this is necessarily a great increase in the appropriation. It is in addition to the \$2,000,000 appropriation made in June, 1918. But what about this transfer of funds the other day by act passed through the House? Is this in addition to that?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It is in addition to that.

Mr. WALSH. Can the gentleman state how much that will place at the disposal of the board?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can. If \$2,000,000 is appropriated, as contemplated by my amendment, they will have \$3,750,000. If it remains as the bill now stands, it will amount to about \$3,000,000. They estimate that by July 1 they will spend \$1,500,000 of their balance of \$1,750,000. I do not believe that they will do it, and they should not do it, and I intend to make a statement in reference to the amendment which I have offered whenever the gentleman has argued the point of order.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts what his point of order is.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts state his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Well, I do not know that this appropriation here is authorized by the act of June 27, 1918. That act was to provide vocational rehabilitation, and so forth, and carried an appropriation; but, pending the point of order, I want to ask the gentleman if this will not give this board practically \$3,750,000 at their disposal to spend during the next fiscal year?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It authorizes this. They had \$2,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If this is given it will mean they will have a total of \$3,750,000. If the amendment which I offered is accepted by the committee, it would mean that for this purpose they would have a total amount of \$3,750,000.

Mr. WALSH. But, if the gentleman will recall, we passed a bill here the other day transferring to this board some funds.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I see the purpose of the gentleman's question. We did not add to the total amount available for this purpose. When the act was passed originally it segregated these funds. It provided, for instance, that a certain fund was available for the payment of tuition. When the board started to place boys in the schools of the country it placed them in State institutions, the mechanical colleges, and high schools; and, to the credit of those State institutions, they told the board they regarded those boys as their own boys and would not accept from the Federal Government any tuition. As a result, that fund was unexpended. In their administration expenses they have had a deficit.

They asked the Appropriations Committee to make available for expenditure immediately as a lump sum all of their unexpended funds, and while the committee was considering that estimate the House passed about 10 days or a week ago a Senate bill which gave to them that which they asked of the Appropriations Committee—the right to spend as a lump sum their unexpended funds. So to-day they have available as a lump sum \$1,750,000, or that was the figure available at the time the board was before the committee. Then their estimate is that they will spend of that \$1,750,000 \$1,500,000 up to July 1. I disagree with them and do not think they can expend it unless they continue to expend money as unwisely as they have in the payment of high salaries to the men at the top of that organization. But even taking that into consideration, it is undoubtedly true that they will need a greater part of that. My own estimate is that they will expend \$1,250,000 or \$1,000,000, which will leave them a surplus to carry on to next year. That surplus, in addition to the fund provided, can care for this work during the next fiscal year. Their estimate is that the peak of their load—which is a phrase the gentleman is familiar with in recent days, "allocation" and "peak of the load" we have been introduced to—the peak of their load will be taken care of about October or November. In view of the expenditures made by this organization for salaries from \$2,400 to \$10,000, the director receiving a salary of \$10,000, one \$7,000 salary, one \$5,000 salary, 20 salaries at \$4,000, 28 salaries at \$3,500, 2 at \$3,400, 29 at \$3,000, 62 at over \$3,000, 49 from \$2,400 to \$3,000, inclusive, making a total of 111 between \$2,400 and \$10,000—

Mr. WALSH. And a noticeable scarcity of dollar-a-year men?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It makes an inexcusable and indefensible expenditure for salaries at the top of an organization.

Mr. WALSH. Now, is it the intention of this proviso to get those salaries down?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. This committee offers this proviso as the only hope—

Mr. WALSH. The proviso does not apply to the \$2,000,000 appropriated. They will again pay these high salaries out of the \$2,000,000 already appropriated.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; out of the \$2,000,000 which is carried by the bill introduced by Mr. BANKHEAD. This will only apply to the appropriations carried in this bill for the next fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I offer an amendment to strike out the figures "\$1,500,000" on line 16 and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: Page 38, line 16, strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.



Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment by striking out the figures "\$2,000,000" carried by that amendment and inserting "\$3,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out "\$2,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$3,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that is of considerable importance, and I do not think it is a subject that can be covered in five minutes, and therefore I ask the generous permission of the House to proceed for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I confess when I secured a copy of the pending sundry civil bill I was very much astounded and disappointed to see the enormous reduction that had been recommended by the committee from the estimates made up and submitted to the committee upon the hearings by the director and other officials of this board for the rehabilitation of disabled soldiers.

The committee will recall when this original bill was passed, as explained here a few days ago in the argument as to coalescing of the funds carried in the original act, it was almost impossible to make an intelligent estimate of the items to be expended the first year. Although \$2,000,000 was appropriated it was not known definitely what those items were to be spent for. I am sorry the members of the committee have not had an opportunity to examine the hearings held before the Committee on Appropriations on this proposition. They are very full and complete, and although, if you examine these hearings you will find, it seems to me, an antagonistic sentiment in that committee against the board on these appropriations, nevertheless every item of the estimates covered by Dr. Prosser, the director of the board, as found on page 1252, for the necessities of the board for the fiscal year 1919-20 are thoroughly, and, it seems to me, completely explained on the basis of conservative estimates. It will be remembered, gentlemen of the committee, that by the very nature of the case, for the first few months of the operation of this law a large amount of the energies of the board and a large amount of the appropriations necessarily had to be used for the purpose of promoting an organization and getting the benefits of the bill placed into the machinery of operation. The board was deprived of an opportunity of coming in contact with all of the disabled soldiers who have been discharged from the hospitals.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], stated that it was estimated that practically all of the original appropriation of \$2,000,000 would be expended by the 1st of July, and that is undoubtedly true. I do not doubt that, on account of the number of disabled soldiers who are being put into actual training under the provisions of this bill, it will all be expended. So that if the committee's recommendation is adopted, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina will only provide \$2,000,000 for carrying on the enormously enlarged activities of this great enterprise, which was the amount allowed by Congress for the first year when they did not have any men under training at all.

Now, up to the present time there are over a thousand men in actual training. A little over a month ago the board only had 227 men in actual training, and if you will take the testimony before the committee, it is estimated by them that by the ratio of increase as shown within the last 30 days by the 1st of July of this year the board will have in actual training over 7,000 of these disabled soldiers and sailors.

Now, gentlemen, it seems to me a rather peculiar discrimination against the activities of this great humanitarian enterprise, that the Committee on Appropriations should have in mind the purpose, admittedly, of making an inadequate appropriation, with the idea of the deficiency being taken care of at a time later on. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] very frankly admits to the committee that the amount suggested by the appropriation will not be sufficient to carry on the activities of the board for the fiscal year 1919-20. What will that result in? If the amount of the appropriation suggested by his amendment is agreed to and the activities of the

board enlarged, as they will be by this constant flow of unfortunate soldiers who are being discharged from the hospitals and who are displaying an eagerness and anxiety to take advantage of this great act we have passed for their benefit, and suppose as a matter of fact the appropriation should be absolutely exhausted, as it no doubt will be, what will be the position of the Federal board with these soldiers on their hands? Out of this fund must come the maintenance in case of dire and extreme necessity.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. If it is brief.

Mr. WALSH. Is it the gentleman's information that these returning soldiers are eager to take advantage of this?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The statistics show to-day that there are over a thousand of them under actual training by the activities of this board, and from the estimate based upon it there will be over 7,000 by the 1st of July.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. For a brief question.

Mr. FESS. Was there not an application of nearly 1,000 to enter training in one month?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; more than that. If you will look at the figures on page 1228 of the hearings you will find them very illuminating on that proposition. They show what is being done.

Here are some of the figures: Number of new cases in which placement in employment has been made by the board and other agencies, 2,455; number of cases in process of placement in training, 2,331, and other statistics showing the activities of this board.

Now, gentlemen, I appeal to this committee upon the proposition of the absolute necessity of making this appropriation. Why should we discriminate in a bill of this sort? This very bill carries \$660,000,000 for building new ships, and yet this committee wants to deprive these wounded soldiers of this little meager opportunity to remake themselves and establish new opportunities for their hopeless lives after they have been discharged from the service.

Neither I nor any other member of the Committee on Education would make this contention if it were not justified by the evidence before the committee, which I recommend to your perusal before you vote on this bill if you have any doubt as to the propriety of the vote you should cast.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Do I understand they are cutting the appropriation for this work?

Mr. BANKHEAD. They are cutting the appropriation under the estimate of the amount required for the coming fiscal year. As shown by the hearings, \$4,000,000 will be required to carry on the work for the next fiscal year. The committee originally cut it down to \$1,500,000, but now the gentleman proposes to amend, raising it to \$2,000,000. That would still leave a deficiency of \$2,000,000 under the estimates made by the board for their requirements.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. It seems to me that if ever it was needed it is now when they are coming back.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes. Now is the time when the board should exercise its full activities.

A good deal has been said by the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill about the large salaries paid. If you will look over the hearings it will appear at first glance that some of these salaries are exorbitant, but they were all made under civil-service examinations. The very nature of this work requires men of discrimination and ability and capacity and experience, and in order to fill these places it was necessary for them to give them adequate monetary inducements. These men who have accepted these positions have had to go to new fields at a sacrifice in many instances and make arrangements for the maintenance of their families at home. But the committee have put into this bill a provision limiting the salaries to suit what the committee thinks should be the maximum limit, so that there can be no argument on that proposition.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Is it not a fact that there are in sight at least 10,000 soldiers who come under the provisions of the act?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The estimate is based on the calculations and the experience of the Canadian and British Armies and upon those of our own Army up to this time that there will be at least 15,000, and most probably 20,000, discharged soldiers who will claim the benefits of this act in the next fiscal year.



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

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. WELLING. I understood the gentleman, in discussing the matter last week, to say that almost the entire cost of the rehabilitation of these men was borne by the institutions in the States.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true, as it relates to their tuition. A very small amount of the appropriation will be used for that purpose.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will adopt the amendment and give the board the amount of their estimate. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think it was Madame Roland who lamented the crimes that were committed in the name of liberty. It is high time that some one should call attention to the crimes of extravagance being committed under appropriations made by Congress for the benefit of our wounded soldiers.

Congress in its wisdom provided liberally for the rehabilitation of the wounded soldiers, and Congress and all its committees will provide liberally for that work. But I suggest to the gentleman that we had better pause before we are carried away with claims for appropriations which are really based on a desire to rehabilitate the fortunes of every broken-down civilian who is trying to obtain a place at the public pie counter under the pretense of doing something for the soldier.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does not the gentleman know that all these appointments were made under the provisions of the civil-service law?

Mr. MONDELL. I know that these appointments were made in a way under the civil-service law; in other words, this board prepared the questions, laid down the rules, fixed the inquiries, and, of course, the folks who passed that kind of an examination were in the main people who had been selected by the board. Of course, they went through civil-service forms, but it was a sham. There is no doubt about that.

I am not calling into question the character of the people who were employed under this appropriation, and I am not complaining about any particular employments. I simply want to call the attention of the House to what has been done under the claim and pretense of doing something for the soldier. When this board came before our committee they had 157 soldiers under their charge. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] is interested. They had 157 soldiers under their charge, and they had at the same time 344 employees, every one of whom was receiving a goodly salary. One of them was receiving \$10,000, 1 was receiving \$7,000, 1 was receiving \$5,000, 20 were receiving \$4,000 a year, 28 were receiving \$3,500 a year, over 62 were receiving more than \$3,000, and 49 were receiving from \$2,500 to \$3,400.

This committee has had a good many cases of scandalous misuse of public funds brought to its attention, but never a case as indefensible as this.

This board was organized to do a good work, and went forth apparently with the principal purpose to give employment at high salaries to everyone they could find who would take employment.

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

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. The committee has taken care of the question of the amount of salaries in the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. The committee has. The salary list was so indefensible that the committee felt it was necessary to limit it, but I am calling attention to the fact that the \$4,000,000 appropriation which was asked—and I would like to have the attention of the gentleman who offered the amendment—the \$4,000,000 estimate includes \$2,745,000 for salaries and incidental administrative expenses. Now, if the gentleman wants to make provision for the soldiers by providing that kind of a pay roll, well and good.

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman, I think, is mistaken. The item he refers to is for lodging, subsistence, and travel of disabled men.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is not at all mistaken, and if the gentleman from Iowa will take the pains to add the various figures of administration and salaries contained in the list that has been handed him, as it has been handed other Members, he will find I am right.

Mr. TOWNER. I have it.

Mr. MONDELL. He will find that of the total of \$4,000,000 asked and \$2,000,000 heretofore granted, \$2,745,000 is asked for the rehabilitation of the broken fortunes of the pie-counter hunters.

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not mistaken; that is the sum I have named—for salaries and expenses.

Mr. TOWNER. If the gentleman will pardon me, I do not want to dispute the proposition. I want to call the gentleman's attention to how and why he is mistaken.

Mr. MONDELL. But I am not mistaken.

Mr. TOWNER. The item that the gentleman refers to in regard to salaries and traveling expenses, instructors and professors—

Mr. MONDELL. Unless I can have more time I can not have the gentleman using my time.

Mr. TOWNER. I see that the gentleman does not desire to be instructed, and therefore I desist.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman endeavor to get me more time?

Mr. TOWNER. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. If so I will analyze the figures, and I call his attention to the page of the paper which he has. Let me call his attention to item 2: "Probable expenditures for salaries and traveling expenses of employees, \$1,195,000." That is up to July. "Additional appropriation needed for that purpose, \$650,000." Then if the gentleman will go down to the next to the last item, item 8, "Miscellaneous expenditures—administration," he will find \$550,000 as the item up to the 1st of July, and \$350,000 as the anticipated expenditure after that time, all of which makes the sum of \$2,745,000, without including certain general administration expenses in item 7 under the head of "Miscellaneous," which amounts to \$900,000 more, or \$3,645,000 in all, for salaries and traveling and other expenses of employees, leaving for purposes which have more or less to do with the rehabilitation of soldiers—

Now, we want to do everything we can for our soldiers, and we are going to do it. We are going to take care of them. We are going to provide for them as soldiers have never been provided for in the history of the world. We want to do everything on earth for them except to rob them of their self-respect; and one of the activities of this bureau, if carried out as they suggest they propose to carry it out, is to hunt out, locate, find, visit every soldier who received a scratch at any time during the war, and try to persuade and cajole him to come onto the pay roll of this bureau. That is a part of their plan. If you will read carefully the statement they have handed to Members you will see that it conflicts with itself in almost every line and paragraph. It is not possible that there will be the number of men or half the number of men they suggest requiring their services; and the amount given by the committee, in addition to the amount which will be available the 1st of July, is more than they can possibly use, unless they spend it for salaries at the very high rates at which they have fixed them. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], out of abundance of liberality, has suggested an increase of \$500,000. That, in my opinion, is not absolutely needed, but out of abundance of caution I shall be glad to have the House adopt it. If you accept the high estimate of the bureau, by so doing the House puts the stamp of its approval upon the indefensible conduct of the board in hiring a great many more people than they needed, at very high salaries, and on the plans they are proposing, of hunting out soldiers who received minor injuries and who do not need or desire the services of the board.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to undertake to speak of the necessity for this appropriation. Congress having put upon the statute books the right of these disabled men to be taken care of, it is now up to Congress to see that they are taken care of.

There have been extravagant statements made in the heat of debate that I think no one here subscribes to; for instance, the reference to "pie counters," and the statement that these men are going around the country finding every soldier with a scratch or a blemish on his body. In other words, there is laid against the Department of Education of this great country the venal charge that it is not only incompetent, but that it is absolutely disobeying the law. If that is so, a resolution is in order to investigate that body and to impeach its officers, to change its



administration, and to go to the root of it and correct it. Flights of oratory will not do that.

But let us regard this situation as it is presented to us in a cold, conservative way. The War Department report that there are 200,000 men disabled and diseased—100,000 disabled and 100,000 diseased. It further says that the Vocational Education Board reports that in the hospitals in France there have been recorded already applications of 11,000 disabled soldiers asking for the opportunities of this greatest humanitarian legislation.

There are 40,000 disabled soldiers in the United States hospitals, and it is regarded that the great majority of them will want the advantage of this legislation. Need I ask, need I dilate, when you see a youth of 20 or thereabouts with one leg off, some with two, some with both arms, some with an eye out, some with a shell-shock suffering, which is worse than all, to say that we should give them the advantage that is recommended by whom? By me? No.

Gentlemen, I am nothing but a kindergarten Member of this House, youthful in my experience and my membership, but I have laid down a rule that when a thing of a technical character comes before this great body for consideration, I have had the general experience of a man in middle life and I am mature enough to know that when a technical subject, when a special subject, is offered for my consideration I will take the advice of those men who have given their lives in training and education to it, and I will decide, with the discretion that is in me, in favor of the contentions they raise.

And so we find here this situation: Twenty-odd thousand men who are now loose throughout the country, who have been dismissed by the War Department and left to go to their homes, their hamlets, their boroughs, their towns, and their municipalities throughout the United States never having called to their particular attention the great advantage of this act. Now, it was supposed that it was planned by the administration of the Vocational Education Board and it was almost tacitly understood between the War Department and it that the demobilization of these disabled men would take place at large consolidated centers and very few in number. What is the result? The result is that the War Department, for reasons which may be justified—and I make no criticism of it—has decided that the distribution of these men to their homes, turned back into civil life, will take place at 200 points, and these twenty-odd thousand men who got away from the hospitals were not permitted to have the advantage of this act. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has claimed that the Federal board is asking for \$2,745,000 for salaries for the one-year period ending June 30, 1920. He has attempted to prove it by figures submitted by the board and printed on page 1252 of the hearings on the sundry civil bill for 1920. I am sorry to say that the gentleman has not read the heads of the columns. Column 3 gives the total probable expenditures for the full two years ending June 30, 1920, and column 4 gives the expenditures from July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, which are the expenditures asked for in the sundry civil appropriation bill now before the committee. Assuming that items 2, 6, and 8 were all for salaries, which is not true, the total amount to be used for salaries for the one year, July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, would be \$1,050,000. But the facts are that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] added together column 3 and column 4. In other words, to get his figures he doubled the request made by the board for the period July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, and, moreover, added the expenditures from July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919. In this way he has made a great mistake and thoroughly misrepresented the request and the expenditures of the Federal board.

The facts are that the board has asked for an appropriation of \$4,000,000, of which at least \$2,500,000 will be required to pay for the lodging, subsistence, and traveling expenses of disabled men in connection with training; for \$250,000 to pay the expenses of placing disabled men in employment, including necessary lodging, subsistence, and traveling expenses; for \$200,000 for special contingencies, including mechanical appliances and special care, including medical attention in emergencies. In other words, \$2,950,000 would be used on the disabled men themselves. Yet the Appropriations Committee has proposed to cut this in two, and cripple the work. Fifty-seven billion dollars to fight the war, but cheeseparing for those wrecked in winning it. How soon we forget!

When the gentleman from Wyoming complains that the board is seeking every soldier, sailor, or marine injured or diseased in the war, he is paying the board the highest possible compliment. What else would Members of Congress desire than that some Government agency should undertake the solemn duty of

seeing that the Nation's obligations to the wounded and diseased from the war were met fully, carefully, but at the same time generously? Is it not better that the body charged with this duty should err, if at all, which I do not believe is true of the board, by being overanxious to reach every man in possible need of help than that by a barbed-wire policy of the old pension system a worthy disabled soldier, sailor, or marine should be neglected? What policy would the gentleman from Wyoming suggest that the board should adopt in meeting the anxious inquiries from his district? Should a representative be sent to see them if, unable to travel, they should request this service?

If able to travel, should the board provide transportation to a central point for interview? These are vital questions relating to the care of disabled men, and I hope the board will spare no effort and no reasonable expense to achieve their declared aim of making contact with every disabled victim of the war whom they could possibly help.

This country, through the Congress of the United States, has committed itself to the proposition of providing for its disabled men a means of training and subsistence which would relieve them of the necessity of appealing to charitable assistance for their education and support. The Federal board is the instrument designated by Congress to carry out this declared intention. The Federal board has undertaken this task in good faith. It has set up an efficient organization for discharging it and has made its plans on the assumption that adequate support for such a program would be provided by Congress. While this work has been going on Members of Congress have severely criticized certain other governmental agencies for neglect of disabled soldiers. If in the future criticism does arise from neglect in the training and support of these men, the blame will be squarely fixed where it belongs should Congress fail to provide ample funds for the work.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, in the estimate made by the board for expenditures necessary for the ensuing year it was found unnecessary to increase the item of \$250,000 now made available. For salaries and traveling expenses, instructors and supervisors, and other experts, the estimate of the board, not for the time, as the gentleman from Wyoming said, up to the 1st of July of this year, but for the time up to the 1st of July, 1920, the year we are appropriating for, was \$1,195,000, of which sum there is available under the original act \$545,000. So to take care of the salaries and all these items up to the 1st of July, 1920, the sum of \$650,000 only is asked for. A large amount of the total increase is in another item. It is for lodging, subsistence, travel, and for care of these men during the time, and prior to the time, that they are taking this instruction.

Gentlemen of the committee, there are now 22,000 men already discharged from the hospitals. They are subject to and ought to receive this training, and 13,000 of them were discharged before the board had an opportunity to reach them or to submit the proposition to them for their consideration. They are now increasing at the rate of over 1,000 a month. Last month over 1,100 applied for admission for training under the board. The peak of admission for training will be reached about June of this year. Then the men will be discharged from the hospitals and applying for admission, and the peak of training will not be reached until the 1st of October. The estimate of the department was that in addition to the \$250,000 already available they would need \$2,750,000 more, but they have scaled the amount down to \$2,500,000, and that is the largest item of expenditure asked for by the board.

Now, gentlemen, why this condemnation of the board? Why this talking about "soldiers that do not want it and do not need it, and these fellows that are hanging around the pie counter in order to get places." You can have no idea of the difficulty of obtaining men of the necessary character, education, and ability for this work. You can not get them even at the price they pay. The board had extreme difficulty in finding men with the necessary education and training to take care of this emergency work. You have limited the salaries of these men, and that is eliminated from consideration. No excessive salaries after the 1st of July can be made, and that settles that matter. Now, gentlemen, it is with you to say whether or not you are willing at this time to discredit these estimates of the board for the wounded soldiers of the United States. Are you willing to take that responsibility? Are you willing to let these men go upon the streets of New York City, as they are now doing, begging for bread, and that is what they are doing, because they did not know and their attention had not been called to the fact that they could be taken care of and educated for an honest living and an independent existence as citizens of this country?

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



Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman does not want to be misinformed. There is no begging in New York City. We do not permit it; we look after the poor.

Mr. TOWNER. There was begging in New York City on the streets of the city. It is true that these men were selling shoe strings—they were selling little trinkets and various things on the street. But they were in their uniforms, to the disgrace of the city of New York and to the disgrace of the United States of America, and in reality they were asking alms under the guise of selling shoe strings.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman is entirely misinformed.

Mr. DYER. Had they been discharged?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Probably they had not been paid.

Mr. TOWNER. I suppose, of course, that they could not have been paid. They had nothing. They were apparently saying to the people of the world, "I am begging because the United States will not take care of me."

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman is always correct in his statements—

Mr. TOWNER. I hope so.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. These men are being paid before they are discharged. That has been said so many times that I personally investigated it. There are no soldiers begging in New York City now—nobody begging in New York City.

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

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD. Just to say that I have myself seen begging in New York City.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Of soldiers in uniform?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes. Of course, the gentleman is technically correct when he says they were not begging; but what difference is there when they appeal to the charity of the people and ask them to buy their shoe strings and little trinkets?

Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD. When I saw them they were not selling these shoe strings; they were asking for alms on the streets of New York.

Mr. TOWNER. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. On the street?

Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD. I saw them in a room in a bank, where they came.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But not on the streets?

Mr. TOWNER. What is the difference? Gentlemen, when you hear the appeals that have been made on the floor of this House against the educational board that is established for the purpose of taking care of these conditions, I want you to remember that it is your board. You established it. They have a right to complain of you if it is not paid. Are you going to take away from this board the necessary funds for going on with their work because you say you do not like the board, that they are not the right kind of men, that they are men who are seeking the pie counter? If that is the case your true remedy is not to take away the necessary appropriations. Your remedy is to see to it that we have the right kind of a board and the right kind of employees, and when any gentleman will come before this House and say that an improvement can be made in this necessary—almost supremely necessary—service for the soldiers, if he can show any method by which it can be improved, then I for one stand ready to give him my hearty approval and say that he is a very patriotic Member of this House.

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

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. What salaries have you been paying, and what is the necessity for limiting the salaries at all?

Mr. TOWNER. I will say this to the gentleman: You must look at this in a common-sense way. The board had to organize this work and organize it quickly. They had, as I said, the extreme difficulty in getting men at all who were qualified for this kind of work, as the gentleman can easily see. It is not ordinary employment. It takes a man who must have special qualifications.

Mr. BURNETT. But the gentleman has not answered the question about the salaries that they have been paid. How many have been receiving these big salaries?

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman heard the statement. The statement is that 62 are receiving over \$3,000.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The statement was at the time that they came before the committee that they had put 277 men in training, and they were paying 257 men—

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman by that statement endeavors to discredit this work, but he knows just as well as anybody that the work has just been organized, and that there are applications now coming in at the rate of 1,000 a month. The gentleman knows that, because his committee was informed about it, and yet he tries to discredit it by saying that these men, these necessary employees, these experts, who had to be hired before the work could be carried on, were hired before the men were there. Of course, necessarily they were.

Mr. BURNETT. If they were getting excessive salaries, that is the thing that I am interested in.

Mr. TOWNER. We will take care of that, if the salaries are excessive, and I will say to the gentleman that I think now it will perhaps be easier to obtain qualified men at reasonable salaries.

Mr. BURNETT. How many were getting more than \$5,000 a year?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Two.

Mr. BURNETT. How many more than \$4,000 a year?

Mr. TOWNER. I do not know.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Twenty at \$4,000.

Mr. BURNETT. Then how can the gentleman talk about it when he does not know?

Mr. TOWNER. If it was necessary for the purpose of organizing the board to pay \$4,000, then we ought to pay it.

Mr. BURNETT. The gentleman may talk about the soldiers, but what is the reason these men, these very patriotic men, who want to do something for the soldiers, all want exorbitant salaries? If they wanted to do something in the interest of the wounded soldiers—

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close, if no one else desires time—

Mr. DYER. I wish five minutes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I want five.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, does that include five minutes for me?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman desires five minutes, I have no doubt the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think this is a very important matter, and I shall object to 20 minutes. If the gentleman will make it 30 minutes—

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. We have been discussing it, I will say to the gentleman, for about 45 minutes.

Mr. DALLINGER. I shall object.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I certainly should like to make some headway with the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Make it all day, for the benefit of the members of the Committee on Education.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FESS. I have the floor, and I refuse to yield for that motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that my friend from Wyoming is not here—

Mr. MONDELL. He is, and is listening to the gentleman.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. The gentleman from Wyoming is here.

Mr. FESS. I want to pay him a compliment in that he is always here whenever a bill of this kind is up for consideration, but I had not seen him at the time I mentioned it. I share in the concern that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] mentioned a moment ago when he spoke of the efforts to reduce unnecessary expenditure, and especially at this time; especially at this time I sympathize with such efforts. I also sympathize with the effort not unduly to increase salaries, and I think the suggestion made of the effort to hunt out these people to be rehabilitated would generally be disapproved, and yet that is a phase with which I must take issue with him, for the reason that unless these persons are solicited to take advantage of the provisions of this bill the Government will not perform its mission to the wounded soldiers.



Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. For a question.

Mr. MONDELL. There are perhaps 10,000 men who were severely wounded. Of course a large proportion of those men will entirely recover, and are in no wise rendered unable to follow their occupations by reason of such wounds. There are a great many thousands of men who are very slightly wounded. Does the gentleman think that this board should hunt out at their homes every man who had a scratch and was reported as being slightly wounded and find out whether or not he wants this vocational rehabilitation? They talk about 100,000 men; in one case of 200,000 men.

Mr. FESS. The failure that, I think, is so apparent to the House is to deal in exaggerations, and I sincerely regret that we have gotten in the habit of denouncing a good effort by saying we are hunting up everybody who has a scratch in order to rehabilitate him. That is beneath the dignity of the discussion of this question. The truth about the matter is—and I want to call attention to it for just a minute—it costs \$275, according to the estimate, to rehabilitate a soldier; think of it, \$275 in taking a wounded man and putting him on his feet and making him self-supporting and self-respecting, so that he does not become a charge upon the Government, but can look the world in the face and not feel that he is a pensioner, a subject of charity, and yet we educate in the universities under private management students at a cost of from \$1,000 to \$2,000 per year, and we send to the Naval Academy and to West Point Academy our own choice and educate them at the rate of \$18,000 to \$25,000 per student for the four years. All that is asked in this bill is to take \$275 to educate and train a wounded man who otherwise might be a charge and subject to charity in this country. We here propose at this meager figure to train him, put him on his feet, and let him be able to look the world in the face as a self-respecting man because he can do this work. [Applause.] Two hundred and seventy-five dollars only, and if there are 15,000 soldiers to be trained at the minimum, as is submitted by the board, it means \$4,125,000. It is a shame to cripple this work as is proposed by this bill to do in this way. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask if I might—

The CHAIRMAN. The motion has been agreed to.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina desire recognition.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I thought the gentleman from Missouri desired to ask a question.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will confess my ignorance of what the Vocational Education Board is doing. I have not heard any gentleman say what they were doing. I do not know what vocations are being taught or anything about it. I do not know whether anybody else does; but if he does, he has carefully concealed it from the House. But I have no doubt that they will do a good work; but here is the situation that confronts Congress: There is not a bureau of the Government, not one, which, if its appropriation is cut or its estimate is cut in an appropriation bill, can not get some very intelligent and estimable gentleman on the floor of this House to urge, when the appropriation bill comes up, that it be increased, and give very good reasons for it. Every Member of the House is in favor of economy on some item that he does not care anything about. He is in favor of cutting the appropriation which somebody else wants and in favor of increasing the appropriation which he wants. And that is proper; it is proper to bring these matters before the House; but you can not have economy without cutting estimates of appropriation and keeping appropriations down, and you can not make all of these appropriations without increasing taxation.

This bureau has been before a fair committee of the House. It has submitted, more fully than can possibly be submitted here on the floor, its case to the Committee on Appropriations. One gentleman said he would take the opinion of experts, and hence takes the opinion of the experts connected with vocational education, but not the opinion of the experts connected with appropriations in this House. If he would take the opinion of the experts on appropriations here—from the Appropriations Committee—he would not increase the appropriation; but if he will take the opinion of the experts outside, who want to get more money from the Treasury, he will increase the appropriation.

It may be it is idle to hope that this Congress will adopt any practice of economy. I am not sure but it is idle to hope that

the next Congress will do any better, but somewhere the line will have to be drawn, because you can not keep increasing appropriations in the times of peace that are coming without increasing the taxes, and the men who vote to increase the taxes will mostly in a few years be outside in private life endeavoring to raise the money with which to pay the taxes. [Applause.]

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], in charge of the bill from the Appropriations Committee. I believe that it is better policy to follow the Committee on Appropriations on these matters than it is to take up something sprung suddenly upon us without an opportunity for the committee to present its judgment concerning it. This Congress will expire, but the Sixty-sixth Congress will be in session, and an opportunity will be had, and the Committee on Appropriations, I am sure, will give every assistance that is needed for this work if more money is required.

Mr. Chairman, I would vote freely and willingly every dollar that is necessary for the carrying on of this work, as I believe every Member of this House will vote for it, when it is really needed and the time is appropriate. I disagree with some of the gentlemen, especially the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] in decrying this appropriation and saying that it will be wasted and ill spent. No doubt some of it has been spent in that way and some of it probably will be; but, Mr. Chairman, this war for which we have expended millions of dollars was won largely by the very boys that this appropriation is intended to help, and any public official who would knowingly ill spend this fund would be as bad as a traitor.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I notice in this bill that they appropriate thousands of dollars for monuments to the dead in Cuba and China. Does the gentleman think it is more important to appropriate for that purpose than to take care of these boys who are returning and who are disabled?

Mr. DYER. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that every sensible Member of Congress—and I think every man here is in that class—is in favor of helping these boys to be wage earners and to be able to take care of themselves. We had up here, Mr. Chairman, some time ago a bill to open the soldiers' homes in this country to the soldiers of this war. I opposed it and prevented consideration of it, because I want to see the soldiers of this war given the advantage of this very law that we are appropriating for—the opportunity that Congress is providing for them to enable them, disabled and crippled as they are, to go out and earn a living for themselves, instead of putting them in the soldiers' homes, shut off from the world, shut off from every opportunity to work and to support themselves and to raise families and be citizens in the various avenues of business. The soldiers' homes are all right for the old disabled soldiers, who no longer have the vitality or the ability by reason of age and debility to earn a livelihood, but to take these young men and say, "We will take care of you in the soldiers' homes; we will provide compensation for you," is not the way to treat men nowadays in this advanced age when we have the opportunity through this vocational educational training to equip them and put them in the world, where their help and influence will aid so greatly. Mr. Chairman, that they may have an opportunity to earn money for themselves and live honorably and peaceably is my great desire. They will be more than willing to do this and will be better citizens by reason of it.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman knows that this bill can not operate until after the soldier is out of the hospital. Most of them are in the hospital and the work will increase from now on very rapidly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if there are only five minutes remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. There are only five minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the members of the Appropriations Committee are just as anxious as every Member of this House to provide a sufficient sum to carry on this work. The Congress originally passed this act. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] himself reported to this House a bill appropriating only \$2,000,000 for this purpose. The war was then on, and he thought \$2,000,000 sufficient. Before the armistice the board filed an estimate for \$4,000,000. Based upon what? On the belief that the war would continue, and that a great many more men would be disabled as the result of the war. Then, after the armistice, when they came before the committee about three weeks ago they made this statement to the committee—that from the organization of the board they had spent but



\$250,000 of the total appropriation of \$2,000,000. They had a balance on hand of \$1,750,000. They asked that that be made available for all purposes of the board. By the action of the Congress in passing the Bankhead bill last week it is made available, so that to-day they have \$1,750,000. If my amendment is adopted they will have \$3,750,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not.

And, gentlemen who have spoken, with tears in their voices, present to the Congress the horror that would result by reason of not appropriating still more money to pay for the training of these disabled soldiers. What is the fact? The money that is provided for here is not paying for the training of the soldiers.

These soldiers on their return are being trained in the institutions which appear listed on the back of Document 743—in Amherst, in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in the Colorado University, in the mechanical and agricultural colleges of the States of the Union—and the truth is, and to the credit of this country I am glad to say it is true, when they sent these disabled soldiers to the colleges of the country and to the State universities and offered to pay their tuition not one institution would accept the pay from the Federal Government. [Applause.] They said, "They are our boys, and we will take care of them." And so this money is not going for tuition of the boys in institutions where they are receiving training. Where is it going? What is not being spent in these excessively high salaries is being spent for the subsistence of the boys when they are in training.

The organic act authorizes the board in special cases to pay subsistence and lodging. I do not know that it was the intention of Congress to pay it in every case, but the board, in its liberality—and I make no criticism of it—has construed it to authorize them to pay to every man who takes the benefit of this act, in addition to \$30 provided by the War Risk Bureau, \$35 out of this fund for his lodging and subsistence, making a total of \$65 per month. In addition to that, they are furnishing clothing and shoes as long as a man stays in training, and they furnish books. That is what is being done with it.

Now, gentlemen say that the criticism of the action of the board in paying these high salaries is irrelevant because of the limitation proposed, but the gentlemen who made the estimate of \$4,000,000 before the armistice was signed are the same gentlemen who fixed the excessive salaries, and if they were so liberal in their ideas as to salaries we can assume that they were equally liberal in this estimate, which they say is but a guess.

At the time they came before the committee they had 277 boys in training, and it cost about \$275,000 in salaries to put them there, or about \$1,000 for every man in training, while the State universities are paying for the training. In the payment of salaries they said they followed the rule of not paying a man more than \$500 in excess of the salary he previously received. In other words, they said to the world, "Bid for this man's services, and when you do we will raise you \$500."

I say the amount recommended by the committee is enough to carry them through the year if any wisdom is exercised in the expenditure of the money. Certainly, it will carry them to the next Congress. If there is a deficiency, they can report to the next Congress, and if they have a good case Congress will provide it. If you give the full amount they asked for last October while the war was on, and the same spirit of extravagance shown in large salaries asserts itself in some other form, you have no remedy. I want the Congress to appropriate every dollar needed for the vocational rehabilitation of the soldiers, but do not want money appropriated for this purpose wasted, and \$3,750,000 is ample for their needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, let us have the amendment reported again.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi demanded a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 30, noes 52.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 31, noes 56.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

For five commissioners, at \$10,000 each; secretary, \$5,000; in all, \$55,000.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if this amendment had been for the appointment of people to some jobs that are noncompetitive or no examination required, there would have been no opposition to it, regardless of the salaries. I have persistently opposed large appropriations. I remember in 1917 when gentlemen came before the House with a bill for the appointment of explosive inspectors I urged that the positions be placed under civil service, but I was overwhelmingly voted down, and the reason given was that certain experts were required and needed because they were men with specialized training and skill, and they could not come under civil service. At that time I was told that it would be undignified and humiliating to subject these men to civil-service examination, and I was voted down. After the bill was passed, men selected by petty politicians in every congressional district, men unlettered and illiterate, were appointed at salaries ranging from \$3,000 to \$3,500.

Now that you need men of experience and education and men of training you come here and try to practice economy. The very fact that you reduce these salaries will make it impossible to get good, able men, and it will make it possible to employ a lot of unemployed petty politicians. I do not know what the State of Wyoming pays its school-teachers, but I know that in New York, where we employ thousands of people for educational purposes, we pay decent salaries.

Now you can not get good men for this kind of work unless you pay them good salaries, because the office-seeking, job-grabbing types are not the kind of people who will fill positions of this kind and do the work we have at hand.

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

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. FESS. One of the richest States in the Union pays its school-teachers on an average \$71 a month; one of the richest States in the Union.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It is not New York.

Mr. FESS. No; it is not New York. That indicates the appreciation in a monetary way in which education is held.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes. Men on the floor of this House constantly preach about keeping away bolshevism, and the one thing that will keep this country free of bolshevism is education.

Mr. FESS. You are right. If the gentleman will further yield, I want to say that only last week a strike got under way in a Government shipyard where they were getting \$64 a week, and they were striking for \$70 a week—just \$1 short of the wages paid to the teachers per month.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

A great deal has been said about soldiers begging. Gentlemen, you must understand we had 4,000,000 men in uniform, and they are being discharged, and there are bound to be individual cases where a man will go out and take advantage of the fact that he was in the Army. But I resent statements that soldiers are begging on the streets of New York. That is absolutely untrue and incorrect. Nobody begs on the streets of New York. We do not permit it. We take care of our poor in New York, and everyone who has been in the Army who is out of work will be cared for as long as he is in New York.

When you come here with a bill to "rehabilitate" the bank account of some disappointed profiteer, asking for a billion dollars, we hear but a feeble protest.

I believe we should have granted every cent the bureau asked. It is a great work, and should be directed and controlled by big men—educators of the first rank. I am certain the work is needed. All seem to agree on that; and yet the committee boasts that it reduced the salaries and placed a limitation. There is not a committee in the House would dare to limit the pay of a hod carrier. Then why limit pay here? I hope the men who are carrying on this work will not become discouraged,



but will continue in the service. Perhaps a good many of the Members and, let us hope, the gentlemen of the committee will better understand the purpose and scope of the work and make necessary and adequate provision for its continuance next session. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALSH. What has become of the rest of the personnel of the Federal Trade Commission?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman has in mind the employees carried in the last bill, I will say to him that by reason of our withdrawing from the Federal Trade Commission the right to rent buildings in the city of Washington there remained no necessity for the carrying of the messengers boys, general mechanic, watchmen, elevator conductors, skilled and unskilled laborers who were formerly employed.

Mr. WALSH. Do they go into the legislative bill?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. They go out entirely, because the Federal Trade Commission will have to give up its rented buildings and go into Government buildings, which will be maintained by some central authority, perhaps the custodian of public buildings and grounds. They will certainly have to go into a Government building, so that there will be no necessity for the employees who formerly looked after the building.

Mr. WALSH. They will have to have clerks, will they not?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The only clerks that were carried they will have to provide for out of their lump sum.

Mr. WALSH. There were about 50 or 60 clerks carried in the current law. Each commissioner has a clerk, and then in the current law there are 4 clerks of class 4, 5 of class 3, 10 of class 2, 17 of class 1, and 21 at \$1,000 each—

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; I have the law before me. In addition to those the gentleman has stated there are 21 at \$900 each. The rest are messengers, general mechanics, watchmen, elevator conductors, laborers, and telephone operators.

Mr. WALSH. I was inquiring to see if the hope that was in my mind was being realized that we were cutting out some of the force of the Federal Trade Commission, in order to prevent them from committing further depredations upon the business of the country.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Last year we gave them a lump sum and we required them to file with us a statement of every employee and the salary paid, and after most careful consideration of it the committee must say that the Federal Trade Commission kept faith with the Congress. They showed in a statement the name of every employee of the commission and the salary received, and they had not increased the compensation of employees except in a few instances. We determined that it would be better to have them all on one list, instead of having a conflict by having some clerks on the statutory roll and some listed under the lump sum.

Mr. WALSH. The only difficulty with that is, the committee may have before it some day some other commission or board that will come in with a tabulated list and be able to show that they have not increased salaries, and the committee will then follow the precedent set in this case and give them a lump sum, and not give them a specific authorization for the number of clerks and other employees that they can have. Now, I think it is rather a poor precedent to establish in relation to a commission whose activities are going to be continued to wipe out the statutory personnel and give them a lump sum of \$1,000,000, which is \$500,000 less than they had last year, and let them employ anybody they please, and then bring in a tabulated list next year and say, "While we have employed so many clerks, we have not increased their salaries," but yet they may have increased the number of employees.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The reason for giving the lump sum last year was that this commission very naturally could not estimate as to the employees necessary to carry out the duties imposed upon them by the various departments.

Mr. WALSH. The duties as they viewed them.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; and it would be unfair to put on the statutory roll the large number of employees who have been carried and make them permanent employees. Now, we are further confronted with this situation, that many of these investigations are being carried on; many of them are incomplete and should be completed. There is the coal investigation, for instance, the cost of production, and others which will be of great service to the industries of the country. Some of the economic investigations should not be carried on, and the committee has reduced the lump sum from \$1,500,000 to \$1,000,000. That necessarily reduces the amount that they can expend. We took \$500,000 out of their appropriation for next year.

Mr. WALSH. They can do damage enough with \$1,000,000, and I think some of the activities they have undertaken which are not completed ought not to be completed but they ought to terminate the inquiries they are making along those lines at once. I think they have gone far afield from the original purposes of the law providing for that commission.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for four minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to quote some eloquent words delivered yesterday within the shadow of Independence Hall by a foremost American. He said:

"My friends, there is liberty in the air. The nations of the earth are clamoring for liberty. And why should not freedom-loving Ireland join in the general cry. Yes; Ireland wants freedom to breathe the air of heaven. She wants freedom to stretch her brawny and sinewy arms. She wants freedom to develop her resources. She wants freedom to develop the riches of her soul. She wants freedom to carve out her own destiny."

"And we are here to-day to plead the cause of Ireland's sons and daughters, that they may stand erect, redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled on their own sacred soil."

These words were uttered by His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons at one of the most remarkable conventions ever held in the city of Philadelphia. That convention adopted resolutions which the cardinal himself presented. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including those resolutions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### THE RESOLUTIONS.

The resolutions are as follows:

"We, the delegates to the convention of the Irish race in America, assembled in Philadelphia, the city in which the immortal declaration of American liberty was given to the world, and speaking for many millions of American citizens, call upon the President and Congress of these United States of America to urge the peace conference now in session at Paris to apply to Ireland the great doctrine of national self-determination, and to recognize the right of the people of Ireland to select for themselves, without interference from any other people, the form of government under which in future they shall live."

"We urge this claim, in the first place, in the name of justice, recognizing and insisting on the truth set forth by the founders of our Republic, that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

"We urge this claim in the name of America, insisting, as we have just shown in the case of France, that we are not an ungrateful people, and recalling that no other people have contributed more than those of Irish blood to the creation, the upbuilding, the developing, and the preservation and defense of our great country."

"We urge this claim in the name of Ireland because of the unparalleled struggle for now seven and a half centuries that Ireland has carried on for national existence and liberty; because all efforts to break down and destroy that existence have failed, and because of the extraordinary majority by which less than two months ago the people of Ireland declared not alone their dissatisfaction with the government of their land by England, but also their determination to govern themselves without interference from any outside influence or power."

"We urge this claim in the name of humanity because we believe that war can not be ended and a just and permanent peace can not be brought about unless the doctrine of self-determination be applied to Ireland and the people of that country be permitted to decide for themselves the form of government under which they shall live."

"We point out that England has tried in every way to coerce or to persuade or to cajole the people of Ireland to give up their devotion to their national aspirations and tried them all in vain. Lloyd George within the last few months has been compelled to assert that Ireland is at present as much opposed to British rule as in the days of Cromwell."

"The industries of Ireland have been destroyed; her trade and commerce wiped out; her population cut in two; her leaders deported and held in English jails without indictment or trial, and yet within the last two months the people, with a unanimity never before attained, have again declared their utter dissatisfaction with English rule and their determination to be free. England refuses to listen to the voice of Ireland, but



we point out that England likewise refused to listen to the voice of the American colonies. England was compelled less than a century and a half ago to recognize the independence of the colonies, and within the last year the efforts of our country saved England and her allies from total defeat at the hands of the central powers.

"The land to which England was thus compelled to do justice has just saved England in her hour of need. Let England now realize that justice to Ireland which she has so long denied, with grievous loss to Ireland, but also with great loss to herself, will now remove from her path the bitterest hostility which she has to encounter all over the world and will convince mankind in general of the sincerity of her declarations when she says that she believes in liberty and justice for others as well as for herself.

"Finally, we urge this claim that peace and order may be brought out of the chaos with which the whole world now seems to be threatened. In this great hour, when governments are being re-formed and when peoples long opposed by tyranny are emerging again into the sunlight of liberty, let there be sincerity and unselfishness upon the part of those who are controlling the peace conference, to the end that the mistakes of the Congress of Vienna may be avoided and a peace made that will be lasting and permanent because it will be just and right.

"Upon the shoulders of our President and Congress rests in the last analysis the responsibility of the peace that shall be made. We urge them to act in accordance with the doctrines laid down on our behalf when we entered the war and in accordance with the resolution recently adopted, almost unanimously, by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives to the end that autocracy and militarism may be forever destroyed, and that the right of self-determination shall be given to all the peoples of the earth."

#### DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

With the adoption of the cardinal's resolutions, Michael J. Ryan, of Philadelphia, read the declaration of principles, which, he said, had been drawn up by a committee representing every section of the United States.

The declaration, in part, follows:

"As American citizens we uphold the honor and interests of the United States as our race has done during all the years that have elapsed from the start of the revolution to the present day. That we are proud of the splendid record our people have made in the fighting forces of the Republic in the war which has just closed and are ready to perform any duty and make any sacrifices our Government may, in the future, demand.

"We heartily approve the principles of justice, liberty, and peace for all mankind proclaimed by President Wilson in his declarations of America's objects in the war. These had the approval of the entire American people and were the chief cause of their enthusiastic support of the war. They were indorsed by the spokesmen of the British Government while hostilities were in progress; and the whole world was led to believe that the achievement of the purposes proclaimed by the President was the sole object of the war. Among those declarations the one that 'all peoples are entitled to self-determination' received universal support and became the war cry of the peoples who were fighting Germany. Our Government and those of the countries associated with us in the war are therefore bound in honor to apply the principle of self-determination to Ireland, as well as to the other submerged nations which have been granted their freedom as a result of the war. If it is not applied to Ireland the United States will be placed in a most unfavorable light before the civilized world, and President Wilson's solemn declarations will be made a mockery."

#### ENGLAND'S "CONSPICUOUS FAILURE."

After stating that Ireland is clearly entitled to self-determination and that she has asserted that right for 750 years, the declaration continues:

"Aside from Ireland's inalienable right to govern herself in her own way, without interference by any people outside her own shores, the attempt of England to rule her against the consent of her own people is the most conspicuous failure in all history. It has failed in every essential thing for which governments exist—the promotion of the welfare of the governed, the protection of their natural rights and interests, the development of their resources, and their contribution to the sum of human happiness and the world's prosperity.

"Even if conquest be acknowledged as giving one people the right to rule another, England has forfeited that right by centuries of continuous misgovernment and injustice, which are practiced by the English Government to-day as relentlessly as at any time in the past, and in utter disregard of the opinions, wishes, and protests of the Irish people.

"The condition of Ireland, which is the direct result of the deliberate action of the English Government, is an international scandal and a constant menace to the world's peace. Three times during the last 300 years her soil has been invaded by foreign armies to aid her people to overthrow English rule. So long as England holds Ireland by military force and denies her the right to govern herself, the Irish people will continue to assert their rights by every means in their power.

"In 1916 they rose in rebellion, and on January 21, 1919, their elected representatives, supported by the overwhelming majority of the people, met in the national capital, issued a declaration of independence, and proclaimed an Irish republic. This action was followed by an appeal for recognition to the free peoples of the world. They elected 3 delegates to plead their case at the peace conference, 2 of whom, with 39 other elected representatives of the people, are held in English prisons without trial and with no charge formulated against them.

"A state of war therefore exists between England and Ireland, which, in the interests of the peace of the world, the peace conference can not ignore, and President Wilson's great task of establishing a permanent peace will not be completed until the Irish question is settled on the principle of self-determination, to which he has unequivocally committed himself and the United States.

"We, therefore, in the name of the many millions of American citizens of Irish birth or lineage, who have contributed their full share to the winning of the war, and with the approval and sympathy of the overwhelming majority of the American people, now demand that President Wilson place before the peace conference and support with all his powerful influence Ireland's right of self-determination and secure for the elected delegates from her constituent assembly to the peace conference the same status and recognition which have been accorded to those of other small nations.

"We remind our fellow Americans of the farewell address to the American people of George Washington, and particularly that portion thereof embodying his advice to avoid all entangling alliances with European powers. These words are as true to-day as when he first uttered them. \* \* \*

"We demand, therefore, if any league of nations be made, that all features of it which may infringe on the traditional American policy, including the Monroe doctrine, shall be eliminated, and that in any such league the right of self-determination of all peoples and the American doctrines of freedom of the seas, so often and earnestly advocated by President Wilson, shall not be overlooked, forgotten, or abridged."

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WATSON of Virginia having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the bill (S. 2812) to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, and sodium on the public domain be recommitted to the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4723) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 204) to provide for the fitting up of quarters in the post-office building at the city of Sacramento, Cal., for the accommodation of the district of California and its officers.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from South Carolina a question in reference to the Federal Trade Commission?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Under the provision of this bill making a lump-sum appropriation for salaries of the employees, how much does the gentleman have an idea the chief clerk will get? He



now gets \$2,000. The disbursing clerk now gets \$2,000, and a clerk to each of the commissioners now gets \$1,800. How much does the gentleman imagine they will be receiving under this lump-sum appropriation?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will say frankly to the gentleman that based on the action of the commission this year, they will not be receiving one cent more.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not, in correcting his remarks for the Record, change that statement, because I would like to have it in the Record when this matter comes up next year, when they submit a tabulated statement of their employees.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will not, and I shall remember, if I am here, and ask for an accounting. The action of the committee now is based on the act that the statement furnished by the commission as to salaries paid out under the lump-sum roll did justify the action.

Mr. MANN. It may be that the gentleman's statement on the floor here, which will go in the Record, will have its weight with the commission; but it is perfectly certain that if such a statement had not been made these gentlemen who now get \$2,000 a year would get \$3,500, and the private secretaries to these commissioners, hunting for something to do, would get \$2,500 or \$3,000 each.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will say that if I am here and they abuse the lump sum, and the gentleman does not make an effort, if I am here I shall personally make the effort to investigate it.

Mr. MANN. I probably will make no effort about it. I should say, as a rule, the most useless body we have at present is the Federal Trade Commission as now constituted. I heard some gentleman say a while ago that no one seeks the job except the job hunter, and I believe all of them were job seekers when appointed.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the committee proposes to give the Federal Trade Commission another chance to prove that given an opportunity to increase salaries it will not do so unduly. I do not know that the committee was entirely justified in its action. Gentlemen understand, of course, that it is difficult to provide a proper statutory roll for this sort of a service, so difficult that the committee concluded that it would be better, if the sums are economically expended, to appropriate in a lump sum, with the hope, expectation, and at least the implied promise that there would be no increases of salaries.

We took that action, still remembering what occurred not so long ago in connection with the appropriation for this same governmental activity. There had been carried in their appropriations a limitation of \$5,000 of salary that might be made to any employee. Members of the commission came before the committee and said that they frequently had very important cases coming before them in connection with which it was necessary for them to employ, at least temporarily, professional people or experts, and pay them a sum in excess of \$5,000 per annum, or at the rate of \$5,000 per annum. They asked the committee to put them on trial and give them an opportunity to show what they would do, without limitation, and the committee did so, with this result, that almost immediately, or very soon after that appropriation became available, the Federal Trade Commission employed a certain gentleman, more or less known throughout the country, at the rate, as I recall it, of \$17,500 per annum, with some per diem on top of that. In all, if my memory serves me right, that active, persistent—I was going to say distinguished—gentleman pulled down, I think, about \$27,000 of the public money. And the echoes of the activities that arose out of that expenditure, far in excess of what the commission said they would make, have been ringing through the corridor of Congress ever since, and have led to the introduction of various bills and to hearings at each end of the Capitol, going on for some time now.

We hope that the Federal Trade Commission will do better, will come nearer adhering to its present good resolutions in this case than it did in the case that I have already referred to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not recall, and the gentleman may refresh my memory, of another instance where Congress has abolished the statutory roll and granted a lump-sum appropriation to a Government activity so that it might increase salaries as it deemed fit.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think the Congress did that or intended to do that. There was certainly no intent on the part of the committee to grant a lump-sum appropriation in order that salaries might be increased.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what you are doing here; you are granting that privilege in this case.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope my friend from Wisconsin, who is an economist, will not make that statement, which may be held

somewhere by some one as authorizing an increase of salary. We are insisting that this action is not taken with a view or for the purpose or intent or with the expectation that the salaries will be increased, but rather on the promise implied, if not direct, that the salaries will not be increased.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no limitation or qualification in the bill. You abandon the statutory roll and I do not recall another instance where Congress abolished the statutory roll and provided a lump sum. It leaves it to the discretion of the commission or the department to raise the salaries at will.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know or recall a case of that kind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. That may not be the purpose, and I ask the gentleman why the statutory roll as carried in existing law was not continued and a lump sum carried for temporary employees. If the gentleman will permit, he has stated that there are instances where they wish to increase the salaries beyond the \$5,000 limit. In a prior paragraph, the committee in good judgment has placed a limitation upon the amount of salary that could be paid out of a lump-sum appropriation of \$3,700,000, which has just been voted. Here you abolish the statutory roll and allow increases without limit to be paid out of this million dollars.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Could such a situation be possible, coming from the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what I am calling to the attention of the committee. I do not know of another instance where the Committee on Appropriations has abandoned a statutory roll and permitted a commission to fix the salaries.

Mr. LEVER. I am absolutely shocked.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would not be shocked if it had come from the Committee on Agriculture, because they pursue that practice frequently.

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman also recalls various instances where members of the Committee on Appropriations have attacked the agricultural appropriation bill because it carries lump-sum appropriations.

Mr. STAFFORD. I confess that I have been guilty on more than one occasion of that vicious practice, but I am surprised that the subcommittee on the sundry civil appropriation bill has seen fit to follow the established practice of the Committee on Agriculture. I am waiting for some explanation as to why they have done it.

Mr. MONDELL. Will my colleague on the committee be good enough to prepare and present a statutory roll covering these activities, in order that we may see whether it is proper to enact it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why, it is in last year's bill.

Mr. MONDELL. The statutory roll of last year's bill very clearly was not a proper one to continue. The committee was of the opinion that if this board would have due regard for the public funds, which we hope they will, they could better allocate, to use a now useful word, the appropriations among the employees in an economical and useful and workable way than the committee could do.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wanted to get five minutes when the provision was under consideration making appropriation to take care of the soldier boys and rehabilitate them for life work, but I could not do it. The amendment to increase the appropriation as offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] was voted down. I was curious to see what the Appropriations Committee, after turning down the estimate for this very just and necessary work, had made appropriations for, thereby giving preference over this item which proposed to take care of these boys. I have been looking through the bill. I want to cite a few items that they have given preference over this appropriation. I notice that they make provision to take care of the Commission of Fine Arts, which includes "the purchase of periodicals, maps, and books of reference." They provide for the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics. The committee was willing to have advice given on aeronautics and make appropriations for it—it was very important—but not advice given to these boys that they might be fitted and trained for life's work. Then there is a large appropriation made, and it is made available immediately, "for the observation of the total eclipse of the sun that may be visible in Bolivia." How important! Then there is the "astrophysical observatory." It had to be provided for—

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



Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Not yet. I have only five minutes, and I am very anxious to finish this statement. I want to see just how the mind of the gentleman from Montana—

Mr. GALLIVAN. Wyoming.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Wyoming—I apologize to Montana—worked in failing to take care of these boys.

Mr. MONDELL. Why does the gentleman charge a member of the minority with the items in this bill? Has he fallen into the error of believing that we have already on this side of the House taken control of the Congress?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Oh, yes; you will soon take charge, and I suppose you, too, will follow the estimates of the various departments on some of these matters, but not when it comes down to providing money for the soldiers to be trained. Members on your side are just as guilty as those on this side. Then here is an appropriation "for an international catalogue of scientific literature," a large appropriation "for American ethnology," and "for the National Zoological Park" out here, where people may go and look at the monkeys and see the wild beasts and other curiosities, and the committee is most generous in appropriating "for work of furnishing headstones for unmarked graves" and "for the roadways in national cemeteries." It is quite necessary to do that, but not necessary to fit these boys that they might be trained to go out and get good positions after they have served their country. Then there is an appropriation "for the expenses of burying, in Arlington Cemetery." It is quite necessary to bury a man, to provide for that, but not necessary to try to cure him and train him so that he can live and make a living.

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

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Not yet. Let me read further—"Antietam battle field, for repair and preservation of the monuments and tablets" there. Likewise a large appropriation is made "for the disposition of the remains of officers, soldiers, and civilians." You want to provide for burying soldiers, after they are dead, but not for taking care of them and training them so that they can go and get a job while living. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is it not true that a distinguished gentleman on the Democratic side of the House argued against the amendment to provide money, while many gentlemen on the Republican side of the House voted for it?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I am afraid the gentleman to whom you allude was just mistaken in his argument, but opposition, I am sorry to say, has arisen on both sides.

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

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I have only five minutes.

Mr. WALSH. I wanted to ask if the gentleman was going to move to strike out these items?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. No; I am not. I am for them, but I am going to give the gentleman from Massachusetts and others an opportunity to say whether they are in favor of taking care of these boys, so that they can be trained for their life work, by making this appropriation on a motion to recommend this bill, and we are going to have a roll call on it.

Mr. WALSH. I shall be delighted to take advantage of that opportunity.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. To see whether you believe it is more essential and more necessary to appropriate money "for tablets in China" than it is to take care of these brave, disabled soldier and sailor boys. Then, again, Mr. Chairman, there is an appropriation made in this bill for "burial of deceased indigent patients out in Arkansas," and all through this bill similar items are found. For instance, here is an appropriation to provide "for trees and shrubs and plants and skilled labor for the grounds of the Capitol and the Senate and House Office Buildings." Willing to appropriate money to make the Capitol Grounds and the House Office grounds beautiful, but not willing to appropriate sufficient money to take care of these disabled boys so that they can go ahead and make a living. And, again, here is an appropriation "for the reindeer in Alaska." Oh, it is very important to appropriate money for the "reindeer" and "for the protection of game" in Alaska—very important—but not important to appropriate a sufficient sum, such as estimated by the department, for these boys.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman join in an effort to strike out some of these appropriations?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I am for all of these items, but I am for a greater preference being shown these disabled soldiers and sailors than for the reindeer and other things I have enumerated. [Applause.] I do not yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I would like to have two or three minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, that paragraph has been passed.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I shall not insist on it.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered by my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], in Boston on Saturday night.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to extend his remarks by printing a speech delivered by Mr. TILSON, of Connecticut, in Boston last Saturday night. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I have withdrawn that motion.

Mr. WALSH. Then I renew it, merely to express my regret to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, who will soon leave our midst to take up duties in a higher forum [applause]—for a long career, I assume—that in the closing days of his service in this House he should have expressed an opinion such as we have listened to in the last five minutes after the amendment which he had favored had been decisively defeated by the committee.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman wishes me to add to my regrets, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I would like to say that if I could in the slightest degree before I leave this body help the soldiers to be trained, so that they could do something in life—if I could help them in any way—I would be satisfied in the thought I had done them a good stunt. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. Oh, yes; of course, that is the sentiment of all of us; but to take the gentleman's remarks as made, one would think we had stricken from this appropriation bill the item carried for that very purpose, and because we did not increase it by over a million dollars, as was asked by gentlemen who are interested on the Committee on Education, the gentleman seeks to convey the impression that the majority party are appropriating money for a lot of useless work and refusing to appropriate money for the soldiers. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have taken the estimates of this Federal Vocational Educational Rehabilitation Board and we have taken the manner in which they have expended the money given to them last session, and the Committee on Appropriations has reduced the amount that they ask for to be appropriated for the ensuing year, and the gentleman knows that if this amount is insufficient for the year 1921 there will be no difficulty in getting a further appropriation; but this trouble is that when you get a body of experts, particularly educational experts and scientists and scientific men and men drawn from the great institutions of learning throughout this country, and turn over to them vast appropriations, they are not always practical in its expenditure; they go upon theoretical lines, and on this work they begin spending money for large salaries. They had more salaried men upon the pay roll at one time than they had men who were being treated.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Now, with the amount made available for them for the ensuing year, plus the amount that was turned over by the act we passed the other day, it certainly ought to be sufficient for them to start out with and embark upon this program. There is nobody opposing this work. There is nobody opposing giving the wounded soldiers every benefit and advantage that they can get, and there is nobody here seeking to appropriate money for Rock Creek Park and erecting monuments to soldiers who have fallen in the battles of the Republic heretofore, and to withhold aid from the soldiers who have been wounded in this struggle across the seas. The gentleman is verging, I regret to say, upon the field of demagoguery when he seeks to make that sort of an argument, and that only adds to my regret that he is about to depart from our midst, because I know that where he is about to go he may find a great many more opportunities to indulge in that practice than he would if he retained his membership in this body, where that kind of stuff does not go. [Applause.] I trust that the gentleman, upon further reflection, will be constrained to admit further in the debate upon this measure that we have done pretty well as to initial appropriations for the increased activities of this board by giving them nearly \$3,000,000 to be available for their work.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I congratulate the gentleman on his plea of confession and avoidance.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentleman for his congratulations.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.



Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I understood the gentleman withdrew the pro forma motion.

Mr. FESS. He renewed it.

Mr. WALSH. I do not like to withdraw it; I would rather have the gentleman defeat it by his eloquence and logic.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

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

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to attempt the duty of lecturing the membership of the committee as some Members have attempted, but I want to call attention to this paragraph, upon which we have had a good deal of comment, where instead of limiting the salary to be paid as done in the preceding paragraph the limitation has been taken off so it can be increased. The comment is simply this, that on matters which have monetary value that are measured in materialism there is always a keen interest to extend or expand the opportunity of expenditure.

But upon matters which are not material, but which are spiritual, or more especially educational, there is always a desire to place a limitation. And the desire has been beautifully expressed by our friend, our colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], when he specifically states that those who have had academic training are unfitted for the expenditure of money, and therefore the clamp ought to be put upon them. Now, the crime of having an academic training some Members of the House will neither deny nor palliate. They are not going to apologize for it; and, while it might be true that there is an impractical trend among theoretical teachers or teachers of theory, I think that my friend will respect the fact that without the training there would be no accomplishment in the material lines, as there would not be in the spiritual line. And the mere fact that some men have committed the error of taking time to train themselves ought not to be a disqualification for a position on the floor of this House or anywhere else where legislation is proposed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. For a short question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have here a book that is gotten out by the Bureau of Education, in cooperation with the United States Food Administration, entitled "Lessons in Community and National Life. Series A. For the upper classes of the high school." I find this question:

Note in the title of the bill the different objects at which Congress aimed and show in each case what Mr. Hoover's interpretation of the different tasks is.

Is that a question for a highly educated man to ask of a pupil in a school?

Mr. FESS. I would say that that question would likely be suitable for a pupil in a school.

But, Mr. Chairman, what I have in mind is this: That in matters of business, where you are keeping a going concern going, there is no limitation on the expenditure, but you lift the limitation to give the latitude. But where, instead of keeping a going concern going, you are going to take a broken-down man who has been taken by the authority of the Government without his will and placed in the line, and he is wounded, and when we want to put him on his feet and make him creative and recreative and productive, you limit the amount to be paid for fear that they are going to take advantage of it. I say that it is a comment upon this body. The soldier rehabilitated is not material. It is to give him some ability to stand on his feet and use the powers that God gave him and that the Government took away from him by wounding him, and put him in shape to be himself again. [Applause.] I do not want to appear to be lecturing anybody. But I do not like to see this discrimination, simply because these men are trained academically and are experts. The fact that a man is an expert ought not to disqualify him for a position.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

#### INTERDEPARTMENTAL SOCIAL HYGIENE BOARD.

The unexpended balances on June 30, 1919, of the appropriations for the fiscal year 1919 contained in section 5, 6, and 7 of Chapter XV of the Army appropriation act, approved July 9, 1918, are reappropriated and made available for the same purposes for the fiscal year 1920: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the sum of \$100,000 in section 7 to be used under the direction of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, books of reference and periodicals, printing and binding, traveling, and other necessary expenses of the board in the administration of the provisions of Chapter XV of the said act.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Miss RANKIN. I have an amendment I wish to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that no amendment can be offered unless the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to hear the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Miss RANKIN: Page 39, after the word "act," line 25, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of the unexpended balance shall be made available for any State which permits the physical examination of females suspected of venereal diseases to be made by male physicians."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, if the lady from Montana will permit, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. How much money is available to be reappropriated?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not answer as to the exact figures. It is something under that \$100,000. May I state to the gentleman from Massachusetts this—

Mr. WALSH. There was a million dollars appropriated under section 5.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. There is a fund providing \$1,400,000 to be appropriated by State boards of health in 1919 and \$1,400,000 for similar purposes in 1920. That was carried in the Army bill. The \$1,400,000 it was estimated would be entirely spent during the year 1919. This \$100,000 is included here for the reason that the language of the original act, while seeking to authorize the expenditure of this fund for the administration of the act, did not do so, because of defective language, and no part of this fund had been spent—that is, the \$100,000 fund for administration. There was a fund of \$1,000,000—this act had about four different funds—which was appropriated for the purpose of cooperating with the States in the isolation and detention of women with venereal diseases. Now, of that fund there is a balance remaining, unencumbered, of \$549,866. It remains because of their inability to carry out their obligations with the States. That fund is used, I will say, in cooperating with the States in the construction of homes for girls, homes for women—State prisons, in other words. The board was anxious to have a large appropriation for this purpose and to secure authority to construct buildings.

The committee has not carried any appropriation for it, but simply authorizes the expenditure in the next fiscal year of the unexpended balance, for the reason that the board has already obligated itself to make these appropriations; and having obligated itself, we wanted to give them the authority during the next fiscal year to expend the unexpended balance.

Mr. WALSH. You want to reappropriate the \$500,000 which is carried in section 5 of that act for the purposes set forth in section 2 of the act?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is right.

Mr. WALSH. Now, the \$100,000 that you carry here, the unexpended balance, you want to make available for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It is for the purpose of administering these funds.

That is the purpose for which it was appropriated in the act, but the act was not correctly worded, and the comptroller held that they could not spend any of that fund. It is to enable them to spend the money for the purpose for which Congress made the appropriation.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. This is to take care of the board provided for in a law which was enacted as a rider on the Army appropriation bill last year?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; it refers to the unexpended balance of this appropriation.

Mr. McKENZIE. Put on by the Senate, and as a matter of fact the law was never considered by a committee of the House or in Committee of the Whole. Is not that true?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. McKENZIE. It is just one of those things that went through as a rider, and it provides that the States shall make appropriations to meet the appropriations made by the Federal Government and that they shall act jointly in the suppression of this disease or for social reform.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Exactly.

Mr. McKENZIE. Now, what I want to ask the gentleman is, How many of the States of the Union have made appropriations to meet the Federal appropriation?



Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. On page 1327 of the hearings it is shown that about 25 States have.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The lady from Montana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Miss RANKIN: Page 39, line 25, after the word "act," strike out the period and insert a colon and the following:

"Provided, That no part of the unexpended balance shall be made available for any State which permits the examination of females suspected of venereal disease to be made by a male physician."

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina reserves a point of order.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, you have just heard this paragraph explained. This paragraph provides that the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1919 contained in section 5, which provides for a million dollars; section 6, which provides for \$1,400,000; and section 7, for \$300,000, of the Army appropriation act, is reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1920.

As you will notice, this does not make the appropriation for 1920, as the act approved provided for an appropriation for two years. Every Member of this House appreciates the fact that much legislation was passed during the war that would not have been passed except for the emergency. We know that during that time the Member of this House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who keeps the House advised of such questions as this was ill and was not here to guard the people against such legislation. I feel confident that when you understand the power carried with this appropriation you would not wish to reappropriate this balance without the proviso that I have offered.

Section 5 provides, as I said, for an appropriation of a million dollars to carry out the provisions of section 2. Section 2 contains provisions that I believe should be explained to the House. I have talked with many women about this provision, and the only group of women I found that approved of it did so because they believed the "end justified the means" during war.

Section 2 reads as follows:

That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized and directed to adopt measures for the purpose of assisting the various States in caring for civilian persons whose detention, isolation, quarantine, and commitment to institutions may be found necessary for the protection of the military and naval forces against venereal disease.

This section gives blanket authority to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to adopt measures—any measure, all measures, any measure they see fit—to assist the various States in caring for "certain civilian persons," regardless of the methods used in the various States. "Civilian persons" is a very innocent term, but when it means civilian persons dangerous to the military and naval forces in regard to venereal disease we know that for all practical purposes it means women. This provision gives blanket authority to the States and to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to set up any regulation, to adopt any means they see fit, to determine when and how it shall be deemed necessary for women to be detained, isolated, quarantined, or committed to an institution for the protection of the military and naval forces against venereal disease.

Are they going to submit every woman to a physical examination? They say no; they are going to examine only the prostitutes. How do they know who the prostitutes are? Do they mean to include in this item all the young girls that are floating about the streets? They are a greater menace than the so-called professional prostitutes. Is there an organized body of women different from other women who can be classified as prostitutes who are licensed and legalized? Are they only going to examine those who have been convicted in the courts as prostitutes? Or are they going to examine any woman who is brought into the court as a suspect liable to prosecution? In the hearings the process of finding out when it was necessary was not mentioned.

Over 10 years ago I studied this question very carefully. For a time I worked in the night court in New York. I was very familiar with the handling of prostitution in some of the Western States, especially Montana and Washington. I know the type of man, the plain-clothes man and the policeman, whose business it is to hunt down prostitutes, and I also know that there is an opportunity for the most flagrant injustices. The man on the Council of National Defense who justified and instigated this section tried to convince me that in the past 10 years the moral standards of the individuals who would be responsible for the practical administration of this act had so changed and improved that there would be no danger of abuse.

We must talk common sense. We know that there has been no such great change in 10 years, and that we are dealing with human nature.

This section is vicious in that it gives blanket authority both to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy not only to adopt a measure but to assist any State regardless of the methods used by that State. They can assist States that are using the most inhuman procedure, and can ride over any regulation that has been made for the protection of women. It gives broad authority under which physical examinations of women might be made without requiring any evidence that the woman is diseased or guilty of prostitution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the lady from Montana has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the lady from Montana may have an additional five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the lady from Montana yield for a question?

Miss RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have just examined the amendment at the Clerk's desk, and I would like to know whether we or the States have a sufficient number of women physicians to meet the requirements?

Miss RANKIN. There have been a great many women released by the ending of the war. We have many more women physicians than would be required to do this work. It may be that they will have to offer inducements for women to come and do this work. But whether they do or not, I think it is better to have the work undone than to pass legislation that would permit some of the injustices resulting from this legislation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Sympathizing with what the lady from Montana has in mind, I wonder whether the adoption of this amendment might not be regarded as coercive in certain States where they do not have a sufficient number of women physicians to meet the requirements of the situation?

Miss RANKIN. It might be.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Suppose in a State like Nevada or Montana there were no women physicians. What would the situation be?

Miss RANKIN. Then a woman physician would have to be brought from some other State.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Meanwhile the patient might be left suffering or the disease might spread.

Miss RANKIN. But this does not have anything to do with the woman who is diseased. It says "a woman suspected of having venereal disease." After it has been found that she has a venereal disease, if she wishes to have a man physician, that is all right. She may have any physician she prefers; but I object to having women examined by men physicians when they have not been proved to be subject to the disease or to being prostitutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. For one I want to compliment the lady for bringing this question up and for her courage in discussing it; but it did occur to me on reading the amendment that it was open to the objection I have stated, that, so far as those States may be concerned where there are no women physicians available, it might be regarded as in a measure coercive, compelling the State to employ women physicians when it did not have them.

Miss RANKIN. I much prefer to compel the States to employ women than to compel women to be subjected to this abuse.

Mr. FLOOD. Will the lady from Montana yield for a question?

Miss RANKIN. Certainly.

Mr. FLOOD. Suppose some woman should prefer to have her family physician examine her rather than to be examined by a lady physician. Your amendment would not permit that.

Miss RANKIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. FLOOD. No; your amendment provides that where a State permits the examination by a male physician no part of this appropriation shall be available.

Miss RANKIN. A woman suspected of venereal disease—a woman who is brought up under this act.

Mr. FLOOD. You would not permit a woman to be examined by her own physician, if she preferred to be, if her own physician was a man?

Miss RANKIN. If a woman prefers to have an examination of her own, that has nothing to do with this; but this bill will not permit money to be used to hire physicians where the State hires only men.



Mr. MCKENZIE. Will the lady from Montana yield for a question?

Miss RANKIN. Certainly.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I would like to ask if it is not possible under this law that anyone who might desire could circulate the report about any woman in a community that she was suspected of being diseased, and she might be haled before a physician and compelled to submit to examination whether she was diseased or not and in that way be branded in the community as being a disgraced woman?

Miss RANKIN. What the gentleman says is true. I have not finished my remarks on that point.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The lady has had experience with the night court in New York. At that time we had women physicians doing the work there.

Miss RANKIN. That has nothing to do with this bill.

This section is vicious in that it gives blanket authority to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy not only to adopt any measure but to assist any State regardless of the methods used by that State. They can assist States that are using most inhuman procedure, and can override any regulations that have been made for the protection of women. It gives authority under which a physical examination of a woman may be made without requiring any evidence that the woman is diseased or found guilty of prostitution.

It is unnecessary for me to talk to Members of this House about the evils of such legislation. Your sense of justice and your sense of precaution will not permit you to give to a group of people blanket power to take any woman they see fit and submit her to a physical examination made by men without any more protection than this section gives.

The next insidious evil in this bill is that it will give to men the false sense of security that comes from the belief that women who are diseased are locked up. Therefore, they reason, women who are out are free from disease.

Authorities in Europe admit that their system of physical examination and lock hospitals is a failure. The United States has been looked up to as the Nation which has handled its problem of prostitution with more intelligence and humanity than any other country—not that we have by any means solved the problem, for we can never hope to approach the solution of any problem that involves men and women by using wisdom of men only. Under the pretext of war are we going to revert to the practice in Europe?

This section has been in force for a short time. You say nothing has happened. Do you know what has happened? Let me give you a few instances which I know are typical of what is happening. Regardless of what may be said in defense of this section on the floor, I know these things and worse are true, because I know human nature, and I know prewar conditions in various States. In one camp, I think it was Newport News, a reliable woman, a personal friend of mine, was sitting in the Public Health Service office. A man came into the office and talked with one of the officials. The official became very angry, and when the man left he came over to my friend and excused his anger by explaining that the man who came in tried to bribe him. The man wanted his wife's red ticket changed to a white ticket so that she might ply her trade. This shows that at this place it was the practice to make a physical examination of the prostitutes and issue a white ticket to the well one and a red ticket to the diseased one. A white ticket was a notice to all men who came that she was free from disease, when, as a matter of fact, within the next hour she might contract the most virulent type and from then on infect every man who came. I reported this to the Division of Venereal Disease of the Bureau of Public Health Service last November. I was told that it would be looked into. I have heard nothing since.

Another incident that shows the method by which this section was carried out is probably known to every one of you. You are all aware of the practice in the Army of punishing men who failed to report when they contracted a disease and of merely giving medical care without punishment to those who reported. One instance came to me of where a man reported to the authorities that he had contracted a venereal disease. One of the questions asked him was, "Do you know where you contracted this?" The man gave the name of a young woman. That was ground enough for the authorities to force that woman to submit to a physical examination made by a male physician, without any other evidence than the word of one man. It means that no woman is safe if some man wishes to give in her name as a suspect. The women of the Pacific coast are already complaining of the operation of this section.

I want to say this, that no political party can go to the women of this country and defend this section, and no individual can ask the women for their vote and defend his vote for an appro-

priation which will make it possible for women to be dragged in and examined by a man, to be so humiliated, disgraced, and marked, while there is the slightest chance that the woman is innocent. It is against every principle of decency and humanity to have such examinations and lock hospitals as this section permits.

The women are sensitive on this subject. The women of Australia voted down conscription because of the manner in which the authorities handled venereal diseases.

I received a letter from a man in one of the camps in France saying that they were allowed only three-hour furloughs because of the prevalence of venereal disease. When these men come home they are going to tell what happened. When the men who were kept on this side are out of their uniforms the women will know more.

I was through with talking about curing venereal diseases 10 years ago. We can never rid the world of this plague as long as we try to cure half of those infected and let the other half go free, or while we refuse to look for the cause of the trouble. We will never make any headway until we recognize the fundamental principles. We must see that all feeble-minded persons, males and females, have permanent custodial care, that all the rest of the men and women have education in the processes of life and right living, and that every woman has the training and opportunity to earn an adequate living by her own efforts.

I ask the adoption of this proviso that many young women may be spared needless humiliation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina insist on his point of order?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I make the point of order on the ground that this is a limitation on the expenditure of a fund provided by legislation in the last sundry civil bill. In the form in which it is now presented, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. On the ground that it is not a limitation?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the position I take is that it is a limitation upon a fund that was provided by the Army act of the last session, if it is a limitation on anything.

Mr. MANN. But this is a reappropriation of the fund. The appropriation is exhausted. The item in the bill provides that certain unexpended balances are reappropriated and made available for the same purposes for the fiscal year 1920. No one would, in fact, claim that when we reappropriate an unexpended balance it is not exactly the same as appropriating the money originally, except that we evade adding it as an amount in the appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. While it is a limitation, is it not a limitation requiring the States to do certain things?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. No.

Mr. MANN. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Is it not legislation, in that it directs what the States shall do?

Mr. MANN. No; it is a mere limitation upon the expenditure of the money, precisely on all fours with the proposition about the appropriation for the benefit of soldiers' homes controlled by States. That is probably the leading case on the subject where a proposition was made that no portion of the money appropriated for the benefit of soldiers' homes owned by States should be given to the States if they permitted the sale of intoxicating liquor of any kind, including wine, beer, and so forth. Now, here is a provision appropriating the unexpended balance and a limitation upon the unexpended balance. It is clearly a limitation. The only provision that is subject to a point of order is the proviso that is in the bill.

Mr. CRISP. Is the Chair ready to rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. Does the gentleman desire to be heard?

Mr. CRISP. No; I think it is clearly a limitation; but if the Chair has his mind made up, I do not care to say anything.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSTER). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair thinks that the point made by the gentleman from South Carolina that this is not an appropriation is not well taken. It does reappropriate the balance for the year 1920. So far as the amendment being a limitation, there was a decision by Judge ALEXANDER on January 16, and also a decision by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GARNER, and also one by the gentlemen from Virginia, Judge SAUNDERS, all of them able parliamentarians in this House, who decided that a similar amendment to this was a limitation, and the Chair is justified in overruling the point of order. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Can we have the amendment read again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk again read the amendment.



Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I desire to amend by adding the words "when there is a female physician available." I want to say that I am in sympathy with the purposes of the lady from Montana. There was a request from the department for a permanent establishment with activities along the same line, but the committee did not see fit to include it in the bill. I made some inquiries through the Health Department of the manner in which this work was carried on. I was informed that under the regulations whenever an examination is made that it is made by a Red Cross nurse, who has been at the office of the clinic for the purpose.

But they say that in some States no women physicians are available; and as this work has to be carried on around the various camps all over the country, that it is essential that they be permitted to carry it on where no woman physician is available. For that reason I offer the amendment, so as to provide that where women physicians are not available male physicians can be used.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina entirely nullifies the amendment I have offered. They do use women physicians where they are available and convenient and at hand. The Red Cross nurse can not make the examination. It has to be done by a medical person. It is a difficult examination to make, and they are using men all over the country to make these examinations of women who have not been found to have the disease, who have not been found guilty of prostitution, and that is in the testimony given before the committee. Women who have not been found guilty of any sexual offense are held for examination, and these examinations are conducted by men in the great majority of cases.

There is a possibility that there may not have been enough women physicians when there were so many women physicians in France, but now that the women physicians have returned there are plenty to do the work if they will make the inducements to get women to do it. I believe that the humiliation and disgrace, not only to the woman who submits to the examination, but to all those who participate in the examination, is a greater evil than the evil that will come from allowing a few suspects to go free. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. What objection would there be to providing that it shall be made by a male wherever the female physician is not available?

Miss RANKIN. Because it nullifies the whole amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Take a State like North Dakota, for instance; there you would not have female physicians available.

Miss RANKIN. They use women anywhere where they can. It absolutely nullifies my amendment and it would have no effect whatever.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The result would be that unless there was a woman physician the work could not be carried on. That is the reason why I say "when a woman physician is not available."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment: Amend the amendment by adding, after the word "physician," the words "when there is a female physician available."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the lady from Montana on the bravery and intelligence she has shown in presenting the woman's side of this matter to the House. [Applause.] The amendment now proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina, if adopted, would mean that the entire amendment offered by the lady from Montana would amount to very little. It rests then wholly with the department to say whether a female physician is available or not, while it is just as easy as rolling off a log for the department to have a female physician available at any camp where it is sought to make any examination whatever. [Applause.] They can put a female physician there if they want to, and that will be the case if the amendment of the lady from Montana prevails. But if the amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] is agreed to, then the department is without any obligation to have a female physician anywhere, and here is the situation: Do not think for a moment that these examinations are confined to prostitutes. Probably no one cares very much how the examination of a prostitute would be made, whether by a man or a woman; but under this broad provision of the law the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy can arrest any woman anywhere and submit her to an examination, and while the chances are that they will not walk into your home or into mine or arrest anyone connected with our families or our acquaintances, yet it is extremely probable that

there will be, as there certainly have been in the past, many arrests for this purpose of young girls, probably improperly hanging around camps, who have not yet reached the point of prostitution. The moment such a girl is arrested and examined by a male physician her respect is gone. You might as well turn her on the street and tell her to make her living by prostitution. I am opposed to taking any innocent girl anywhere in the country and aiding in sending her to prostitution. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Flood). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina to the amendment of the lady from Montana.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the lady from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the amendment just adopted, after the word "provided," the word "further."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to keep informed regarding and to enforce compliance with acts to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads; the act requiring common carriers to make reports of accidents and authorizing investigations thereof; and to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate and test block-signal and train-control systems and appliances intended to promote the safety of railway operation, as authorized by the joint resolution approved June 30, 1906, and the provision of the sundry civil act approved May 27, 1908, including the employment of inspectors, and per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, \$313,600.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. 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. Flood, 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. 16104, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### OIL-LEASING BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill S. 2812, to encourage and permit the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain, with Senate amendments thereto, and that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman would tell us why he asks this.

Mr. FERRIS. A point of order to the conference report, on the ground that the conferees had exceeded their authority in providing for the leasing of coal in Alaska, was made and sustained in the Senate on the consideration of the conference report, and it is the thought of the conferees to go back and cut out the objectionable part.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will there be something printed to show what is going back to conference?

Mr. FERRIS. As I understand it, the adoption of the conference report in the House discharged the conferees.

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. So it is a question of going back to conference again.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but it goes back with the part eliminated that went out on the point of order.

Mr. FERRIS. It does not have that effect. It has the effect of rejecting the conference report, and we are now where we were at the start. The whole matter goes to conference.

Mr. ELSTON. And then comes back to the House for consideration?

Mr. STAFFORD. Just as a new conference report.

Mr. FERRIS. Exactly. It comes back for consideration in the event the conferees agree.

Mr. STAFFORD. Subject to points of order and all other privileges in the House.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman is moving to insist upon the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendments?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair announced the following conferees: Mr. FERRIS, Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, Mr. RAKER, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. SINNOTT.



## SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman having the measure in charge tell us the reason for the \$63,000 increase, apparently, in this block-signal and train-control system investigation?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In the last session of Congress, Congress increased the salaries of inspectors and other employees from \$1,800 to \$3,000, and this increase is simply due to the necessity of carrying out the law as it now stands. It is the exact amount of the increase made necessary by the legislation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Valuation of property of carriers: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the objects of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof," by providing for a valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto and securing information concerning their stocks, bonds, and other securities, approved March 1, 1913, including per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and including not exceeding \$15,000 for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia, \$2,500,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to obtain some information. How far has the work of valuing the property of carriers proceeded?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The information given the committee was that on January 1 they had received engineering reports on 25,000 miles of roads, and that they would, at the end of the year, receive reports on 25,000 miles more; that the field work in connection with the valuation of railroads would be completed by January 1, 1920; that the work in the office, the compilation of the information, will not be completed for two years. The opinion of Judge Prouty, who has been in charge of this work, is that from this time on they will be able to make much greater progress because during the war they have been somewhat hampered.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman state how much money has been expended in valuing the railroads up to date?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Fifteen million eight hundred thousand four hundred and sixty-two dollars was appropriated and \$13,706,197 has been spent in the valuation of both railroads and telegraph and telephones—\$499,366 having been expended in the valuation of telegraph and telephone lines, the balance in railroads.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. When was the work commenced?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The first appropriation was in the year 1915. My recollection is—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It was before that.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That the fiscal year of 1915 was the first appropriation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has been running four years and has cost up to date over \$13,000,000, is that correct?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Fifteen million dollars appropriated and it cost \$13,706,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And now they are selling off the private cars, are they not? Are they not offering the private cars at auction in which they used to go around and value these physical properties of the railroads? Are they not selling them at auction?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I have no information about that, I never heard—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will look in the newspapers in Virginia he will find they are advertising them. Now, why not lop off some of these unnecessary expenses—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Now, I am making this inquiry of the gentleman, because for several years it seemed to some of us this appropriation ought to be curtailed, that their work ought to be finished. It will probably run on as long as we continue to make appropriations.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows it was a special act of Congress which directed this work to be done. Three years ago the gentleman in charge of the work guessed that it would cost in all not more

than \$20,000,000, and to-day, notwithstanding the increased cost of everything and the increased salaries, his opinion of it is in the same amount of \$20,000,000 that he prophesied three or four years ago. This work is to be completed, and his guess is that it will be entirely completed in two years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The opinion of many men, some of them railroad men, is that this is a valueless work, and that it is a waste of public money. That is the opinion that many men hold. I am inclined to think they are right and would like to see this business wound up some day. How many men are employed on this particular branch of the service now?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will try to give that to the gentleman in a moment. So far as the work is concerned this Congress directed the commissioners to do it. They have now spent \$13,766,000. Their field work is almost completed, and the whole work will be completed in a year and a half or two years. The total expenditure, according to those having to do with it, is that it will not exceed their original estimate of \$20,000,000. Therefore it seems to me the wise thing is for us to wind it up, so that if it is of any value we will not have wasted \$15,000,000 of appropriation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How does the commission get jurisdiction as to telephone and telegraph companies?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Why, the original act directed the valuation of telephone and telegraph supplies, and they have already completed the valuation of the Western Union line.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And that was included in that of railroads?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman, whether there was any argument on behalf of the commission in favor of the continuation of this work?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The commission takes just this position, that Congress directed them to do it, and they make no special plea for its continuation. They believe as it has been commenced it ought to be completed, in view of the fact that we have spent \$15,000,000, and if all this work is not to be thrown away we should complete it, but they make no special plea for it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And they have submitted to the committee that the work can be completed and ought to be completed in the year 1920?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. By January, 1920, they say their field work will be completed. This year the estimate is for little less than 800 employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington offers an amendment: Page 41, line 22, after the word "Columbia," strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$1,500,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, right in line with the argument which was presented in the discussion in reference to the physical valuation of railroads here is a chance for this House to lop off \$1,000,000 and do no harm. The statement was recently made on the floor that an effort will be made to recommit this bill in order to get a larger appropriation for the rehabilitation of soldiers—an additional million. If you want to pay that extra \$1,000,000, you can save it right here in the bill. It is agreed that this physical valuation is running out very thin. In my opinion it will amount to nothing more than a great mass of books and statistics of doubtful value. Right now the valuation commissioners are selling some of the cars that they used to go around to make these valuations. The valuations have been run down and there can not be much left to do. All they need is to have sufficient money to wind up and make reports on it. Here \$1,000,000 can be cut off. Save it. Here is your chance.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Washington, I desire to say that the appropriation for the current year was \$3,500,000—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And could be cut without—

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. This appropriation is for \$2,500,000. The only result of the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington would be that less work would be done and the work stretched out over a long period of years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Did not the gentleman in his argument say that they were doing this work just as Congress directed they should go ahead with the work—



Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; the gentleman misunderstood me then. They have an organization which, according to their plans, will enable them to complete this field work by January, 1920.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What about these private cars which have become more or less unpopular which were formerly used to haul a lot of experts around to make and remake this valuation? Let the House of Representatives show its authority and lop off \$1,000,000 and no harm will be done. I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. But the adoption of the amendment would simply mean a prolongation in the time of the work and delay the time in which it can be completed and would be uneconomical in my opinion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But would save a million and a half dollars, nevertheless.

Mr. WALSH. I move to strike out the section.

Mr. Chairman, this work has been going on for several years, and, as the gentleman says, Congress first recommended it, and it has continued for such a length of time that I do not see and neither have I been able to find out from any testimony that has ever been given before any committee, how the work when it is completed will be of any value to the authorities, the Interstate Commerce Commission having some jurisdiction over the railroads, or to any other department of the Government, or to the Congress in legislating in the future touching the railroads. All they pretend is that they have got some scheme whereby they can take valuations made in 1914 and bring them up to standard wages paid in 1921, when the work is hoped to be completed, and increased prices and cost of materials and equipment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH. But I do not see how, if we are going to continue this appropriation of millions of dollars year after year upon the plea that, "Well, we are almost finished now, and if you do not let us have \$2,000,000 this year or \$3,000,000 next year all we have spent heretofore will have been wasted."

I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Just a statement to the effect that this physical valuation has never yet been able to keep up with the wear and tear of railroad ties alone, to say nothing else.

Mr. WALSH. I submit, Mr. Chairman, it is better to charge off the \$13,000,000 or \$14,000,000 that have already been expended and to cease making appropriations of \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 annually to continue this work, when the end of it is not yet in sight, and particularly in view of the situation which now confronts the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. FESS. What is going to be the substantial value of the report when it comes in?

Mr. WALSH. I have just stated that I have not been able to ascertain from either the testimony of Mr. Prouty or any other member of the Interstate Commerce Commission what the value of this report is going to be when it is completed, if it ever is completed.

Mr. FESS. Could it be used as a basis for rate fixing?

Mr. WALSH. I certainly do not see how it could be used as the basis for rate fixing. It started in 1913 and 1914. The gentleman thinks it was in 1915, but I think he will find that a part of the work began in 1914, from a lump-sum appropriation. And I would like to ask the gentleman under what authority they undertake to value the telephone and telegraph property?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Under the original act.

Mr. WALSH. Under the basic act of February, 1887. Well, they have hitched that on as another alluring feature.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It was a special act authorizing this valuation.

Mr. WALSH. I was of the opinion that the special act authorizing railroad valuation did not comprehend telephones and telegraphs. But I trust that the House here will quit appropriating money by the millions annually for a work the nature of which seems to keep just a lap ahead of us year after year. Last year we were given to understand, if I recollect aright, that by 1920 we would have the end so near that we could almost grasp it. Now it has gotten up to 1921; next year it will be 1922, and so on.

I recall that in the State which I have the honor to represent in part, on the program of publishing the old Province laws, they started out with a modest appropriation and with an assurance that next year would see the completion of it, and that continued for 14 or 15 years, and every year they cut the appropriations, because the end would probably be reached in the next year. And this is parallel to that. They are trying to

value the railroads, and they will have a part of the valuation based upon 1914 prices and values, and part of it in 1921, and after we have got it it will be of no particular use. I trust we will just eliminate this \$2,500,000 and give the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] an opportunity to use that for his rehabilitation purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to strike out the section.

Mr. STAFFORD. It has never been reported, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WALSH: Page 41, line 11, strike out the section.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. It is not because I consider it necessary to do so, but because I think we owe it to the House to have a few words said to counteract some portion of the very considerable amount of misinformation which the gentleman has proceeded to give us in the last few moments.

As to the ultimate value of the work that is being done in the matter of valuation of the railroads of the country, that is a matter of opinion. There are folks who think that the information will be of little value. There are others who believe it will be of great value. I belong to the latter class. And while when the work was undertaken I had some doubts about its value, my belief in the value of the work has increased as time has passed and as I have familiarized myself with the work, and as I have tried to study and forecast the effect of it.

This work has been carried on systematically, energetically, in the main not extravagantly, and is nearing a conclusion. And great as the work is it will be concluded approximately within the sum originally estimated by the more intelligent of those who favored the appropriation in the beginning and had the courage to declare how much they thought it would cost. Of course there were some gentlemen who, approving the work, did not have the courage, or possibly the foresight or the judgment, to say what the cost would be. The work will cost somewhere between \$20,000,000 and \$21,000,000.

We have appropriated heretofore \$15,800,000. We are appropriating in this bill \$2,500,000, or in all, \$18,300,000 in round figures. The work in the field is very nearly completed. The work on the larger railway systems of the country is practically all completed in the field. The valuation figures are made with regard to quite a number of them. They have been submitted to the roads in some cases, and it is hoped that the work may be completely finished some time in 1921, possibly early in the year. In my opinion, while this work has cost much money, it is worth all that it has cost and more, providing we continue the work, and by continuing, keep pace with the changes and modifications and improvements and extensions, so that we may have for reference and information an estimate of the value of the railways of the country at any given moment of time.

Now, those values will be serviceable in fixing rates. They will be one of the useful factors in fixing rates; not the only factor. They will be of value locally in fixing assessments. Their value will be utilized in many lines. In my opinion we were well justified in entering upon the work, although I was not enthusiastic about it in the beginning. It has been carried out faithfully and well. It has been done intelligently and thoroughly. It is about to be completed. About one more appropriation and we shall see the work wound up, and shall have the benefits of the work, which I hope will be considerable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be reported.

The amendment was again read.

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:

For all authorized expenditures under the provisions of the act of February 17, 1911, "To promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," and amendment of March 4, 1915, extending "the same powers and duties with respect to all parts and appurtenances"



nances of the locomotive and tender," including such stenographic and clerical help to the chief inspector and his two assistants as the Interstate Commerce Commission may deem necessary, and for per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, \$288,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I did not ask for a division on the amendment to reduce the great sum asked for physical valuation of railroads. It was an effort to save a million dollars, and I felt it would be useless, for the reason that nearly all the paragraphs in the items in the sundry civil bill are the result of special appeals, pulls, and drags from the departments, the bureaus, and the commissions, which are the arms of the Government, that never weaken when it comes to reaching into Uncle Sam's money sack. That is their main business. I have no doubt whatever but that the House in appropriating \$2,500,000 to carry on this physical valuation of railroads is wasting a large sum of money. The valuations made in my part of the country some years ago were made on material that is now in the junk pile, and yet the valuations are going to appear in the figures and statistics some day.

It is the same way all through this bill. I feel the same as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], that there is something the matter with a great many of these items. We should all speak plainly, but we do not. There is a popular song that should be sung as this bill weaves its way through the House, and the title of that song is "Do Not Forget Me." [Laughter.] Why, the bureau chiefs themselves are around these doors singing that song—whispering, lobbying, and begging either to hold on the old appropriations or to get a little more. That is the trouble with regard to most of the items in the sundry civil bill. Deny it if you can. We are shortly to come to an item for money to buy more land for Potomac Park. That scheme should be cut in half. But it will not be. Somebody will be around here singing the song, "Do Not Forget Me."

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Has the gentleman examined the Book of Estimates and the particular information that this committee has had to deal with, and the amounts they have cut out? Has the gentleman examined how much the committee have reduced the estimates?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, yes. I give the committee full credit for making some reductions in the face of tremendous pressure. But as we increase departments and bureaus and commissions, we know how that pressure is bound to increase. Really, I am surprised that Members of the House are willing as committee men to work on this bill. As the bureaus and commissions continue to grow and continue to work their press agents and their pull, the work will be harder year after year. Too many people on the pay roll of the Government; too many bureau chiefs with fads and notions. Too much desire to have Uncle Sam do everything for everybody. Too much for Uncle Sam to do in the way of philanthropy, uplift, education, and reform for us ever to hope for governmental economy. I offer these amendments, but what is the use? But wait until the revenue bill begins to get in its work. Then there will be a change.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington withdraws his pro forma amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### LINCOLN MEMORIAL COMMISSION.

For expenses of dedicating the Lincoln Memorial, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, \$5,000, to be available immediately.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order on the item.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if that item is authorized by law?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The Lincoln Memorial was authorized by law, and the money here is intended to provide for its dedication.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. What is the money to be spent for? For the completion of the building? It may be spent for feeding the witnesses to the dedication. It might be expended for wine, if we did not have a dry law here. It might be expended on seats for somebody to see the spectacle.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. As a matter of fact, that is true. The Members of Congress, and the gentleman himself, will be invited, along with others. The Congress has expended that much money, and it is the custom to invite Members of Congress and the Supreme Court and other officials of the Government to see it dedicated.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I do not know if the Chair heard what was said by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood what the gentleman said as to the reason for the appropriation.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman from South Carolina said that the purpose of the appropriation was to build seats, so that the spectators might view the ceremonies of the dedication. He also said it was not a part of completing the building, and had nothing to do with the building. The Lincoln Memorial is a public building and, as is suggested, was authorized by law, and anything which tends to the completion of the building, of course, is entirely appropriate in this bill. But I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this item provides for an expenditure of money in connection with the dedication of the memorial and "for each and every purpose connected therewith."

It is quite clear that the appropriation has nothing to do with completing the building. It seems to me that as a matter of principle we ought not to be spending public money to provide spectacles for people. It would be just as legitimate to provide costumes for somebody to take part in a spectacle, or to perform a play or something else that would portray some incident in the life of Lincoln. I do not think it is proper.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman knows that it is customary to have ceremonies in the dedication of these great buildings. This is a building constructed out of a special appropriation, costing a very great deal of money, in honor of a very great man.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes; but is this spectacle that is proposed to be presented in honor of Lincoln, or is it just to afford pleasure to a lot of people, to go there and see it. It is not for the benefit of those who are going to be spectators, instead of being in honor of the great man who is gone? Are we not doing this for ourselves instead of for Lincoln? If we are, we ought not to do it. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that it is not authorized by law. It is not a part of completing the building, and it is not contemplated by the original statute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

On motion of Mr. KITCHIN, the committee rose; and Mr. CHASE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. FLOOD, 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. 16104) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### VICTORY LOAN.

Mr. KITCHIN, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported a bill (H. R. 16136) to amend the liberty-bond acts and the War Finance Corporation act, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and, with the accompanying report (No. 1131), ordered to be printed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves all points of order on the bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. I should like to state to the Members of the House that the report is printed and can be found on the desk by the door. I would be glad if Members would get copies and read it this afternoon or to-night.

Mr. BUTLER. When does the gentleman expect to call it up?

Mr. KITCHIN. I expect to call it up about 4 o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill, H. R. 16104, with Mr. FLOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

For scientific research, technical investigations, and special reports in the field of aeronautics, including the necessary laboratory and technical assistants; traveling expenses of members and employees; office supplies, printing, and other miscellaneous expenses, including technical periodicals and books of reference; equipment, maintenance, and operation of research laboratory and wind tunnel, and construction of additional buildings necessary in connection therewith; not to exceed \$1,500 for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle; personal services in the field and in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for clerical, drafting, watchmen, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed \$43,000; in all, \$175,000.



Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph just read. I have gone over the hearings, but I could not find any reference to the authorization for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That request was made last year, and I know it was discussed this year in the hearings, and I do not know why the gentleman can not find it. I can tell the gentleman the necessity for this. Langley Field is located 8 or 9 miles from a town. There is no street-car connection and no other public-vehicle service. During the war these men have been using an Army automobile as a general thing to go back and forth. They can do that no longer, and there is no way of getting out to the field except to walk. Their desire was that we authorize them to spend this amount for the purchase and maintenance of a machine, which would make it possible for them to get to that field.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 42, beginning with line 15, strike out the entire paragraph ending with line 6, page 43.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, there is no necessity for this appropriation at this time. What I am trying to do, as I stated when the Army appropriation bill was before the House, and the naval appropriation bill, and the Post Office appropriation bill, is to concentrate the aviation activities in one department.

I want to point out to you on what information the committee brings in this appropriation. Mr. Walcott testified, on page 95 of the hearings:

During the war the development of aeronautics has been very rapid, and we have probably in America to-day as high-grade fighting machines and engines as any country in the world.

Gentlemen, that witness is from now on entirely discredited, because that statement is absolutely incorrect.

The next witness, Col. Jesse G. Vincent, says:

I am very much afraid that the future of aeronautics is going to be jeopardized by a wholesome attempt to use the war machines, which are now available, for air-transport work. These machines have been built strictly for fighting and bombing purposes, and, while some of the larger day and night bombers can be adapted to certain kinds of commercial use, they will never be ideal; or, in other words, the best of these machines will fall far short of what could be accomplished by designing machines especially for commercial purposes.

Col. Vincent is the gentleman who has been telling you for the past 18 months that we had solved the problem of aerial navigation, because the Liberty motor was created and produced—the great miracle—a motor which was good for all purposes. Now that he is through with the Liberty motor, now that he has been exonerated by the President for any crimes committed by him, he comes in and says it is not advisable to use these war machines with his same motor, and so on. Was he telling the country a falsehood during the war, or is he right now? Col. Vincent, according to the investigation of Judge Hughes, was charged with misconduct and went pleading to the President in the last few days before the President sailed, when the President must have been extremely busy with other important matters, and he goes home with an exoneration. If he was innocent, why did he not go to trial before a court-martial? Of course the President has the power to pardon any person committing a crime, and he had the right to exercise that power in the case of Col. Vincent.

Then we have the Navy Department coming in, and the Navy admits that it is conducting its own experimental work, but says that they might make out of this a bureau.

The Smithsonian Institution and the Bureau of Standards have enough to do with their own work, and they can not properly develop aviation by just dabbling in it from time to time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know whether Col. Deeds will have anything to do with the expenditure of this money?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If he has anything to do with it, we had better cut it out.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that Col. Deeds is regarded by the War Department as a very able man in aviation?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Col. Deeds has received the clemency of the administration.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is using harsh terms, harsher than I should want to use. Col. Deeds was recommended for court-martial by Justice Hughes, and the De-

partment of Justice recommended that Col. Deeds be court-martialed, but the Secretary of War concluded that Col. Deeds was all right and said so at an interesting function in New York where Col. Deeds was present. I was wondering if we make this appropriation whether Col. Deeds will have anything to do with it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Because the House believed that Col. Deeds would do all that he said he would do it appropriated a billion dollars for aviation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That which Col. Deeds had to do with amounted to \$640,000,000, and he never put a fighting plane into France, yet the Secretary of War appeared delighted.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The Secretary of War is too honest and intelligent to be really delighted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Secretary of War is an intelligent man and seems to know the business of the department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks to extend his time five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In other words, the gentleman will not forget in discussing a matter of this kind, and which comes up from the Bureau of Standards, which is really doing efficient work for the Government, that when we were in the midst of a great war, when we had thousands of young fighters and aviators in France waiting for American machines for which Congress appropriated \$640,000,000, the boys did not get the machines.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The Hughes report, subsequently approved by the Attorney General, should have caused Col. Deeds to do one of two things—to waive immunity, go before a grand jury and tell all he knows or blow his brains out.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is still harsh. The Secretary of War whitewashed Col. Deeds, holding him to be a very creditable officer.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Let us not whitewash this item.

Mr. BUTLER. Who is Col. Deeds?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. He is the head of the Delco Lighting system, I believe.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the company that Col. Deeds is interested in the same company that Secretary of War Baker's brother was interested in, or are they two different companies?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman will find that Secretary Baker's brother was exonerated. He is eliminated from this discussion. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] attained a record in aviation of which he should be proud, and all Congress was proud of him while he was fighting in an Italian machine over in Austria, and I thought it fair to consider in his statement of facts, that Congress had performed its duty toward the aviators, that it had appropriated \$640,000,000 to provide for the American boys, and that it was lost largely through mismanagement.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Congress was generous, but the Packard Co. got the fruits of the generosity. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Was the commendation of the Secretary of War after the investigation of Col. Deeds?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It was.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman does not know whether the Secretary of War was cognizant of all the facts?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am confident that the President was not cognizant of all the facts when he granted executive clemency. It was hardly fair to ask the President in those trying days. He was the busiest man in this country.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I can answer the gentleman from Texas in a few words. A gentleman by the name of Borglum presented certain charges to the President of the United States which the President did not fully indorse. The President apparently did not want to involve the Nation in any scandal. But Mr. Borglum was a very persistent person, and insisted that there were certain gentlemen concerned in aviation who were working for their own benefit. The President appointed Justice Hughes—

Mr. HARDY. I know all those facts.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The President appointed former Justice Hughes as the head of a committee to investigate—

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman is not answering my question.



Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And that committee discovered that a vast amount of money had been expended, but not for combat planes in France.

Mr. HARDY. Oh, I think the gentleman has told us that himself three or four times.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then Justice Hughes came along with his report, in which he recommended that Col. Deeds be court-martialed. That report went to Mr. Gregory, the Attorney General, and the Attorney General sustained the report of Justice Hughes and said yes, Col. Deeds ought to be court-martialed—

Mr. HARDY. Has not the gentleman told us that before?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And that went to the War Department, and the War Department finally whitewashed Col. Deeds, with the sanction of the Secretary of War. Subsequently they gave Col. Deeds a dinner, and they all got around the table and sang "For he's a jolly good fellow," and that was the end of our \$640,000,000. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this in reply to the gentleman's amendment, that the purpose of this board is to continue the scientific investigations in connection with aviation. The result of the continuance of that simply means this: That instead of the Army having an investigation of its own and the Navy having an investigation of its own, and the Bureau of Standards a scientific investigation, under this board which has been appointed, representatives of each of these services being on the board, this investigation will be continued. The board asked for an appropriation of \$325,000 for the next year, and the committee has recommended in the bill an appropriation of \$175,000. That will enable the board to go on with this investigation in order to devise means which will best adapt aeroplanes to civil purposes.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Can the chairman of the committee give us any assurance that by the adoption of this section of the bill providing for this appropriation, it will cut off the experiment in the War Department and in the Navy Department and in the marine department? The gentleman will remember that in the military appropriation bill they asked for \$10,000,000 for just this character of work.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Not for this character of work, because that question was specifically asked of the officials, Admiral Taylor and other representatives of the departments, and it is in connection with scientific investigation of air currents and things of that kind, which should be investigated, if we are to develop this particular branch of the service. It is in the line of concentrating this work instead of having money spent by each bureau and in line with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] desires.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman knows that I am entirely in sympathy with concentrating this work.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. This is a good start. To do the work that the gentleman indicates \$175,000 is not a drop in the bucket. They need at least \$5,000,000 to carry out this work. We have given \$15,000,000 to the Navy—

Mr. BUTLER. How many millions to the Navy?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Fifteen million dollars.

We took ten off, and \$15,000,000 to the Army. They are going to do this work. As I said the other day, when the postal bill was under consideration, we have got to starve these people into reason, and by cutting out the appropriation they will get together and stop this opposition that exists between the Army and the Navy and the Post Office Department.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The appropriations to which the gentleman refers were not for this specific purpose—scientific investigation—and the result of defeating this would simply mean that in addition to these appropriations now provided for the Army and the Navy and the Post Office Service we would have an additional bureau for scientific investigation in each one of them, and this is really in line with economy.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Does not the gentleman think that out of \$30,000,000 they could devote a part to carrying on that work, at least \$175,000?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It would not be done, because it was not asked for that purpose. It is not included in their request.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to heckle the gentleman, but I desire him to answer me this question. Will this enable the two military forces to do away with their appropriations for such purposes? Will these people be able to do that work?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. For scientific investigation. There is no reason why this board should not concentrate this work, but it would not enable them to do away with investigation under the \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000, which may have been for constructive purposes.

Mr. BUTLER. But for the purpose set out in this paragraph?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The purpose of it is to do that.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Is not the purpose of this appropriation for scientific investigation that is common to all branches of the service, whether the Army, or the Navy, or the Post Office Department, or commercial, or any other?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Exactly, the gentleman has correctly stated the proposition.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say just a word about this. I hold no brief for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, but the reason given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] for striking this out seems to me not to be one which would justify that action. He says he is very anxious to create a unified air service, and, therefore, he wants to hitch all of the various air services which may exist in the Government in order to force them some day to accept his viewpoint—a viewpoint as to the wisdom of which there has been a great deal of controversy, not only here but in England and other countries where they have air service. For my part I am not very much concerned about creating an independent, additional service to grow to be as big and as expensive as the Army and the Navy service.

But this particular work of this board, which was created in order to deal with scientific matters that related to air navigation, did not pertain particularly to the Army or the Navy or any special phase of air navigation, but the whole problem. Now, it may be that its work does not justify its existence. If that be so the committee can strike it out, but to say you want to strike it out for the purpose of forcing somebody to come to a conclusion that we ought to have a unified air service seems to me to be following a predilection instead of a reason. These people are in touch with scientists in regard to a great many developments in connection with the air service and with the knowledge of the air and the currents of air, with problems that are truly scientific as contradistinguished from problems of construction and of type. That is the reason they came into existence; that is the reason they are urging for continuing in existence.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Can the gentleman give one specific scientific problem that was solved by this board during the time of its existence?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know that I could give it offhand, but I think they could give quite a few; but if the gentleman is opposing it on the ground that the work is inefficient and therefore they have no reason to exist, all right; but when a gentleman states his reason is because he is going to take a crack at everything related to aviation until he can force what he believes to be an ideal unified air service I disagree with him.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But the gentleman will agree that we want to stop waste and produce something?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I think I have spent some little time since I have been a Member of the House in trying to stop waste.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Can the gentleman inform me if this committee has constructed a wind tunnel as yet?

Mr. SHERLEY. They have not, I think—

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Have they absolutely anything to show in two years—

Mr. SHERLEY. They are now building that wind tunnel. They have been doing work, they have got a very small one, and they are building a large one, but they have done work with the small one. Now, we have the hearings and reports, and if the gentleman wants it I will be glad to turn them over to him so he can go into the report of the details as to their expenditures. Then after the gentleman has read that carefully, knowing he is an authority on the matter, if he will come back and say their work is absolutely worthless, I, for my part, will vote with him.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I will say this, we have more reports and more papers on aviation in this country and less to show for it than any country in the world.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is probably true, and probably one reason is that people do not read them. I suggest that the gentleman read this particular one and give it the benefit of



his special knowledge on the subject, and I am perfectly sincere in saying to him that if he says the work they are doing and have done is worthless I will agree with him to vote to strike it out. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

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

On a division (demanded by Mr. LA GUARDIA) there were—ayes 4, yeas 17.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ROCK CREEK AND POTOMAC PARKWAY COMMISSION.

To enable the commission created by section 22 of the public buildings act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stats. L., p. 885), to continue proceedings toward the acquisition of lands required for a connecting parkway between Potomac Park, the Zoological Park, and Rock Creek Park, \$250,000, to be available until expended and to be payable one-half out of the Treasury of the United States and one-half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the total area of lands finally to be acquired for said parkway shall not exceed the area and parcels described and delineated in the map No. 2, contained in House Document No. 1114 of the Sixty-fourth Congress, first session: *Provided further*, That the expenditure of the funds appropriated herein shall be subject to all the conditions imposed by the sundry civil appropriation act approved July 1, 1916.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 43, line 14, after the word "Park," strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$150,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, there is a chance for the House to save a few cents.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

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

On a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington) there were—ayes 8, yeas 22.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee where this land is to be acquired?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It connects Rock Creek Park with Potomac Park, following and going under the Connecticut Avenue Bridge up to Georgetown, and joins the Potomac Park there.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Well, is there any particular street or road involved? It speaks of a connecting parkway. I would like to know whether there is any particular street there?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, he will recall that several years ago there was a detailed report made as to the area to be embraced in this connecting link of the two parkways, and that was approved by the Congress and a small appropriation made. From year to year the commissioners and the people in Washington have urged that this work ought to be more rapidly pushed and this desirable connection be had at an earlier date, but the committee has felt that while it was desirable to go forward and not abandon a project that meets the approval of Congress and of those acquainted with it, that we ought not to go forward too rapidly, and we have carried a small sum from year to year with the idea that as fast as the property could be properly acquired at the figures set in the report that the money might be available. It is not a new scheme. I will say to the gentleman; it is one that has been thoroughly thrashed out and authorized, and it is simply a part of the general park scheme of the city of Washington.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is there any reason on earth why we could not wait a few years when we are appropriating all this money? Have not these people got enough parks?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think there is no good reason why we should refuse to make any sort of appropriation. The matter was authorized a number of years ago. The advocates of it believe we have been very slow as it is. And this commission has been making very careful inquiries into values and securing options within the price that was fixed in order to avoid condemnation proceedings. It is simply a question of policy. If the Congress wants to stop all sort of park work, this as well as other park work could stop. But I do not think the committee has been extravagant in its recommendations. I think

we have been very conservative in connection with it, and after five years the extent of expenditure on this work seems to me to have been very moderate.

Now, that is simply a matter of judgment. The gentleman can say whether he believes we ought to stop any part of the development or not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I say this, that I doubt if we will ever be able to give the people of the District of Columbia anywhere near enough parks to satisfy them as long as they have real estate to sell.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think that may be true; but I do not think because you can not satisfy the unreasonable people that you should not satisfy the reasonable ones. I am not being controlled in my judgment because somebody wants to do something that is extreme and absurd. The park problem has been carefully considered and approved by Congress.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. TILSON. Are we protected in any way from abnormal rise in the price of this land we must have, or is there any assurance that we shall be able to get hold of all this land that is necessary in due time except at an exorbitant figure?

Mr. SHERLEY. There is a limit of cost, as I recall it, of \$1,300,000, and the purchases that have been made have been made on the average lower than the assessment and estimate upon which that limit of cost was made.

Mr. TILSON. Is there anything to prevent a holdup on any part of this line up and down Rock Creek that would prevent us from paying an exorbitant figure for it?

Mr. SHERLEY. We have a right to condemn, and I have to assume that the gentlemen who were carrying out the authorization in the act of Congress are protecting the Government, and each year when they make purchases out of the moneys that have been appropriated for it we make careful inquiries as to the price at which they have taken the options and the money that has been spent.

Mr. TILSON. I think that we ought to have it, and I was just wondering if we were protected against exorbitant prices.

Mr. SHERLEY. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Treasury are on the commission, and while it is true that they necessarily rely on Col. Ridley, or who happens to be the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds, I do not know anything that would warrant the belief that this money is not being spent for property at its fair and proper value.

Mr. TILSON. How much has been appropriated?

Mr. SHERLEY. In 1917, \$50,000; in 1918, \$100,000; in 1919, \$150,000. That would make \$300,000.

Mr. TILSON. And this would make \$550,000?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Can the gentleman inform the House the average price per acre for this land in the past?

Mr. SHERLEY. I wish we could buy it on an acre basis.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is not fit for building purposes or agricultural purposes. All it is good for is park purposes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think the gentleman is mistaken as to a part of that. A part of it is fit for building, and it was because it was not wanted to have it built up that this parkway plan was approved.

Now, I simply submit to the House that here is a project that had the very careful consideration of a previous Congress. The price that it should cost was determined upon after a very elaborate investigation. I personally made two fights against including in this area land which I did not think was necessary, and which the commission voted against, but which various people wanted to put in. They have not succeeded. Whether they will in the future or not I do not know. But I do believe in the Nation's Capital it is proper to connect the Potomac Driveway with Rock Creek Park; and while I am not willing ever to spend any money for any property at a false value, I think the history of park development in the cities of America will bear out the general statement that the mistakes that have been made in acquiring park areas have been mistakes because of the refusal of a community to go forward, and if they had gone forward in a bolder way in the beginning the cost would have been very much less to the community. I am personally in favor of parks for cities. I favor this driveway.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman will admit that a great deal of this—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five additional minutes.

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



Mr. KNUTSON. I dare say that 75 per cent of the land in Rock Creek Park would be designated as waste land out in the West. I do not know about the East.

Mr. SHERLEY. That may be.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is fit for nothing but park purposes.

Mr. SHERLEY. It might be perfectly proper to condemn it as waste land situated there, but not proper to designate it as waste land situated here.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman will agree that land that is not fit for anything but park purposes is partly waste land.

Mr. SHERLEY. I say that land that is fit for park purposes in a community is far from being waste land. It is a question as to what the gentleman considers waste. I do not believe man lives by bread alone, and I believe there is scriptural warrant for that belief.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the discussion just had indicates how easy it is to criticize the committee with limited or partial knowledge of a subject. Six years ago the Congress determined to buy more of the land between the Zoo and the Potomac River along Rock Creek, with a view of extending the Rock Creek Park to the Potomac and improving that parkway, so that there would be a continuous park from the head of Rock Creek to the end of the peninsula of East Potomac Park. One million three hundred thousand dollars was placed as the limit of cost. That is six years ago.

Of course when Congress determined to take those lands over they were no longer useful; they were no longer salable for ordinary purposes. For six years we have been holding the owners of those lands in a position where they could not dispose of their holdings. We certainly are not likely to secure the lands any more cheaply by reason of holding them year after year out of use. Some of the lands are usable for residence purposes, and some of them have been used for those purposes. But having entered upon the development of this park we should carry it forward as rapidly as may be consistent with the interests of the Treasury and other activities. We have gone very slowly up to this time. In six years we have appropriated \$300,000.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Have you bought in occasional tracts or have you tried to buy as you go?

Mr. MONDELL. The commission handling the matter has bought tracts as they could buy at what they considered reasonable prices, and up to date they have purchased what they have purchased for something less than the assessed value; a little below the assessed value. Of course the commission has not started at one end or the other end and refused to buy any property that was offered unless they could buy all of the property in the section. That would not be a wise policy. We are obliged to purchase all that property. We can condemn all or any part of the property at any time, but it is not wise to condemn unless it becomes necessary. In the meantime it is wise to buy here, there, or elsewhere any tract that is offered at what is considered a reasonable price within the limit of cost.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. What are the prospects of our getting a sufficient amount as would make a physical connection between Potomac Park, so that we can get a road between them in the near future?

Mr. MONDELL. I think we could buy most of the property now at a reasonable price if we were to appropriate the money for it. A million dollars was asked for this work this year.

That is for the purchase of land and improvement. The committee limited the amount to \$250,000, and yet certain gentlemen who are not fully informed on the subject think the committee is subject to criticism for having gone that far.

Mr. TILSON. I should rather think it would be the other way.

Mr. MONDELL. I think perhaps the committee should be criticized for not having gone further in this matter.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Has not the gentleman noticed that that park road is already marked on the map and needs only to be reworked in order to make connection between the two points?

Mr. MONDELL. We can not, of course, make any improvements on the park until we have acquired all the land. The gentleman will realize that, and after the sum contained in this bill is appropriated, \$750,000 will have to be appropriated be-

fore we begin to improve the park. If we appropriate further at the rate in this bill it will take four years to secure the land. It seems to me we are not moving along too rapidly. As a matter of fact we are subject to some criticism that we are not moving more rapidly, in view of the fact that only half of this money is to come out of the Federal Treasury, the other half coming out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SHIPPING BOARD.

For five commissioners, at \$7,500 each; secretary, \$5,000; in all, \$42,500.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, no subject is so fraught with concern for the United States at the present time as that of the construction of ships and the transportation of troops and supplies. We want to get our boys home. Therefore we ought to have ship bottoms in which to bring them. We want to transport American products. Therefore we ought to have sufficient ships.

But one of the difficulties at this time arises from the fact that we are not yet ready with American ships to do our business as it ought to be done. That is one reason why our boys are lingering on the other side when they ought to be home. Another reason for delay is that much space that might be utilized in carrying this human freight is devoted to carrying supplies for the people on the other side of the water.

We passed an appropriation here recently evincing the friendly disposition of the Congress of the United States toward the people in distress abroad. It carried \$100,000,000 for food supplies. I presume Mr. Hoover will be authorized to spend that money. A few days ago we passed another bill, which proposed to make good the President's guaranty of the food price that involved, or is supposed to involve before we get through with it, a billion dollars—certainly an evidence of our desire to do the right thing—and this apart from the fact that we have involved ourselves more deeply in obligations and indebtedness than the people of the United States have ever been involved before, in order to show good faith with the people on the other side.

I hope Mr. Hurley may be able to make good on his shipping program. Sometimes I question whether he will. There is a controversy now between Mr. Hurley and the marine insurance companies of the United States. While some of us have been thinking for a long time that the preference was in favor of foreign bottoms as against American shipping, Mr. Hurley, who was abroad and fraternizing with our allies and their shipping masters, appears to have come to the conclusion that some preference has been given by marine insurance companies to our foreign competitors. That controversy is now pending.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in protecting the United States. I believe in protecting the industries of the United States. I wish we had shipping enough on our own account to take care of the business of the United States, but notwithstanding our expenditures it appears we have not. We have appropriated millions, hundreds of millions, yea, billions of dollars to build ships during the war. We do not yet have the ships. We are making all kinds of dickers with foreign nations concerning ships. We have been told that our shipping expenses have grown so great that rather than account for them in ships the president of the Shipping Board is going to wipe out \$1,000,000,000 that we have appropriated for the purpose of constructing ships. That may have gone into the "know-how," it may have gone into wasteful fields, it may have been extravagantly spent, it may have been spent under pressure of war without the results that we have expected in peace times. I know not, but the story is that we are wiping out \$1,000,000,000 of the money we have appropriated for this purpose by mere departmental edict.

On Washington's Birthday in Paris there was a dinner attended by a number of Americans, some very distinguished men. They were over there speaking for us, telling the people on the other side of the water what they thought we ought to do, notwithstanding the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations recently brought in a very large deficiency bill, and notwithstanding that we shall come in from the Ways and Means Committee to-morrow with another bill to provide for another \$7,000,000,000 to take care of our friends on the other side of the water as well as ourselves. These Americans on the other side, some of them official and some not—what do they say by



way of pledging the Congress of the United States to do certain things? Oh, they get very philanthropic. They have broad ideas. They visualize the world. There are no limitations to their eloquence nor to their promises.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended five minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. One of the gentlemen at this dinner was Mr. Herbert Hoover, a gentleman who normally lives in England, whose home is in Kensington, London, but who has been given great credence by the President of the United States and who has attained a world-wide celebrity because of his charitable and philanthropic disposition. He is a man of extraordinary ability. We concede all that; but he is like a number of other gentlemen who, when they have the power to dispense other people's money, are extremely liberal. Hence \$100,000,000 for food-supply administration in the United States. And another \$100,000,000 to keep up the work and another \$100,000,000 to spend in Europe. And, incidental to it all, but greater than it all, \$100,000,000,000 to guarantee the food prices in the United States, which in the last analysis means we must either keep up the price to the consumer in the United States, when the price is reduced one-half abroad, or the Treasury of the United States, which means taxes paid by the people of the United States, must make up the difference. We passed that billion-dollar bill the other day. It is hung up in another body. It may stay there indefinitely. I do not know. But here is what Mr. Hoover, in the exuberance of after-dinner oratory, suggests that we of the United States should do:

Before the war—  
he says—

the supply of food in Europe was sufficient to last six months. But European production was never at such a low ebb as at present.

He presents a beautiful picture for us.

It has practically stopped. The situation, however, is not desperate.

Oh, it may be that some people are begging for food in New York, as was stated on this floor a little while ago. It may be that returning soldiers in uniform who have reached New York are penniless and without food, but Mr. Hoover says the situation in Europe is "not desperate."

Conflicting ideas, we hope, will be removed, and that the good, common sense which helped the father of our country to conduct the destinies of our country through troublous times will enable his successor—

That is our present President, who is coming home to-day—

Mr. BUTLER. He is home already.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He is home already. I accept the amendment—

will enable his successor—

Woodrow Wilson—

to help guide the world out of its present predicament.

Get the full force of that. George Washington, the Father of his Country, is applauded by Herbert Hoover, but equal or greater applause goes to that modern President of the United States who is "to help guide the world out of its present predicament." That is the job set for the Congress of the United States if it supports the President of the United States as Mr. Hoover interprets it. We are to "help the world out of its predicament." We have got into a pretty big predicament ourselves, and we will be generations, aye, centuries getting out of the predicament in which we find ourselves now, and into which we will go deeper to-morrow when we pass this new \$7,000,000,000 bond bill. But the Hoover picture comes in from Paris and is spread abroad over the world to illustrate the altruism of our people, who are to labor and starve in order that the whole world, which has had trouble from the beginning, is to be helped out of its predicament. That is the job Mr. Hoover sets down for us.

But he is not the only one. Our returning ambassador, Mr. Sharp, formerly a Member of this House, for whom we all have high personal respect, followed Mr. Hoover in this discussion. What did he say? Ah, here is the feeling that is being spread over Europe as to the duty of the United States with regard to this foreign situation:

All jealousy—

says Mr. Sharp—

should disappear between nations. Food is needed badly in certain countries. The question which should be uppermost in the statesmen's minds should be to carry food where it is needed. No feelings—

That is, no feelings about this future indebtedness, no feelings of our predicament, no feelings about the soldier boys we have contributed—

should be expressed because certain countries, owing to circumstances and transportation facilities—

Referring to our shipping which we have not got—

are able to float foodstuffs more promptly, thereby reaping quicker benefits than the others.

That is to say, that if England can float foodstuffs quicker than we can and profit thereby we are not to complain. No; they are to have their way and we are to bear the burden.

The end alone—

Continues the ambassador—the American ambassador—must be considered, and this is helping needy brothers.

Yes; go on, ye men at the hoe, ye men at the harrow, ye men at the plow, ye men at the mill, ye men at the factory in the United States, go on. It is your duty to plod forever and forever, to tax yourselves with burden upon burden, in order that this altruistic dream may be made good.

We are to go on striving to help our needy brothers—those from every clime, of every color, of every race, no matter how many centuries they have fought with each other nor how intricate and difficult their problems. We must all strive. Our Americans are striving through the ambassador toward a better world, without envy or jealousy. It is the duty levied upon us. And such is the dream of several of our great leaders, several of our great national figures, and supporting them are headlines on the front pages of metropolitan newspapers teaching us to be patient, to be generous, to pursue our daily labors, in order that the world may be relieved of its troubles.

Just how does it work in practice? Here is an everyday letter from a practical everyday business concern, the N. & G. Taylor Co., of Philadelphia, which sets out that the War Industries Board of the United States, made up of dollar-a-year men during the war, fixed the price of tin plate in the United States at somewhere about 72½. The world price has gone down to 54, and we are holding the price up against our own people. Shall we continue to permit our competitors to make tin plate, while we attempt to keep in the running at extravagant figures and furnish them food besides. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert some of these letters in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to insert letters in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We passed a billion-dollar food-guaranty bill the other day.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Is not the gentleman aware that he is inviting and subjecting himself to the charge of being a little American because he is speaking of American rights?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; but I have no fear of being called a little American when I stand on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. But will they hold you up?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think they will. I think enough people remain in the United States to sustain American principles. I think when we show them that the hand of every other fellow is down to his elbow in our pockets, taking away from us to enrich themselves, we can make them understand it. I think when we come to show that our house has been invaded, our domesticity has been disturbed, our homes and factories have been gutted, and that others are reaping the benefit of it we can bring them back to their senses.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent to proceed with the reading of this letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to finish the reading of the letter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Reserving the right to object, how long is the letter.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It will not take over five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Can not the gentleman save time by putting it in the Record?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert these letters in the Record. That is what I want to do. They will speak for themselves.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman already has that permission.

The letters are as follows:

**TIN-PLATE MEN COMPLAIN.**

N. & G. TAYLOR CO. (INC.),  
MANUFACTURERS OF TIN PLATE,  
Philadelphia, January 9, 1919.

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

Subject: Arbitrary action of War Industries Board in connection with the pig tin situation.

DEAR SIR: The pig tin committee of the War Industries Board arranged in an interallied agreement for the purchase of a quota of pig tin for this country. All arrangements were distinctly a war measure, and a quantity of pig tin was bought, on the authority of the War Industries Board, for American consumers, and the medium through which this pig tin was brought to this country was the Steel Products Co. (the export end of the United States Steel Corporation).

We are led to believe that the questionnaire sent out by the War Industries Board, and the data secured by them, were neither complete nor thorough, and, based on certain incomplete figures which they procured, they proceeded to buy for this country from 10,000 to 12,000 tons of Straits pig tin at a Government cost to the consumer of 72½ cents per pound. With the cessation of hostilities—in fact, prior to that—the open-market price of pig tin started to fall, and the present open-market price is something less than 54 cents, as against a Government monopoly price of 72½ cents.

The War Industries Board insists that the American consumers be forced to use this 72½-cent pig tin, and consume the entire quantity before they will allow the American consumers to benefit by the open-market price of the world. In other words, the consumer has to carry the burden, and it is this very un-American plan of forced monopoly, insisted on by Mr. Armsby, that we wish to call to your attention as a serious menace to our industry.

We are asked to compete with the tin-plate markets of the world for export trade. The British manufacturers have access to lower costs of pig tin; the American manufacturer has not. When pig tin was being bought at 72½ cents the fixed price of finished tin plate was \$7.75. The Government insists on holding up the cost of the raw material to 72½ cents, and has allowed the price of the finished tin plate to go to \$7.35.

We believe that the purchase of these 10,000 tons of pig tin through the United States Steel Products Co. should be looked on as a war measure. No longer is need evident for tin regulation, and the sooner a free market is established the better. The logical solution is to let down at once the bars on imports. The loss incurred on the tin now held by the Steel Products Co. should be charged to profit and loss account of the war, and not be borne as a burden by the American manufacturer.

No redress is seemingly to be secured through the War Industries Board, who naturally are loath to go to Congress and ask for the assumption on the part of the Government of the four or five million dollars represented by the difference between the cost of the pig tin they bought and the present market. We have had letters from a number of tin-plate manufacturers agreeing with our position, and we urge you to give your attention to this situation, which has been given considerable publicity in the trade papers, noticeably, the authority on the subject, the American Metal Market, published by Charles S. Trench, editor, New York City, who would be very glad to give you such further data as you might require.

The injustice of the situation is so apparent that we beg your careful consideration and action.

Very truly, yours,

N. & G. TAYLOR CO. (INC.),  
WILLIAM W. JUSTICE, Jr.,  
Vice President.

**COMPETITION IN WHEAT PRODUCTS.**

Operating the only automatic pretzel plants in the world. Capacity 16,000,000 pounds per annum.

AMERICAN PRETZEL COMPANY,  
Philadelphia, Pa., February 10, 1919.

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

DEAR SIR: On behalf of myself and others among your constituents I am writing to call your attention to the guaranteed price on wheat and sugar obtaining in this country and the injury this may bring to the American manufacturers brought in competition with South America and Europe.

Unless the Government places a high tariff on the imported product and allows a draw-back on exporting, the baker can not hope to compete with European manufacturers. Under normal conditions the cracker bakers of England were able to sell large quantities of crackers in this country. Under present conditions they could come over here and undersell any cracker baker in the United States.

This alone is a most serious matter but when combined with the high taxes proposed for 1918-19 would tend to be disastrous to the cracker baking industry.

Flour and sugar are the principal raw materials used by the cracker bakers and if they are forced to pay a minimum price as high as existed during war times they will have difficulty in carrying on their business when the price of other foodstuffs is permitted to be responsive to the laws of supply and demand.

Asking that you give this your serious consideration, we are,

Yours, very truly,

AMERICAN PRETZEL COMPANY.

**CAPTURING THE AUTO TRADE.**

From the Barley Motor Car Co., Kalamazoo, Mich., comes the following letter from its agent in London, England:

"So that you may be absolutely conversant with the situation here and will not expect the impossible, I am going to outline to you just what is happening here at the present moment.

"As you know the Government controls all importations; motor cars are on the prohibited list and can only be imported on special licenses. My customers have been trying now for six weeks to get a license but so far without success. I called at the Government department dealing with the matter myself and found that they were not prepared to

make any statement as to when the prohibition on motor cars would be withdrawn. It is strongly rumored, however, that the Government intends to continue this prohibition in force for at least a year and possibly two years, as by law they can control imports for three years after peace is signed.

"The policy of the Government in power is to exclude all American manufactured articles either by absolute prohibition or by a high tariff. While, of course, the regulations are not aimed at America especially, we all know that America is the only country which will be affected, because we are the only people who are in position to supply. Of course you can not blame the British for wanting to give their industries a chance to get on their feet before being subjected to our competition, but, on the other hand, it is mighty poor return for our assistance in winning the war to do everything possible to eliminate us from England and the British colonial markets and this is just what is being done.

"It is not necessary now to get export licenses for practically anything unless they go to countries bordering on Germany. In other words, the whole scheme is 'speed up English exports and block American imports.' This is the policy of the Government as far as I can find out. There is, however, a strong body of opinion in this country, including the Labor Party, which feel that a high protective tariff would be a disaster for the country and I do not think the Government are going to have it all their own way in dealing with the matter. Nobody knows what to do or how to act until the policy of the Government is determined, consequently all propositions which are based on supplies from America are hanging fire for the moment until Parliament meets after the first of the year and we know where we are at. The situation in France is very much the same.

"It is quite possible that we may do a very fine business in England; on the other hand it is equally possible that it will be out of the question to get a single car into this country for some time to come.

"I have followed the situation very carefully and I think the above is a fair outline of the position as it exists at the moment.

"I was told the other day by a manufacturer that he had been approached by a representative of the British ministry of munitions, who submitted to him an article now being made in the United States. He was asked if he could make it, and on his replying that he could he was told that if he would manufacture on a quantity basis the Government would see that none were allowed to be imported from America. As the manufacturer told me this himself, and as it is quite likely they will do it with others if they will do it with one, it gives a better idea of the situation than any other instance I have run across.

"As I said before, if conditions will allow it we are sure to do a good business on Roamer cars and chassis, as the market is starved for cars and could easily absorb all the cars which could be made in this country under the most favorable conditions for the next five years. The British Isles have approximately one-half the population of the United States but they only have one-twentieth as many cars in use. This gives an idea as to the capacity of the market when given full freedom of development.

"I have written you at some length because I do not want you to be disappointed if nothing matures."

**COAL-TRADE SHIPPING.**

THE WHOLESALE COAL TRADE ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK (INC.),  
New York, February 8, 1919.

DEAR SIR: You and your constituents are interested in developing the foreign trade of this country.

This is being restricted by the governmental control of bottoms which may be used for that purpose.

This is true with respect to all lines of business, but especially as to coal.

Will you give your consideration to the inclosed resolution and lend the weight of your influence by indorsing it in a personal interview with or letter to the Shipping Board?

Respectfully, yours,

CHAS. S. ALLEN, Secretary.

Whereas the armistice has checked the movement of our armies and munitions across the ocean and has thereby released a large number of vessels for commercial purposes; and

Whereas the past and present restrictions and regulations on shipping present great difficulties to the exporter and have led to the loss of much business in the past, and will continue to do so: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Wholesale Coal Trade Association of New York that all vessels not actually required for the movement of troops, munitions, and present food supplies be forthwith returned to private ownership and control, to the end that the usual view of supply and demand be given full operation and business be once more reinstated on a normal basis.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in connection with the appropriation made for the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and I do it because the amounts are so large that I am not willing that the House should pass them without consideration. Before undertaking to tell you something of the amounts of money that have been appropriated heretofore for the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the amount of \$660,000,000 carried in this bill, I desire to call attention to the situation that confronted the Congress in the past and that now confronts it in connection with the emergency shipping fund.

Members will recall the situation that confronted the world, and confronted America; in connection with shipping as a result of the German submarine warfare, and it is important that we should remember these matters in considering what is reported to the committee now and what has been done in the past.

One great cry that went up all over the world from the leading nations fighting Germany was for ships. There were many anxious weeks and anxious months when men wondered whether the combined energy of the world would be sufficient to produce ships as fast as the submarines of the Germans were destroying them. And unless we could reduce the destruction or in-



crease our output to more than make it good, it was apparent that it was only a question of time when Germany would be successful in her war. Therefore pressure was brought to bear all over the world, and particularly in this country after our entrance into the war, for the building of ships, ships, and more ships. The very large authorizations that were made in connection with the shipping program were made in the last sundry civil bill, although there had been prior to that a sum authorized to be expended in shipping construction that was way beyond anything that this country had ever dreamed of putting into shipbuilding.

Last May the Shipping Board came before the Committee on Appropriations with a program as of date April 30, which called for a very great enlargement of the building and requisition program, a program that contemplated the acquiring of about 18,300,448 dead-weight tons of shipping by requisition, purchase, and construction; this total embracing steel, wood, and concrete ships numbering 3,425, at a cost for the ships only then estimated at \$3,423,713,218.

It is well to recall that in March the great German drive started. It continued for many weeks. There were days and days here when we wondered whether the next day's news might not show us a complete breaking of the allies' lines and the taking of the channel ports and the capture of Paris. Everybody realized what either of those events must mean to the allied cause. So it was that the American program for the movement of troops, and consequently for ships, underwent a very great expansion. As a result of that expansion officials of the Fleet Corporation came to Congress and asked for very large additional sums in cash and in authorizations particularly as to troop ships. Congress voted those sums. It voted them without division. There was not a man in Congress as I recall, House or Senate, who ever challenged the wisdom of voting those huge sums, and I doubt if any man who had undertaken to very seriously oppose the appropriation of those sums would have been in very great favor with the people of America. He would likely have been burned in effigy, if nothing worse happened to him, and that was because of a then tremendous, pressing, compelling need that the people of America recognized and proposed to supply, no matter if it did cost billions of dollars. We voted the Emergency Fleet Corporation these huge sums, and it went ahead to carry out that program. How efficiently and how economically it was carried out is another story, and a story that can not be told here in five minutes, or 10 minutes, or in an hour's speech, and a story concerning which we probably have not sufficient data now to fully arrive at a correct conclusion. That there has been great extravagance, and that there has been great waste in many, many particulars, I have not the slightest doubt, and I do not think the country has the slightest doubt. As to how far the costs could have been reduced is a question about which men will differ. There were many things that served to increase the cost. The labor situation in the country was anything but ideal, and we did not have the skilled people to carry out such a program as this. From the standpoint of economy, such a program could not have been justified. The only justification that can possibly be made for the size of the program for shipbuilding that this country undertook was the need from a military and national standpoint that I have tried very briefly to portray. No nation could suddenly undertake to expand its shipbuilding industry to the extent that we undertook to do it and hope to accomplish it economically and efficiently, but there were a lot of things that we had to do in those days of stress when we could not count the cost and this was one of them.

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

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. We have authorized in previous bills an expenditure of \$3,903,500,000 in the way of ship construction and those things that were related to it; \$2,884,000,000 was for building ships ourselves—I mean as contradistinguished from requisitioning ships that other people were building or had built in the country at the time we entered upon this program; \$515,000,000 was for the payment for requisitioned ships, built or building, for which contracts existed, which the Government proposed to take over; \$150,000,000 was for the purchase of ships other than those so requisitioned; \$55,000,000 was for purchase of ships constructed in foreign yards; \$122,000,000 was for the acquisition of establishments or plants in connection with building of ships; \$75,000,000 was for housing in connection with the workers in the shipyards; and \$65,000,000

was for operation of ships. It was to create a working fund in connection with those operations. Twenty million dollars was to help transportation systems in connection with the movement of workers to the plants engaged in shipbuilding, and \$17,500,000 was for recruiting, training, and instructing officers and crews. This makes up the total amount of authorizations, including cash, that was voted from time to time in connection with the shipbuilding program.

As to the construction of ships, we have heretofore appropriated \$1,938,451,000, and there is carried as one of the items about to be read in this bill \$549,653,254, which will make total appropriations made in what is spoken of as the ship construction item of the program of \$2,488,104,254. That is \$395,895,746 less than the amount that we have authorized the President to obligate the Government for.

A gentleman said to me, "The Appropriations Committee seems to have been pretty liberal with the moneys it is recommending for the Emergency Fleet Corporation for shipbuilding." I said to him, "The committee has practically no option"; and that is what I want to bring to the attention of the House, so that if the House does not in any way agree with the committee it may indicate its disagreement by its motions and its votes.

We are carrying this money as part of the obligation that we authorized—I say we, the Congress authorized—the President to incur in connection with shipbuilding. Now, the need of this money and the need of some three hundred and odd millions that will have to be appropriated subsequently, if the program goes through as now outlined, is predicated upon the amount of money that we will have to pay for the ships that have been built and are building and those that it is proposed to have the keels laid and to complete and it represents what is the judgment of the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation as the extent to which their shipbuilding program that they have entered upon could be reduced by cancellation. Now, I do not know whether they could reduce economically more by cancellation than they have, and I do not know how I possibly can find out, because I have not the opportunity now nor have I personal information that would warrant me in coming to a judgment as contradistinguished from their own. They testify that they have undertaken to cancel all contracts that they could cancel with a real saving to the Government. You will realize that probably as to every ship that is proposed to be built and where the keels are not laid there has been an expenditure of from 30 to 35 per cent, roughly speaking, in materials that have been assembled and that have been ordered and which must be assembled prior to the laying of the keel.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. It has been said to me that these ships we are building now and for which the keels are being laid and construction started could be bought cheaper if we bought them from English and French shipyards than we can build them ourselves. What does the gentleman think about that?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I do not know, except I am satisfied that you could not buy them from England, and I know you could not buy any of them in France, because the French have not the yards and would like to buy ships in America. I doubt very much if England is going to sell us any ships for a number of years to come.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Is this true, that the construction of these ships is costing a great deal more per ton than it is costing to build like ships in English and French yards?

Mr. SHERLEY. I would say it is unquestionably true it is costing more for us to build ships than in England and always has, except perhaps as to a limited number of a given type of ship that were built on the Great Lakes, where we have standardized to a point that it probably would cost us about what a similar type of an English-built ship would cost.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Here is the question in my mind—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would ask for five minutes more.

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

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Here is the question I am trying to get at in all good faith. If it costs so much more to build these ships than it costs the foreign shipbuilders, how can we expect ever to compete with them on equal terms for the world's commerce?

Mr. SHERLEY. If I was able to answer that question, I think my answer would probably be worth a great many millions of



dollars to the Government of the United States. That is one of the problems that is going to be left over to the next Congress that has so few problems to deal with.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman permit me to answer that question?

Mr. SHERLEY. I doubt if anyone can answer fully that question, certainly within five minutes. I wish to say to the gentleman I would like to proceed.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If the gentleman will not yield—

Mr. SHERLEY. I will yield for a minute, but I do not wish to get into a broad discussion of that question in my limited time.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will not ask for it; I will take my own time and answer the gentleman.

Mr. SHERLEY. Speaking for myself, I question very much whether we are going to be able to compete with foreign nations in a highly competitive market upon successful terms, counting in the cost of those ships during these war times. I think those ships will have to be run on a basis of less capital investment than what they actually cost, but I think it is one of the least of your problems in connection with the operation of ships successfully in a normal competitive market. I think you have a good many problems in connection with the manning of your ships, with your shipping laws, with wages, and a lot of other things. The shipping business is not a simple thing, and I have not the wisdom to think I can settle it briefly here.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. BLACK. That is to what extent the Emergency Fleet Corporation has made cancellations of contracts?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is what I am going to try to come to. I did not want, gentlemen, to go into the question of a shipping policy for this Government except to say this: That I think it is of the very highest importance that a policy should be determined and determined at a very early date and that almost any policy would be better than a complete absence of one that exists now and the drifting that has taken place in connection with the whole question of our merchant marine and what we propose to do with it. I know nothing that is more important than that there should be presented to the Congress a real program, one that the Congress in its wisdom may modify or accept as the facts may warrant, but to drift along having what will amount in a last analysis to nearly \$4,000,000,000 investment in ships and in plants, without any knowledge of what we are going to do with it, seems to me the height of national folly.

My judgment is that you may practically count off as profit and loss incident to the war 50 per cent of your investment of four billions, and at the end of this building program you will probably have about \$2,000,000,000 worth of property in the way of ships and yards, and of the ships a certain percentage of them will be of a type of value in competitive trade and others will be of a type of rather restricted value in restricted trades.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Will it be agreeable for the gentleman to yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. I notice on page 4 of the hearings there is given the number of vessels to which we have been committed and the total tonnage, something like 16,196,761 dead-weight tons. Will the gentleman tell us what part of that total tonnage is actually in the water and under control of the Shipping Board as of December 31, to which these figures relate?

Mr. SHERLEY. Those figures relate to a program which is supposed to have been undertaken up to December 31 and were figures that were given last May as to a program. There is in the hearings—and I do not know whether I can find it immediately or not—the tonnage that we would have if the present program is carried through. Unfortunately, I say frankly to the gentleman, I have practically had no opportunity to reread this testimony. I tried to get some condensed tables of ready reference, but I am not sure that they have been put in here in the form that would give me the information. But the gentleman will find in the hearings a letter from Mr. Hurley, head of the Shipping Board, as to the policy that they have proceeded on, on page 218, in connection with this program, and he will also find statements from the division of planning and statistics undertaking to show the number of keels that have been laid between January and February and the number that is proposed to be laid after February 14.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. I had seen figures of that character, but I had not observed anywhere figures showing the tonnage actually in the water and under control of the Emergency Fleet. I was anxious to get that if it was readily available.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is available, but I can not put my hand on it at the moment.

Now, the program that they now are undertaking to complete contemplates a total construction of something under 12,000,000 tons of ships, exclusive of requisition ships. Including all ships it represents a tonnage of about 14,500,000 dead-weight tons. There is to-day supposed to be a deficiency in world tonnage, including that which has been built by us, of 9,750,000 dead-weight tons as against the figure that existed in 1914 prior to the submarine campaign. Excluding what we already have built, we are going forward now with about 10,000,000 tons of shipping. So we are probably not building any more than what would be necessary to replace the tonnage that has been destroyed.

I think Mr. Hurley in his letter states that some 5,000,000 tons are being built by other nations, which would seem to indicate that if we carry out this program and they carry out theirs we will have supplied the tonnage that has been lost by virtue of the war and some 5,000,000 tons in addition; and it is thought that represents about what should have been the normal growth in tonnage between 1914 and 1920.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Can the gentleman tell us how many tons have been constructed in this country since we entered the war?

Mr. SHERLEY. I was trying to tell the gentleman that we have a plan, with this program of ships purchased, built, and building, representing about 14,500,000 dead-weight tons of shipping.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How many tons were actually built?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am trying to find that. It is in the hearing. I can not for the moment put my hand on it.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I wanted to ask the gentleman this: I notice he made a reference to the fact that he hoped some definite policy would be defined. I want to state that since the election in November I have been called on to state what definite policy would be pursued by the change of administration that would take place. I said I was not able to disclose it at the present time, because we had not gone so far as even to create committees, and I could not tell what the definite plan would be. Certainly we who have been in the minority have been largely kept in the dark as to what is being done. We are getting only indefinite reports, and not many of them. We are rather at a loss to define a policy, but will endeavor whenever we have the control of the legislative branch of the Government to define some kind of definite policy.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, I made no reference in any partisan or party sense.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. And neither did I.

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand you did not.

As to the matter of policy, I simply presented this situation to the House and to the country, that we have invested practically in moneys spent and moneys contracted to be spent something like \$4,000,000,000. Now, that was made necessary because of the war, and we went ahead. All of us went ahead.

There was no division and there was no question. There was not 3 per cent of the people in America that questioned the wisdom of building ships at the time these commitments were made in the spring and early summer of last year. But, having done that, I think it is up to the Shipping Board, I think it is up to this administration, I think it is up to the Congress to work out a plan. I do not care whether it is a Republican or Democratic plan if it is the right plan. And I do not think any of us are so sure—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more, and then I will not take any more time.

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

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not think any of us feel warranted in saying that we know the last word on what should be the national program. It has got to be approached from the standpoint of a tremendous ownership by the Government of ships. Shall the Government operate? Shall it sell them or lease them upon the value they are to the Government or upon the value that they think it is necessary to place upon them in order to put them on terms of equality and competition with the rest of the world?

What shall be our navigation laws? How shall we undertake to equalize our operating expense with that of European countries? Those are great problems. They are not going to be settled in a minute by speeches by anybody. All I am trying to do is to show that the Committee on Appropriations have recommended the appropriation of these moneys because there is nothing else it could have done, and that in bringing in this six hundred-odd millions in this bill it is doing it on representations by the Emergency Fleet Corporation as to the amounts



of money they will have to pay on contracts that have been entered into and which they believe they can not properly cancel.

Now, if anybody knows that there can be a cancellation of more of these contracts than they state, then I want that person to suggest the amount and to offer a reduction, so as to bring that about, and to justify it. But I have felt that it was not right that the Committee on Appropriations should recommend these huge sums without stating to the House the basis upon which we made the recommendations.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for the statement he has made. It was not my point to criticize his action or any of the action of the committee as to this large amount. I simply want to say that is a problem that will call for all the wisdom that we can possibly find anywhere on both sides of the House, and we will endeavor, so far as we can in the coming Congress, to arrive at some definite policy.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, I have found the tables which the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] inquired about. If the gentleman will look on page 27, of part 3, of the hearings on the sundry civil bill, which relates entirely to the shipbuilding situation, he will find a table which undertakes to show the number of delivered vessels, those that are in the water, those that are on the ways, and those of which the keels have not been laid, and the total amount.

Now, of requisitioned ships there have been delivered 298, with a dead-weight tonnage of 1,931,061. Of contract ships there have been 164 delivered, with a dead-weight tonnage of 968,425; of wood ships there have been 106, with a dead-weight tonnage of 376,400; and 10 composite ships, with a dead-weight tonnage of 37,500; or of wood and composite ships there have been 116, with a dead-weight tonnage of 413,900. The total number of ships which have been delivered, both those requisitioned and those built under contract, amounts to 578, with a dead-weight tonnage of 3,313,386.

Now, without undertaking to separate them into their classes, there are in the water at this time 348 ships, with a dead-weight tonnage of 1,643,475 tons. There are on the ways 774 ships, with a dead-weight tonnage of 3,791,985 tons. There are of keels not laid, which it is expected we can go forward with, because they believe it is uneconomical not to do so, 832 ships, with a dead-weight tonnage of 5,829,365, which would make a total of 2,532 ships, with a total dead-weight tonnage of 14,578,111 tons.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. As to the authorization of the requisitioned use of vessels, as distinguished from the taking of title to the vessels, can the gentleman tell whether of these 348 ships in the water any are ships of which we have only the use?

Mr. SHERLEY. No. These are all ships in which we take title.

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

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. The actual tonnage we have now completed is something like 3,000,000 tons?

Mr. SHERLEY. Including the requisitioned ships there have been delivered 3,313,000. Those that are in the water are 1,643,000, and those that are on the ways are 3,791,985 dead-weight tons, and those with keels not laid 5,829,365.

Mr. FESS. That amounts to something like 14,000,000.

Mr. SHERLEY. It amounts to 14,578,111 tons. I am not sure now as to the keels not laid. They represent the program as it has been reduced by cancellation. I would want to look at these tables with some little more care than I can do it just on my feet here.

Mr. FESS. If work on the fleet we are obtaining can be continued has the gentleman any idea of when we will have the 14,000,000 tonnage?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I think that if we went ahead with this program rapidly we would have it in the course of a year and a half, but I am hoping that we are not going to build ships under the pressure with which we have been building them heretofore, with all the overtime and the waste incident to it, and it is my understanding that they have cut out all overtime, and they are not undertaking building with extra shifts and all the expensive costs which were only justified when time was the most important thing to be considered.

Mr. FESS. I think the gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman one more question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Then I will subside. I understand we requisitioned a whole lot of ships which were under construction on foreign account. This table is a condensed table of construction. Does it include only those ships, or does it also include those ships which were completed and under charter to Americans?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, the 298 ships of 1,931,061 dead-weight tons are requisitioned ships that were building or contracted for and which we took over. They were not built. They were ships that were building.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky, has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I can not give to the committee all the accurate, detailed information that is contained in this hearing of two hundred and odd pages. The committee tried very diligently to get the information, but I have been continuously engaged in work that has been pressing from day to day—

Mr. BUTLER. It is not necessary for the gentleman to make any apologies, because we know he has given us the best he could.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not making any apologies, but I wanted to call the attention of gentlemen to the hearings, so that they can there find out more fully the facts.

Mr. BUTLER. The trouble is we always wait for the gentleman to give us the information instead of getting it for ourselves.

Mr. SHERLEY. The amounts that we are carrying here represent what these people insist they must have during the next fiscal year, and in point of fact they insist that they need part of the money before the 1st of July—something over \$100,000,000—which they submitted as a deficiency estimate. We threw it all together in the sundry civil bill, making that part immediately available; and in the event that the sundry civil bill should not be going to pass it would be my expectation that the Senate would take that part of the amount of these appropriations which are made immediately available and carry them on the deficiency bill, because they unquestionably need something over \$100,000,000 in order to pay their bills within the next three months. The balance is moneys that are going to be needed during the next fiscal year, and if this program is not reduced further it means that Congress will have to appropriate \$395,000,000 in addition before we are through.

Mr. BUTLER. Before we get our 14,000,000 tons of ships.

Mr. SHERLEY. And when we shall have done that, we shall have appropriated \$3,913,500,000, in addition to the \$50,000,000 that we appropriated in the original shipping act. Now, with the permission of the committee, I will endeavor to revise my remarks and get these figures accurately stated and arranged for easy consideration.

Under the permission granted, I insert the following data:

*Condensed statement of contract commitments for contract ships Dec. 1, 1918, and cancellations or suspensions subsequent.*

Ship construction.	Commitments.			Cancellations.		
	Ships.	Dead-weight tonnage.	Value.	Ships.	Dead-weight tonnage.	Value.
Steel:						
Cargo.....	1,285	8,753,480	\$1,761,624,986	110	847,800	\$168,558,472
Tankers.....	88	828,000	202,222,710	5	37,500	9,121,750
Transports.....	96	898,000	293,462,700	20	160,000	52,407,720
Refrigerators.....	8	75,200	19,352,406			
Barges.....	10	31,000	2,830,881			
Tugs, ocean.....	104		34,000,010	56		17,145,600
Tugs, harbor.....	8		1,353,920			
Total.....	1,599	10,585,680	2,315,907,613	191	1,045,300	247,233,542



Condensed statement of contract commitments for contract ships Dec. 1, 1918, and cancellations or suspensions subsequent—Continued.

Ship construction.	Commitments.			Cancellations.		
	Ships.	Dead-weight tonnage.	Value.	Ships.	Dead-weight tonnage.	Value.
Wood:						
Cargo.....	685	2,494,450	\$466,047,488	132	503,350	\$93,457,570
Composite.....	32	116,000	22,034,240			
Barges.....	43	126,650	9,637,000	2	19,000	688,000
Tugs, ocean.....	60		14,291,600	15		3,620,300
Tugs, harbor.....	97		14,309,900	49		7,124,900
Total.....	917	2,737,100	526,320,228	198	513,350	104,890,770
Concrete:						
Cargo.....	4	13,500	2,260,000			
Tankers.....	18	135,000	20,880,000	8	60,000	9,280,000
Total.....	22	148,500	23,140,000	8	60,000	9,280,000
Total contract construction.....	2,538	13,471,280	2,865,367,841	397	1,618,650	361,404,312

Condensed statement of suspended or canceled contracts for contract ships.

Kind of vessels.	Ship.	Dead-weight tonnage.	Estimated cost complete ships.	Estimated savings account of cancellation.	Estimated cost of cancellation.
Steel:					
Cargo.....	110	847,800	\$168,558,472	\$124,846,778	\$43,711,694
Tankers.....	5	37,500	9,121,750	7,297,400	1,824,350
Transports.....	20	160,000	52,407,720	31,926,176	20,481,544
Ocean tugs.....	56		17,145,600	1,859,200	4,286,400
Total.....	191	1,045,300	247,233,542	176,929,554	70,303,988
Wood:					
Cargo.....	132	503,350	\$93,457,570	74,807,570	18,650,000
Barges.....	2	10,000	688,000	619,200	68,800
Tugs, ocean.....	15		3,620,300	2,715,225	905,075
Tugs, harbor.....	49		7,124,900	5,343,675	1,781,225
Total.....	198	513,350	104,890,770	83,485,670	21,405,100
Concrete, tankers.....	8	60,000	9,280,000	8,120,000	1,160,000
Grand total.....	397	1,618,650	361,404,312	268,535,224	92,809,088

Condensed table of construction Dec. 31, 1918.

Kind of vessel.	Delivered.		In water.		On ways.		Keels not laid.		Total.	
	No.	Dead-weight tonnage.	No.	Dead-weight tonnage.	No.	Dead-weight tonnage.	No.	Dead-weight tonnage.	No.	Dead-weight tonnage.
Requisition ships:										
Cargo—										
Ocean yards.....	135	1,025,676	17	132,150	22	196,400	23	203,500	197	1,557,726
Lake yards.....	99	327,200							99	327,200
Tankers.....	40	400,419	4	35,500	10	85,220	6	53,500	60	574,639
Colliers.....	9	70,350							9	70,350
Transports.....	3	14,325	5	36,150					8	50,475
Refrigerators.....	12	93,100			3	25,000	3	27,000	18	145,100
Total.....	298	1,931,061	26	203,800	35	306,620	32	284,000	391	2,725,481
Contract ships:										
Steel cargo—										
Ocean yards.....	74	636,175	78	603,825	218	1,717,365	459	3,592,265	829	6,549,630
Lake yards.....	89	322,850	29	111,650	70	279,650	158	641,900	346	1,356,050
Tankers.....			2	17,600	18	173,700	63	599,200	83	790,500
Transports.....					12	116,000	64	622,000	76	738,000
Refrigerators.....	1	9,400	4	37,600	3	28,200			8	75,200
Barges.....					1	7,500	9	23,500	10	31,000
Ocean tugs.....			4		25		19		48	
Harbor tugs.....			2		4		2		8	
Total.....	164	968,425	119	770,675	351	2,322,415	774	5,478,865	1,408	9,540,380
Wood:										
Cargo.....	106	376,400	173	622,350	236	951,850	8	40,500	553	1,991,100
Composite.....	10	37,500	11	40,000	11	38,500			32	116,000
Barges.....			1	3,650	36	102,000	4	11,000	41	116,650
Ocean tugs.....			10		23		12		45	
Harbor tugs.....			7		41				48	
Total.....	116	413,900	202	66,000	377	1,092,350	24	51,500	719	2,223,780
Concrete:										
Cargo.....			1	3,000	3	10,500			4	13,500
Tankers.....					8	60,000	2	15,000	10	75,000
Total.....			1	3,000	11	70,500	2	15,000	14	88,500
Total requisition.....	298	1,931,061	26	203,800	35	306,620	32	284,000	391	2,725,481
Total contract.....	280	1,382,325	322	1,439,675	739	3,485,365	800	5,545,365	2,141	11,852,639
Total program.....	578	3,313,386	348	1,643,475	774	3,791,985	832	5,829,365	2,532	14,578,111



On December 31, 1918, the total number of vessels, both built and on order, under direct contract and requisition by the United States Shipping Board, Emergency Fleet Corporation, was 2,963 ships of 16,482,611 dead-weight tons, including suspension.

As of the same date the Emergency Fleet Corporation had made actual deliveries of 578 ships of 3,313,386 dead-weight tons, excluding Japanese purchased ships.

As of February 4, 1919, it had canceled or suspended subject to cancellation 132 wood ships of 503,350 dead-weight tons. Two wood barges, 10,000 dead-weight tons; 15 wood ocean-going tugs, and 49 wood harbor tugs. In addition, 110 steel cargo ships, 74,800 dead-weight tons; 5 steel tankers, 37,500 dead-weight tons; 20 steel transports, 160,000 dead-weight tons; 56 steel ocean-going tugs; and 8 concrete tankers of 60,000 dead-weight tons, making a grand total of sus-

pended or canceled of 397 ships of a dead-weight tonnage of 1,618,650. This leaves 1,988 ships of 11,550,575 dead-weight tons for delivery after January 1, 1919, provided all ships under suspension are canceled.

As of December 31, 1918, there were under contract and requisition 2,385 ships of 13,169,225 dead-weight tons not delivered, of which number 348 ships of 1,643,475 dead-weight tons were fitting out afloat, 774 ships of 3,791,885 dead-weight tons already had keels laid and practically all of their material assembled and were in advanced stages of completion. This left a balance of 1,263 ships of 7,733,865 dead-weight tons which have not as yet had their keels laid. Out of this balance it has suspended as of February 4, 1919, 397 ships of a dead-weight tonnage of 1,618,650, leaving a balance of 866 ships of a dead-weight tonnage of 6,115,215 on which keels have not been laid.

*Emergency shipping fund.*

	Authorized.	Heretofore appropriated.	Appropriated in this bill.	Total appropriations, including those heretofore appropriated and in this bill.	Remaining to be appropriated.
Construction of ships, etc.....	\$2,884,000,000	\$1,938,451,000	\$549,633,254	\$2,488,104,254	\$395,895,746
Requisitioning of ships, etc.....	515,000,000	415,000,000	100,000,000	515,000,000	.....
Purchase of ships other than those requisitioned or constructed.....	150,000,000	150,000,000	.....	150,000,000	.....
Purchase of ships constructed in foreign yards.....	55,000,000	55,000,000	.....	55,000,000	.....
Acquisition of establishments or plants.....	122,000,000	122,000,000	.....	122,000,000	.....
Housing for shipyard workers.....	75,000,000	75,000,000	( <sup>1</sup> )	75,000,000	.....
Operation of ships (in addition to revenues).....	65,000,000	65,000,000	.....	65,000,000	.....
Transportation systems in connection with shipyard workers and plant employees.....	20,000,000	20,000,000	( <sup>2</sup> )	20,000,000	.....
Recruiting, training, and instruction of officers and crews.....	17,500,000	6,250,000	11,250,000	17,500,000	.....
	3,903,506,000	2,846,701,000	660,903,254	3,507,604,254	395,895,746
Capital stock in original shipping act.....	50,000,000	50,000,000	.....	50,000,000	.....
	3,953,506,000	2,896,701,000	660,903,254	3,557,604,254	395,895,746

<sup>1</sup> \$5,685,646 of the housing appropriation repealed by this bill.

<sup>2</sup> \$8,787,172.93 of the transportation appropriation repealed by this bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, during the general debate on this bill on Saturday I discussed at some little length this matter of shipping construction to a large and enthusiastic audience gathered at the other end of the Capitol, listening to a discussion of the league of nations. That is, while I was discussing this matter here, many of the Members were at the other end of the Capitol listening to a speech on the league of nations. As what I said then is immured in the RECORD, where few will ever read it, I feel that I owe it to the House to make at least a brief statement for the minority side with regard to this shipping program.

There is a program of approximately 2,500 ships, of which 876, built and requisitioned, have been delivered, with a dead-weight tonnage of 5,245,447 tons.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield there for an explanation?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I have heard this tonnage business referred to so often—

Mr. MONDELL. Not being a seafaring man, I hope the gentleman will not interrogate me too closely about the details of this matter of tonnage.

Mr. MANN. I know what the ordinary tonnage means, but the Shipping Board in order to conceal the facts, so it is stated—I do not know—have devised a new method of stating tonnage.

Mr. MONDELL. I see the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has delivered to the floor leader of the minority an official explanation of what dead-weight tonnage means.

Mr. MANN. Well, I know, but I think it ought to be in the RECORD.

Mr. SHERLEY. A year ago I undertook to do that, and it was printed in the RECORD. I explained the difference between gross tonnage and dead-weight tonnage and net tonnage. It is a technical thing that I do not like to trust my memory on without rereading.

Mr. MANN. All these things are matters of measurement.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. These are dead-weight tons.

Mr. MANN. Dead-weight tonnage and gross tonnage and net tonnage are not necessarily related.

Mr. MONDELL. No; they are not.

Mr. MANN. Nearly everybody who has studied tonnage knows about gross tonnage and net tonnage, but very few know what dead-weight tonnage is.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Dead-weight tonnage is about one-third more than gross tonnage.

Mr. MANN. That is the reason they use it.

Mr. SHERLEY. The reason they use dead-weight tonnage as against either gross tonnage or net tonnage is because dead-weight tonnage does not have to bear a relationship to the par-

ticular character of the ship. Now, gross tonnage and net tonnage, and the relationship they bear to each other, vary according to the type of the ship.

Mr. MANN. After all, it does not make a particle of difference what the weight of the ship is. What they want to know is what its carrying capacity is.

Mr. MONDELL. That is what dead-weight tonnage is.

Mr. MANN. They deliberately conceal the carrying capacity in order to make people think they are doing a great deal more by building something that weighs heavily.

Mr. MONDELL. With apologies to gentlemen who know much more about it than I do, I will say that, as I understand it, the dead-weight tonnage more nearly measures the cargo capacity of the ship than any other classification of tonnage.

Mr. TILSON. But does not that refer to the maximum weight that it could carry?

Mr. MONDELL. We have then received of built and requisitioned ships; that is, ships requisitioned on the ways, or the contracts for which were requisitioned, 876 ships of a tonnage of approximately 5,250,000 tons, as against a gross program of approximately 14,000,000 tons, or approximately 2,500 ships. About a third of the program has been completed and delivered. The cost when we have completed the program will be a little less than \$4,000,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I want to ask the gentleman a question. Would he prefer to finish his statement?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will just let me finish the statement I have in mind.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] estimates the loss on the shipping program at about \$1,500,000,000. That is a very conservative estimate, in my opinion. I think it will be somewhere between \$1,500,000,000 and \$2,000,000,000. About 35 per cent must be taken from the first cost of the ships of all sorts.

Then, from the wooden ships there must be taken a considerable larger percentage of cost. There is the cost of the yard, which is not charged against the fabricated ships in estimating their tonnage cost. Sixty-six millions at Hog Island. Mr. Piez says there is no future for Hog Island, and Mr. Piez knows. I estimated the other day that we might get 25 per cent of the sixty-six millions out of Hog Island. I was very optimistic on Saturday. It may be that we will get more than 25 per cent from some of the other fabricating yards, but there is over \$100,000,000 invested in yards and many millions for housing, all of which must be greatly reduced before we shall reach the value on which we may ultimately realize.



Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Before the gentleman leaves the Hog Island proposition I want to ask a question.

Mr. MONDELL. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I understand these yards are adapted to the building of one, or at most two, types of fabricated ships and that it is not possible and will not be possible to use them for any other type of ship.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will read the hearings—and they are most interesting—he will find that Mr. Piez discussed that subject at length. These are fabricated yards, assembling yards that have no shops; they take the assembled steel and rivet it together in ships. Hog Island has so many ways that it would not be practicable to maintain it as a shipbuilding establishment with its present number of ways or anything like that number of ways. When you reduce the number of ways for building fabricated ships, then your overhead becomes so high that you can not afford to build the ships; and, furthermore, Mr. Piez says that in time of peace it possibly would not be practicable to build fabricated ships because of the fact that it would be difficult to get industrial plants to agree to fabricate the steel that would be needed for construction.

If an effort was made to remodel these yards into yards for building ships in the ordinary way, there would be an increase of overhead by reduction of the number of ways. There would be a great expense, perhaps 50 per cent of the expenditure already made, for shops and for all the necessary appliances.

What I am saying is not in criticism of the shipbuilding program. I voted for it, and we believed at the time that it was the thing to do, although we voted for that, as we did for many other things, with very serious doubts. But this is true: There has been an enormous and unnecessary waste in carrying out the program.

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

Mr. MONDELL. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for another question, and then I will quit bothering him?

Mr. MONDELL. It does not bother me.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Here is the thing I have in my mind about this bill. It is apparent that we are going to lose about 50 per cent of the cost of constructing the ships, that they will be worth about half of what they cost, and we have 516,000,000 tons to build. Would not that loss be less as a matter of pure finance if we canceled the contracts and pay the shipbuilders the amount of damages under the uncompleted contracts?

Mr. MONDELL. My understanding is that the purpose of the Emergency Fleet Corporation is this: To cancel where the least loss would result through cancellation and build where the greater saving results from building. It is the opinion of the Shipping Board, which the committee must accept because they could not be fully informed on the subject, that we lose much more by not appropriating the sum in this bill than by appropriating it. In other words, that there are ships so far along in construction, there is so much material assembled that can not be used advantageously for other purposes, that unless we go forward with the program the loss will be much greater than if we stopped now.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. We have authorized about 850 ships of which the keels have not been laid.

Mr. MONDELL. While that is true, the material has been assembled and in the matter of fabricated ships the material has been fabricated; it is on the ground and it is apparently of little value for other purposes. Now, there is another matter that must be considered—the ships are not costing us as much now as during the war. The ships we are building now will not be so great a loss as the ships we built during the war. And it is possible, if the price of ships keeps up fairly well, the loss on the ships now building will not be as great as on the ships first built—25 per cent is about the difference in cost between the cost of building ships in American yards and foreign yards at this particular time.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. In view of the fact that we have established a principle, provided a billion dollars to take care of the wheat growers when the spring wheat has not been planted, and we raised a surplus when it is apparent that we are not going to have a surplus of ships, does not the gentleman think that we might establish a precedent that it would be hard to get away from on this proposition?

Mr. MONDELL. I understand we are not building ships purely on the theory that we have contracted to build them,

Where we can cancel a contract with less loss than we would suffer otherwise we cancel it, but where we can not cancel it with less loss than we would suffer otherwise we fulfill the contract.

Mr. RAGSDALE. About the only contract that we are carrying out, which the carrying out of will entail a great loss, is the wheat contract.

Mr. MONDELL. We are always good to the farmers, and we always should be. Furthermore, that was altogether a different obligation than a shipping contract.

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

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. What I wanted to ask the gentleman is this: Our country is needing every ship that we can build, if we carry out the whole program?

Mr. MONDELL. I think the world's business is; yes.

Mr. HARDY. Is it not altogether probable that the ships under way in the shipyards, whatever the extravagance that has heretofore accompanied their construction, can now be built in those yards as cheaply as they could be built anywhere in the United States.

Mr. MONDELL. I think that may be true.

Mr. HARDY. So that we are up against the proposition, if we want the ships, of building them under the arrangements that have been made or else turning to new quarters?

Mr. MONDELL. I think that is true.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. Are these ships being built all under contract or are some of them being built by the Government direct?

Mr. MONDELL. They are all being built under some form of contract.

Mr. PLATT. The Emergency Fleet Corporation is, of course, the Government itself?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. And is doing some of it itself?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to undertake to answer one question asked by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. He asked, if the American capitalist had to buy ships that would cost him more than ships cost his foreign competitor, and in addition had to pay more for the operating expenses of those ships than his foreign competitor has to pay for his ships, how would he be able to compete on the high seas for the trade of the world? The answer to that is exceedingly simple, not very difficult, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] suggested. He can not do it. [Laughter and applause.] Here is the situation that confronts us to-day. We have been building ships at a great rate as a part of our war operations. If we take those ships that the Government has contracted for on Government account and turn them over to the American capitalist at a cost which will match the cost of the ships of his foreign competitor, then the American can enter, so far as the race is concerned, up to that point, on equal terms, but that means, of course, that the Government will bear all loss connected with the transaction of sale. The moment that the Government of the United States is willing to take that action, that very moment we can put American capital into business on the high seas under favorable conditions, so far as his foreign competitor is concerned. But even after you have gone that far, if the cost of operating the ships on the high seas is greater than the cost to the foreigner, you must go one step further. It will be necessary to guarantee out of the Federal Treasury to any capitalist who proposes to go into the shipping enterprise the difference between the cost of maintenance of his operations and the cost of the foreigner's maintenance.

That means again a charge on the Federal Treasury. There is no use of this talk about legislation. We do not need any legislation. What we need are appropriations, not legislation. American capital can to-day buy foreign ships if it wants to do so, for practically all of the restrictive legislation that formerly surrounded mercantile shipping operations on the part of capital in the United States, on the high seas, has been swept away under legislation that this House has heretofore passed, reported out of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I happen to be a member. The whole problem is one, not of legislation, but of appropriations. The moment that the Government is willing to launch merchant-marine operations on the high seas on the basis that I have suggested, then at that very moment, so far as private capital is concerned, it can



enter into competition with the foreigner on a fair and equitable basis, but not sooner.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] knows as well as the rest of this House that there was a time when American shipping did compete upon the high seas under a very simple arrangement, as old almost as the Constitution itself. Goods carried in American bottoms entering the United States were given a differential of 10 or 20 per cent, so far as custom duties were concerned.

It has been always urged that we could not return to that system. We lost it in a singular way. By a treaty made with France immediately after the Revolution her ships were given equal rights as to duties with those of America, and gradually in the course of years the most-favored-nation clause was introduced into our treaties and finally in 1854, or about that date, that most-favored-nation clause was extended to England and from that time our shipping fell off. It is always urged that we can not go back to that system. It seems to me that now is the time. The whole world is in a state of upheaval, new arrangements have to be made, England, if she respects her own interests, ought to believe that it is to her advantage that American interests shall be encouraged and American shipping shall furnish a recruiting ground for our Navy and a chance for our being a power upon the seas, and now is the time when those treaties with other nations should be denounced so far as that clause is concerned.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I do.

Mr. MANN. Of course the gentleman knows that the differential provision is in existing law now?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. But subject to those treaties. The treaties must first be denounced, because, though it is not in the law, our Government can not enforce it because of those treaties.

Mr. MANN. I do not remember there is anything in the law about treaties.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Not a word.

Mr. MANN. That is a matter of construction?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. That is a matter of construction.

Mr. MANN. And probably of legal construction.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. It is a matter of legal construction, I take it, because the treaty being made with other nations has to be obeyed until it is denounced, until the administration of this Government has the courage to say to foreign nations that they order that differential by statute and they desire those treaties should be reformed so as to give a chance to Americans to sail the seas. Now, I believe there are some other ways of encouraging our shipping, which are not really a charge upon the United States Treasury. The United States requires for its defense a Naval Reserve. I have proposed for years that it should be provided by law that any man who has stood a tour of duty of one year in the United States Navy and entered his name upon the Naval Reserve should be entitled to go to any shipowner sailing the seas and say, "You will receive so much toward my wages if you employ me." My proposition was that shipowners should be paid, not a speed subsidy—speed changes from year to year, and what is fair in one year becomes unfair in another—not a tonnage subsidy, the rates of tonnage vary so that any subsidy might become unfair, but a man subsidy, saying, we will pay the shipowner for employing Americans and induce them to go to sea. We have, thank Heaven—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I ask for five minutes more.

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

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, we have that system now to the extent that we have a system of transports that are now manned by the Naval Reserve. Their officers have had to pass through naval examinations. The business the United States carried on during this war has been by men trained and certified by the Navy in the Naval Reserve. This is a system adopted by other countries in the world, the only difference being they subsidize their steamers for carrying the mail, they subsidize their steamers for carrying trade, or for instituting and maintaining a certain line. We can go on the direct plan of saying the reason we can not sail the seas is that it costs more to employ Americans and we will pay to the shipowner the difference of that cost, so that it pays them to sail the seas. Still the cost is not lost or a charge on the Treasury, for it comes back to us in the existence of a Naval Reserve of men ready for service in our Navy.

I proposed this plan years ago to the Naval Board, in which Admiral Dewey sat as chief. It was received with the greatest interest. But the difficulty was that at that time it would have cost \$3,000,000 to give \$20 a man per month in extra wages to the shipowner to see that Americans were employed, and they thought that ought to be done through the shipping committee or through a shipping appropriation, and would not put it on the naval appropriation. On the other hand, the shipping men said it was not sufficient to get men on ships. And so they let it drop.

I do not want to pay men who go into the Naval Reserve. That has been tried in England. The result is that those men become longshoremen very soon, which the shipping merchants do not want to employ, because they have to go away once a year to take a month's training, and they are not worth so much on the ships. But if the simple plan is adopted providing that they do not require a month's training a year in the Navy, but only require that the man shall have stood his year's training in the Navy before he takes his rating, and then providing besides that whenever he wants to take a place as an officer he shall have qualified with a naval examination and got the right to belong to the Naval Reserve, and that then the shipowner shall be paid for the officer or the man a good proportion of his wages, we can secure a merchant marine such as the national defense requires, without excessive cost to the Government by what are called subsidies, which almost always run into abuses.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer a little contribution on this subject. So far as the shipping is concerned, we are staggering along like a drunken man. I might say that we are like a vessel without compass, rudder, destination, cargo, or captain, tossing on a stormy sea. No one knows whither we are drifting or where we design to land. We have no program except to spend money with prodigality and wastefulness. We propose now to add merrily, with a smile and with no knowledge, \$660,000,000 to the amount to be expended by the Government in this fantastical chase. Everyone knows that the ships which we construct in this way, if they are shown to be seaworthy, and I hope we get at least that much, can not be operated by the Government directly without an immense assistance from the Federal Treasury. Everyone knows that they can not be operated by private parties even on easy leases from the Government, without assistance from the Federal Treasury. And while some gentlemen assume that the whole difference of cost of operation is in the difference in wages paid to seamen, still that is far short of the difficulty.

Under the seamen's act which we passed and which I think we are not likely to repeal, we not only would have higher wages, which come though the natural laws, but we require better food, more space per seaman, and a great many other things which add materially to the cost of operation of an American ship over that of a foreign ship. We have made no effort to correct these things. Of course, while the war continued we would have operated ships if we had had them, no matter what it cost, regardless of expense. But gentlemen need not imagine when the war is over and peace is finally concluded the people of the United States will continue to pay taxes in large and onerous sums for expenditure without knowledge of what the money is used for and why.

I am not offering any contribution from a man who knows about these things. I do not. I have listened to the gentleman who talked this afternoon, and before, on the subject. While they give us a few figures, which the Shipping Board supplies, those are misleading, and no one seems to know anything about it except that the Shipping Board wants more money. Therefore, we give them more money. How are you going to get the men to operate these ships? Where are you going to get the sailors, the seamen, from with which to man American ships?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. This bill carries an item of \$11,000,000 for recruiting, instructing, and training officers, engineers, and crews for American vessels. Where are they to come from? The Shipping Board can not get them now. The Navy is operating a lot of ships; they can not get men to operate them without holding the men who enlisted for the war in the service and refusing to discharge them. And to say that we need them in our business, that we will not let them go, are we going to come to the point where we are going to draft men throughout the United States to operate ships either owned by the Government



or leased to private parties or owned by corporations and sailing the seas? Are we going to say that we will pay twice as much, either in the form of freight rates or taxes, for the transportation of goods in bottoms, both our own and foreign, coming back to us as we can get goods carried for by other countries?

Are we prepared, in addition to wasting, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] says, at least half of the \$4,000,000,000 already appropriated; in addition to wasting that \$2,000,000,000, are we prepared to keep on operating these vessels and paying the expense out of the Federal Treasury? If it is not paid out of the Federal Treasury, who is going to pay it? We can not regulate the freight rates charged by foreign vessel owners, and we can not force our American shippers to use American vessels at higher rates as long as we admit foreign-owned vessels into our ports.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] referred to the differential that used to exist, which he says established the American shipping on the high seas. I do not think that was what established it myself. In the days when the ships were sailing vessels and it required courageous and brave and intelligent people to operate the ships Americans could compete with the world. But when it requires at the best but a low order of intelligence you can not force a large share of the American boys on board of these vessels, not even along the coast, not even where they are used to the sea. But the differential which was referred to by my distinguished friend from New Jersey is now the law. We put it—I do not say I had anything to do with it; I made fun of it—into the Underwood tariff law. I said when the bill passed that it either meant nothing or it meant a great deal more than was contemplated. Well, it seems that it means nothing. It is there. It is the law, and now it is proposed and suggested by the gentleman from New Jersey that we change these treaties.

Why, Mr. Chairman, in this day, with the spirit that there is in the world to-day—even acknowledging the extent that a league of nations may be controverted in the United States—with the spirit in the world to-day it is an impossibility to have all the different nations of the world enter upon a warfare, to begin with, that they will not treat vessels of different nations equally with their own. We can not say to England: "We will prefer our own vessels," and then say to England: "You shall not prefer yours." They will be both treated alike or there will be war.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered by my colleague [Mr. FORDNEY] in New York last Friday evening on post-war legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by his colleague [Mr. FORDNEY] in New York last week. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction of ships authorized by the deficiency appropriation acts approved June 15 and October 6, respectively, 1917, and the sundry civil appropriation act approved July 1, 1918, \$549,653,254: *Provided*, That obligations not to exceed \$35,000,000 heretofore incurred for the construction of requisitioned ships may be paid out of or charged to the appropriations herein or heretofore made for the construction of ships.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized. He reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, as to this provision as to the payment of obligations, \$35,000,000, for the construction of requisitioned ships, why is that needed in here? Have they spent a lot of money that was not appropriated and was not authorized?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. My recollection of the statement of the Manager of the Fleet Corporation is that as the result of the requisitioning of ships claims were filed for just compensation, many of them by the Norwegian owners of ships under contract, and that while this amount of \$35,000,000 is estimated for here the claims go as high as \$80,000,000 or \$85,000,000; that they have not up to this time paid any of them.

Mr. MANN. That is where the Shipping Board seized the Norwegian vessels?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is, where they had a contract for the ships, and the Shipping Board came in and took the ship after it had been sold to an innocent party—took the right to construct after he had actually paid out his money.

Mr. MANN. Where was the ship?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Sometimes the ships had been started in our yards when we requisitioned the contract in order to proceed to construction, taking them at the original cost, where the contracts had been sold in many instances to a third party, who had a monetary interest and whose claims, according to my recollection, are as high as \$80,000,000.

Mr. MANN. Why did they not pay for it? They had the money.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. They are asking for it now.

Mr. MANN. I know they are now seeking to get the money to pay for it. I do not pretend to be very well informed on the subject; but, so far as I know, either they did not have the money, in which case, I think, they were not authorized to obligate it, or else they did have the money and were authorized to pay it out.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will say to the gentleman very frankly that the impression made upon my mind at the time of the hearing was that they could not avoid exceeding their authorization by the sum of \$35,000,000.

Mr. MANN. I think I will fix this, if I can, so that the Senate will have an opportunity to consider the item. It may be perfectly proper.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It is proper; but, no doubt, they exceeded their authorization.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the provision must be carried sooner or later. A certain sum of the appropriation made for the construction of ships was used as a requisitioning fund, or was used as a construction fund under the requisition item, and it is necessary either to make an appropriation under that item or make \$35,000,000 of this appropriation available. They did exceed the limit under the other item, although, of course, there is some question as to whether or not they were authorized to use a part of what was strictly a construction fund for requisitioning construction.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the item may be perfectly proper. I do not know. Apparently there is not very much information about it here; and without any criticism at all of the Committee on Appropriations—

Mr. MONDELL. We know exactly how it occurred.

Mr. MANN. I do not think anybody knows much about what the Shipping Board is doing, except those who are doing it, and they carefully conceal the information. But I do not think it would hurt any to have this item considered in another body, in the Senate committee, where very likely it would not be very carefully considered if it were put in here, but if they were asking to have it put in over there it would be carefully considered.

Mr. MONDELL. Our committee did carefully consider it, and my idea was to save the honorable gentlemen at the other end the necessity of going into the subject as carefully.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman may have the information. I do not say that he has not. I have not got it, and I have not heard it.

Mr. SHERLEY. If I can help the gentleman any, I shall be glad to do so. I was off the floor when his inquiry came up. The gentleman is inquiring as to why we provide \$35,000,000 which can be charged to the construction of ships rather than to requisitioning?

Mr. MANN. I inquired whether they had the authority to incur this obligation when they did it; and if they had, why they did not pay it out of the appropriation that was made.

Mr. SHERLEY. Strictly speaking, I think they did not have the authority to exceed the \$515,000,000 that could be spent for requisitioning ships; but they did it. Of course, they did have the authority up to \$515,000,000, and to that extent we were obligated to appropriate the money. Now they have gone ahead and requisitioned these ships. The amount of shipping that they requisitioned as such was less than \$515,000,000. I think it was about \$506,000,000; but they charged against the requisitioning fund expenses in connection with the requisitioning, moving to the seaboard, and reconstruction of vessels from the Great Lakes, and for some other ships that were not figured in when they made their original statement to us last year of the total need of \$515,000,000.

Now, this was the problem with which the committee was confronted: They had these obligations, which were Government obligations and which would have to be paid. We did not want to increase the authorizations that had been made for



all purposes for the Shipping Board. There was a leeway of over \$100,000,000 in the ship-construction funds, and, without increasing the authorization, it seemed to us wise to authorize \$35,000,000 of this to be charged against the ship-construction fund instead of increasing the authorization for requisitioning ships. I think it was that reason that controlled the committee in the matter.

Mr. MANN. The committee had no authority, had it, to increase the amount for requisitioning ships?

Mr. SHERLEY. We did not increase the amount originally, except—

Mr. MANN. No; but the gentleman said he did this in preference to increasing the amount for requisitioning ships. Did the committee have any authority to increase that amount?

Mr. SHERLEY. It would have power to bring it in here subject to the rules of the House. But what I meant was this: There were already obligations incurred which had to be paid unless we were in some way to get the Government out of them or to repudiate them. Now, instead of appropriating \$35,000,000 which they need according to their statement to pay their liabilities under action which they had taken in regard to requisitioning, we thought it was better to reduce by \$35,000,000 the leeway that still existed in the construction of ships and pay for the requisitioning of them in that form.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, then, they have incurred obligations for \$35,000,000 on account of the construction of these requisitioned ships more than they were authorized to incur?

Mr. SHERLEY. In regard to construction and other matters incident to requisitioning.

Mr. MANN. I really do not think it would hurt them any to have to go and explain all that to the Senate committee. Probably it will not be very difficult.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have only tried to give the gentleman the information I have. There is a good deal of information in the hearings, but I am frank to say that I can not, just on the spur of the moment, recall it all for the benefit of the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNYDER. A short time ago the gentleman made a statement with regard to certain tonnage that had been built and was to be built. In those figures did the gentleman include the tonnage that had been requisitioned?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Then, this \$35,000,000 we are now referring to has not been referred to as pertaining to the cost of that tonnage?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. SNYDER. If that is so, then we must add to any figures that have been given heretofore this \$35,000,000?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I think the gentleman is in error.

Mr. SNYDER. I may be wrong, but I want to have it made clear.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will try to make it clear if I can. Congress authorized obligations to be incurred in the way of requisitioning ships to the extent of \$515,000,000. We also authorized certain expenses to be incurred in connection with the construction of ships to the extent of \$2,884,000,000. We actually had appropriated considerably less sums than that, but they have incurred obligations in the way of shipbuilding and plants that will require a sum to be paid out of the requisitioning ship fund, instead of \$515,000,000, of \$35,000,000 additional, or \$550,000,000.

Now, the "construction of ship" obligations they have incurred, and which they expect to have to meet, is something under \$100,000,000 of what they were authorized to incur. In other words, they went over their limit as to the "requisitioning ships" authorizations, and they went under the limit in the "construction of ships" authorization. They contend that strictly speaking some things were charged to requisitioning ships that ought not to have been so charged, because they were not requisitioned ships in the sense they had spoken of when they got the limit of cost of \$515,000,000, but were sums paid out in building ships, where they had canceled private contracts and then built ships, and such sums should have been charged under the construction fund.

In giving the figures I did I gave the figures which represented the amount of ships from all sources that they expected to acquire. I do not know that I stated the amount of money that they would cost in detail, but assuming that all they have been authorized to spend will be spent, and no more than that spent, there will have been spent \$3,953,500,000, which would represent the cost of all the ships, plants, and so forth.

Mr. SNYDER. Including the requisitioned ships and those constructed?

Mr. SHERLEY. All ships, whether requisitioned, constructed, or purchased.

Mr. SNYDER. This \$35,000,000 is not in addition to the moneys appropriated before?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is a transfer of \$35,000,000 now charged against the requisition fund to the construction fund.

Mr. MANN. Does this include all claims in regard to requisitioned ships?

Mr. SHERLEY. They state that then the \$100,000,000 carried in this bill will be sufficient to meet all their obligations in connection with requisitioned ships.

Mr. MANN. Including claims of foreign owners of foreign governments?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes, as to requisitioned ships.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know how much the foreign claims are?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; they were stated in the hearings. I think they claim the aggregate is about \$80,000,000, but they did not think that amount would have to be paid, but the financial estimate was predicated on that amount as I recall.

Mr. MANN. That is included in the \$100,000,000 item?

Mr. SHERLEY. In that and what has heretofore been appropriated under requisition. I am advised by my colleague that in the testimony Mr. Page, I think it was, stated that they thought the claims could be settled for about \$65,000,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, while I think the gentleman has made a fair explanation, I do not think it will do any harm to go over it again, and I make the point of order on the proviso at the bottom of the page.

Mr. SHERLEY. I concede that it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CARAWAY). The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For recruiting, instructing, and training officers, engineers, and crews for American vessels, and for all expenditures incidental thereto, \$11,250,000, of which sum \$3,750,000 shall be available immediately.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 2, after the word "immediately," insert "no part of the appropriations made in this act for the Shipping Board or Emergency Fleet Corporation shall be expended for the preparation, printing, or publication of any bulletin, newspaper, magazine, or periodical, or for service in connection with the same not including the preparation and printing of reports and documents required to be issued or made by law."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is indicated in the language in which it is submitted. It is rather difficult from the hearings and various tables inserted, furnished by the Shipping Board, to distinguish how much has been expended for publicity, printing of the various bulletins and documents for publicity by the board. They have issued a number of journals in various sections of the country which I think during the war emergency may have succeeded in arousing some interest.

I notice that the board has had an information bureau which costs \$9,200 with four employees, an intelligence office costing \$9,600 with three employees, a minute division costing \$9,100, with an editorial clerk, and has expended some \$6,397 for advertising and also has issued in connection with the Boston branch a publication known as the Merchant Mariner at a cost of some \$7,000. Of course, these expenditures are insignificant in comparison with the total of the appropriations carried in this measure, but I think the rampant fever for publicity and self-laudation upon the part of many of the departments ought to receive some sort of a temporary check, in the interest of economy.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have not a word of complaint to say against all that the gentleman has said. As far as I am concerned I should be glad to see not only in this department but in all the others, a stoppage of all this publicity. It may have had a reason in time of war, though I am not sure of that, but certainly it has none now. I only caught the reading of the gentleman's limitation and I would inquire how far it might interfere with any necessary work in connection with these schools and the training of marine personnel, and the legitimate work of the Emergency Fleet Corporation. So far as all of this publicity is concerned, the gentleman and I are in accord, and I think it ought to be stopped overnight.

Mr. WALSH. I would state that the amendment is confined to bulletins, newspapers, magazines, or periodicals which have been issued, and, in my opinion, the language would not inter-



fare at all with the issuance of the necessary documents for the instruction of these men attending the recruiting service schools or other branches of the service. I think, as the gentleman has so well said, that we ought to stop overnight the issuance of the Merchant Mariner, the Emergency Fleet News, the Shipping Corporation Daily, and these other publications and bulletins that are issued, containing complimentary references to officials and employees and flattering notices as to the accomplishment of some of the chiefs of the various divisions, with pictures of drug stores and other institutions that have assisted in some way in the service. The language that I have used in the amendment would stop this publicity rage that has prevailed, particularly in the Shipping Board. They are not the only branch of the Government service that have suffered from this fever, and some of the other branches have it in equally violent form. I trust that when opportunity presents the committee will adopt similar restrictions and limitations upon appropriations; but this language, in my judgment, would not prevent legitimate publications for the actual work of the Shipping Board.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, I think if he would modify his amendment so as to exclude from its prohibition the necessary work in connection with matters required to be carried on, it would be satisfactory. The language, "not required by law," would, perhaps, restrict it to a particular thing for which you could not find definite authorization.

Mr. WALSH. Suppose I substitute the word "authorized" for "required"? I think that would correct it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Very well.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment by substituting the word "authorized" for the word "required."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is a good one. It is a good, philosophical amendment, anyway. Will it accomplish anything? I hope so. I remember a few years ago when the House was in a state of hysteria over publications by one branch of the Agriculture Department. Gentlemen said they were seeking to advertise themselves and get enlarged appropriations, and a provision was inserted in the law forbidding money to be used for purposes of publication. Since that time I have watched with interest the course of these publications. A little while ago a gentleman came to me, in the Government service, and asked if I would write a little memorandum telling what a great thing it was to issue a new Government publication, stating that they would publish and give me the credit, advertise me, and showed me one where a lot of other Members of Congress had been advertised. I have not yet done it, and probably will not, though perhaps I need good advertising as much as anybody. There you have it. They have a fad—which seemingly can not be controlled—to advertise themselves.

The Reclamation Service publishes a bulletin which, so far as it has value in it, is merely telling about what some man employed in the Reclamation Service is doing in order to puff him up. Most of the material that is in it is pure stuff. The Agricultural Department issues a lot of bulletins; I do not mean the kind they call Farmers' Bulletins, but publications designed merely to advertise a man connected with that department. Various other departments of the Government do the same thing. I hope this will be effective, but—

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The unexpended balance of the appropriation "for observation of the total eclipse of the sun of June 8, 1918, etc.," is reappropriated and made available immediately for observation of the total eclipse of the sun of May 28, 1919, visible in Bolivia.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item was referred to rather disparagingly by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I would like to ask how much of this appropriation is available to be reappropriated?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. There was a balance of between \$1,300 and \$1,400 available for this purpose, and it was

stated the purpose of the language was that they have under this heading a station in Chile which the representative of the department has not been able to visit during the war and was anxious to visit on this occasion, not only to perform that duty, but also to look after the work that has been carried on in Argentina.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I am sure, Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi were here after the information has been given by the chairman of the subcommittee he would not seriously object to spending \$1,300 or \$1,400 for an opportunity for somebody to go to Chile or South America and exist in total darkness for a few seconds observing this important astronomical event.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the proposition of the gentleman from Mississippi was to restrain himself in regard to objecting to appropriations until he reached the item of nearly \$7,000,000 for the Mississippi River, and possibly he may feel then that his insistence for economy would lead him to object and move to strike that out.

Mr. WALSH. I think very likely that may account for the brief absence of the gentleman from the floor. He is fortifying himself in that respect.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, it is quite a pleasant mental exercise to turn away from the consideration of the publications referred to awhile ago to the publications referred to here under the Smithsonian Institution under the head of International Exchanges, American Ethnology, International Catalogue of Scientific Literature, and so forth. I think our membership quite appreciates the great work that this scientific institution has done and is now doing. I believe I am within the field of certainty when I say that the American Ethnological Association has done, of its kind, the finest scientific work in the way of publications that has been accomplished in any country in the world. I believe also that these international exchanges of catalogues, as well as the other international exchanges, have been the largest accumulation of scientific knowledge with less expenditure of money of any institution of its kind in the world. It is really a source of great inspiration to our country; and when we recall that this institution was started back sometime before the Civil War with a small endowment, and it has now grown to the position of the finest accumulation of scientific authority that can be gathered in any scientific center anywhere in the world, and without a very large expenditure on the part of the Government—an endowment that started with about \$500,000, as I now recall it—has reached at least close to \$1,000,000 without any undue expenditure on the part of the Government itself. And so, while there has been a ground for rightful criticism of these cheap publications that are very largely self-advertisements, here is a very marked exception. It is one of the evidences that Washington is rapidly becoming the greatest center of scholarship and expert knowledge that to-day is found on the globe.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will yield to my friend.

Mr. PLATT. I notice this appropriation for the International Catalogue of Scientific Literature is only \$7,500. I would like to ask what can be done with so small an appropriation as that?

Mr. FESS. Nearly all of this is a matter of exchanges, and what we do is to publish something for ourselves and exchange it with other countries for like publications and in that way, with a small output, we get a great accumulation of scientific information. It to me is one remarkable educational scientific movement in the country.

Mr. PLATT. The gentleman's statement is very interesting, but I notice that this item says "including the preparation of a classified indexed catalogue of American scientific publications," and it includes clerk hire, purchase of necessary books and periodicals, and other necessary incidental expenses. It seems to me, even with the explanation of the gentleman, that that is a very small amount for the items which have to be provided.

Mr. FESS. I admit that in this time of great expenditures this small expenditure is rather disturbing to us, but the work is there nevertheless.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Zoological Park: For roads, walks, bridges, water supply, sewerage, and drainage; grading, planting, and otherwise improving the grounds; erecting and repairing buildings and inclosures; care, subsistence, purchase, and transportation of animals; necessary employees; incidental expenses not otherwise provided for, including purchase, maintenance, and driving of horses and vehicles required for official purposes, not exceeding \$100 for the purchase of necessary books and periodicals, and exclusive of architect's fees or compensation, \$115,000; one half of which sum shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia and the other half from the Treasury of the United States.



Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What is the necessity for architect's fees in connection with the Smithsonian Institution? Are they carrying on alterations?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The language says "exclusive of architect's fees."

Mr. WALSH. I know; but I say are they carrying on some construction work?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. They were hiring architects to prepare plans, and under the provision here they now have to go to the municipal architect for the drawing of plans for buildings that may be constructed by them, or bridges, or anything else. This excludes them from hiring architects out of this.

Mr. WALSH. I understand the purpose of the language, but I wondered why they excluded it—what the activity was.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. They have been contracting architect's fees for the construction of bridges out in the Zoo.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TARIFF COMMISSION.

For salaries and expenses of the United States Tariff Commission, including the purchase of professional and scientific books, law books, books of reference, and periodicals as may be necessary, as authorized under Title VII of the act entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes," approved September 8, 1916, \$300,000: *Provided*, That the disbursing clerk of the Treasury Department shall act in a similar capacity for the United States Tariff Commission.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There is an increase of \$100,000 in this appropriation. I wonder if that is predicated upon the renewed or increased activity in view of the approaching presidential election, when possibly and very likely the complexion of the political atmosphere in this section may be changed?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can tell the gentleman the reason for that. Under the act creating the commission the sum of \$300,000 was named as its annual expense. That amount was appropriated every year until last year, when the committee recommended that it be reduced to \$200,000 in view of the fact that during the war there was additional reason for economy, and then, too, they could not be expected to have as much work to do. Now, with the ending of the war they undoubtedly will be called upon to make many investigations, and Congress, in the consideration of tariff legislation, will want all the information they can get from the commission. Certainly there is no reason why we should not appropriate the sum which has been appropriated for the Tariff Commission from its organization—\$300,000—and which was intended to be appropriated by the organic act.

Mr. WALSH. If I understand the gentleman correctly, this is an instance where in getting back to normal we are increasing the appropriation?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is true. We are going back to prewar conditions—\$300,000. During the war we went below normal, and it is one of the few instances where we did.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, the gentleman is aware that the Tariff Commission has not been dormant during the war. We have all received quite a voluminous and illuminating document on its activities during the past year or 18 months, and if they were able to pursue that inquiry and investigation with a \$200,000 appropriation, it seems to me that it might be well to limit them to that amount for the ensuing year. Does not the gentleman think there is merit in the suggestion?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am satisfied that the gentleman will conclude that the commission ought to know what force it can depend upon. As originally contemplated, the appropriation was \$300,000, and certainly now when they will have more work than ever and when, as a matter of fact, the commission asked for \$350,000 or \$400,000, the committee's action in fixing this at the sum that was originally contemplated is justified.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out, in line 19, page 48, the figures "\$300,000" and insert "\$200,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALSH moves to amend, on page 48, line 19, by striking out "\$300,000" and inserting "\$200,000."

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina why it is the salaries of the members of the commission are not put in this provision? Are they fixed by law?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. They are included in this appropriation.

Mr. DYER. They are not set out as they are in other appropriations.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. They are fixed by statute, and so it is unnecessary to set them out.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman does not follow that in the bill in all particulars. In the Shipping Board and in others the salaries are set out at so much each.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Certainly it would be a mere duplication to set them out here, inasmuch as the statute provides what the salary shall be.

Mr. DYER. Does the statute provide what salaries the employees shall receive, or does the Tariff Commission fix that?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It fixes the salary of the Secretary and the commission. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### WAR TRADE BOARD.

The unexpended balance on June 30, 1919, of the appropriation of \$3,500,000 for the War Trade Board for the fiscal year 1919 is reappropriated and made available for the same purposes until the President shall have proclaimed the termination of the war between the United States and the central powers of Europe.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. BRAND, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. SUMNERS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina moves to strike out the paragraph, and the gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph for this reason: This is the only one of the war boards for which an appropriation was carried, and the statement was made that they might need an appropriation to wind up their affairs. Upon consideration I see no good reason why an exception should be made in this case, and I therefore move that the paragraph be stricken out, so that they will have no funds that can be used after July 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from South Carolina say about the point of order?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The paragraph certainly is not subject to a point of order, because it provides only for the reappropriation of funds. My motion is to strike out the paragraph, so that there will be no funds at the disposal of the board for its activities.

Mr. CRISP. It is not authorized by law.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It is authorized by law.

Mr. WALSH. It is a reappropriation. Of course, it makes the appropriation available until the President shall have proclaimed a termination of the war between the United States and the "central powers of Europe." While we have not declared war against the "central powers of Europe," yet it is apparent that that is the war between the United States and the Imperial German Government and the Royal Austrian and Hungarian Government. It makes it available, possibly, beyond the next fiscal year. If that is so, it is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the item should remain in the bill, because there may be some work for this board after the 1st of July, although I think it is doubtful. They are very anxious to close out their business. The committee thought we ought to extend their activities beyond the fiscal year, but beyond question the item is subject to a point of order. It is not definitely authorized by law.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wyoming yield for a question not directly on the point of order?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS. This War Trade Board is now requiring licenses?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; various licenses.

Mr. SUMNERS. Especially as to exportations to Mexico and to Cuba.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; to various places.

Mr. SUMNERS. They not only grant the licenses on every application, practically, but it takes days and sometimes weeks, and the only effect of the exercise of the power of this War Trade Board is to interfere with business.

Mr. MONDELL. To interfere with trade and business.

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes. The only effect is to establish interference in trade between our country and foreign countries.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. In the event they find a consignee to be an alien enemy they do not grant the license. They are still



maintaining an embargo on behalf of the allies, and the result is they are interfering very considerably with the transaction of our business.

Mr. SUMNERS. There is no doubt about it. I make the statement that they are interfering, and interference is practically the only effect of their activities.

Mr. MONDELL. But, Mr. Chairman, to come back to the point of order, while I should like to see this item remain in, because there may be some activities for this board beyond the fiscal year, if the treaty of peace should not be signed before that time—the probability is that the treaty of peace will be signed before that time—the item is not definitely provided for by law, and it is simply submitted to the House for its consideration.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I ask for a ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was desiring to get a little bit of information to settle that question as to whether it was subject to a point of order or not.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from South Carolina will agree that there is no specific statute creating the War Trade Board; that they were formed as a part of the war activities, and were given an appropriation last year for the first time. The mere fact of giving a war activity an appropriation, that activity having been independently created by the Executive, does not warrant the continuance of that appropriation if the point of order is made against it. I may be in error, but as I understand this is an activity that was created by the President, and last year for the first time the Congress appropriated specifically for it. Apparently they have not used all of their funds, and it is attempted here not only to reappropriate the unexpended balance, but to make it available for a period of time which may go beyond the expiration of the next fiscal year. Therefore it seems to me the item is subject to a point of order. With reference to the point made by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] that the War Trade Board is not a product of a specific statute—and I think the gentleman is correct—it certainly is subject to a point of order to try to come in and reappropriate an unexpended balance. Now, I understand that this War Trade Board is about to give up the ghost voluntarily in the near future.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CARAWAY). The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a question. Is there an authorization for this appropriation?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. There is no authorization specifically creating the War Trade Board. The War Trade Board was created by the President as a means for carrying out the duties devolving upon him under the trading-with-the-enemy act and the espionage act.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. May I ask the chairman of the committee a question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The President did have authority under some act to create the War Trade Board, did he not?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. He did, under the trading-with-the-enemy act and the espionage act.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If he had some specific authority to create it, it would be the same as if it had been created by direct act of Congress, if that is the history of it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is the history of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina state that there was authority for its creation?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am satisfied that there was authority for its creation, because those acts gave the President the power to enforce certain regulations by such agencies as he might devise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The motion is to strike out the paragraph, on the ground that there is no necessity for the board during the next fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: Page 48, line 23, strike out the paragraph beginning with line 23 and ending with line 4, page 49.

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Chairman, I submit an amendment to perfect the text.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment to perfect the text.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BRAND offers the following amendment: Page 49, line 4, after the word "Europe," strike out the period and insert a colon and add the following:

"Provided, That so long as the embargo on the exportation of American goods and farm products provided for in title 7 of the espionage act approved May 16, 1918, remains in force and effect, and the

regulations and orders issued thereon remain effective, no part of the appropriation of said \$3,500,000 for the War Trade Board shall be available for the purposes named in this bill."

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. CRISP. I ask that the point of order be made. I call for the regular order.

Mr. DYER. I make the point of order.

Mr. CRISP. We would like to know what the point of order is.

Mr. STEAGALL. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a point of order now to be determined.

Mr. WINGO. What is the point of order that the gentleman makes?

Mr. DYER. As I caught it, it provides for things not authorized by the act creating the War Trade Board, and this is offered as an amendment to the motion to strike out.

The CHAIRMAN. It is offered as an amendment to the amendment, to perfect the text.

Mr. WINGO. It is a limitation on the expenditure of a public fund, is it not?

Mr. DYER. Oh, yes; it does.

Mr. WINGO. Would it not be in order on that theory?

Mr. DYER. I think not.

Mr. WINGO. There is no question about the germaneness of the amendment in construing the expenditure.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order if the Chair has any doubt about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CRISP. The parliamentary proposition pending before the House is the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina to strike out a section of the bill. The gentleman from Georgia has offered an amendment to perfect the text which it is proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina to strike out. The rules of the House are specific in this respect as to the motion to perfect the text being first in order.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will pause, the Chair has no doubt about that.

Mr. CRISP. Then, Mr. Chairman, as to the other proposition I think it is equally clear that it is a limitation. There is a provision in the bill appropriating money for the War Trade Board and the amendment simply provides that no part of the fund shall be expended as long as any embargo is maintained on the exportation of American goods and products.

Mr. DYER. Is not that legislation, indirectly?

Mr. CRISP. Absolutely not; it is a limitation pure and simple. There is no discretion whatever left with any executive department. They have nothing to determine except to see whether the embargo is enforced against American products and American goods. If any such embargo is in existence, then the limitation applies and says that this fund shall not be used. It is a clear limitation, pure and simple, and such limitations are always in order on an appropriation bill. It is always in order to offer a limitation on an appropriation contained in an appropriation bill, and whether the limitation is wise or unwise is not for the Chair to determine. It is for the committee to determine. The only province of the Chair is to determine whether it is purely and simply a limitation; and if it is, it is in order.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. It does not require that the embargo be raised, but requires that the money shall not be spent if it is not raised.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman is right. If they raise the embargo the money is available, if they do not the money can not be spent. That is the whole effect of the amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that it is limited to apply only to the expenditure of funds provided for in this bill for the next fiscal year.

Mr. CRISP. That is true.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Therefore if the amendment is offered to strike out the paragraph they will have no funds and they will have no fund that you will want to limit.

Mr. CRISP. I will not take issue with the gentleman on that proposition. I am arguing that this amendment is clearly in order under the rules of the House.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the amendment to strike out is not adopted the War Trade Board would have the right to expend a part of this fund to enforce the blockade as to other commodities not included in the amendment, whereas if the fund is taken from them they could not enforce the blockade on anything.



Mr. CRISP. I am not familiar with the terms of the bill, but I agree with the gentleman that if the fund is taken away they could not use it for any purpose.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Missouri, I wish to say that I am sure the gentleman from Missouri must have forgotten an amendment which he offered sometime ago to an appropriation bill, and which was sustained as a limitation. This amendment is interesting in this connection because it shows in the most emphatic fashion that the present amendment is a limitation. The gentleman from Missouri offered an amendment to the following effect that "no money appropriated herein shall be used unless all former Government employees who have been drafted or enlisted in the United States in the war with Germany shall be reinstated." After argument that was held out of order, but on appeal it was held that it was a limitation, although there was a direct compulsion on the part of officials to reinstate these men.

Mr. DYER. The law already provided for the reinstatement of these men.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes, but you provided that the appropriation should not be available unless the soldiers were reinstated. That was a clear case of compulsion upon the officials. That makes the difference between that amendment and this one.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. MONDELL. Before the Chair rules I would like to be heard.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, just a word. I am not going to detain the Chair, or the committee but for a moment. This amendment is a pure limitation, dealing exclusively with money. It is an indirect inhibition upon the use of the money. It does not compel directly any action whatever, it does not direct the officials to do anything. It merely says that under the conditions recited in the amendment the appropriations shall not be available. It is as pure a limitation as is possible to be constructed under the rules of the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, this is a change of existing law on an appropriation bill, which violates the rules, in the guise of a limitation. It is not a limitation; it is prohibition. It prohibits the use of this money unless certain acts which have been authorized by law are rescinded. It is not a limitation in any sense. It is a prohibition against the use of the money unless certain things occur. It is not on all fours with the amendment referred to by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER]. In that case there was an existing law which calls upon the executive officers to do certain things. They were not performing their duty under that law, and the gentleman's amendment called on them to perform their duty or not expend the money. That was clearly a limitation, but this is a very different proposition. This is an attempt to repeal a law, to make it inoperative, under the guise of a limitation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If this were a case of first impressions, it is doubtful what the opinion of the Chair might be with reference to the proposed amendment, but in line with repeated precedents handed down by the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SAUNDERS, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GARNER, the gentleman from Missouri, Judge ALEXANDER, and others, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STEAGALL: Amend the amendment by adding a comma after the word "products" and insert the words "including cottonseed and peanut oils."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes that this is an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. STEAGALL. I understood that this was a motion to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks this would not be in order at this time.

Mr. STEAGALL. Then I withdraw the amendment for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, if one wants to start a flurry in this House on the Democratic side all that is necessary is to mention King Cotton, and immediately all the gentlemen are on their feet stampeding the House in their desire to get into the Record. I am one of those who are of the opinion that we ought to do away with embargoes as soon as

possible and wherever possible. They hamper and restrict trade. There is no doubt about that. They do it even now under conditions where license is ordinarily issued. There is always some delay, although the gentlemen who appeared before our committee and with whom we discussed this matter at length assured us that there was comparatively little delay. They said that we are still under some obligations to the allies over on the other side. We are pledged, they said, to a certain extent to them to maintain an embargo, at least against alien enemies. You may or may not agree with the President about the league of nations, but I do not think the House ought to do anything, even in order that gentlemen may stand well with their cotton constituents, that will not be in keeping with the obligations we are under, whatever they may be, to the allies.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to know how there could be any obligation of the United States to our allies to keep an embargo on American products at any time.

Mr. MONDELL. I give the gentleman the word of the gentlemen who are responsible under the administration. I am not a member of it. I am not under any responsibility in regard to those things, but they do say that so far as trading with the enemy is concerned, they are still obligated to see that such trade is not carried on, and that trade with enemy sympathizers is not carried on.

I know that nothing that I can say will affect the vote upon this amendment, for gentlemen must always go on record as being alive and on the qui vive in defense of cotton, and that is all right; that is commendable.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, I think they are getting excited over a very small and comparatively unimportant matter, but still it is well always to be on guard when cotton is in danger. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRISP. I had not intended to say anything about cotton, and the amendment does not name cotton, but deals with cotton and shoes and wheat and any other American product or mineral that is affected by the embargo. Does the gentleman contend that it is the duty of this Government, since he has mentioned cotton, to do anything to enable the English spinners to get the cotton of the South below its value, when cotton in normal peace times has been the one American product that has kept the balance of trade in favor of this country?

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman kindly address his inquiry to the President and those in charge of this administration? They are the people who are handling this thing; I am not.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman and others have addressed inquiries, written and verbal, to the President asking that all embargoes be lifted off exportation of American goods.

Mr. MONDELL. That was before the President came back.

Mr. CRISP. He will receive some more communications when he arrives.

Mr. MONDELL. But, Mr. Chairman, I did not rise for the purpose of discussing the cotton end of this controversy. I realize nothing I could say in regard to it would affect the votes of gentlemen from the cotton States. I do want to remind them, however, that their administration suggests that there is some obligation. I do not know. Personally, I think that we ought to remove all of these bars to trade, but while I am discussing this matter, if the House will bear with me I would like—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. May I have five minutes more?

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, last spring the woolgrowers of this country were called to Washington, and they were asked to agree to a maximum price for the American wool clip. They are patriotic folks. Wool was then worth about 65 cents a pound in the grease on the average. After a good deal of discussion the price was fixed for the entire American clip on a basis of the price of the year before. It developed, after the clip had been purchased by the Government and graded and classified, that the average price which the purchasers received was a little less than 50 cents—probably about 47 cents—a pound on the average.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. I would like to know what that same wool brought in 1914?



Mr. MONDELL. Well, it was selling almost as low in proportion as cotton was about that time.

Mr. CRISP. I would like to have an answer to the question how much it brought then. I do not know.

Mr. MONDELL. It brought at that time—1914—I think, about 30 to 35 cents.

Mr. CRISP. Wool in the grease, that same wool that is now 48 cents?

Mr. MONDELL. About 32 to 35 cents.

Mr. CRISP. Of course, I do not know.

Mr. MONDELL. There were times when wool was lower and times when it was higher. There were times when cotton was lower and when cotton was higher. The price fixed was 15 to 18 cents below the market price at the time the price was fixed or the agreement entered into, and the entire American clip was sold at that price. The woolgrower did not receive any benefit of war prices. After that clip had been sold the only possible protection to the Government and the woolgrower was an embargo on foreign shipments. I made inquiry about it, and I was assured by those in position to know that the embargo would not be lifted, and on that assurance I wired my people to that effect, but unfortunately my wire moved a little slow, as wires sometimes do now under Federal control, and another wire sent a few hours later got there ahead of mine and advised my people that the embargo had been lifted. By the lifting of the embargo woolgrowers were left at the mercy of importations from all the world. Now, there was a case where the embargo might properly have been retained. The Federal Government had 300,000,000 pounds of the American wool clip of last year, about 100,000,000 pounds of foreign wool, and stands to lose a great deal of money by reason of the Government taking off the embargo at the time when it was understood and stated by those in authority the Government would retain the embargo.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. One sentence more and I will. The only thing that stands between the American woolgrower to-day and a price that is absolutely confiscatory is the English issue price. If it were not for the English issue policy, which does maintain a price above what would probably be the price fixed by supply and demand, the woolgrowers of America, who were not allowed to secure any war benefits, would probably face bankruptcy.

Mr. RAGSDALE. In other words, as the gentleman now knows, the English are cooperating and guaranteeing a price in Australia, as the result of which the American grower is being benefited, and neither England nor the United States is doing anything to-day to protect the cotton grower, whom England is trying to destroy. And the gentleman well knows while the United States Government has an enormous quantity of wool on hand, on which it will lose an enormous sum of money, it has not a pound of cotton on hand on which it will lose a dollar of money.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know what the English attitude on cotton is, but I know the attitude of the English Government is the only thing that sustains the wool price.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Does not the gentleman know by reading the papers that the Manchester mills and the Liverpool market are daily selling the cotton market short here and that the American producer of cotton is absolutely without any benefit from anybody, while the American Government to-day denies the market of the world to him, and the markets of the world sell here and destroy the producer?

Mr. MONDELL. It seems the administration is neither protecting the woolgrower nor the cotton grower. Neither is the administration protecting the Government against loss on its wool holdings. Who is the administration protecting?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The vote is on the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia to the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STEAGALL: Amend the amendment by adding a comma after the word "products" and insert "including cottonseed and peanut oils."

The CHAIRMAN. The vote is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia want to be heard on his amendment?

Mr. BRAND. No. I have expressed my views on the merits of the question involved in my remarks submitted last Friday night.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words as to my amendment.

The situation is simply this: Gentlemen argue against maintaining a blockade on wool and cotton and on cotton seed and other commodities. The motion I have made to strike out the paragraph means that the War Trade Board will not be in existence after July 1 to maintain a blockade on anything. Now, a limitation upon it means simply this, that these funds which we seek to cover into the Treasury will continue to be at the disposal of the War Trade Board to conduct a blockade on some commodity if they see fit to do so after that time. The adoption of my amendment, which strikes out the paragraph, closes up the War Trade Board so that they can not maintain a blockade on anything, and at the same time covers this money into the Treasury instead of leaving it at the disposal of the War Trade Board.

How can anyone vote to continue an organization when they say they do not want that organization to function any longer.

Mr. BRAND. I would like to know the time when you say this War Trade Board will cease to function.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. July 1. If they have any balance then, it is covered back into the Treasury.

Mr. BRAND. They will not cover it back until then?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No, sir. As this bill only carries appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, the amendments which are offered to this paragraph limiting appropriations in the bill can not have any effect before July 1.

Mr. BRAND. In the meantime can not the War Trade Board keep this embargo on cotton?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. They can; and nothing offered here in this bill can stop them from doing it. Your limitation is a limitation on the expenditure of funds after July 1.

Mr. BRAND. Why not stop them now entirely?

Mr. STEAGALL. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. STEAGALL. Suppose the motion of the gentleman obtains and the paragraph is stricken out, would not the President still have power under the law already in existence to issue an order by which some other board could reestablish the embargo?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. After July 1 the President will have no \$50,000,000 fund. There is no provision in here to give him that fund for next year.

Mr. STEAGALL. I am not speaking of the funds. I am talking about the effect of striking out this paragraph included in the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina. Now, the President, so far as the law or authority conferred upon him is concerned, may issue an order putting this power in the hands of some other bureau.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Of course, he could. He could do that under your limitation, because you only limit this fund. If he had funds and gave them money, they could maintain a blockade, whether you limited the activities of the board, as you desire, or put them out of business entirely, as I desire.

Mr. STEAGALL. Then I want to ask one other question. Does not the gentleman believe that at this time, the war having closed last fall, this extraordinary power to deny the producers of America the right to ship their products to the world ought to be discontinued? And do you not believe that if the American Congress expresses its will upon the subject in favor of the removal of that embargo, the people of this country having gone to war in defense of their rights to ship their products to all corners of the earth, the President would respect the will of the American people as expressed by their Representatives in Congress?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman from Alabama asks about two things. I believe just what he believes, that this blockade should be raised. I believe it, but that does not change the situation, and the facts that he attempts to set forth have absolutely nothing to do with this fund. What I am endeavoring to do is to destroy the agency that the gentleman complains of, and the gentleman's motion aims at the continuation of that agency of which he complains. Why spend the money to continue an organization of which you complain? Why not destroy it?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. How would this board have any funds next year if this limitation were passed?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Because the funds are carried by this appropriation. It gives them that much money—the unexpended balance of their appropriations.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Well, yes—



Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. They can use it to maintain a blockade on other commodities.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. They can not use it for other purposes as long as this embargo remains. They will not have any money to spend.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is a limitation only as to certain purposes, and the gentleman knows they can use that money.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It says no part of this appropriation can be used so long as the embargo remains.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If they have not got the money certainly they can not use it, can they?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is another matter.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Then why object to cutting out the paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded. The motion is to strike out the section.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 30, noes 35.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For bar-stock storage shed with necessary facilities, \$50,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an inquiry for the purpose of asking why they are using bar stock in the arsenals of the Federal Government?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is not the kind of bar the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. WALSH. This is not the stock of the legal fraternity? Does that mean some kind of material?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; iron.

Mr. WALSH. There is so much prohibition in the air nowadays that I was misled.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Repairs of arsenals: For repairs and improvements of arsenals, and to meet such unforeseen expenditures as accidents or other contingencies during the year may render necessary, including machinery for manufacturing purposes in the arsenals, \$1,550,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, here is an appropriation nearly as large as was made last year during the war for repair of arsenals.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No. If the gentleman will allow me, the appropriation last year was \$2,750,000.

Mr. WALSH. Well, only \$1,750,000 was carried in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. And \$1,000,000 was carried in the deficiency bill. I will say to the gentleman that the estimate filed by the department is \$6,200,000, and the committee made it \$1,550,000.

Mr. WALSH. The committee runs true to form in the reduction?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes. The gentleman will agree that it is good form.

Mr. WALSH. I wondered what activities were being conducted in these arsenals with the cessation of the prosecution of the war which required \$1,550,000 for repairs and improvements and unforeseen expenditures.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will state to the gentleman that by reason of the war we have increased our investment. Certainly we can not fail to provide for its maintenance during the next year.

Mr. WALSH. Of course.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. During the war there has been added to the arsenals material to the value of \$60,000,000, and in the face of that, as the gentleman will see by looking at the bill there, we are really reverting to the prewar appropriations.

Mr. WALSH. It says "repairs and improvements."

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. But there is a good deal more material in those arsenals to-day than there was before.

Some of the buildings have been enlarged. They will require some repairs during the year.

Mr. WALSH. If they have all been enlarged and fixed up so as to meet the emergency due to the prosecution of the war, what do you need that \$1,550,000 for now when these activities have slowed down?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It includes repairs to machinery, and the machinery has been run 24 hours a day with three shifts of men. Certainly, in view of the estimate of \$6,000,000—an estimate made by the gentlemen who are in charge of this work and who are presumably somewhat familiar with the conditions, and who urged these estimates with great earnestness—the action of the committee in recommending only \$1,500,000 is conservative.

Mr. WALSH. The action of the committee is highly commendable. I am willing to grant that, but I can not understand what activities are being conducted there now, when we have ceased, in some measure at least, to turn out large guns.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The Government has an investment in those arsenals of \$95,000,000. This item is a little over 1 per cent for the repair, maintenance, and preservation of \$95,000,000 worth of property. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. WALSH. I think they can purchase machinery under this language. The gentleman said it included repairs to machinery.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It does. Money is spent out of this fund for repairs to machinery.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know just how much my friend from Massachusetts would have the committee trim these estimates. Here was an estimate of \$6,291,835 reduced to \$1,550,000, and that would seem to be a pretty fair reduction even on this bill, which is a fair example of the way estimates can be trimmed. During the war we have very greatly enlarged our arsenals and armories. We are now engaged in the work of placing in some of the older arsenals and armories some of the machinery which has been used in the plants temporarily built up for war purposes. The cost of that transfer of machinery will not be borne in the main by this item, but a part of the cost of placing the machinery will be borne by this item. The original item was based on a 4 per cent estimate of cost of repairs on the old arsenals and a 1 per cent estimate on the new. It seems to me the item is as low as it could well be under the circumstances, if we are to appropriate anything at all for the ordinary upkeep of these great properties which have been so extensively added to during the war.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Disposition of remains of officers, soldiers, and civilian employees: For interment, or of preparation and transportation to their homes or to such national cemeteries as may be designated by proper authority, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, of the remains of officers, cadets, United States Military Academy, including acting assistant surgeons and enlisted men in active service; interment, or of preparation and transportation to their homes, of the remains of civil employees of the Army in the employ of the War Department who die abroad, in Alaska, in the Canal Zone, or on Army transports, or who die while on duty in the field or at military posts within the limits of the United States; interment of military prisoners who die at military posts; for the interment and shipment to their homes of remains of enlisted men who are discharged in hospitals in the United States and continue as inmates of said hospitals to the date of their death, and for interment of prisoners of war and interned alien enemies who die at prison camps in the United States; removal of remains from abandoned posts to permanent military posts or national cemeteries, including the remains of Federal soldiers, sailors, or marines, interred in fields or abandoned private and city cemeteries; and in any case where the expenses of burial or shipment of the remains of officers or enlisted men of the Army who die on the active list are borne by individuals, where such expenses would have been lawful claims against the Government, reimbursement to such individuals may be made of the amount allowed by the Government for such services out of this sum, but no reimbursement shall be made of such expenses incurred prior to July 1, 1910, \$8,451,000: *Provided*, That during the continuance of the present war the above provisions shall be applicable in the cases of officers and enlisted men on the retired list of the Army who have died or may hereafter die while on active duty by proper assignment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. Can the chairman of the committee state what necessity exists for the interment of alien enemies who may die at military posts?

Mr. SHERLEY. Simply that they have to be buried.

Mr. WALSH. Are they going to be buried in the national cemeteries?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think not. I did not hear the testimony before the committee on this part of the bill. I have reread it hastily, but I do not recall whether anything was said directly



on the subject of alien enemies. We really carry most all of this money for our own soldier dead.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but the language refers to alien enemies interned?

Mr. SHERLEY. We have had to intern quite a number of alien enemies, some of whom have died.

Mr. WALSH. Died at prison camps?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. We have had to bury them. Certainly they are not going to be buried in national cemeteries, so far as I know.

Mr. WALSH. As I followed the reading of this section I understood that this was to cover the expenses of transporting from abroad those who may have been killed in action and those who may die in this country or at military posts.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is largely for the return of the dead officers and soldiers abroad to the United States.

Mr. WALSH. I was just wondering whether we were going to permit these alien enemies to be buried in our national cemeteries.

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I think it is for their burial where they die. We are not supposed to pay for their shipment to any particular place, so far as I know.

Mr. WALSH. If that is not the intention I will withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Gettysburg National Park: For continuing the establishment of the park; acquisition of lands, surveys, and maps; constructing, improving, and maintaining avenues, roads, and bridges thereon; fences and gates; marking the lines of battle with tablets and guns, each tablet bearing a brief legend giving historic facts and compiled without censure and without praise; preserving the features of the battle field and the monuments thereon; compensation of civilian commissioner, clerical and other services, expenses, and labor; purchase and preparation of tablets and gun carriages and placing them in position; maintenance, repair, and operation of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, and all other expenses incident to the foregoing, \$50,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. That is the same appropriation carried last year?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Just the same.

Mr. WALSH. It is not intended this year to authorize the purchase of motor-carrying vehicles?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; that was purposely left out.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Guilford Courthouse National Military Park: For continuing the establishment of a national military park at the battle field of Guilford Courthouse, in accordance with the act entitled "An act to establish a national military park at the battle field of Guilford Courthouse," approved March 2, 1917, \$9,200.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to ask the reason for the increase of this item of \$1,100.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The appropriation last year was \$8,100, and the estimate this year was for \$15,700. The committee recommended the sum of \$9,200. They requested an appropriation for the purchase of land and to do many other things. My recollection is that the purpose of the increase here was that there was one additional commissioner appointed this year, \$100, and the balance of the appropriation was urged on the ground that they wanted to improve this new park.

Mr. WALSH. This is a new park recently authorized to commemorate that event?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; and they have done a little work on it. If it is to be kept up at all they will have to make some slight improvements.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know if they have purchased any land that is contemplated to be embraced within the confines of the park?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. They have not purchased any since the original act establishing it. If they received the \$15,000 estimated, they would have purchased some land, but the Committee on Appropriations thought they could wait awhile longer for it.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For ordinary care of Lafayette Park, \$2,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to direct the attention of the gentleman having the bill in charge as to the item just read providing for the ordinary care of Lafayette Park. Last Monday when a bill was up for the establishment of the Lafayette National Park, at Mount Desert Island, it was stated on the floor that the name of this park north of the White House was properly Jackson Park and not Lafayette Park. Has the gentleman any informa-

tion as to the correct name of the park that sometimes bears the name of Jackson Park and sometimes Lafayette Park?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not inform the gentleman as I have never known of its being called Andrew Jackson Park. The gentleman has been a resident of Washington so much longer than I have and so much more industrious that if that were the fact I think he would have discovered it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may say for the information of the gentleman that the predecessor of another illustrious gentleman who bears the same name as the gentleman from South Carolina, the Hon. JOSEPH BYRNES, to wit, John Wesley Gaines, who was a great admirer of Andrew Jackson, persisted in saying that the proper name of the park north of the White House was Jackson Park. The park contains in its center the equestrian statue of Andrew Jackson.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Was that due to the fact that the statue of Jackson is in the vicinity?

Mr. STAFFORD. It is in the center of the park.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman has no objection to this being carried as Lafayette Park for another year?

Mr. STAFFORD. There was serious protest on the floor of the House in allowing the name of Lafayette to be attached to any park where the President is burned in effigy.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I would like to stop the burning in effigy, but I do not know that the change in the name would do it.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman want the name of Old Hickory attached to that sort of a place?

Mr. STAFFORD. It might have some influence on the fighting qualities of the militant suffragettes who take advantage of that park in close proximity to the White House.

Mr. WALSH. I have been informed by distinguished and very authentic authority that the name of that place where these momentous events and ridiculous capers have taken place is Jackson Square, and that that could be verified by turning to the archives and finding the act establishing that park and granting it as a public place.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think it should bear the name of the illustrious President Andrew Jackson. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For improvement, care, and maintenance of Smithsonian Grounds, \$4,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What has happened down at the Smithsonian Grounds that requires an increase in the appropriation?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, during the past year or two they have constructed new Government buildings there, and in doing so they have torn up the ground surrounding the Smithsonian Institution, and that park, which is visited by nearly everyone who comes to the city, of Washington, as a result of the construction of these buildings, is in worse state than almost any other part.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, yes; they have torn up the grounds, but they have covered over a lot of ground, and there is less ground to take care of.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman will remember, if he visited that section during the last year—

Mr. WALSH. I certainly have.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That the Government employees have been out in the park and that the soldiers have used it as a drill ground, and that they have destroyed the grounds. They have to resod the grounds, and they are asking for a much larger sum than the committee has recommended.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, I assume that is so, because that has been almost invariably the rule with reference to appropriations.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. WALSH. And I have taken occasion to commend the committee heretofore; but are there any markers or guides by which you can distinguish the Smithsonian Grounds from the Mall or from East Potomac Park or from Henry Park?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes. I could not direct the gentleman to the exact points—I would not know how to do it—but I am satisfied that the gentleman knows that the park nearest the Botanic Gardens is known as Seaton Park and that the one in front of the Smithsonian Institution is known as the Smithsonian Grounds. There is a Henry Park; and I have no doubt that he really is better informed as to the divisions than I am.

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

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression that the grounds immediately in front of the Smithsonian Institution and the old National Museum were under the charge of the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds, whereas this



item really applies to the grounds to the south of the Smithsonian Institution and immediate environs.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. This is under the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. STAFFORD. What part of the so-called Mall does this pertain to?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The ground right out in front of the Smithsonian Institution and the new National Museum. It has been carried here as the Smithsonian Grounds, right where the Smithsonian and the National Museum are.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there any provision for improving that part of the Mall just immediately west of the Botanic Gardens, which is in a very sorry condition?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. We will strike that in a few minutes. It is in the bill. It is the last item on page 61.

The Clerk read as follows:

For care and improvement of Rock Creek Park and the Piney Branch Parkway, exclusive of building for superintendent's residence, and including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$23,200.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. What authority of law is there for Piney Branch Parkway and for including personal services in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. This item was carried in the District bill last year; therefore, it was not necessary to carry the authority for personal services in the District of Columbia. It is now carried in this bill, and it is necessary. Rock Creek Park and Piney Branch Parkway are both authorized by law. The only difference is the authorization for personal services in the District of Columbia. This involves no increase in the amount at all.

Mr. WALSH. Where does the gentleman say it was carried—in the District bill?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In the District of Columbia appropriation bill last year.

Mr. WALSH. How was it transferred?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The information I have is that the jurisdiction was transferred under the sundry civil act of last year to the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds, which necessitated its being carried here.

Mr. WALSH. That the jurisdiction of these two parks was transferred by the sundry civil appropriation act of last year to the Engineer Department from the District of Columbia?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. That is a sufficient reason for its being in this bill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is the only reason.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For placing and maintaining special portions of the parks in condition for outdoor sports, \$15,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In putting parks in condition for outdoor sports, does that apply to cleaning up Lafayette Square so the suffragettes can have bonfires there?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Certainly the gentleman does not refer to that as outdoor sport?

Mr. WALSH. They seem to think it is considerable of a sport to burn speeches of the Chief Executive of the land. It says, "For placing and maintaining special portions of the parks in condition for outdoor sports," and I take it that means all the parks within the jurisdiction of the Engineer Department.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. As a matter of fact, in the construction of buildings, quite a number of the parks heretofore used for out-of-door sports have been destroyed for this purpose, and it really would justify an increase in the appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is that the reason for the action of the committee in reducing the amount from \$20,000 to \$15,000?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The action of the committee was merely in an effort to try and save some money.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the committee is attempting to save in the wrong place, because from my knowledge of the parks utilized for temporary buildings not one square foot of space was utilized for out-of-door sports.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Almost the only motion from gentlemen on that side of the House has been to reduce appropriations for parks.

Mr. STAFFORD. We are not seeking to reduce proper provisions that will promote health and are for the pastime of the denizens of the District. I am willing to provide places in our public parks to be used—

Mr. WALSH. I will yield to the gentleman, although I do not understand some of the phrases he is using.

Mr. STAFFORD. When a gentleman comes from Massachusetts I take him to be all wise and I am glad he admits he has not an acquaintance with some recognized phrases.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Did the gentleman say "wise" or "wild"?

Mr. WALSH. Of course, I do not yield for any abuse or anything of that sort.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman can not even take the encomiums of Members. But has not the committee made a mistake in reducing this estimate to this amount? I suppose this item is used for placing the Mall and the White House grounds in condition for tennis, baseball, and so forth.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman will be satisfied when I call to his attention the fact that, prior to last year, the appropriation was \$10,000, and last year, in order to do definite, specific work, the appropriation was raised from \$10,000 to \$20,000, so as to provide some place for outdoor sports that were lost to the people by reason of building construction. Now we recommend \$15,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. It may be that increase was due to my calling the attention to the then superintendent, Col. Harts, some years ago to the need of having ponds throughout the District here, where they could be frozen, so that people could enjoy skating, which I must say I enjoy and indulge in when I am home to a great extent.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I have no doubt that is true, and I hope the gentleman in the future—

Mr. STAFFORD. I will not have any more opportunity in Washington, but I am going to have plenty of opportunity when I return to my old Queen City, where we have skating four months in the year.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For operation, care, repair, and maintenance of the pumps which operate the three fountains on the Union Station Plaza, \$4,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Last year when this appropriation of \$4,000 was carried there was a report to be made to find out how they could reduce the expenditures of those fountains. Has that report been made to the Congress or to the department?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will tell the gentleman the situation. The report showed that by an investment of \$10,000 they could possibly save \$700 a year, which the committee thought to be entirely too high, and we were unwilling to recommend the expenditure, and therefore referred it back to the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds and requested that he furnish to the committee by the next session an estimate as to whether the change can not be made for less than \$10,000.

Mr. WALSH. Why, the gentleman does not mean to say he referred it to the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, does he?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. He did not refer it back to the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds? This is within the jurisdiction of the Engineer Department, or else it is erroneously set forth.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The proposed change is to connect with the Capitol power plant, and we asked the superintendent to take it up with the engineers. The cost at this time is \$4,000 a year, and the estimate was that by making the change recommended the annual cost would be \$3,264, and that to make that change it would cost \$10,000. Gentlemen can figure the interest on the \$10,000. And the belief that most of us had was that if the estimate was made at a time when the cost of material was not so high—possibly next year—it could be shown that it was a matter of economy to change it, and then we would do it; but as it stands now it would not be an economical thing to do.

The Clerk read as follows:

For soiling and seeding East and West Seaton Park, \$5,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee how late he expects to continue to-night.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I hope we can continue for some time, because we have but seven days more of this session, and we have read to-day only about 25 pages of this bill. The best part of the day has been consumed, and I trust we can get along and make some headway now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I shall not interrupt, but does the gentleman expect to run until half past 10?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I hope we can run until 10 o'clock, anyway.



Mr. MONDELL. I think the gentleman from South Carolina scarcely intends to run until 10 o'clock.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Why?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I hope we can do so, unless we can make some great headway, so that we can wind this bill up to-morrow.

Mr. MONDELL. If we run an hour or two longer we will be doing very well.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If we can make any headway in the bill, if the gentleman will call my attention to it possibly we can rise.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. On page 101 of the bill, "Territory of Alaska," there is an appropriation of \$4,000,000 for the Alaskan Engineering Commission in charge of the completion of the railroad. I want a little time to discuss it. I am advised that there are more overhead employees up there than there are railroad men.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am satisfied that the gentleman should have the opportunity, and we can arrange it when the item is reached.

The Clerk read as follows:

One half of the foregoing sums under "Buildings and grounds in and around Washington" shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia and the other half from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. These items are scattered about here. How much is the total appropriation carried for the care and maintenance of the Executive Mansion?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It is \$72,600. That includes the grounds.

Mr. WALSH. Does that include repairs?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It includes repairs, lighting, fuel, the maintenance of the greenhouse, and everything else.

Mr. WALSH. Includes the upkeep and maintenance when its occupants are away from here?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Or here.

Mr. WALSH. No reduction in the estimate on account of the contemplated absences?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; it is open to the public each day.

The Clerk read as follows:

Birthplace of George Washington, Wakefield, Va.: For repairs to fences and cleaning up and maintaining grounds about the monument, \$100.

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND of Virginia: Page 60, line 24, after the figures "\$100," strike out the period and add a semicolon, and add the following: "for repairs to Government wharf in Potomac River, at Wakefield, Va., leading to the birthplace of George Washington, and for restoration of said wharf, \$20,000."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the provision for the repair of this wharf has not been submitted to the committee, and my attention was not brought to it until a few days ago.

I understand that some years ago the wharf was constructed by the Government at Wakefield, costing something like \$20,000. The ice of last winter carried away that wharf, and there is practically no wharf there now.

If I had received the information in time, I would have brought it to the attention of the committee, or I would have gotten the necessary information in Washington. The information I have is based entirely upon a letter received by me from a constituent, so that I am not in a position to say to the committee positively that the sum of \$20,000 is a reasonable or an unreasonable sum, but I only state the amount suggested in the communication I have referred to.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, as to this amendment, I think the committee will be satisfied that no estimate having been brought to our attention we can not in the absence of an estimate consider making an appropriation. If it is necessary, and the gentleman will call it to the attention of the department, I am satisfied it will do something to remedy the situation.

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. I will bring it to the attention of the War Department and bring it to the attention of the Senate committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wixco). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment reads: "For repair to the Government wharf in Potomac River, at Wakefield, Va.," and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Chair will permit, there is no law authorizing the construction of a wharf at Wakefield, Va. There being no law authorizing the construction of a wharf at Wakefield, and therefore the mere fact that the amendment provides for the repair of a private wharf does not make it in order on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair makes his ruling, relying on the statement made by the gentleman from Virginia that the Government formerly had a wharf there and that the ice has destroyed that wharf.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I reserved a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If it be true that that was a Government wharf, would not an amendment for the repair of it, although the repair might be in the nature of a restoration, be in order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I hardly think so; not on the sundry civil appropriation bill. I hardly think so. I question whether we have the right, under the circumstances, to provide for the restoration of something that years back was established by the Government. It is admitted by the gentleman that there is no wharf there at the present time.

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. I did not admit that. The amendment itself says, "For the repair of a Government wharf at Wakefield, in the Potomac River, at Wakefield, Va."

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any information that at any time it was erected by the Government?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Yes; but I can not put my hand on the legislation at this time. But looking over the Congressional Directory, particularly as to the work that was done by my predecessor here, I notice that in his earlier days he introduced a bill for the construction of a wharf at Wakefield, Va., and my general information is that the Government later did authorize the construction of a wharf at that place.

Mr. STAFFORD. When?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. I could not say just now when it was done, but it was done in consequence of legislative enactment, and I am satisfied that I can put my hand upon the law authorizing the construction of the wharf. My recollection is that it was about \$20,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The pending item is for repairing and maintaining fences and cleaning up grounds about the monument at the birthplace of George Washington, at Wakefield, Va. The amendment of the gentleman from Virginia provides for the repair of the Government wharf at that place. If there be no Government wharf there, of course the amendment is absolutely void; but the language of the amendment provides for the repair of Government property, and the Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 11, yeas 7.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina demands tellers. Those in favor of ordering tellers will please rise and stand until they are counted. Evidently not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused. The amendment is agreed to—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, how many Members rose in response to the call for tellers?

The CHAIRMAN. On the division there were 11 in the affirmative and 7 in the negative. On the call for tellers only four Members rose.

Mr. WALSH. There is a point of no quorum pending, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Is it too late to put the question on the demand for tellers?

The CHAIRMAN. No; not if there is any doubt about the count; but the point of no quorum has been made.

Mr. WALSH. We are not going to have any jockeying around on the question of tellers.



The CHAIRMAN. On the division there were—ayes 11, noes 7, or 18 Members voting. Evidently there were not enough Members to sustain the call for tellers; but in view of the suggestion of the chairman of the committee, the Chair is perfectly willing to submit the question again.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I renew the call for tellers.

Mr. WALSH. And I renew the point of no quorum.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will ask the gentleman to let us have the call for tellers submitted again. I want the membership of the committee to have an opportunity to vote on the question.

Mr. MONDELL. If the House has reached a point where amendments are to be agreed to for which no estimates have been submitted and for work that as far as we know the Government never undertook, it seems to me that we should have a quorum here, so that we can legislate intelligently.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the point of no quorum withdrawn?

Mr. WALSH. In view of the statement of the gentleman in charge of the bill that he desires to have the question submitted again, I will withdraw the point, but will not agree not to renew it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina demands tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina and Mr. BLAND of Virginia.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 8, noes 17.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WALSH. In view of the multitude who are present I will not renew the point of no quorum. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Flood control: For prosecuting work of flood control in accordance with the provisions of the flood-control act approved March 1, 1917, as follows:

Mississippi River, \$6,670,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. WALSH. I make a point of order on that paragraph. The provision that this item shall remain available until expended is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It is not subject to a point of order, because there is a statute which says that river and harbor appropriations shall be available until expended.

Mr. WALSH. But this particular item is for flood control.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. What is the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. My point of order is against the words "to remain available until expended."

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts state his point of order again?

Mr. WALSH. This item is for prosecuting the work of flood control under the flood-control act approved March 1, 1917. There is an appropriation of \$6,670,000, and the item contains the following language:

To remain available until expended.

Now, there is no authorization in the flood-control act of March 1, 1917, that appropriations made shall remain available until expended. If there is any such provision in that act, then certainly there is no need for carrying this language in the sundry civil bill.

My point of order to the provision is that it shall remain available until expended. That is legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The statute provides this:

That from and after the 1st day of July, 1874, and of each year thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause all unexpended balances of appropriations which shall have remained upon the books of the Treasury for two fiscal years to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to permanent specific appropriations, appropriations for rivers and harbors, lighthouses, fortifications, public buildings, or the pay of the Navy and Marine Corps; but the appropriations named in this proviso shall continue available until otherwise ordered by Congress.

This, by its language, is for the Mississippi River and an appropriation for a river.

Mr. WALSH. I know, but this is the same appropriation, the same sum that was appropriated last year, \$6,670,000. The appropriation made last year was not to remain available until expended. It was a flat appropriation to be expended within the limits of the fiscal year. Here is an appropriation for \$6,670,000, and you want to spread it out.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It has always been ruled that it is available as a part of the appropriation provided, but if the gentleman wants to change it I am willing that he should do so.

Mr. WALSH. This is not a river and harbor appropriation.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The statute says for rivers and public buildings.

Mr. WALSH. That does not include the statute of March 1, 1917. It names rivers and harbors and public buildings, but the

act which the gentleman read was passed long prior to the act of March 1, 1917.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. There is nothing in the law that says that it shall be appropriations in the river and harbor bill—it says that money expended on rivers and harbors. This is a part of the river which has been authorized for continuous improvement. The Secretary of War has been authorized and directed to make certain improvements for navigation, for flood control, the only limitation being that he could not expend more on the Mississippi River—or the Mississippi River Commission could not expend more than \$10,000,000 annually. It is for the improvement of the river nevertheless; the law does not say that it applies to items carried in the river and harbor bill.

Mr. WALSH. I know; but that act was passed long before the act of 1917. My contention is, Mr. Chairman, that this appropriation is the result of a specific and particular act, approved by the President March 1, 1917, for flood-control work.

We have thrashed out on the floor on one or two occasions the question whether this was river and harbor work. It is the work of another character that does not bring it within the terms of the existing law. This is a subsequent statute and you are attempting to make an appropriation available until it is expended.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. If the gentleman will pardon me, the Mississippi River Commission was created and the project was adopted by Congress and the commission authorized to do the work thirty-odd years ago.

Mr. WALSH. And this appropriation is not made by legislative authority of 30 years ago.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. What Congress did in the flood-control act of March 1, 1917, was simply to authorize the Secretary of War to take this particular stream and complete the project theretofore adopted within the limits prescribed of \$45,000,000 provided that the commission did not expend more than \$10,000,000 in one year. Under that they have gone along, except in rare instances when there was any money left on the 1st of July, and carried it over into the next year. That has happened ever since the commission was created in 1881. I think, therefore, that the gentleman's point is untenable. This law was passed subsequent to the general statute which the gentleman from South Carolina just read.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Massachusetts realizes that there will be no difficulty in carrying an amendment with this sum should this go out on a point of order which is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. MONDELL. Then I did not catch the trend of the gentleman's purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I understand the gentleman makes the point of order against the language "available until expended."

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I understand the only gentleman opposed to the item was the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], who was criticizing the commission on account of the extravagance. Was this the item?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. This is one of the good items. Mr. Chairman, can I say a word on the point of order? I merely want to state, Mr. Chairman, that this point of order was made to the item of the Mississippi River, \$6,700,000 and the provision that it be available until expended. This provision in the law that gives authority to that appropriation does not say for improvement of rivers and maintenance of rivers, but it says that it shall not apply to a permanent specific appropriation for rivers and harbors.

This is an appropriation for the Mississippi River, \$6,607,000 to remain available until expended. It could not come any more clearly under that proviso. It has always been carried that way. It is a continuous appropriation. You do not have to expend it within the fiscal year.

Mr. WALSH. Then what is the necessity for the language?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. It is not necessary at all; but it is there, and because it is there does not invalidate the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman to state that the words "to remain available until expended" are not necessary?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I do not think they are necessary, because it is not one of those appropriations that go back to the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman send up the statute?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, of course at the time the statute of 1874 was passed the language used, "appropriations for



ivers and harbors," was applicable to river and harbor appropriation bills, which, although sometimes never become a law, we have always with us. This is an entirely new activity and a new class of appropriation. It was not necessary in passing the flood-control act of 1917 to put a clause in there specifically taking it out of the statute of 1874. Last year they appropriated \$6,670,000 in the sundry civil appropriation bill, and that appropriation was not to remain available until expended. Nobody ever dreams that an appropriation of \$6,000,000 for the Mississippi River will not be expended within the 12 months. Of course it will.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Of course it will and ought to be.

Mr. WALSH. Then why make this available until expended? Why, if there should be but \$1,000,000 expended, should the balance not properly go to increasing the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation of soldiers? If they can not expend this amount within 12 months, it ought to go back into the Treasury so it can be used for that worthy purpose, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the distinguished Senator, soon to be, was urging earlier in the day.

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

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], I was under the impression, wanted the item to go out. I gained that impression from his discussion this afternoon, when he called attention to a lot of other things he thought ought not to be in this bill. He has not seen fit so far to advise the gentleman from Massachusetts that there is a most excellent reason for this provision in connection with this appropriation. There is always a very considerable "hang over," if I may use that term, in an appropriation of this kind. It is impossible to expend this sort of appropriation on the kind of work it is used to carry on, without having contracts that extend beyond the fiscal year and without overlapping work. There is, or will be at the end of the present fiscal year, some moneys from the year before which will be used next year. There has always been upon the Mississippi River overlapping funds. The moneys can be best expended and most advantageously expended when the funds are used in that way. It is impossible to stop short at the end of the fiscal year a work of this kind and have it done economically.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubts that as to the merits of the proposition the gentleman from Wyoming has given very sound reasons, but I submit that this language in this appropriation is not authorized by law and that it is legislation, and I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The point of order is made to the following paragraph:

Flood control: For prosecuting work of flood control in accordance with the provisions of the flood-control act approved March 1, 1917, as follows:

"Mississippi River, \$5,670,000, to remain available until expended."

The act of 1874 is as follows:

That from and after the 1st day of July, 1874, and of each year thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause all unexpended balances of appropriations which shall have remained upon the books of the Treasury for two fiscal years to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury: *Provided, That this provision shall not apply to permanent specific appropriations, appropriations for rivers and harbors, lighthouses, fortifications, public buildings, or the pay of the Navy and Marine Corps; but the appropriations named in this proviso shall continue available until otherwise ordered by Congress.*

It is contended that inasmuch as Congress has seen fit to create a separate committee, known as the Flood Control Committee, and given that committee jurisdiction of all appropriations for the control of flood waters, that the exception in favor of appropriations for rivers and harbors contained in the proviso of the act of 1874 only goes to appropriations made by the Rivers and Harbors Committee and not to appropriations within the jurisdiction of the Flood Control Committee.

In order to determine this question it is necessary to analyze the purpose that Congress had in enacting the statute of 1874. It is evident that Congress at that time realized that there are certain classes of public work that can be prosecuted more economically by continuous work, and that in the very nature of things the work must be uninterrupted, and for that reason it covered the appropriations for that class of work by the proviso in the act of 1874, which provided that appropriations made for that class of public work shall continue available until otherwise ordered by Congress.

This proviso does not undertake to say that appropriations of a certain character for rivers and harbors shall continue available, but it specifically provides for "appropriations for rivers." This language covers all appropriations for rivers of whatever character and proposed by any committee of Congress. The test is not what committee reports the appropriation; but is the

appropriation for rivers? If the appropriation is for rivers or for a river, then the proviso of the act of 1874 covers the appropriation regardless of whether it is reported by the Rivers and Harbors Committee, by the Flood Control Committee, or by any other committee to which the Congress by its rules and for its own convenience and for the purpose of intelligent consideration may have assigned jurisdiction.

The act of March, 1917, under which the pending item is provided for, specifically provides for a continuing work on the Mississippi River, with a limit of \$45,000,000, with a proviso that not more than \$10,000,000 of the total shall be expended in any one year. This appropriation is certainly an "appropriation for rivers," and is further an appropriation for a project of the class that was evidently in the mind of Congress when it enacted the act of 1874, and therefore falls clearly within that class of appropriations which by the proviso of that act shall continue available.

For these reasons the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer to amend on line 13, page 66, by striking out the figures "\$6,670,000" and inserting "\$3,250,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 66, line 13, strike out "\$6,670,000" and insert "\$3,250,000."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment in view of the fact that it is admitted apparently they will be unable to expend this sum of money in the work on the Mississippi flood control during the coming year, and apparently they have not been able to expend this vast appropriation during the past year. I do not know whether it is due to the work that has already been done under this activity of the Government, but certainly this past year or 18 months that section of the country has not suffered unduly from floods and there has been no great loss of life or damage to property by reason of this river overflowing its banks or breaking through the levee. Now, it seems to me when we get to appropriating money for this work in sums of \$6,670,000, when we have a bill containing items for placing headstones and monuments to the soldiers of the Republic who have died either in the service or after they have been discharged, and that the gentleman from Mississippi criticizes these appropriations and contrasts them with the lack of enthusiasm on the part of the majority of this committee to increase the appropriation for rehabilitation purposes, that here is a chance for his magnanimous soul to indicate his generosity and be willing to cut in half the appropriation for the great river which empties into the Gulf not far from his district and leave in the Treasury \$3,000,000 which may be available, perhaps, if his motion to recommit should prevail, for the worthy object for which he pleads so eloquently and ably earlier in the session of the committee. Now, I think the gentleman will admit that \$3,000,000 in that section will do a vast amount of work apparently as there has been no serious damage done to the banks or levees of the river during the last winter or fall or spring or summer or whatever time of the year the river usually undertakes to go on a rampage, I believe it is usually in the spring, and I trust the gentleman will not assume that I am offering this amendment in any spirit of opposition to the work but purely with the idea of economizing on some of these larger appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

On a division (demanded by Mr. WALSH) there were—yeas 6, noes 10.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Survey of northern and northwestern lakes: For survey of northern and northwestern lakes, Lake of the Woods, and other boundary and connecting waters between said lake and Lake Superior, Lake Champlain, and the natural navigable waters embraced in the navigation system of the New York canals, including all necessary expenses for preparing, correcting, extending, printing, binding, and issuing charts and bulletins, and of investigating lake levels with a view to their regulation, \$125,000.

Mr. WALSH and Mr. GARD rose.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, if I may be recognized, I desire to ask some information of the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control concerning this item about a survey of the northern and northwestern lakes. I am led to make the inquiry because I think this Congress, in establishing the Committee on Flood Control, had in mind a very useful thing, and I am interested to know whether the question of flood control is being intelligently pursued, and I note from this item—survey of northern and northwestern lakes—that certain surveys are



attempted. I therefore ask the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, now that he has returned, whether this item of survey of northern lakes, Lake of the Woods, and so forth, are embraced under the activities of his committee?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. They are not.

Mr. GARD. Do I understand that the only item that has to do with flood control is the item of the Mississippi River?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The only two projects in the United States, according to the report of the engineers, which were ready for congressional action were the Mississippi River and the Sacramento River in California.

Mr. GARD. In all seriousness, does not the gentleman think in the length of time this Committee on Flood Control has been in existence that they should intelligently have sought to develop some form of flood control, not to pick out two rivers that happen to flow in the territory, and that is my understanding, of members of the Committee on Flood Control, but to get down to a basis of a system of flood control where flood control should be operated? I assume, of course, that it could best be done under the Corps of Engineers. What I am leading up to is to ask the gentleman, now that he is here, does he understand the report of the engineers to call for a yearly expenditure of \$6,670,000 on the Mississippi River?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The report of the engineers of the Mississippi River Commission called for an expenditure of \$10,000,000 as authorized by the act of Congress. But the committee saw fit to cut that to \$6,670,000, which, I think, in view of the emergency, is reasonable.

Mr. GARD. You mean the lack of emergency. There is no emergency at the present time, nor was there one last year caused by a flood in any of the reaches of the Mississippi River. What I want to get at is whether the flood-control system such as the committee has developed, and I am critical in what it has developed, and honestly critical, is embraced only in this sum of \$6,670,000 which yearly must be appropriated for the Mississippi River? Is there anything else to be done? Has the committee anything else in mind?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Of course, if the gentleman does not understand there is any emergency facing this country, I think it hopeless for me to give him any information.

Mr. GARD. I think there is an emergency. There is a country-wide emergency, and the Committee on Flood Control was created, and I would be glad to have the plan of action and I am sure the country would.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that the committee should go about this matter intelligently, and I think the committee did go about it intelligently. The gentleman from Ohio did not think that, and made a very vigorous protest at the time to the House, but was not able to get enough gentlemen to agree to his view, even to the extent of calling for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GARD. That is not convincing at all.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It was not at all convincing, inasmuch as the gentleman, as I said, could not get enough to agree to his views to even have the roll called. It was thoroughly unconvincing. But the position which the Flood Control Committee took, having been submitted to the House, after three days of very illuminating debate, was thoroughly convincing to the House, so much so that the bill was passed, as I recall it, by a vote of 186 to 19. So much for the intelligent manner in which the committee treated the subject over the protests and suggestions of the gentleman from Ohio.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the 6th of April, 1917, what the rest of us have since then considered a great emergency arose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman be given five additional minutes.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I object. Let us get down to the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. This is not relevant to this particular section that provides for the charting of the lakes. They are discussing the flood control and their positions relative to the same. I would be glad if they would let us go on, because the time is getting short.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I have no desire to delay. I will withdraw the request. The gentleman from Ohio called upon me to enlighten the House and the country, and I assumed he spoke for both, and therefore I wanted to accommodate him.

Mr. GARD. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted one minute so that I can ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HAYES. I object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. For a number of years I have been receiving—and I suppose in company with other Members—charts showing surveys of the northwestern lakes. I rise to inquire what is meant by continuing in this bill the \$125,000 appropriation every year?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The appropriation is carried for the purpose of enabling these people to chart the lakes, which the maritime interests on the lakes say is more absolutely essential at this time than ever before, and the estimate asked for is far in excess of the appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression that this work was performed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It is performed by these people, and the appropriation has been made \$125,000 for a number of years. Nevertheless they are urging that the condition of the lakes, and they urged it in a very forcible manner, demanded additional charting of area.

Mr. STAFFORD. Am I in error in assuming that the Coast and Geodetic Survey has not made a survey of the Great Lakes?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The survey is conducted under this item here.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of crews and maintenance of patrol fleet, six steam tugs and one launch, \$90,000;  
In all, \$100,260.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina what fleet is this? What patrol fleet is that in New York Harbor?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It is under the Chief of Engineers, to prevent dumping of refuse in New York Harbor.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is in the Engineer Department?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appliances for disabled soldiers: For furnishing surgical appliances to persons disabled in the military or naval service of the United States prior to October 6, 1917, and not entitled to artificial limbs or trusses for the same disabilities, \$500.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman having charge of the bill explain the reason for inserting in this paragraph the limitation as to those who would be entitled to receive this aid to those who were injured prior to October 6, 1917?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Because the insurance act provides for those who were injured after that. During this war they are provided for under the war insurance act. This provides only for those who were injured in the Civil War and in the Spanish-American War.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For farm, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$9,000; in all, \$441,000.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARD: Page 72, line 25, after the period, insert:

"Provided, That jurisdiction and control over said Southern Branch shall be reinvested in the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers on or about May 1, 1920."

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I reserve a point of order on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina and the gentleman from Missouri reserve points of order on the amendment.



Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I am led to offer this amendment by the receipt of a petition from certain members of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers who are now resident at the Central Branch at Dayton, Ohio. The petition is worded in such a direct, simple, and beautiful way as I think must carry a very pertinent appeal to all persons here, and therefore as part of my statement I will read the petition:

CENTRAL BRANCH, N. H. D. V. S.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, greeting:

Subject: To be returned to the Southern Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Hampton, Va.

We concede the fact, that as veteran soldiers of the Civil War and other wars, our prayer should be answered in the affirmative by the honorable Members of the Congress, inasmuch as many of your petitioners have wife, children, and grandchildren residing in and about Hampton, Phoebus, and Newport News, Va.

Indigent circumstances deprive us from bringing these dear ones to Dayton, Ohio (our present abode), and all we ask is simple justice and that you put yourself in our place for the nonce and act accordingly.

We urgently wish to return to Virginia. Of the nearly 500 ex-members of the Southern Branch now here, a vast majority come directly from Pennsylvania, New York, and Maryland, with our loved ones distant only 12 hours by rail away.

The Congress saved the South Dakota Sanitarium to the veterans; we ask simple justice of you to restore our old home to the undersigned, who gave their all to save our country from disruption.

We are aware that the Southern Branch has fulfilled its mission and is now almost vacated.

Individually and collectively we haven't a word derogatory to express against the Central Branch or its conduct. It is simply a longing to be nearer to those we love and cherish.

The petition is signed by some 500 veterans of the Civil War, of the Spanish-American War, and of other wars. When the act of October 4, 1918, was carried into effect these members were transferred from the Hampton Home to the Central Branch Home at Dayton, Ohio. Now, I am strongly in accord with their wish, and I entertain rather an advanced idea of the utility of these soldiers' homes, because I think they should be used in the best possible way. I did not offer any objection, and I do not offer any objection now, to the use of the Hampton Branch Home as a hospital. I think it is aiding in a great purpose, and I would not for a moment wish that it be deterred from continuing its great purpose. It is used as a branch hospital where our soldier boys returning from foreign shores are temporarily placed until they can be sent to other and more permanent hospitals or to their homes. I would not think of offering this amendment if I had not first communicated with the office of the Surgeon General, and Col. Smith, in charge of the office, advises me that, so far as his best information goes—it is impossible to be definite—they will not need for hospital purposes the soldiers' home at Hampton any longer than a year from this time. Now, in order to afford the fullest opportunity for its use, the amendment I present provides that it shall not be transferred back or revested, in the language of the old bill, until on or before May 1, 1920, my idea being that in that length of time its use as a hospital will be fully terminated.

The language of the act of October 4, 1918, provides that it shall be returned to the board of managers. The transfer was but a temporary one, and that which the amendment seeks to carry into effect is the fixing of a date when, after the conclusion of the hospital work, the soldiers' home at Hampton, Va., may be returned to the board of managers.

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

Mr. GARD. Yes.

Mr. DYER. How many are included in this petition whom the gentleman would have sent back to the Southern Branch?

Mr. GARD. I do not have them sent back. I am simply presenting their petition.

Mr. DYER. How many are there that the gentleman's amendment is intended to send back?

Mr. GARD. The petition, which I read, states:

Of the nearly 500 ex-members of the Southern Branch now here a vast majority come directly from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland, with our loved ones distant only 12 hours by rail away.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman is speaking of the Central Branch. They are now at the Central Branch?

Mr. GARD. They are now at the Central Branch.

Mr. DYER. Can the gentleman tell us how many soldiers there are at the Central Branch at this time?

Mr. GARD. I think there are in the neighborhood of 3,000.

Mr. DYER. And the facilities there are for how many?

Mr. GARD. With the 500 there may be more than 3,000 there now. There may be possibly between 3,500 and 4,000. There have been as many as 4,000 or 4,500 members there.

Mr. DYER. The place is not crowded at all?

Mr. GARD. Oh, no. These people are being well cared for. There is no question about that. This is the situation: The gentleman probably knows it as well as I do, since he has given very intelligent attention to the subject. The gentleman

has visited Dayton, and they were very proud to have him there when he was commander in chief of the Spanish War Veterans.

The situation regarding these homes is that the older men, men who have some little means and who have families, who wish to be with their wives or families, desire to live outside the home. They rent little cottages. They utilize such money as they get for the rental of small cottages, and seek to live with their wives just outside the reservation of the home. This is the situation more particularly with regard to the home at Hampton, Va., than it is at Dayton, even. The mildness of the climate down there appeals to the older members of the home at Dayton who formerly lived at Hampton, Va. The two controlling things in their minds, as I can advise the members of the committee, are that they want to get back there, because it is near their homes. They want to get back and be as near their families as they can, and they want also to enjoy the mild, pleasant climate down at Hampton.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Did not the act transferring the home for hospital purposes transfer it only for the period of the war?

Mr. GARD. Section 2 of the act provides that upon the close of the war, or as soon thereafter as may be practicable, the Secretary of War shall cause said home to be vacated by the medical department of the Army, and thereupon jurisdiction and control over said home shall revert to said Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

The only thing which the amendment seeks to carry into effect is to fix an outside date, a far limit, by which the time may be established when this return can be made, and that date I have fixed after consultation with the Surgeon General's office.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I must insist on the point of order, because, as the gentleman has read, the law now provides that this home shall be turned over to the Army for the use of a hospital, to receive wounded soldiers as they return and shall so continue until the close of the war, or as soon thereafter as practicable. This amendment would change existing law, and would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For farm, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$5,000.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 76, after line 17, insert the following as a new paragraph:

"For increase of present water supply, including the purchase of land and pipe line, \$10,000."

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered seeks to appropriate \$10,000 for additional water supply for the Battle Mountain Sanitarium at Hot Springs. The present water supply was donated by two Hot Springs ladies, Mrs. Martin and Mrs. Miner, her mother, at the time the institution was established.

My remembrance is they donated half of what is known as the Mammoth Spring, and that amounts to a flow of about 560 gallons per minute. The institution has grown to be a larger one than was then contemplated. The grounds have become more spacious and the gardens are larger, and they have need of more water. Last year and the year before the water supply was not sufficient through the summer season.

The reason this item did not come regularly was due to the fact that at the time the estimates were being prepared there was prospect that the institution would be temporarily transferred to the War Department for hospital purposes.

The matter of additional water supply had been considered by the chief engineer and by the governor of the institution, by a representative of the board of managers, and by the committee of the Surgeon General's office who inspected the sanitarium.

In discussing the matter the Surgeon General's office was of the opinion that if the institution be transferred to the War Department, they could take care of the increased water supply out of existing lump-sum appropriations. At that time it was thought that there was no doubt the transfer would be made, and so the board of managers did not include the item in their estimates, thinking that when the transfer was made the War Department would take care of the item.



The transfer was not made to the War Department and apparently will not be made. We are confronted with a shortage of water and we know, too, that there has passed the Senate an item in a general hospital bill which seeks to make available all unused space in this institution for the care of these discharged soldiers and sailors of the present war for whom the War Risk Bureau is obligated to care. I hope we will not come to next summer season without provision for additional water supply.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GANDY. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of whom is it intended to buy the water rights, from the same people who made the gift of the water?

Mr. GANDY. Yes; I was just coming to that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is the objection to these gifts. They always come around afterwards and want to sell it. I am not criticizing these splendid ladies in this instance, but every time we come to a gift we run up against this proposition.

Mr. GANDY. I may say that the donation was 15 or 18 years ago, and there was no thought at that time that an additional water supply would be needed. This is a gravity water supply, water from the hot springs flowing down to the institution, and there is still available in the same canyon additional springs that can be purchased.

Mr. DYER. How many soldiers are there at the home now?

Mr. GANDY. Three hundred and thirty at this time.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman is proposing to transfer this branch to the War Department for use as a hospital.

Mr. GANDY. Not now. The bill authorizing the transfer failed of passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GANDY. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I dislike to object, and I would not do so if the amendment is in order. But if it is not I must insist on the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman withhold it for just one moment?

Mr. GANDY. I do not concede the point of order.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I make the point of order that there is no authority for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on this. There is a water system at this institution. It is a Government institution. Every step of the way this institution has been authorized by law. I maintain that the same authority that established the institution, that appropriated the money for the building of the pipe lines and everything incident to the completion of the institution, is authority now for the increasing of the water supply when it is found to be deficient.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman contend that an amendment seeking to purchase land would be in order on an appropriation bill?

Mr. GANDY. The amendment seeking to purchase land is only in connection with the springs.

Mr. WELLING. It is a right of way.

Mr. GANDY. It is a right of way. You can not purchase the springs without purchasing the land, unless you have a bucket to carry the water away with. I desire now to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming, who is acquainted with the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina withhold his point of order?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, on an appropriation bill we certainly can not appropriate to purchase lands not authorized by law.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to argue the point of order with my colleague on the committee. As this matter has been raised, and as I have some information on the subject, I would like to make a brief statement.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I withhold the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. I am fairly well acquainted with the condition at Battle Mountain Sanitarium. It is quite near my home. The water supply is somewhat deficient. There has never been as liberal a water supply as there should be. The present supply was, I think, a gift from some relatives of ex-Congressman Martin. It is now proposed to add to that water supply by purchasing some small springs in the same locality.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, let me interrupt the gentleman to say that they are not small springs. The springs proposed to be purchased have a capacity of around 800 gallons per minute.

Mr. MONDELL. I did not mean that they were small springs in the sense that they were not entirely adequate, because

they are, but they are not as large as some of the very large springs that furnish the water at Hot Springs. An additional water supply is needed. There is no question about that. Word came to me in regard to the matter after we had considered the items of the bill, and this is the first opportunity I have had of expressing an opinion in regard to it. If the way were open to provide for the purchase, I think it would be well to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina insist upon his point of order?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I find myself compelled to do so. No information from anyone connected with the home was given to the committee. I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, \$4,716,850.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman is about to move to rise?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. As soon as we finish this particular portion of the bill.

Mr. DYER. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question in regard to this item. The amount carried here is \$4,716,850. That is more than was carried in the last appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. There is an increase for the reason that the increased cost of all supplies necessitated a slight increase for subsistence at every one of these homes.

Mr. DYER. But the number of soldiers in the homes has decreased.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is true, but you have got to have just as much coal to heat the buildings, and they have had to spend more money this year for that.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, that is one of the reasons why the National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers are not in my judgment all that we would like to have them in this respect. Of course we want to give the best we have in this country to these old soldiers, but here we have in the soldiers' homes an expenditure going on to \$5,000,000, a substantial increase over the last year, and yet we know that many of these old soldiers died since the last appropriation bill. How they are able to increase the expenditures, with the number of soldiers decreasing, is explained by only one thing, and that is that the soldiers' homes are to-day filled up and honeycombed with civilian employees, whose jobs are the result in many respects of political patronage and appointments.

And instead of the old soldiers getting the benefit of this home the money is going largely to pay salaries of men outside, officers of the board and hundreds and hundreds of civilian employees. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I know it as a matter of fact in the past, and I believe it is so to-day, that where there is opportunity to give employment and pay some of these small wages to the soldiers themselves who are able to do some work very little opportunity is given them, but civilians are brought in and paid this money and we go on appropriating and voting for it believing that we are doing it for the benefit of the soldiers, and Members of the House, if we rise in our places and call attention to it, oftentimes have criticisms made that we are not trying to help these unfortunate veterans of the war when as a matter of fact I believe that the country has not anything too good for these old soldiers and for their dependents, too.

But, Mr. Chairman, we ought to see that the money goes for the benefit of the soldiers, and not for the benefit of civilians who are feeding and fattening upon the money appropriated for carrying on the work of taking care of these old veterans. And an effort is being made, I think largely by the board of managers of these homes, to try to find some way of taking in now some boys of the present war. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that in my judgment they are violating the law when they are doing so, and I hope that this Congress will not permit the enlarging of the powers of these homes to take in soldiers from this war in order that these jobs may be continued for the benefit of a lot of politicians.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That no part of the foregoing appropriations shall be expended for any purpose at any branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers that maintains or permits to be maintained on its premises a bar, canteen, or other place where beer, wine, or other intoxicating liquors are sold.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. Mr. Chairman, this section will not become effective under this bill until the 1st of July. Now, we know there is a law on the statute books that provides not only that there shall



not be any saloons or bars in the soldiers' homes, but there shall not be any anywhere in the United States; so I do not see the necessity for expending the money of the people in printing something that is of no use and no meaning. I move to strike it out.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is not in earnest at all. The war prohibition act provides several exceptions, and one of these is a governmental exception. It might be possible that the governors of the soldiers' homes would attempt to reestablish the canteen on the basis that it was a governmental exception from the war prohibition act.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman think that after the 1st of July we will be able to continue barrooms or create barrooms on Government property?

Mr. RANDALL. Hardly, except that under that theory they might call it a governmental use.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman thinks the House Office Building will be dry?

Mr. RANDALL. I hardly think the gentleman from Missouri is in accord with the sentiment of his own State, which ratified the prohibition amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on striking out the paragraph.

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

On a division (demanded by Mr. DYER) there were—yeas 6, yeas 15.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I very seriously differ from the gentleman from Missouri, who lately spoke regarding the use of these governmental homes for disabled soldiers, by the soldiers of the present war, the war in which the United States of America has been engaged. I think it is the highest duty of every American citizen, whether he be here in this Congress or anywhere else, to afford every opportunity which can be afforded for the care and betterment of the returned soldiers who in foreign fields have borne American arms. These soldiers' homes were created for disabled American soldiers; they have been used for the purpose of sheltering and caring for veterans of every American war, and there is no reason why they can not now be used to take care of men who come back from our foreign fighting fronts. The gentleman from Missouri the other day made an objection to a bill which had for its purpose the clarifying of the atmosphere relative to the admission to the National Military Home.

But I say that under the present law it is my opinion that men of the American Army to-day and of the American Army at any time during this present war emergency are entitled to admission to national military homes if they are disabled and if they are indigent, and for one I will see that every opportunity for their care in national military homes is afforded.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Would the gentleman prefer to have them in these homes as objects of charity than to giving them proper pensions so that they can live decently?

Mr. GARD. No, sir; I would have no American soldier an object of charity.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, just a moment. I think the soldiers' homes are well conducted. I think they are economically managed. There are no men carrying on Government activities and who appear before the Committee on Appropriations who present as clear and definite and understandable statements with regard to their expenditures as the managers of the soldiers' homes. They know exactly where they have spent their money, how they have spent it, and what they have spent it for. They give the committee full and complete information with regard to their expenditures.

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

Mr. MONDELL. There is every evidence that they carefully consider their expenditures.

Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman tell the committee approximately how much of this \$4,716,850 is to be used for the feeding and housing of the veterans and how much of it is to be used for paying salaries and for feeding and other things for the employees?

Mr. MONDELL. My friend has the appropriations before him and he can go through the different items and foot them up. He is as good a mathematician as I am, I am sure.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MONDELL. It is no part of the business of the Appropriations Committee to separate those items. The soldiers' homes are, in my opinion, well managed and the soldiers are well cared for.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman know that the soldiers, the old veterans who have fought and who saved the Union, are not given the same quality and variety of food as civilian employees are given in these homes?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman can, on his responsibility as a Member, say that that is so—

Mr. DYER. That is so.

Mr. MONDELL. I have not visited the homes, and so I shall not challenge his statement to that effect. But I nevertheless believe the soldiers are well cared for.

Now, with regard to the opening of the soldiers' homes to the soldiers of the present war, I agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] that under the law they are entitled to admission to these homes. Furthermore they are being admitted to the homes. And the estimates in this bill are allowed with the fact in view that the soldiers of the present war are being admitted to the homes in considerable number.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman one question in his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DYER. I move to strike out the last two words. I simply wanted to do that, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of calling the gentleman's attention to what I believe is a fact, and that is, that the law creating the soldiers' homes was specifically created, and it was so stated in the original act, for the benefit of the Union veterans of the Civil War. Those who served in the Spanish War were later added. No amendment has ever been added to that act by this Congress to include the veterans of this present war.

Mr. MONDELL. An amendment to the act includes the veterans of the Spanish War—and I do not know whether there are any later campaigns specifically referred to or not—and other wars in which the United States has been engaged.

Mr. DYER. Yes; wars in which this Nation has been engaged; but that was passed before this war was declared.

Mr. MONDELL. Has not the United States been engaged in this war? Of course it has and the law applies.

The Clerk read as follows:

For arrears of pay and allowances on account of service of officers and men of the Army during the War with Spain and in the Philippine Islands that may be certified to be due by the accounting officer of the Treasury during the fiscal year 1920 and that are chargeable to the appropriations that has been carried to the surplus fund, \$500.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. GARD having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. CARAWAY, 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. 16104) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, 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. 5999. An act for the establishment of Gulfport, Miss., as a port of entry and delivery for immediate transportation without appraisement of dutiable merchandise; and

H. R. 171. An act to repeal the last proviso of section 4 of an act to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park, in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, approved January 26, 1915.

#### HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW—11 O'CLOCK A. M.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do I understand that it is the intention to go on to-morrow with the sundry civil bill?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No; the bond bill comes up to-morrow.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are to take up the bond bill at 4 o'clock.

Mr. WALSH. Has that been stated to the House?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It was stated to the House before.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. KITCHIN] announced that he would call up the bond bill at 4 o'clock to-morrow afternoon. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously agreed to, until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 25, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HILLIARD, from the Committee on Education, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16016) providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1128), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Rules, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 607) providing for the consideration of H. R. 15993, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1132), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16129) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of certain public buildings; and to authorize the purchase of sites for certain public buildings, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1133), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4225) for the relief of the Atlas Lumber Co.; Babcock & Wilcox; Johnson, Jackson & Corning Co.; and the C. H. Klein Brick Co., each of which companies furnished to Silas N. Opdahl, a failing Government contractor, certain building materials which were used in the construction of Burke Hall, at the Pierre Indian School, in the State of South Dakota, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1134), 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. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 16137) to provide for entry under bond of exhibits of arts, sciences, and industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 16138) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Battle Creek, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16139) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Coldwater, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16140) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Union City, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: A bill (H. R. 16141) to provide for a referendum vote of the people of the United States on the proposed league of nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 16142) providing for a review of the finding of general courts-martial convened during the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 16143) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cottonwood, Cal., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 16144) to provide relief for the producers of manganese, chrome, pyrites, or tungsten mined to supply the urgent needs of the Nation in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. EAGLE: A bill (H. R. 16145) waiving the age limit for admission to the United States Naval Academy in the case of John E. Adkins; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 16146) providing a penalty for those who wear or display medals of honor, decoration, etc., unless such medals or decoration were duly awarded them by military procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 16149) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Starkville, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16150) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Macon, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16151) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Aberdeen, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16152) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Columbus, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16153) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tupelo, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16154) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Fulton, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16155) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Booneville, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16156) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Corinth, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16157) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Iuka, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 16159) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Caney, Kans., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAZARO: Resolution (H. Res. 605) to allow additional clerks to the Committee on Enrolled Bills; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FERRIS: Resolution (H. Res. 606) to pay Willis J. Davis extra compensation for performing the duties of clerk to the Committee on Water Power; to the Committee on Accounts.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to legislate with respect to resolution of the American National Live Stock Association; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, joint memorial to the Congress of the United States relative to the construction of a military highway between Fort Leavenworth, Camp Funston, and Fort Bliss; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, urging Congress to appropriate money for the purchase of the wheat crop of 1919; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURNETT: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Alabama, urging the Congress of the United States to appropriate \$250,000 for the elimination of influenza; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Alabama, urging Congress to continue the nitrate development at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOSS: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Illinois, favoring lower freight rates on material for public works; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring the continuance of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging the passage of House bill 12770; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 16147) directing the Secretary of the Navy to grant an honorable discharge to Charles D. Uhl; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.



Also, a bill (H. R. 16148) directing the Secretary of War to grant an honorable discharge of Robert Zakin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 16158) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin J. Schlusser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of employees of Taylor & Co., Camden, N. J., protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: Resolutions of Portsmouth Lodge, No. 444, Loyal Order of Moose, favoring the granting to all men in the military service six months' pay at the time of their discharge from the service as a bonus; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, telegrams from the following residents of New Hampshire, advocating the continuance of the United States Employment Service of the Department of Labor: Enos K. Sawyer, Federal director United States Employment Service; and Tilton Optical Co., by Stanton E. Smith, treasurer, of Franklin; Charles P. Herrick, president Tilton (N. H.) Chamber of Commerce. Also, Berlin (N. H.) Central Labor Union, by Earl C. Lane, of Berlin. Also, Elizabeth C. Sawyer, chairman New Hampshire Committee Women's Land Army, of A. M. A. (Inc.), of Dover. Also, Concord Axle Co., by George Kenney, foreman; Charles J. French, mayor; Lyster Bros., wholesale and retail grocers; the R. J. Crowley Coal Co.; the Very Rev. Thomas M. O'Leary; and Charles J. Corning, judge of probate court; Roy W. Ludlow, chairman of Boston & Maine Railroad local federated crafts; the Central Cash Market, by John Higgins, manager; William Mullen, foreman, Boston & Maine Railroad; George A. S. Kimball, city marshal; the M. E. Clifford Co.; Concord Wiring & Supply Co., by William T. Ferns, manager; the David E. Murphy Department Stores, by David E. Murphy; Joseph A. Worthen, industrial adviser; Central Hotel, by Orrin Hodgdon, manager; Boston & Maine Railroad, by Honer B. Clough, foreman, all of the city of Concord; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Progressive Mutual Loan Corporation, Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against Burnett bill (H. R. 13669) pertaining to immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Mrs. William Kittle, chairman Women in Industry; Mrs. Edwin C. Thompson, State council of defense, representing 80,000 women, urging continuance of Women in Industry, Department of Government Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CLASSON: Petition of citizens of Kaukauna and Appleton, Wis., in favor of Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of Traffic Club, of Chicago, Ill., urging naval appropriation of \$1,500,000 originally provided for the purpose of caring for harbor at Great Lakes Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petitions of A. F. Pickard, master, Illinois State Grange, Rockford; Frank Rademacher, examiner in charge, La Salle; Victor A. Olander, secretary-treasurer, Illinois State Federation of Labor, Chicago; John H. Camlin, president, and R. D. Chappell, secretary, Rockford Chamber of Commerce; James F. Farrell, secretary Ottawa Chamber of Commerce; the Ottawa Chamber of Commerce; the Ottawa Building Trades Council; E. F. Bradford, mayor of Ottawa; and Hibbard, Spencer Bartlett Co., of Chicago, all in the State of Illinois, favoring appropriation to continue the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Biograph Co., New York; Maude E. Woodruff; Morse Dry Dock & Repair Co.; American Sugar Refining Co.; McAlpine Employment Department; Bankers' Pen Co.; C. Kenyon Co. (Inc.); Barnett & Brown, New York; Nathan Manufacturing Co., Flushing, Long Island; Parker-Davis Co.; New York Consolidated Card Co.; E. D. Anderson Co.; H. W. Hepburn & Co.; Headquarters Air Service Depot; Poughkeepsie Chamber of Commerce; Mrs. Mary Linto; the Beacon Falls Rubber Shoe Co. (Inc.); Simon Ascher & Co.; Wright-Martin Corporation; Houghin-Aiken Co. (Inc.); Women's City Club of New York; the Austin Co., Dover, N. J.; the British Consulate General; Brooklyn Victory Celebration Committee; Robert H. Ingersoll & Bros.; Kenneth Malcolm; Isabel A. Ward; Mrs. J. L. Ward; Harlem Board of Commerce;

Colony Club; C. J. Tagliabue Manufacturing Co.; Pyrene Manufacturing Co.; Brewster & Co.; Quinn & Quinn (Inc.); Bonwit-Teller Co.; Eastern District Piece Dye Works (Inc.); J. F. Tapley Co.; Pemold Products Co.; Lapidolith L. Sonneborn Sons (Inc.); Department of Street Cleaning; Novelty Veiling Co.; Chamber of Commerce, Corning, N. Y.; Permolene Products Co.; Hotel Association of New York City; the American Red Cross; Mrs. M. T. Chapman; the Hand Embroidery Co.; Knickerbocker Cleaning & Dyeing Co.; the Mechanics & Metals National Bank; Altman Neckwear Co.; J. H. Cox; the Home Talk Publishing Co.; Lowe Motor Supplies Co.; Operative Plasterers and Cement Finishers; Houpert Machine Co.; Pianostyle Music Co.; P. L. Cooney, lieutenant colonel of the Chemical Warfare Service, United States Army; Kanter Modry & Co.; Thomas De La Rue & Co. (Ltd.); National Biscuit Co.; Fred D. Shandorf; Ensor & Co.; Harry C. Plotze; N. H. Bunker; L. W. F. Engineering Co. (Inc.); the Charity Organization Society; the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.; Eagle Hut; American Can Co.; Stephen Ransom (Inc.); the Bronx Board of Trade; American Ever Ready Works; John N. Loughory; Howell, Field & Goddard (Inc.); Crown Music Co.; Pennsylvania Textile Co.; the National City Bank; Jules Weber; Brunswick Balke Collender Co.; Empire Art Metal Co.; Charles V. Devonshire; Rosenwasser Bros. (Inc.); Harold Woodruff; Paul R. Peicott; A. E. Riney; John Thomson Press Co.; American Hard Rubber Co.; Burroughs Adding Machine Co.; Aeolian Co.; Federation of American Motorcyclists; Frank Bros.' Boot Shop; J. F. Tapley Co.; the Remiller Co.; Loft (Inc.); Chamber of Commerce of the Tonawandas; American Druggist Syndicate; Neptune Meter Co.; Rite Form Corset Co. (Inc.); the Prager Co.; the Lamson Co.; the National Sugar Refining Co. of New Jersey; Oppenheim, Collins & Co.; Joseph Raffaele, jr.; Roswell D. Thompkins; George Batten Co.; Oppenheimer, Collins & Co.; Charleston Port Terminal; favoring the continuance of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Young Women's Christian Association, Scranton, Pa.; Young Women's Christian Association, Allentown, Pa.; Young Women's Christian Association, Bay City, Mich.; Young Women's Christian Association, Wilmington, Del.; Young Women's Christian Association, Reading, Pa.; National Council of Women Voters, Boise, Idaho; Young Women's Christian Association, East St. Louis, Ill.; industrial committee of the Young Women's Christian Association, Harrisburg, Pa.; metropolitan industry secretary Young Women's Christian Association, Baltimore, Md.; Young Women's Christian Association, Seattle, Wash.; Young Women's Christian Association, Cotesville, Pa.; staff of Business Women's League, Philadelphia, Pa.; Young Women's Christian Association, McKeesport, Pa.; Women in Industry and Council of Defense, Madison, Wis.; Young Women's Christian Association, Athens, Ga.; board of directors of Young Women's Christian Association, Lancaster, Pa.; Young Women's Christian Association, Racine, Wis.; Young Women's Christian Association, Anderson, Ind.; Young Women's Christian Association, Savannah, Ga.; Young Women's Christian Association, Columbia, S. C.; Young Women's Christian Association, Aurora, Ill.; Young Women's Christian Association, Chester, Pa.; Young Women's Christian Association, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Young Women's Christian Association, Battle Creek, Mich.; National American Women's Suffrage Association, Philadelphia, Pa.; Equal Suffrage Association, Portsmouth, N. H.; executive committee on war work, National Council, Young Women's Christian Association, New York; South Atlantic field committee, Young Women's Christian Association, Richmond, Va.; Women's Trade Union League, New York; industrial committee, national board, Young Women's Christian Association, New York; Suffragists of Pennsylvania; South Central field committee, Young Women's Christian Association, St. Louis, Mo.; Woman's Division, State Council of Defense, Hartford, Conn.; northwestern field committee, Young Women's Christian Association, Seattle, Wash.; board of directors, Consumers' League, Providence, R. I.; committee of women's industry, State of Rhode Island, Providence; Connecticut Woman Suffrage Association, Hartford; Equal Suffrage League, Aiken, S. C.; the Equal Suffrage League, Wilmington, Del.; conference of Young Women's Christian Association, Erie, Pa.; Ruth Bond, York, Pa., all urging Congress to continue Bureau of Women in Industry in Department of Labor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Anna Weinstock, secretary Neckwear Workers' Union, representing 15,200 members, of Boston, Mass., and Mrs. Edward W. Biddle, president Civic Club of Philadelphia, representing 1,500 women, urging passage of the full appropriation asked for by Secretary of Labor for Employment Service



and Women in Industry Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Catherine D. McKeen; A. J. Clements; Thomas A. H. Hay, secretary; Treadwell Engineering Co.; R. H. Track, assemblyman; Northampton Co., all of Easton, Pa., and Joseph Lee, president War Camp Community Service, New York, urging passage of appropriation bill for continuance of Government Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of E. C. Fisher, of the Wickes Boiler Co., Saginaw, Mich.; Saginaw Shipbuilding Co., H. J. Smith, manager; James C. McCabe, secretary Board of Commerce, Bay City, Mich.; and Joshua Brugh, Lafayette Post, Grand Army of the Republic; Rev. John E. McCann; J. J. Cunningham, manager Bureau Returning Soldiers and Sailors, of Easton, Pa., urging appropriation for continuance of Government Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of Wellsville Chamber of Commerce, favoring temporary continuance of Government control of wire system until legislation can be enacted for their reasonable return to their owners without injury; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of National Association of Custodian Employees, United States Treasury Department, Detroit, Mich., favoring House bill 15130, to increase salaries; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Yorkville (Ohio) Lodge No. 81, Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers of North America, demanding withdrawal of American troops from Russia at the earliest possible moment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of United Mine Workers of America, favoring completion of authorized public improvements; also prohibiting immigration until soldiers, sailors, and war workers find employment; also extra monthly pay for 12 months unless sooner employed, and the purchase of waste land and improvement of it and Government-owned land and sale on easy terms to soldiers, sailors, and others; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of board of education of city school district of Cleveland, Ohio, urging passage of bill to loan machine tools to technical high schools; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of George S. Webster; Bureau for Soldiers, Sailors, and War Workers; J. K. Shaw; George M. Henderson; Albert C. Bruce; Community Labor Board; and William H. Hayward, president Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, of Baltimore, Md., urging appropriation for Government Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of J. C. L. Cole; Lawrasau Iggs; John H. Ferguson; E. A. Slack; John K. Shaw; State advisory board; Clinton L. Riggs, Federal director; Merchants and Miners' Association, of Baltimore, Md., urging appropriation for Employment Service, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of H. M. Moler, Baltimore, Md., urging free transportation for returning soldiers to place of enlistment instead of some demobilization camp from which they are compelled to pay their car fare home; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Alex Blumberg, president of United Hebrew Charities of Baltimore, Md., with membership of 8,000, supported by the most influential citizens, protesting against the Burnett bill, against immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Bernard Munter, Baltimore, Md., urging that the United States Coast Guard be made a part of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Navy Affairs.

Also, petition of the Maryland Chrome Corporation, Owings Mills, Baltimore, Md., urging Government protection for chromite mining and asking for appropriation for damages sustained by producers of war minerals; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Katherine V. Hopper, Baltimore Kindergarten Club, asking for passage of Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Robert Biggs, Baltimore, Md., protesting against Burnett immigration bill and urging an amendment; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Baltimore Federation of Labor, Henry F. Broening, secretary, recommending the further control by the Government of public utilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of A. Ray Katz, president Federated Jewish Charities of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the Burnett immigration bill now pending before Congress; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LONDON: Memorial of Socialist Party, Bronx County organization, demanding amnesty to all persons imprisoned during the war for acts or utterances dictated by their conscience or for reasons directly or indirectly due to their active participation in the labor movement; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Lithuanian Library Association of Pittston, Pa., asking for the withdrawal of American troops from Russian soil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Local 32, Lithuanian Socialist Party, Pittston, Pa., requesting the withdrawal of American troops on Russian soil and the recognition of the Russian Soviet Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Local Union No. 2, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, urging the Government of the United States to grant an immediate and general amnesty to those who have been convicted of expressing views found to be incompatible with the interests of the country under the conditions of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Alderson, Pa., and vicinity, to pass a law for the immediate establishment of Government ownership and operation of the railroads and wire systems of the Nation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of special convention of Seventh District Lithuanian Socialist Party, held at Scranton, Pa., calling for the withdrawal of American troops on Russian soil and requesting recognition for Russian Soviet government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of City Federation of Women's Clubs, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Vallejo (Cal.) Metal Trades, requesting the maintenance of the Woman in Industry Service and the Employment Service of the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of James B. Helan, of San Francisco, urging appropriation for United States Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Northern California Milk Producers' Association, protesting against the granting of privileges to the manufacturers of foreign butter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of Northern California Milk Producers' Association, protesting against importation of foreign adulterated butter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of City Federation of Women's Clubs, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROWLAND: Papers in case of J. R. Campbell, House bill 9036; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of Minneapolis City Council, asking Congress to grant the soldiers and sailors six months' extra pay upon discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Local 928, United Brotherhood of Maintenance of Wage Employees and Shop Laborers, of Minneapolis, Minn., urging Government ownership of railways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Chamber of Commerce, Providence, R. I., protesting against Government operation of the telephone systems of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce regarding the purchase and enlargement of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Petition of General Assembly of State of Indiana, indorsing universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.