

I had a conversation a short time ago with an engineer of very great ability and capacity and very great experience, who told me he had made a careful study of the project for interests that desired to develop it, and that by reason of the fact that there was no storage it could not be developed profitably except to the capacity of the stream in the season of low water, unless by a supplementary steam plant that would supply the needs in the season of low water. I do not know whether he is right or wrong about it, but I remember very distinctly that as early as 1914, probably in 1913, the whole subject was presented very elaborately to the Senate by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

I was very much taken by the proposition as then presented by the Senator, but, Mr. President, a report that was made prior to the year 1914 which disclosed that the property would be developed and made productive is of no significance now. Things have changed wonderfully since that time. The cost of installation of the plant has been increased as a matter of course with the increasing cost of everything. The interest that must be paid upon the money necessary to develop the property as a matter of course has been increased. A report from an engineer that prior to the year 1914 this property could be developed and made profitable and made a paying enterprise would not justify us in ordering the enterprise to be conducted at this time at all.

I thought that what would be done with reference to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska would be to direct the commission to inquire and make a report to Congress about the advisability under existing conditions of making the improvement at the public expense. I believe that that would be commendable, but I can not believe that the Senate of the United States, upon the presentation that has been made to it, would want to go on record as willing to spend now \$25,000,000 in the development of a plant without some further evidence that under existing conditions it can be made a profitable enterprise.

Mr. NELSON. I would suggest to the Senator from Montana that if he desires to make the motion to reconsider it, we can take it up in the morning.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I move now to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. NELSON. I move—

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the Senator yield for a moment? I wish to offer an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. NELSON. Very well.

Mr. HENDERSON. I offer an amendment which I ask may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suppose that nobody wants to pay \$25,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States in connection with the Niagara project. I equally suppose that a great many people in the United States want to know something about this particular question, and I merely wanted to rise for the purpose of calling the attention of the Senate to the question at issue and asking each Senator to consider that independently of all the general questions which are at stake, it seems to me that this is a very important point, and if we are going to take care of the interests of the people at large as against the interests of the people who may fall heir to these licenses, or whatever you may choose to call them, we ought to think about it three times before we vote.

I have long since lost interest in the ordinary machinery of politics; I do not care anything about it; I condemn and despise it; but there are times when men ought to stop and think a while before they vote.

I find at this present moment that there are five Republican Senators present and that there are six Democratic Senators present. Those 11 Senators have heard the argument; none of the others has. This is a fair sample of the utility of the United States Senate to the people of the United States. Eleven Senators, five on one side and six on the other side, represent the two great parties here who are undertaking to determine very important industrial propositions; and this is a very important industrial proposition.

Mr. President, I withdraw my last remarks. There are two more Republicans who have come in since I made the reference. I ask that they be recorded. That is about the way the United States Senate, the fifth wheel in the Government of this country, is carrying itself. It is not paying any attention to its public business; I am not paying any attention to mine as a Member of this august body; nobody else is. Old Benjamin Franklin was about right when he said this was the fifth wheel and ought to be dispensed with. The American people are gradually rising to the height of demanding the abolition of the

United States Senate simply because the United States Senate does not function; it does not operate.

Do you know, Mr. President, I feel almost tempted to demand the presence of a quorum in order to determine the pending proposition? I will not do so, because that would be unclublike, and I am a member of this club.

Mr. NELSON. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 14, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 13, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, for the spirit of good implanted in the soul of man which is ever struggling for supremacy. The most licentious admires purity in another. The most dishonest admires honesty in another. The consummate liar admires truth in another. We hold sacred the Bible not as a fetish but because it contains the fundamental principles of right, and truth, and justice. Every utterance of the prophet, sage, or exponent of righteousness appeals to all that is best in man.

We cherish the utterances of the Master. Every parable lives, because it finds a response in the heart. The Sermon on the Mount is immortal because it reaches the soul and inspires godliness.

Inspire us day by day with this holy truth and give us the courage to live it. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

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

REQUEST TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the Berger case.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the Berger case. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I object. The gentleman from New York would not let Mr. Berger be heard.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3681. An act to amend section 848, chapter 16, Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to witness fees;

S. 3696. An act to change the time for holding court in Laurinburg, eastern district of North Carolina;

S. 3566. An act to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States," approved February 5, 1917;

S. 3384. An act to provide for burial and expenses of transportation of remains of certain officers and enlisted men of the reserve forces of the United States;

S. 3386. An act to provide for the assistance of civilian aviators in distress by authorizing the Secretary of War to sell at cost price at aviation posts or stations gasoline, oil, and aircraft supplies to persons in charge of civilian aircraft landing upon or near said post;

S. 3385. An act to authorize the War Department to restore the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Park to its condition prior to use for military purposes during the war with Germany, and to appropriate the necessary funds therefor;

S. 3387. An act for the relief of dependents of Lieuts. Jean Jagou and Fernand Herbert, French military mission to the United States; and

S. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to equalize the pay and allowances of commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Coast Guard with those of the Navy.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 3681. An act to amend section 848, chapter 16, Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to witness fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3386. An act to provide for the assistance of civilian aviators in distress by authorizing the Secretary of War to sell at cost price at aviation posts or stations gasoline, oil, and aircraft supplies to persons in charge of civilian aircraft landing upon or near said posts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3696. An act to change the time for holding court in Laurinburg, eastern district of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3566. An act to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States," approved February 5, 1917; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 3384. An act to provide for burial and expenses of transportation of remains of certain officers and enlisted men of the reserve forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3387. An act for the relief of dependents of Lieuts. Jean Jagou and Fernand Herbert, French military mission to the United States; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to equalize the pay and allowances of commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Coast Guard with those of the Navy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ARMY DISTINGUISHED-SERVICE MEDAL.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution H. Res. 428, and that it be placed upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 428.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the following facts in his possession incident to the awarding of the distinguished-service medal to certain officers and enlisted men of the United States Army and to civilians on account of distinguished or meritorious service during the World War:

(1) A complete list of officers and men recommended to receive these awards by their superior officers, together with the citation recommended in each instance and the specific act or acts on which the recommendations were based.

(2) A complete list of the civilians recommended to receive these awards by any official or board of officials, together with the citation in each instance and the specific act or acts on which the recommendations were based.

(3) A list of the names of the officers constituting the board or boards which passed upon the recommendations or made the awards of distinguished-service medals, whether sitting in Chaumont or Paris or London or Washington, D. C.

(4) A list of the names, if any, of the officers sitting on such boards who awarded distinguished-service medals to themselves or their colleagues.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we ought to pass on a question of this importance without a quorum. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Eagan	Humphreys	O'Connor
Anthony	Eagle	Hutchinson	Oldfield
Aswell	Evans, Mont.	Johnson, Wash.	Rayburn
Bell	Ferris	Kennedy, Iowa	Riordan
Benson	Fess	Kennedy, R. I.	Rowan
Bland, Ind.	Flood	Kitchin	Rowe
Booher	Focht	Kreider	Rucker
Bowers	Fuller, Mass.	Langley	Sanders, La.
Britten	Gandy	Layton	Scott
Browning	Ganly	Leshner	Scully
Brumbaugh	Goldfogle	Linthicum	Small
Byrns, Tenn.	Goodall	McCulloch	Smith, Idaho
Candler	Graham, Pa.	McDuffie	Snell
Carew	Griffin	McFadden	Strong, Pa.
Cleary	Hamill	McKenzie	Sullivan
Costello	Hamilton	McKeown	Taylor, Ark.
Crowther	Hardy, Colo.	McPherson	Taylor, Tenn.
Curry, Calif.	Harrison	MacCrate	Thompson
Davey	Hernandez	Mead	Vare
Dempsey	Hill	Moon, Tenn.	Walters
Dooley	Howard	Neely	Welty
Doremus	Hudspeth	Nicholls, S. C.	Wilson, La.
Dupré	Hulings	Nichols, Mich.	Woodyard

The SPEAKER. On this call 335 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from the consideration of House resolution 428.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I understand this motion is not debatable?

The SPEAKER. It is not debatable.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will make that ten minutes, so that in case I desire to use the time I have may five minutes.

Mr. KAHN. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that he may address the House for five minutes and that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] may address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is clearly privileged. Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I ask that the resolution be reported.

The SPEAKER. It has been reported once. Without objection, the resolution will be reported again.

Mr. KAHN. This will not be taken out of my time?

The SPEAKER. Of course not.

The Clerk read the resolution again.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution is clearly privileged. It calls for information for the use of the Members of the House. The Committee on Military Affairs considered the resolution but thought it advisable to find out from the War Department about how much time it would require to get the information and how much clerical help would be involved in furnishing it. I took up the matter with the Secretary of War a day or two after the resolution was introduced. The Secretary told me that he would furnish me that information and let me know just exactly what was involved in those particulars. I have not heard from the Secretary since, and, of course, I am not able to give the House any information as to how many clerks it would take to get this information or how many volumes of reports they would have to go through in order to furnish it. I think the information should be given to Congress, and I have no objection to the passage of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from the further consideration of the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that I am recognized for one hour?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is entitled to be recognized for one hour.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that if there is any Member of the House who may feel inclined to oppose this resolution, that I will gladly yield some time to him before I have finished. I desire to be notified when I have consumed 45 minutes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the attention of the House very closely to what I have to say, because I can assure the House that I am not going to make any political speech or any political attack on anyone.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to note particularly that my resolution makes no reference to the awards of the distinguished-service cross. Many of the bravest of our boys, both officers and enlisted men, received this decoration for the performance of a service of unusual character and for exceptional bravery in the presence of the enemy.

The criticism to be made in awarding the distinguished-service cross is that of lack of uniformity on the part of the commanding officers in making recommendations, this lack of uniformity arising out of the different viewpoints of the several officers commanding troops as to who should and who should not be designated for having performed an unusual service under fire. It is known, however, that many recommendations for the distinguished-service cross never received favorable action. If there is to be any general investigation of the manner of making awards for distinguished service, whether that service be in the nature of the performance of administrative duty or of actual fighting on the battle front, then this investigation should include that of ascertaining the reasons why

favorable action was taken on some recommendations and other recommendations were set aside. There is one feature, however, in the awarding of distinguished-service crosses which should be closely looked into by any committee making an investigation of the award of medals, and that is where these medals have been awarded to aides and special staff officers of high commanders whose posts of command were in rear of the battle lines. It is a notable fact, that many line officers who commanded troops in the front-line trenches, exposed to the fire of the enemy for 24 hours a day, received no recognition, while staff officers who for various reasons may have visited the front lines for very brief periods of time were rewarded because of "exceptional bravery in the presence of the enemy."

DISTINGUISHED-SERVICE MEDAL.

The awarding of the distinguished-service medal—that is, D. S. M.—often referred to by the Army as the "desk" service medal, is the subject of most severe criticism by practically every member of the United States military service, except, of course, the favored few who have because of friends at court received them. It would be manifestly unfair to broadly state, however, that none of these medals have been meritoriously awarded. This medal, which should be respected by the entire service, has been awarded to many splendid officers and men, but it has been cheapened, even dishonored and certainly ridiculed, by the bold and brazen manner in which it has been passed out to those who belong to the elect. It has been used as a reward for friendship, regardless of the service of the recipient. It has even been used to placate those who have been removed to make way for some one else. Furthermore, it is believed that practically every member of the General Staff here in Washington has been awarded one of these medals, regardless of the character of service performed, and, mark you, I desire to include in this statement those assigned to the General Staff for temporary duty.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I prefer not to yield until I have concluded.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I simply want to know if these men were ever overseas.

Mr. GALLIVAN. No, sir; not the men I refer to.

The reading of the sum total of the citations in awarding the distinguished-service medal to swivel-chair officers of the General Staff, who never left Washington during the war, if believed, would certainly impress one with the fact that the war was fought with red ink at mahogany desks near the shadows of Washington Monument rather than in the Argonne and St. Mihiel sectors. If there is an officer of the General Staff who served in Washington during the war and who did not receive one of these medals, he must feel like a gray horse in a barnyard full of mules. [Laughter.]

Surely the "lounge lizards" of the "Second Army of the Potomac" can have no quarrel with their comrades, the "lobby lancers" of the Capitol, as to the number of D. S. M.'s these two valiant units received for heroic service in this war. Scarcely a single one of them has been passed over.

As for France, wherever the commander in chief sent a "commissioned messenger boy" on an errand the D. S. M. was sure to be the reward. Napoleon said, "Every private carries a field marshal's baton in his knapsack." Gen. Pershing might have said, "Every staff officer and aid, with proper credentials as to standing with the elite, carries a D. S. M. in his messenger's case."

The "boulevard shock troops" of Paris and Chaumont and Tours can take oath as to the truth of the foregoing words. Scarcely a single member of that wonderful outfit but has received a special glorification by the placing of a distinguished service medal on his manly chest.

But let us return to Washington for the moment. We had four different Chiefs of Staff here in Washington during the period we were at war with Germany. Everyone who knows anything at all about the workings of the War Department knows that the predecessors to the present high priest of Prussianism, Gen. Peyton C. March, were considered unequal to the task. Through one pretense or another they were removed. Ordinarily when a man has failed in the performance of any specific task he is removed without reward. This, however, has not been true with reference to the removal of inefficient from their posts in Washington. These men have, on the other hand, been rewarded in the name of the President of the United States by the bestowal upon them of the distinguished-service medal. Whatever the answer may be for this action the fact remains that these men were here on duty in Washington and were tried out in the posts and were removed from their functions and transferred elsewhere.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I do not care to yield now unless the gentleman wants to make some assertion that should come in here.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman refers to Gen. Bliss. Gen. Bliss was sent to France and functioned with the war commission; he functioned in France after January 18, 1918. During the balance of the war he was not here to perform the duty of Chief of Staff, and that is why another Chief of Staff was appointed in his place.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Gen. Bliss was removed long before he went to France. I may be in error about that, but that is my recollection, that he was removed before he went with the President.

Mr. KAHN. I think the gentleman will find that he went to France to serve over there, and Gen. Biddle was appointed Acting Chief of Staff while Gen. Bliss was in Europe. Gen. Biddle was then superseded.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I have not mentioned the name of Gen. Bliss. It is the distinguished chairman of the Military Committee who has brought names into the discussion.

Here are some quotations from the citations making the award of the distinguished-service medal to these men, no doubt honorable officers and of long and faithful service but unequal to the great task with which they were confronted. It is not my purpose to dwell too much in personalities in attempting to right a great wrong to loyal and faithful service. For this reason, names are not connected with the quotations of citations. Those who are interested may readily identify the officers concerned.

Quoting from citations relating to ex-Chiefs of Staff to whom the official action was tied:

For his most exceptional services as Assistant Chief of Staff, Acting Chief of Staff, and Chief of Staff of the United States Army, in which important positions his administrative ability and professional attainments were of great value to our armies.

Here is a quotation from the citation to another deposed chief, who became a charter member of that very much ridiculed body referred to in the Army as the "old women's knitting club"—the war council:

For exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous service as Chief of Staff in advocating and persistently urging the adoption of the selective-service law.

To a third, " * * * Who sat at the desk of the Chief of Staff * * *," weighed in the balance and found wanting, was given a distinguished-service medal, but some one's conscience must have been temporarily revived for no reference is made to his former duties while in the Chief of Staff's chair, but the citation is confined wholly to handing him a bunch of posies for service far away from the scene of active warfare.

The Kaiser, with some spark of appreciation for consistency, yet alive, said, "Me und Gott." Not so your Chief of Staff, United States Army, Peyton C. March, who sees no reason for including "Gott." It is simply "Me" with him. He naturally asks where this "Gott" comes in. Now, here is what is said, in the name of the President of the United States, of the man for whom no officer or soldier ever speaks a word except in contempt; the man whom the Regular Army believes has brought the entire service into disrepute and has destroyed the splendid morale of that once proud and loyal Army:

Gen. March (then major general, United States Army), as commanding general of the Army Artillery of the First Army from October 4, 1917, to January 31, 1918, initiated and prepared the plans for the organization of the Artillery of the American Army in France; as Acting Chief of Staff of the United States Army from March 2, 1918, to May 20, 1918, and as Chief of Staff of the United States Army (general, United States Army) after May 20, 1918, he performed with intelligence, zeal, and patriotic devotion duties of inestimable value in the development, the direction, and the carrying into effect of the military program of the United States.

No further comment is necessary. One is almost tempted to believe that the language is that of the Almighty High himself, for it is hardly possible that there is anyone in the military service who would voluntarily express himself in such laudatory terms—certainly no one except under orders.

In France there was a board of awards of medals that sat in Chaumont and looked with easy favor on giving awards to their friends, and with blind eyes and deaf ears to recommendations of those without the pale. The grand chief of this board is said to have been one "Davis," brigadier general, appointed to that grade over the heads of many senior officers of distinguished service; he was also adjutant general of the American Expeditionary Forces. Of course Davis has a medal, and it is also said that every other member of this famous medal board has a distinguished-service medal. For the sake of sparing the blushes and embarrassment of those very modest young men, it is said that each one was excused in turn from attendance at the sessions of the board while his remaining colleagues extolled him on his merits and wound up by reluctantly—because

of the embarrassment to him—awarding, in the name of the President of the United States, a distinguished-service medal. Here are just a few extracts from citations in placing the distinguished-service medal on these manly breasts:

For exceptional and meritorious and distinguished services as adjutant general of the American Expeditionary Forces; he has performed his exacting duties with high professional skill and administrative ability. The exceptional efficiency of the Adjutant General's Department under his direction was a material factor in the success of the staff work at general headquarters.

It was this "efficiency" that sent officers all over France looking for their regiments, and in some instances traveling many miles to join their organizations, only to learn on arrival that the vacancy to which they had been sent had been filled many days before. This "efficiency" was marked by the rule of the martinet, for "Cockey" Davis was at the helm. The same "efficiency" is yet on exhibition at headquarters American Expeditionary Forces here in Washington. If you want any information just try the office of the American Expeditionary Forces, where Davis, a junior, many, many numbers below distinguished officers who are now majors and lieutenant colonels, yet retains his status of brigadier general by the grace of the former commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces.

Here is another member of the famous medal board. They had to try it twice on him before it would take. Here is the first effort to justify the use of the President's name:

For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. By his untiring efforts, his great ability, and his devotion to duty he has rendered most conspicuous services to the Government as deputy chief of staff of the American Expeditionary Forces.

That was the best that could be done extemporaneously, but it did not sound like much, so they took another whack at it:

For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. As a member of the operations section, general staff, General Headquarters, American Expeditionary Forces, he exhibited sound military judgment and foresight in drafting important plans. Later as deputy chief of staff of the American Expeditionary Forces throughout the period of active operations and thereafter he discharged the important and complex duties of his position with admirable efficiency, and by his untiring efforts and devotion to duty rendered conspicuous service to the Government.

Here is the man who after the armistice kept our 2,000,000 men in France performing maneuvers, regardless of weather, regardless of clothing, regardless of character of billets and of food. This is the man whom 2,000,000 Yanks have to thank for those trying times during the early winter of 1918-19, when for hours they plodded knee-deep in mud, often inadequately shod, cold to the skin, participating in a so-called training schedule. Note the following:

For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. In charge of the training section of the general staff, this brilliant officer perfected and administered the efficient scheme of instruction through which the American Army in France was thoroughly trained for combat in the shortest possible time. By his great depth of vision, his foresight, and his clear conception of modern tactical training he has enabled our forces to enter each engagement with that preparedness and efficiency that have distinguished the American Army in each battle.

What does the returning Yank think of that sentence which reads: "He enabled our forces to enter each engagement with that preparedness and efficiency that have distinguished the American Army in each battle"? Oh, that the thousands of American dead who were forced into the battle front without ever having fired a military rifle, with few weeks' military training of any character, could shout an answer from their poppy-covered graves in France!

Concerning another member of this board of immortals, as his friends thought, the quotation of the citation is expressed in the following manner when the distinguished-service medal is pinned by caressing hands to a blouse wrinkled through leaning over a desk:

For exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous services as assistant chief of staff. He handled with great executive ability and rare understanding all problems of equipping and supplying the large numbers of American troops arrived and operating in France, and by his large grasp of supply problems and tireless energy he has conspicuously aided the successful administration of the supply department.

Now for a few cases from several hundred pages devoted to placcation, adulation, and admiration in Washington and in France:

For especially meritorious and conspicuous service in administering The Adjutant General's Department during the early period of the war. Through his efficient management this department was able to meet the excessive burdens placed upon it.

This is a case where the medal was given to a deserving man, not with the purpose of rewarding merit, but for the purpose of placating an officer who, because of his opposition to the plans of the General Staff to assume the administration of the entire Army, was conveniently dropped out of the office of that of The Adjutant General of the Army and assigned to the com-

mand of a division. Anyone having an intimate knowledge of the reasons underlying the change in the head of The Adjutant General's office can not help but smile when reading this citation conferring the distinguished-service medal upon a worthy and distinguished officer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have many more citations here which I will not read but I will ask unanimous consent to insert them in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, what does the gentleman intend to insert?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Citations which have been awarded in general orders of the War Department.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman is criticizing the exercise of discretion of the war officers in awarding these medals?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman mention their names?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I announced at the start that I would mention no names, with one or two exceptions, and I have not.

Mr. WINGO. Does not the gentleman think it would serve a more practical purpose if he would point out these instances and give the names of the men?

Mr. GALLIVAN. If the gentleman objects, I will read them.

Mr. WINGO. Unless the gentleman can specify the citations and give the names of the men—

Mr. GALLIVAN. I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that objection comes from the Democratic side of the House when there is no politics in it. When these cases come up somehow or other the objection always comes from the Democratic side.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Democratic side—

Mr. GALLIVAN. The gentleman from Alabama is not in order. I have not yielded to him.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Democratic side is getting very weary of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have not yielded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). The gentleman declines to yield. The gentleman from Alabama is out of order.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Here is the man whose attitude toward the National Guard officers of the Field Artillery is known to have been antagonistic and who attempted to institute such a high standard of technical qualifications as to eliminate a large number of these officers:

For especially meritorious and conspicuous service in planning and executing those measures responsible for the efficiency of the Field Artillery during the war.

Another officer whose services probably have contributed more to discontent on the part of the commissioned personnel of the Army than that of any other officer in the service, excepting the Chief of Staff, is the head of the personnel section, who formerly was secretary to the Chief of Staff and who was rapidly passed from grade of major to that of brigadier general and placed at the head of the personnel section of the General Staff.

For especially meritorious and conspicuous service as secretary of the General Staff and in the organization and coordination of matters relating to the commissioned personnel of the Army.

If any investigation is to be made of the awarding of distinguished-service medals, it is certainly urged that especial attention be given to this case, and also that of the former Chief of the Tank Corps. Here is what they say of him:

For especially meritorious and conspicuous service in the organization and administration of the Tank Corps.

If investigation is made of these cases, there is no doubt in the mind of anyone familiar with the work performed by these two officers as to what the result will be.

We find another officer who was on duty during the entire period of the war as a messenger between the General Staff and the foreign officers. They gave him the high-sounding name of "liaison officer." His citation reads:

For exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous service. While on duty as liaison officer between the War Department and the foreign military missions he displayed the greatest discretion and ability and contributed materially to the successful conduct of military-diplomatic relations between the War Department and the allied military missions.

Now, listen to this one:

For exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous service; for duty rendered in the office of the Surgeon General as Chief, Air Service Division.

Then we have a medal bestowed on an officer for the following happy service:

* * * At the beginning of the war he was placed in charge of the physical training in officers' training camps.

There are other nice things said about this officer, but the above is the gist of the citation.

Mr. Speaker, I approach the next case with some trepidation lest I be accused of some political intent. I assure the House

that my speech has no political significance. I am trying to correct an evil which has shattered the morale of our Army almost beyond redemption. Whether the passage of this resolution and a subsequent investigation will bring about the necessary reforms is a matter of speculation. May I now refer to an especial case of international notoriety?

Gen. Leonard Wood, as everyone knows, was considered by the Army as one of its most capable officers and the only officer on the active list of the service who had exercised a high command. He was never given an important active command during the period of the war. However, in order to placate public opinion something must be done in recognition of the service. The bestowal of the distinguished-service medal on Gen. Wood is hardly approved by the entire military service, I am told, although I do not agree with the opposition, but the reason for such bestowal looks like an interrogation point in the minds of everyone who has a knowledge of Gen. Wood's treatment. This is the way the citation reads:

For especially meritorious and conspicuous service as a department, division, and camp commander during the war. He has displayed qualities of leadership and professional attainments of a high order in the administration and training of his various commands and has furthered in every way during the war the system of officers' training schools.

Here is another notable and interesting incident in the awards of decorations:

Maj. Gen. John F. Morrison was returned from France for the purpose of assuming charge of the training program in the United States. He established offices with the General Staff in Washington, but for some mysterious reasons suddenly disappeared and was given an outside command. It was generally understood that Gen. Morrison was not in sympathy with the General Staff's program, and because of this lack of harmony was either removed or voluntarily asked to be removed from his duties. Whatever the underlying facts may be, Gen. Morrison was awarded a distinguished-service medal for:

Exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous service as department commander, Western Department, in handling with great skill, tact, and sound judgment many difficult problems arising in his department.

During the early part of the war one of the problems confronting those officers in the War Department who were opposed to National Guard officers holding high rank was how to get rid of them. Some one conceived the brilliant idea of organizing "A Brigade and Field Officers' School." Such a school was approved and was located at San Antonio, Tex. The idea was a good one provided the satisfactory man could be secured to head this school. Such a man was found in the person of one Thomas B. Dugan, brigadier general of the Regular Army, hard-boiled and firm, with very definite ideas as to the proper place of a National Guard officer. To Gen. Dugan were sent many field officers of the National Guard whose attendance at that famous institution, the Brigade and Field Officers' School, marked the end of their military careers. This school was often referred to by the Army as the "canning factory." Dugan was afterwards given command of an infantry brigade in France, and later was in command of the division. He was given a distinguished-service medal, but tactfully no reference was made in his citation to his former functions as the head of the "canning factory" in San Antonio:

For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. He commanded the Seventieth Infantry Brigade during a part of the Meuse-Argonne offensive with great distinction and marked ability. By his painstaking energy, zeal, and great initiative he proved to be a material factor in the successes of the division.

It should be noted in this connection that the officers in Washington who approved in the name of the President of the United States and Secretary of War the discharge from the service of many National Guard officers were also rewarded with the distinguished-service medal.

And what shall I say of the notorious Bamford, who for 23 days was in command of the famous fighting Twenty-sixth Division, composed of New England's best and bravest boys in the National Guard? This man was removed after less than three weeks' command because of his bungling and brutality.

Bamford had gone to France as a captain, but because he was a favorite with the Leavenworth clique he had been advanced to the rank of brigadier general. When gallant Maj. Gen. Clarence R. Edwards, who had organized this wonderful fighting force and had led it overseas, who had rubbed elbows with even the lowliest private in his outfit and had lived with his men in trench and in hut, declined to do the dirty work of removing from their commands many brave officers from New England, whose only offense was that they were National Guard graduates, Bamford was sent up to take command of the division just before the armistice was signed, and he immediately proceeded to wreck its personnel by removing Brig. Gen. Charles H. Cole, of the Fifty-second Brigade; Col. Edward L. Logan, of

the One hundred and first Infantry; Col. Hume, of the One hundred and third Infantry, and five other field officers. Frederick Palmer tells you in his book how thoroughly this wrecker—Bramford—did the job assigned to him, and yet when every officer so removed demanded a hearing and the outrage committed had been aired in Congress, the American "high command" in Chaumont ordered these officers returned to duty and every man of them came back to America in charge of his original outfit. Yet, Bramford received a distinguished-service medal. So, too, another in that division, Lieut. Col. Duncan K. Major, an officer loathed by every man in the outfit, and charged with disloyalty from the beginning to Maj. Gen. Edwards, was decorated with the distinguished-service medal. You may not know it but when the Twenty-sixth Division received orders to embark for home early in 1919, with its home port to be Boston, where the infamy of this man—Major—had been thoroughly advertised, he immediately requested a transfer because he did not dare to return to the city whose sons he had attempted to disgrace.

Who else in the Yankee Division are specially favored? Brig. Gen. Glassford, a regular; Col. Hiram I. Bearss, originally of the Marines; Col. Morris E. Locke, a regular. But, so far as I am able to learn, not an officer or man with the single exception of a second lieutenant, whose valor could not be overlooked—a lad named Reece—who went over and stayed with the division from the beginning to the end of its service was awarded a distinguished-service medal. Think of it, gentlemen! But five medals to a division through which there must have passed almost 50,000 men from the day it first set foot in the Chemin-des-Dames in February, 1918, until it finished its heroic work at 11 o'clock in the morning of November 11, 1918! Shame on the men who would deprive those who fought their best, under our colors, of merited decorations solely because those in power hated the commander of the Yankee Division!

But I have a few more interesting types among those selected for special preferment. We find an officer rewarded for performing, among other things:

* * * Due to his foresight and energy our armies in the field were at all times supplied abundantly with excellent maps of the theater of operations.

We find another officer decorated, because " * * * he revealed marked ability in the inspection of conduct and methods and showed military tactical knowledge of a high order."

We find another officer decorated because " * * * he organized and coordinated the several activities of the salvage depot at St. Pierre de Corps," and so forth.

We find that another officer engaged in the Services of Supply is decorated for: " * * * Under his administration the supply of troops, care of property, and the operation of the quartermaster depot at Gievere showed an excellent degree of efficiency."

Another officer gets the medal for performing " * * * the important duty of administering the Supplies Division of the Quartermaster Department of the American Expeditionary Forces."

Another quartermaster swells his chest to receive the medal because " * * * as quartermaster at Langres and at the regulating station at Is-sur-Tille his energy and thorough knowledge of methods and standards of supply have been of the greatest value to the Government."

Another officer gets the medal for " * * * most excellent service as a member of the United States Aeronautical Commission, charged with the selection of types of European aeronautical material to be manufactured in the United States."

Another case, and the special attention of the returned Yanks is invited to this case, for this is the gentleman who is responsible for the prompt delivery of letters from home. The specific information about this gentleman was given me by an officer returned from France who was in the American Expeditionary Forces three months before he received his first letter from his people in the United States. Listen to this:

For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. As chief of the Postal Express Service, he organized and administered with marked ability the postal service of the American Expeditionary Forces. He displayed great breadth of vision and untiring zeal in overcoming the many obstacles that were encountered in the organization of the service of handling mail for our troops in Europe.

We find a colonel of The Adjutant General's Office had been decorated because " * * * he displayed unusual skill and untiring zeal in organizing and administering the Statistical Division of The Adjutant General's Office."

The mothers of the United States who received notices of the death of their sons when they were not killed and of their safety when they had been killed will appreciate the following language used in bestowing the distinguished-service medal on

a lieutenant colonel of the United States Army: " * * * He handled the complex problems constantly arising with great discretion, displaying keen perception amid the maze of details involved in the reporting of casualties and changes of status of officers and soldiers. With unflinching energy and exceptional ability he performed a task of great magnitude."

Among the many officers who were rewarded for services in "the Battle of Paris" is that of a lieutenant colonel who was decorated for rendering exceptionally valuable service in connection with the selection of Signal Corps equipment.

The prohibitionists will appreciate the distinguished honor bestowed upon a colonel of the United States Army who now wears upon his proud and protruding chest the D. S. M. because he was " * * * responsible for the plentiful supply of pure drinking water to the combat troops."

Another officer, with the rank of lieutenant colonel, is given the D. S. M. because he " * * * was in charge of the locomotive and car repair shops at Nevers, and he carried out the installation and operation of this plant, exhibiting rare executive ability and engineering qualifications of the highest order."

We find another officer, a major in the service, receiving a medal " * * * by displaying untiring energy and enthusiasm in the performance of his important duties he developed efficient gas discipline in the Thirty-second Division, resulting in the prevention of gas fatalities."

We find that all of the personal aids of the commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces have been decorated, and it is also noted, in reading over the orders publishing the citations and the award of these medals, that three of the personal aids of the commander in chief have been decorated in the same orders.

We have a case of another colonel rewarded because " * * * as assistant to the adjutant general American Expeditionary Forces he was charged with the important duty of verifying, preparing, and distributing all orders and bulletins issued from general headquarters."

We find a colonel of Infantry who was decorated a long time after the armistice. He was in charge of the athletic training and received a medal for holding a track meet in Paris. The citation does not exactly say so, but the facts are that that was what actually happened.

It will be interesting to those soldiers who were passed through Brest on their way home shortly after the armistice to know that the officers in charge of that famous camp were decorated with the D. S. M. This information will be particularly interesting to the Senator's wife who broke down and cried when she saw the condition in which she found the American troops at that camp.

It is also noted that all the military attachés to foreign countries were decorated, regardless of the character of the service performed.

I would like to know how many civilians got a medal. Who were they? Most of us recall Eisemann, of Cleveland. Eisemann and his outfit were practically dropped, and yet I am informed this "brilliant genius" eventually received a D. S. M.

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I would rather not; but I yield to the gentleman lest I am in error.

Mr. MOONEY. I want to ask the gentleman if he knows that Mr. Eisemann was absolutely exonerated of every charge made against him?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I did not know that, and I am very glad to have the gentleman's statement go in with my remarks. My information was contrary to that fact, and that the McKellar investigation drove Eisemann out of Washington.

Oh, how my friend from Texas [Mr. BEE] enjoys this, as he enjoys everything I say when I address the House. He is my most impartial listener.

I have been asked whether more medals were given to officers who never left Washington than to men who went overseas, and I answer, proportionately, yes. I have been so advised by men who ought to know. At any rate, it seems advisable to me, in order to get all the information, to ask the Secretary of War for a report as to whom constituted the various boards designated for passing on recommendations for medals. While the officers of the Regular Army, including those youngsters who were appointed at the beginning of the war, represented less than 5 per cent of the total number of officers engaged in the war, it is believed that the report will show that practically 100 per cent of the members of the board named to pass on awards were Regular Army officers, graduates of West Point and of the service schools at Leavenworth. It is possible that there may have been some temporary officers on these boards, also some Regular Army officers who were commissioned from

the ranks of civil life; but, if such is the case, the number of such in proportion to the whole will be found to be quite small. The control of all awards was practically in the hands of the West Point and Leavenworth cliques.

Mr. Speaker, an investigation has been ordered by another branch of this Congress into the awards of decorations by the Secretary of the Navy. I appeal to you to have another investigation which will include that branch of the military service, with its greater opportunity in the battle line to disclose heroes of rank or of file. When we find men honored and glorified by the award of this medal who were responsible for the frightful errors and delays in reporting casualties, men who made a madhouse out of the offices of the War Department throughout the entire country after the armistice had been signed, what answer can we make to the mothers and fathers who, exulting that their boys came out of the conflict alive, were driven frantic months afterwards to learn that they had been killed weeks, and in many cases months, before the armistice? You will recall at that time we had knowledge in this country of approximately but 80,000 casualties, and now we learn that the American Expeditionary Forces suffered 300,000 casualties. The armistice has been in effect over 14 months, some wounds have been healed, and our boys have been demobilized and have gone back to their civic pursuits. These lads did some wonderful fighting and have gloried in their participation in the war. How many of them have said to you as they have said to me, "Never again, never again"? Why do they hate the Regular Army and the system?

The proper answer to this is that the war was conducted from the beginning without taking into consideration the human element. Army theorists long trained in Prussian systems were in control. Their idea of an effective military force was to give a man a serial number and an officer a grade and to make grade and number fit in at any point where there were vacancies, regardless of whether or not there were any special qualifications. It is my firm belief that the underlying cause of this hate will be found in instruction given in the officers' training camps. These camps were in charge of officers of the Regular Army who had little contact with civil life and who had no appreciation of the necessity of making the military discipline of the Army conform to the average man's idea of a democratic army. It is the personal experience of many of the old officers of the Army who had profited by the experience of the war that it was this lack of appreciation of the human element that has caused practically every soldier who has worn the uniform to return to his home with an intense hate for the military institution. It should be borne in mind that the system of discipline in the old Regular Army can be traced to the same source as that of Frederick the Great, of Prussia, and there is but little distinction or difference in the methods. There is this difference, however, that in the Prussian Army an officer is required to make good. We have never been able to inject any such method in our system. The officers have been carried on, many of them wholly incompetent. Because of incompetence, together with a very autocratic system, nothing could be expected except that the system would fall down when it came in contact with any large number of American citizens, as was the case in our late war.

The remedy for existing conditions is one very difficult of solution by Congress. If the Army is to properly function, its administration must be left largely to the executive branch of the Government, as it is a part of that branch. Congress, of course, exercises its control largely through appropriations. The fundamental thing to be corrected is that of clipping the wings of the General Staff so that it can not exercise administrative control of the Army. Such control is not the proper function of the General Staff, never was intended to be, and never should have been permitted.

I am advised that the morale of the Army, as far as the enlisted men are concerned, has been shattered almost beyond belief. The officer morale has been shattered because of three particular reasons: First, the palpable display of favoritism in selections for promotion and in making citations and awards for medals; second, the reduction of many distinguished officers to junior grades upon their arrival at the port of debarkation of the United States, and placing them under the immediate command of officers many years their juniors and who have not been outside the United States during the war. This is quite a common abuse and the feeling in the Army over it is intense. Third, the manner in which the General Staff has handled the entire military situation. It has bungled practically every problem with which it has been confronted. It has handled the Army personnel with the total disregard of the human element. Selections for a high command have been made because of personal acquaintance rather than on military

record. It has destroyed practically every administrative branch of the Military Establishment and has usurped their functions to itself. There is no part of the Army which can now turn its hand without consulting some officer of the General Staff who is often a man of inexperience and with little knowledge of the subject upon which he is called to give an opinion and make a decision.

Mr. Speaker, I can not refrain from saying to this House that it is common talk in the Army, whenever medal awards are discussed, that our present Chief of Staff and one of his assistants, a colonel, whose duty it was to escort and dine foreign missions here in Washington, have no space left between their belts to their collars to display the medals that have been given them as a result of this service, and yet neither heard a hostile shot throughout the entire period of the war. I have no thought of preaching to this House about individual cases of officers and men who were recommended for service crosses and medals and who never received them. If I should enter on this phase of the story it would take more time and space than is permitted to a Member of Congress, even under extraordinary conditions.

There ought not to be any sound reason why the majority of the 2,000,000 men who saw service overseas are not genuine admirers of the Regular Army, and yet they are not. Why? I ask again. Gen Pershing has his four stars, the stars of Washington, and the thanks of Congress. Admitting the good things that have been done, and there were many such or else we could not have won this war, there should be no objection to an honest investigation, not only about the expenditures, about decorations, about promotions and demotions, but the most important question of all, Why does the American boy who won this war hate what his superiors did in France, and why does he hate the Regular Army? This is a question of extreme importance to the Army, to the Government itself, and, most of all, to the mothers and fathers of the young men of America who gave their sons freely and willingly that a world democracy might be perpetuated and that all nations might be free. [Applause.]

Mr. CALDWELL rose.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask if the reporter has noted that the applause was on the Republican side?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Oh, there was some on the Democratic side. There are some intense patriots on the Democratic side who applauded it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] is recognized.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] has been so very generous in the distribution of the time that was allotted to him, to wit, one hour, that I doubt very much whether anyone, even if he had the eloquence of a Demosthenes, or a Cicero, or a Daniel Webster, would be able to reply to him in this generous allotment given to me of eight minutes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. It is three minutes more than the gentleman asked for.

Mr. DEWALT. I never knew of any edifice that was ever erected, however beautiful, however strong, however fair its proportions, that some one was not able to criticize it and throw mud at it, and I believe also that it is far easier to tear down that which is built than to originally build it. There seem to be some men in this world, and their number is not few, who have the inherent desire to find fault and criticize that which has been done, instead of possessing initiative and trying to do that which should be done.

I have no quarrel with my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] as to what he desires to accomplish, namely, an orderly and seemly investigation, but I do have complaint to make, as a Member of this House, regardless of my political affiliation, in respect to the method that he pursues. I listened patiently to all that he had to say. In the course of his remarks, consuming 52 minutes, he cited possibly 50 cases, more or less, of those who had received the distinguished-service medal. Every one of them he condemned. Not one of them received his approbation. The wonder to me now is that we ever fought this war to a successful conclusion. All these men whom he has criticized took part in this great struggle, fostered and fathered, if you please, by the authoritative source of our Government, countenanced and upheld by the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, recognized for their ability, if you please, by the Secretary of War. Yet the gentleman from Massachusetts condemns them all, finds no word of approbation for any

of their acts. Again, I inquire, how it is that with these men in the service as they undoubtedly were, whether they were here in Washington performing the duties allotted to them and necessary for the prosecution of the war or in the front line of battle performing their duty—I wonder how it is that with them in the service, if they were such as he depicts them to be, we ever could have reached a successful issue.

I rise particularly at this time as a Pennsylvanian.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, careful perhaps and cautious in his way, not timid, for no one would accuse him of timidity, but perhaps overcautious, said that he would mention no names, but he does single out Gen. Peyton March. I know something of Peyton March's record. I have known him since he was a boy. I have what is to be considered the honor, not the distinction, but the pride, of being a Lafayette College graduate. I learned my first lessons as a college student under the guidance of the reverend father of Gen. Peyton March. I knew him as a boy. I have known of his career since his boyhood days. I have yet to hear from any authentic source, from any authoritative source, that he has ever been guilty of anything which deserves the just condemnation of any fair-minded man. [Applause.] I have heard him branded here in this House as that archfiend of rank Prussianism, or words to that effect. I cast them back into the teeth of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] and say that he is little deserving of the position he holds as a Member from Massachusetts to use epithets against the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, Gen. Peyton March. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. I yield.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Would the gentleman have made that charge against me if I had an opportunity to reply to him? Why does he wait until the closing hours of the debate to make that sort of a charge? [Laughter.] Oh, applaud, my southern Democratic friends—cheer.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. I will yield further if I am granted more time by unanimous consent.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Then I object for that sort of thing.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask for recognition in my own right.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I was going to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. I do for a parliamentary inquiry; yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Is it not a fact, in view of the fact that the previous question has not been demanded or moved, that any gentleman who is opposed to this resolution is entitled to recognition for one hour?

Mr. DEWALT. I am going to ask for recognition in my own right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any Member who gets recognition is entitled to one hour.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have recognition at this time, and I ask for an extension of that recognition beyond the eight minutes in my own right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Well, the Chair declines to recognize the gentleman further. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. DEWALT. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks a very pertinent question, and says "If I had known the gentleman from Pennsylvania was to make a charge of that kind, I would have asked for time in which to reply." Ah, who knew what he was about to say except he himself? No one but he with his printed record before him. How could the gentleman from Pennsylvania, or any other Member of this House, anticipate what he was to say? I tried to make a reply in order, in my feeble way, as one Member to uphold what I believe to be a fair proposition, and that is this, that every man, whether he be in the Army or in the Navy, or whether he be in the ranks of civil life, should have a fair chance to meet his accusers face to face and also have a decent chance to make a reply. All these men enumerated by the gentleman from Massachusetts, whoever they may be, whatever their political affiliations may be, have been condemned by him upon the floor of this House, and not one of them will ever have an opportunity to make reply upon this floor. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced the Chair was in doubt.

The House again divided; and there were—ayes 77, noes 67.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of no quorum has been made, and the Chair will endeavor to ascertain if there is a quorum present. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 155, nays 174, not voting 99, as follows:

YEAS—155.

Ackerman	Emerson	Klecza	Ricketts
Anderson	Esch	Knutson	Riddick
Andrews, Nebr.	Evans, Nebr.	Kraus	Rogers
Anthony	Focht	Lampert	Sanders, Ind.
Bacharach	Fordney	Longworth	Sanders, N. Y.
Baer	Foster	Luce	Sells
Barbour	Frear	Lufkin	Shreve
Benham	Freeman	McArthur	Siegel
Bland, Ind.	Fuller, Ill.	McKenzie	Sinclair
Boles	Gallivan	McKinley	Sinnott
Brooks, Ill.	Garland	McLaughlin, Mich.	Slemp
Brooks, Pa.	Glynn	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Smith, Idaho
Brown	Good	Magee	Smith, Ill.
Burdick	Goodykoontz	Mapes	Smith, Mich.
Burrhoughs	Gould	Mason	Steenerson
Campbell, Kans.	Graham, Ill.	Miller	Stephens, Ohio
Cannon	Greene, Mass.	Monahan, Wis.	Swope
Chindblom	Greene, Vt.	Mondell	Taylor, Tenn.
Christopherson	Hadley	Moore, Ohio	Temple
Cole	Harrell	Moore, Ind.	Timberlake
Cooper	Haugen	Morgan	Tincher
Cramton	Hawley	Morin	Tinkham
Currie, Mich.	Hernandez	Nelson, Wis.	Treadway
Curry, Calif.	Hersey	Newton, Minn.	Vestal
Dale	Hickey	Newton, Mo.	Volstead
Dallinger	Hicks	Osney	Walsh
Darrow	Houghton	Osborne	Ward
Davis, Minn.	Hull, Iowa	Paige	Wason
Dempsey	Ireland	Parker	Watson
Denison	Jefferis	Peters	Wheeler
Dickinson, Iowa	Johnson, S. Dak.	Porter	White, Kans.
Dowell	Jones, Pa.	Purnell	White, Me.
Dunn	Juul	Radcliffe	Williams
Dyer	Kahn	Ramseyer	Wilson, Ill.
Echols	Kearns	Ramsey	Wood, Ind.
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Randall, Wis.	Yates
Elliott	Kendall	Reber	Young, N. Dak.
Ellsworth	Kiess	Reed, N. Y.	Zihlman
Elston	Kinkaid	Rhodes	

NAYS—174.

Almon	Fields	McClintie	Rubey
Ashbrook	Fisher	McGlennon	Rucker
Ayres	French	McKiniry	Sabath
Babka	Gallagher	McLane	Saunders, Va.
Bankhead	Gard	MacGregor	Schall
Bee	Garner	Maher	Sears
Black	Garrett	Major	Sherwood
Blackmon	Godwin, N. C.	Mann, Ill.	Sims
Bland, Mo.	Goodwin, Ark.	Mann, S. C.	Sisson
Bland, Va.	Green, Iowa	Mansfield	Small
Blanton	Griest	Martin	Smith, N. Y.
Box	Hardy, Tex.	Mays	Smithwick
Brand	Hastings	Mead	Stegall
Briggs	Hedlin	Merritt	Stedman
Buchanan	Hersman	Michener	Steele
Butler	Hoch	Minahan, N. J.	Stephens, Miss.
Byrnes, S. C.	Holland	Montague	Stoll
Byrnes, Tenn.	Huddleston	Mooney	Strong, Kans.
Caldwell	Hull, Tenn.	Moore, Va.	Summers, Wash.
Caraway	Humphreys	Moore, Mo.	Sumners, Tex.
Carss	Husted	Nolan	Sweet
Carter	Igoe	O'Connell	Tague
Clark, Mo.	Jacoway	Ogden	Taylor, Colo.
Claxson	James	Oliver	Thomas
Cleary	Johnson, Ky.	Padgett	Tillman
Collier	Johnson, Miss.	Park	Tilson
Connally	Johnston, N. Y.	Parrish	Towner
Copley	Jones, Tex.	Pell	Valle
Costello	Keller	Phelan	Vare
Crago	Kelly, Pa.	Platt	Venable
Crisp	Kettner	Pou	Vinson
Cullen	Kincheloe	Quin	Voigt
Davis, Tenn.	King	Rainey, Ala.	Watkins
Dewalt	Lanham	Rainey, H. T.	Weaver
Dickinson, Mo.	Lankford	Rainey, J. W.	Webster
Dominick	Larsen	Raker	Welling
Donovan	Layton	Randall, Calif.	Whaley
Doremus	Lazaro	Reavis	Wilson, Pa.
Doughton	Lea, Calif.	Riordan	Wingo
Drane	Lee, Ga.	Robinson, N. C.	Wise
Dunbar	Leshler	Robson, Ky.	Woods, Va.
Evans, Nev.	Little	Romjue	Young, Tex.
Fairfield	Loneragan	Rose	
Ferris	McAndrews	Rouse	

NOT VOTING—99.

Andrews, Md.	Eagan	Kennedy, Iowa	Rayburn
Aswell	Eagle	Kennedy, R. I.	Reed, W. Va.
Barkley	Evans, Mont.	Kitchin	Rodenberg
Begg	Fess	Kreider	Rowan
Bell	Flood	Langlely	Rowe
Benson	Fuller, Mass.	Lehlbach	Sandars, La.
Booher	Gandy	Linthicum	Sanford
Bowers	Ganly	Luhring	Scott
Brinson	Goldfogle	McCulloch	Scully
Britten	Goodall	McDuffie	Snell
Browning	Graham, Pa.	McFadden	Snyder
Brumbaugh	Griffin	McKeown	Stevenson
Burke	Hamill	MacCrate	Stiness
Campbell, Pa.	Hamilton	Madden	Strong, Pa.
Candler	Hardy, Colo.	Moon	Sullivan
Cantrill	Harrison	Mott	Taylor, Ark.
Carew	Hayden	Mudd	Thompson
Casey	Hill	Murphy	Upshaw
Clark, Fla.	Hoy	Neely	Walters
Coady	Howard	Nicholls, S. C.	Welly
Crowther	Hudspeth	Nichols, Mich.	Wilson, La.
Davey	Hulings	O'Connor	Winslow
Dent	Hutchinson	Oldfield	Woodyard
Dooling	Johnson, Wash.	Overstreet	Wright
Dupre			

So the previous question was refused.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. WILSON of Louisiana.

Mr. BEGG with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.

Mr. BOWERS with Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. WELLY.

Mr. FESS with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. STEVENSON.

Mr. BROWNING with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. RAYBURN.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. OVERSTREET.

Mr. GOODALL with Mr. OLDFIELD.

Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. O'CONNOR.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado with Mr. McKEOWN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington with Mr. McDUFFIE.

Mr. HAYS with Mr. LINTHICUM.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. HILL with Mr. HUDSPETH.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. HULINGS with Mr. HOEY.

Mr. KREIDER with Mr. HAYDEN.

Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. LUHRING with Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. MOTT with Mr. GANLY.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. GANDY.

Mr. MURPHY with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan with Mr. EVANS of Montana.

Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. CULLEN.

Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. CAREW.

Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. UPSHAW.

Mr. McFADDEN with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. EAGAN.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. DUPRE.

Mr. ROWE with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. COADY.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. BRINSON.

Mr. WALTERS with Mr. CASEY.

Mr. STINESS with Mr. CANTRELL.

Mr. WINSLOW with Mr. CANDLER.

Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. BENSON.

Mr. MACCRATE with Mr. BELL.

Mr. MADDEN with Mr. BARKLEY.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] is recognized.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] yield to the gentleman from Virginia for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DEWALT. I will.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The previous question having been voted down, does not the recognition pass now to some one recognized in opposition?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair so understands; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania having asked for recognition and having obtained time from those in favor of the resolution, it seems to the Chair, would be the proper one to be recognized, and therefore recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I did not ask for recognition. I asked if somebody who represented the opposition was not entitled to be recognized?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair so understands; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is the only one the Chair has heard as being in opposition. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] is recognized.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] asked me to announce that he was compelled to be away on account of official business. If he had been present, he would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] is recognized.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, first let me congratulate the Republican membership for the fairness of their conduct in helping to defeat the demand for the previous question. [Applause.] Nothing is ever gained, either in political dispute or in argumentation on the floor of this House, by attempting to use what might be strictly known as "gag methods." And it was with not personal gratification, but with an estimate of the high character for fairness exhibited by my brethren on this side of the aisle that I noticed many of them were willing to hear, at least in part, some refutation of the arguments made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

The gentleman from Massachusetts in the course of his remarks said that he did not desire to exhibit any partisan feeling. Far be it from me to have any such tenor in my thoughts or in my remarks. In fact, I can prove conclusively that there is no partisanship in this matter so far as I am concerned. I sit on this side of the aisle as a Democrat. The gentleman from Pennsylvania whose record I attempted, in a few feeble words, to defend, Gen. Peyton March, is a Republican, and I know it to be a fact. I know, further, that his brother, who is also a graduate of Lafayette College, was the Republican candidate for Congress in the Northampton-Pike-Carbon-Monroe district, represented by Mr. STEELE, and therefore I can well say, without fear of contradiction, that, so far as I am concerned, there is no partisanship in this matter.

But there is a greater issue than party here. What is it? It is the issue of fair play. Time and time again I have patiently—sometimes with impatience—listened to the arguments of men condemning the conduct of everybody, everywhere, and at every time—men in official station, men in private life, men in the Army and in the Navy—and I recognized, whilst that was going on, that these men had the privilege of the House, that these men who were doing the attacking had the privilege of the House, could say what they pleased to say, without the opportunity for anyone of these accused parties to be heard. From the very early Saxon days to this day there has been a right of trial. Every man accused under the laws, as now existing, and existing from all civilized time, has the right to be heard in his own defense. And yet as before said, just a few moments ago I heard the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] in a tirade, either because of personal spleen or for some motive unknown to me, besmirch the character of every one that he did not mention by name but described by official station. Is it any less an offense to accuse a man by innuendo than it is to point him out directly and say, "Thou art the man"? He took it upon himself to make the distinction as to Gen. Peyton March and Gen. Wood. I know nothing of the characteristics or the military record of Gen. Wood, except by what I have read, and by reputation. But it strikes me that if general report be true, there is no one second to Gen. Wood in ability as an Army officer. And I know that he is not a Democrat.

There is another issue that presents itself here. What good can this thing do? Is the country at large, are 110,000,000 people in this great country very much excited as to who received a distinguished-service medal? Are the people in California and New York and in Texas and in Maine excited as to whether or not Gen. Peyton March wears upon his manly breast, as characterized by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN], this distinguished-service medal? Are there not other matters here of far more moment, more worthy of the consideration of the statesman from Massachusetts? Is there not a legislative program here of construction and reconstruc-

tion, of the lessening of taxes and curtailing of expenses, the reorganization of the Army, the equipment of our Navy, the establishment of peace in the world? Are they not of more moment than this question as to whether Tom Jones or Jacob Smith was awarded a distinguished-service medal? [Applause.]

Another thought presents itself to my mind at this time. What good can come of this? The gentleman from Massachusetts says a reorganization of the staff; a betterment of Army conditions. I beg leave to differ with him. There is nothing so provocative of disorder, there is nothing so enhancing of dissatisfaction and discipline in any rank, be it civil or military, than this constant harping on and criticism of superiors. [Applause.] He has openly charged here that the men of the Regular Army are opposed to the military organization; that they hate their superiors. I have yet to hear, and I have met many of the boys that come from across the water—I have yet to hear any one of them say that he hated his superior officer. I have heard remarks of condemnation; yes. I have heard criticism; yes. I have heard complaint; yes. But that is natural and inherent in all large bodies of men. But when the complaint comes in this form, when a Member of the House of Representatives, representing in part the great State of Massachusetts, known and admired for its war record, esteemed and loved because of its glorious history, rises on this floor and says that the Army and the Regular Army hate their superior officers, I beg leave to challenge the assertion. [Applause.]

I do not believe it. But whether it be true or false, the best way to create dissatisfaction, the best way to create disorganization, tumult, and discontent, is to further and foster this criticism by these untimely and, in my judgment, unseemly remarks.

I grant you that many of these citations that were read by the gentleman from Massachusetts were couched, perhaps, in extravagant language. I know that when members of the bar meet and pass resolutions of condolence upon the death of a deceased member they do not hesitate very much in regard to the extravagance of their praise. These men, most of them, I suppose, are still living who have been awarded the cross or the medal, and in so awarding this honor and this token of merit I have no doubt that extravagant terms were used—hyperbole, if you please. But the main question was this: Were these medals awarded honestly and fairly? And can you arrive at a fair conclusion in regard to this matter by having this report and this resolution taken from the Committee on Military Affairs and thrown into the body of the House, demanding of the Secretary of War this information? He has not refused it. He has not denied it. The only remark that I hear, in confirmation of a refusal, is from the honored chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, when he says that he made the request some time ago—how long ago he does not state—and that that request has not yet been complied with, and the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs says he himself does not know how long the investigation would take, or how many clerks there would have to be employed.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Recognizing the fact that there is a widespread feeling throughout the Army among the officers and enlisted men that there was a so-called "decoration ring," does not the gentleman believe that this resolution ought to pass, and that all the facts ought to be given to the American public?

Mr. DEWALT. In reply to that I have to say "Yes; there should be an investigation if there is any open charge of any unmerited awards." But we should have a bill of particulars, not a general blanket charge. When I plead in the courts, and when I file my declaration, if you please, it is a matter of right, it is a matter of justice that the party that pleads against me shall say, "Mr. DEWALT, file your bill of particulars of complaint." But here you have a general blanket charge, which says that every man, with a few exceptions, if you please—not naming the exceptions—has received an award not merited and by favoritism.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman if the passage of this resolution will not lead to the giving of the facts upon which a bill of particulars can be made?

Mr. DEWALT. The resolution might lead to the giving of the facts, but the facts, in my judgment, can be more clearly obtained by a reply from the Secretary of War, and he has not yet said that he would not give it, and the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has not so said.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. If I said that every officer on duty at general headquarters of the American Expeditionary Force had been given by that "decoration ring" enough medals so that they jingle like a Polish Fourth of July, ought we not to pass a resolution to find out how they gave decorations to each other? [Applause.]

Mr. DEWALT. Well, in reply to that remark I will say that it jingles with glittering generalities. [Laughter.] Again I would ask the gentleman to present a bill of particulars.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does not the gentleman remember that the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] were in themselves, so far as they went, a bill of particulars? And is not that what the gentleman objects to?

Mr. DEWALT. No; it was not a bill of particulars, because in the very essence thereof he said, "I refuse or I, at least, omit to mention the names, and I give you a general description, and therefore I leave it to you as a special pleader in the case, and, under the circumstances as detailed by me, to select any individual that you see fit to designate or judge," and that in itself is not a bill of particulars.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yet the gentleman's statement was such that the gentleman himself was able to fit them to the persons concerned.

Mr. DEWALT. Yes, to some; but as to most I confess my ignorance; and I think the gentleman will confess his own ignorance in regard to most of them.

But that is not the meat of the question. The meat of the proposition is just this: How many awards there were we do not know; how many there will be we do not know; but this we do know, that there has been presented here by a reputable Member of this House, for whom I have the very highest regard personally, coming from the great State of Massachusetts, a blanket charge against the general awarding of these service medals, because, he asserts, that the General Staff and the "Leavenworth clique," as he calls it, have been the instigators of the awards.

Now, I may be perhaps what is called—I believe somebody did call me here upon one occasion—a technical lawyer, but whether I be a technical lawyer or whether I be in common parlance but a lawyer and a member of the bar, I am more than that in my own estimation. I try to be and I hope I will be always a just man and a fair man [applause], and I believe there should be a recognition of the rights of these gentlemen who are thus openly attacked, if not directly by name, at least by innuendo.

Now, my friends, one word more and then I shall have finished. I said a few moments ago that I wonder how, if all these distinguished gentlemen, or extinguished gentlemen, as perhaps my friend from Massachusetts would characterize them, were such as he pictured them to be—and all these men took prominent parts in the war, whether here at home or across the sea—I wonder how we were ever able to win the war, in spite of such mismanagement and such incompetency. But we did win it. Thanks be to God, it is over, and there was no partisan feeling in that and there never will be. There was no division on party lines nor on sectional lines. The boys who were of the boys in blue in the days of the Civil War stood shoulder to shoulder with those who came from the wearers of the gray of the Southern Confederacy; those from the Atlantic coast went on in steady tread with those from the Pacific. They were all engaged in a common cause, to wit, the freedom of the world and the maintenance of American doctrines. I say, then, my friends, there was glory enough for all and there is glory enough for all. Let us not attempt to besmirch the fair fame of an individual in order to enhance the private spleen of other individuals. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting quietly in my seat a few minutes ago and inadvertently remarked to a friend of mine that I thought the names of the officers attacked ought to be put in, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] had occasion to refer to his "friend from Texas," who was his impartial judge.

I want to say to the House that I have been a Member about 10 months, and I know now what has been the matter with

my service. I have not heretofore enjoyed the acquaintance or friendship of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN]. For the first time I have been so honored, and I expect from this on I will be able to proceed with some degree of satisfaction to my constituents. However, I am going to take this opportunity to say that the old-time custom that throws a constitutional privilege about the language used by a Member of Congress in debate ought to have been abolished long since, if a man's character and reputation are to be aspersed and a man is to be villified by name, directly and by innuendo, upon the floor of this House, as has been done by the gentleman from Massachusetts. If a Member surrounds himself with the constitutional prerogative that prevents his being called to account elsewhere for language used on the floor, the sooner and the better for the manhood of this country that provision is set aside and the less will men on this floor be inclined to attack personally, by name, men not entitled to the floor of this House. [Applause.] I have been in this House about eight months. I have heard the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] on various occasions. I have never yet heard him say a good word of any man except two or three that he mentioned to-day.

I have found out since I came here that there are different kinds of Congressmen. They are all excellent men, but there are constructive Congressmen and there are men who do not do very much, and there are Congressmen who constantly criticize and abuse and accomplish nothing, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] is in the front row of the last class. [Laughter.] If the gentleman from Massachusetts had been alive in the days of George Washington, he would have been one of the Conway cabal that pursued Washington through his entire career. Had the gentleman from Massachusetts lived in the days of the War of 1812, he would have condemned Andrew Jackson for using cotton bales instead of something else of a defensive character at New Orleans. If the gentleman from Massachusetts had lived in the days of the Mexican War, he would have condemned Winfield Scott and Zachary Taylor. If he had lived in the time of the Civil War, the great Abraham Lincoln would have found in him a constant carping critic because he did not appeal to this gentleman's wise military judgment as to how that great war should be conducted.

In the days of the Spanish-American War and in the days of this great World War there may have been individual awards that ought not to have been made. It may be that some men have been granted medals to whom they should not have been granted. The gentleman does not differentiate between the distinguished-service medal and the distinguished-service cross. Take the list just published by the War Department and see the names of thousands of brave soldiers of this country who have been decorated with the distinguished-service cross because of their gallantry upon the field of battle. There may have been instances in which friendship has intervened. My new-found friendship for the gentleman from Massachusetts and his new-found admiration for me impels me to hope that in the years to come if he is again honored as a Member of this House the Democratic side of the House will not constantly have to remain silent under the speeches that he makes upon this floor amid the uproarious applause of the Republican side of the House. [Applause.]

The Democratic Party did not win this war. The Republican Party did not win this war. Thank God this was a people's war, for the glory of our united country. The general who commanded those forces, the great Pershing, is a Republican in politics and has been talked about as the Republican nominee for President, and Gen. March, a distinguished soldier, whom I know only slightly but favorably, is a Republican. There is no politics in this matter. Let me appeal to all the Members of this House when I say there is an opportunity and a chance for the people of this country to decide once more that the war is over, and it is over with glory and honor and credit to the great flag of our country and to the gallant sons of America upon the battle fields of France. [Applause.] And carping criticisms, personal flings, or what not ought not to disrupt the morale of the American Army. The gentleman from Massachusetts talks about the morale of the American Army being disrupted because somebody got a distinguished-service medal whom he thinks ought not to have received it. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that such speeches as he has made upon the floor of this House from carefully prepared manuscript, from which he would not divert for one minute, circulated over this country, will do as much to destroy the morale of the American Army, to destroy the respect of the men in the Army for their officers as the efforts of the rankest Bolshevik in this country who is trying to destroy the sanctity and the security of our institutions.

Let us admit that mistakes have been made. Let us consider that the men who participated in this war are human as we are, and that they have made their mistakes. Let us stop and consider that it takes a great mind, a great heart, and a great conscience to build the magnificent edifices of our country; but any man, no matter how small and insignificant he may be, can blacken, pull them down. I read once of a man who had slandered the character of a woman. He went to his good, old priest and confessed his fault and asked that he might atone for it, if possible. The priest said to him, "Take a goose and pick its feathers, as you walk from here to yonder corner. The man did so. Now, said the priest, "Go back over the same ground and pick up those feathers again and place them where they were." The man said, "I can not do it." The priest said, "That is exactly what you have done with your slander of the character of the woman whose name you have aspersed. You have scattered your slander abroad, and you can not recall it."

Therefore, I say to you, gentlemen of the House, that when my new-found friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, scatters these aspersions against the character of these officers he leaves them in the position of the woman whose good name has been taken away from her. He gives them no chance for a word of explanation, because this record will be so full of innuendos that the enemies of these men can put them together to build an indictment against them and charge that they have been unworthy and unfaithful officers of their country in their country's hour of need.

Now, gentlemen of the House, I have taken more time than I ought. I am a new Member of the House, and the courtesy extended to me on every side by Republican and Democrat alike, the knowledge of their high character, has warmed the cockles of my heart and has done more to destroy the hot partisanship of my youth than any other agency that has ever come into my life.

I have found in this House that men are solely working for one single purpose from their viewpoints and localities, and that purpose is the upbuilding of our great country—the glorification of the flag—carrying this country forward to its great destiny beyond human ken. We all stand together for that flag and that country, and we look over here and there from our standpoint as we view the scene. I have found that out, but I could not let this opportunity pass without saying one word to this House, and I thank my friend from Massachusetts for his reference that gave me the opportunity to rise for these remarks.

Once more let us proclaim our allegiance to a united country, once more let us build our institutions so that they shall be impervious to attack, once more, be he a Member of Congress, an Army officer, or a citizen in the field, let this Congress put itself on record that no more shall personal aspersions destroy the character of helpless men who can not respond to these charges. [Applause.]

Mr. BEE had leave to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STEELE].

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I was called from the House as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] was addressing it on his resolution. As I was leaving I heard him refer to the Prussianized Chief of Staff of the American Army. The Chief of Staff is Gen. Peyton C. March, who was born and brought up in Easton, my native city, in Pennsylvania. It was to him that this Prussianized allusion was made.

I have known the family of Gen. March all my life. His brother was a schoolmate of mine, and although he was my opponent when I was last a candidate for Congress I never ceased to have a high personal regard for every member of the March family.

The father of Gen. March was probably one of the most distinguished linguists in the world. For more than 40 years he was professor of languages at Lafayette College in my home town, and probably received degrees from all the colleges in the United States, together with Oxford and Cambridge, and the most celebrated institutions in Europe.

Gen. March inherited in a marked degree the abilities of his father. I recall very well when he was appointed a cadet at West Point. His appointment came from a Democratic Congressman from that district, who recognized his preeminent ability and fitness for the appointment. His whole course of conduct since then has simply borne out what was expected of him at the time of his appointment.

His career in the Army has been one of the most notable careers of those in the Army at the present time. He has been recognized not only for his ability but for his fighting qualities as well. He has served with distinction in all the appointments of the Army from the time of his entering into it down to the present time. His service in the Philippines was of special

distinction, and by reason of his own force of character and his own ability he has risen to the high station which he now commands.

Therefore when belittling reference is made to Gen. March it seems to me very fitting that, being unable to say anything in his own defense at this time, no one should be permitted to besmirch his military fame and allow it to go unchallenged before the country as coming from the House of Representatives of the United States.

When this war opened he was sent abroad. He desired to remain there, but, like a true soldier, when the orders came that he should return to this country he came back, notwithstanding his anxious desire to remain abroad at the battle front. In support of what I have just said, I wish to give this House not my opinion of his merits as a military officer but the estimate of men in the Army who have had special opportunity to recognize his merit and his work as a military officer. Not only his work as a military officer but the distinguished services that he has rendered the country in the Great War which has just closed, and which in the opinion of expert military officers is second only to that of Gen. Pershing himself. I wish to read to the House for its information on this subject another voice coming from Massachusetts, but of an entirely different character from what you have heard here. It is a letter which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last year, written by Gen. Duvall, a retired major general of the Army, to the Hon. HOKE SMITH, a Member of the United States Senate.

The letter is as follows:

BOSTON, June 21, 1919.

TO UNITED STATES SENATOR HOKE SMITH,
Washington.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: Because some time in the past 18 months you honored me by stating your confidence in my opinion on things military, and quite unsolicited gave me permission to address you on such subjects, I am going to take the liberty for the first time of offering you my professional opinion upon a matter in which I hope you will interest yourself for the good of the service, viz, the granting of suitable reward and honors to the Chief of Staff of our victorious Army.

Of Gen. Pershing's title to the recognition proposed by the President I need not speak to you, for the brilliant results accomplished by the commanding general in the field are plain to everybody, and can not be gainsaid by enemies or even ignored by the thoughtless, thus differing from the work of the Chief of Staff, which is little appreciated by laymen, and is only too likely to incur for him the enmity of those who feel a personal antagonism for the war-time rigors of military methods.

In this connection I can well understand that March's characteristic conciseness of diction and brevity of expression in both written and spoken intercourse might give offense to those who do not know the man, but this very failing, if you would call it so, is indicative of his power. He is habitually intensely concentrated, instinct with energy always unerringly and sharply directed. He can do and does do more work in a given time than any other three or four men, working in tandem, that I have ever known. I have observed him ever since he was a second lieutenant—in the regiment, in the artillery school, in the United States Volunteers, in campaign in the Philippines, and in the General Staff, where, when it was first organized (in 1903), he was in a division of which I was the head and in which Capt. Pershing and Dickman were also serving.

Knowing well his qualifications, as compared with those of all other officers of general rank, I say unhesitatingly that not only in ability to accomplish of valuable work but in the amount of such work actually accomplished in this war he stands preeminent.

We are already beginning to forget the relief and amazement felt in this country and throughout the allied world at the size of the American force assembled in France for the summer campaign. Who accomplished this miracle? March, who was thus the author of Pershing's magnificent success. I do not believe there is another man in the Army who could have done what March did, and I say this from the standpoint of an old officer who has taken unmeasured delight in seeing come to the top in the test of war so many of the younger men whom I in former years had picked out and recommended for various advancements. March, in my opinion, though junior to many, always stood at the head of them all.

From my long experience and seasoned knowledge of the tone and spirit of the Army I wish to say to you, Mr. Senator, that whether March is at the moment popular or not in political or military circles, there can be no doubt that to reduce his rank in the face of his tremendous achievement would be a most disheartening precedent for all those in the profession capable of the sort of mental grasp, fearless decision, and energetic action necessary to military safety; the Army could but know that even consummate military skill is not sure of reward.

Finally, dear Mr. Senator, let me beg of you, for the welfare of the Army, to exert your powerful influence against the threatened denial of the fair reward intended by the President in nominating to the grade of General this great Chief of Staff.

With high regard, I am, very sincerely yours,

WM. P. DUVAL,
Major General, retired.

It is this man who brought about this great accomplishment referred to by Gen. Duvall, who performed the miracle necessary for Gen. Pershing to accomplish the great success that he had on the other side, that to-day is aspersed upon the floor of this House. It seems to me very fitting that the general estimate of the Army of the great accomplishment which Gen. March performed should be properly set forth in this Record. [Applause.]

By unanimous consent, Mr. STEELE was granted leave to extend and revise his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present in the House at the time the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] made his argument in favor of House resolution 428, and I am not familiar with the charges and countercharges to which reference has been made by other Members of the House. I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to the resolution instead of discussing the wonderful achievements of the Army, talking about the Stars and Stripes and going far afield in a discussion concerning the relative merits of different Army officers. The resolution provides that the Secretary of War shall submit a complete list of the officers and men recommended to receive awards by their superior officers, together with the citation recommended in each instance and the specific act or acts upon which the recommendations were based. It also provides that he shall submit a complete list of the civilians recommended to receive these awards by any officials or board of officials, together with the citation in each instance and the specific act or acts upon which the recommendations were based. It provides also for the list of the names of the officers constituting the board or boards which passed upon the recommendations or made the awards of distinguished-service medals, and also a list of the names, if any, of the officers sitting on those boards who awarded the distinguished-service medals to themselves or their colleagues. I submit that there is no reason in the world that should prevent the Secretary of War from giving these facts. It must be true that the majority of the officers who have been recommended for distinguished-service medals have been entitled to them.

This war could not be won in the front line by the combat troops. It took everyone, from the civilian to the combat men, to win. No one can or will object to the giving of a distinguished-service medal, but it is common knowledge and was common knowledge throughout the Army, and it is common knowledge throughout the Army to-day, that there have been some few cases where men have been awarded medals who were not entitled to them. Unless I had all of the facts in each individual case, I would not attempt to mention any particular individual officer, because it would be unfair for me, with the privilege of a Member of this House, to go upon the floor and attack some officer who could not strike back, but it being common knowledge and being admitted by all those who know, that there have been some injustices, I believe that without mentioning any names, without trying to attack an officer, without trying to defend one, these facts ought to be given to the House—each fact that has been asked for. I believe that the gentleman from Massachusetts is actuated by proper motives in making the request. The passage of this resolution is not an attack upon Gen. March nor is it a defense of him. It is not an attack nor a defense of any other officer in the service, but it is simply a demand for facts with reference to the giving of medals, and if there is one body of men in the world that ought to have those facts, it is this body, and I urge the enactment of the resolution.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL].

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, the resolution asks for the names of the persons, and the facts on which the award was made, who were awarded the distinguished-service medals, not for the distinguished-service cross, not for any other decoration, and the names of the boards recommending same. I call the attention of the House to the fact that these boards were formed under general Army orders, giving the name, rank, and branch of the service of their membership, and that every time an award of the distinguished-service medal was made a general Army order, printed at the expense of the United States Government, was circulated throughout the Army and published in the service papers and the public press. The name of the man to whom it was awarded was given, and the distinguished service which he had performed was recited in sufficient detail to justify the award. Any Member of this House, any citizen of the United States, who is interested in any single instance, or every instance, where a distinguished-service medal was awarded can secure a printed copy of the official order, which will give him all of the facts that he wants. I understand that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] has in his possession a stack of those orders of the War Department carrying, if not every one, practically every one of the distinguished-service medal awards that have been made during the war. The distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] says that it was common knowledge that this was done by a clique; at least, I think that was the intent of his words, that it was common knowledge that favoritism was practiced here. Favoritism when? What is the common knowledge

based upon? Is it based upon some general criticism of somebody who was dissatisfied, or has a glaring inequality been pointed out in any particular instance where a man's name was specified and the service for which he was recognized was criticized by any responsible person in the United States? If so, I have not heard of it.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. I have only six minutes. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] lays a great deal of stress upon what he calls the Leavenworth clique. Gentlemen, you remember that for years there has been a criticism in this country by irresponsible critics of the Army against the West Point men. Why? Because the West Point men, by reason of their training and education and ability and control, and certain men who did not have that training and ability could not get that control, and prompted by this natural and human jealousy, they criticized the men who were in power. For the same reason there has come about a criticism of what they call the Leavenworth clique. What is the Leavenworth clique? They are the graduates of the postgraduate school of the Army, an organization built at the expense of the American people, where Army officers of ability and distinguished character—West Point men and others—are sent for postgraduate training. Those of us who crossed the seas to examine what was done in behalf of the American people in this Great War were pleased to hear the reports on every hand from the men there who were explaining to us the service of our men in this Great War. They were proud of the service performed by the men from Leavenworth, because it was said that when a man was in battle, and he knew his neighbor was a Leavenworth man, even if communications were severed and conditions did change, he knew that by reason of the training that the Leavenworth man had, he could depend upon it that that officer would conduct himself as a Leavenworth man had been taught, and could go ahead with blind confidence. This was done, we were told, in many instances and justified that confidence and the expense to the American Government.

It is natural that men of the greatest experience and widest training, men upon whom we have lavished our money in order that they may be educated, should be put in control of our Army when it goes into battle and should be called upon to decide relative merits of men in the service. It is natural that the ambitious who are not so well equipped, who have not had such opportunity, should complain they have not the opportunity, and that somebody else was standing in their way, but it is also natural that a grateful American people will support the honored and distinguished men who have performed the service of winning this war for all humanity, and I hope that this House will not support an unjustified attack under cover against these men who have fought on behalf of American institutions. [Applause.] I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE]. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I shall use very much less time than the gentleman from Pennsylvania has so kindly allotted me for the little I have to say.

Now, what is the question which we are discussing? As I understand, the resolution which in the first instance was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs is a simple resolution of inquiry. It asks for information relative to a subject which is, of course, of general interest. Awhile ago the committee by a vote of the House was discharged from the consideration of the resolution. If it had then at once proceeded to vote upon the resolution I for one should have cast my vote in its favor. The naked resolution of inquiry would not have invited any opposition as far as I am concerned. If the Committee on Military Affairs to-morrow or at any subsequent time should bring in a resolution of this sort, I shall certainly vote in favor of it because I think it is to the advantage of all of us here and to the advantage of the people of the country that the information should be furnished. But while I should have supported the resolution if the gentleman from Massachusetts had not discussed it, I shall not now vote for it because he has coupled with it a violent and abusive attack upon certain individuals—a prejudice of the case—and I for one do not propose to give my indorsement to the attack or the method of attack of the gentleman from Massachusetts. [Applause.] In my opinion that is unfair to those involved, the General Staff and the Chief of the General Staff. Why, if we vote for the resolution now it amounts to an adjudication of the charges against Gen. March. We may expect next week to be called on to vote

a prejudgment of Gen. Pershing, and the week after, perhaps, a prejudgment of some other officer, and there may be an endless performance in the way of the House reaching and expressing conclusions derogatory of individuals without giving those individuals any previous opportunity of making any explanation or offering any defense.

I hold no brief for anybody connected with the War Department. I am only speaking in the interest of fair play and of ordinary justice. I have but very slight acquaintance with Gen. March. I have come in contact with a few cases that had to do with the matter of deciding whether medals or crosses should be awarded, and I have felt that in at least two of those cases there was injustice done. But I do not believe the young men I have in mind would desire me to express approval of the wholesale attack made here this morning.

Indeed, it is perfectly obvious that with such a large Army and large Navy discriminations are inevitable and the heart burnings that may result are inevitable. That is a condition we have to recognize, but whether that be true or not, the outstanding fact is that we ought not to acquiesce in a condemnation without a hearing, and that the whole subject should be proceeded with in a more orderly way. Let the Committee on Military Affairs bring in a resolution asking for the information and I believe I can say with confidence that the resolution will receive unanimous approval on this side of the House. [Applause.] That is not only the orderly way with which to dispose of the matter, but it is the fair and just way. I respectfully submit to my friends upon the other side that they should take the course I am suggesting. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FIELDS. Is it in order at this time to rerefer the resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Not with the previous question being demanded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the previous question is not ordered then it will be in order. The gentleman from Illinois moves the previous question.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I understand it is too late at this time to move to rerefer the resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LITTLE. Am I in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LITTLE. How long has the Committee on Military Affairs already had to investigate the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a proper parliamentary inquiry to propound to the Chair.

Mr. LITTLE. They have had it long enough, have they not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the Chair was in doubt.

The House again divided; and there were—ayes 73, noes 64.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York demands the yeas and nays. Evidently a sufficient number has arisen and the yeas and nays are ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 183, nays 123, not voting 122, as follows:

YEAS—183.

Ackerman	Chindblom	Dunn	Gould
Andrews, Nebr.	Christopherson	Echols	Graham, Ill.
Anthony	Clark, Mo.	Elliott	Green, Iowa
Babka	Classon	Elsworth	Greene, Mass.
Bacharach	Cole	Emerson	Greene, Vt.
Baer	Cooper	Evans, Nebr.	Hadley
Barbour	Copley	Fields	Harrell
Benham	Cramton	Focht	Hawley
Blanton	Cullen	Fordney	Hernandez
Boies	Currie, Mich.	Foster	Hersey
Briggs	Dale	Frear	Hickey
Brooks, Ill.	Dallinger	Freeman	Hicks
Brooks, Pa.	Darrow	French	Hoch
Browne	Davis, Minn.	Fuller, Ill.	Houghton
Burdick	Denison	Gallagher	Huddleston
Burroughs	Dickinson, Iowa	Gallivan	Husted
Campbell, Kans.	Dowell	Gard	Ireland
Cannon	Dunbar	Glynn	James

Jeffers	Mead	Reber	Tague
Johnson, S. Dak.	Merritt	Reed, N. Y.	Taylor, Tenn.
Johnston, N. Y.	Michener	Reed, W. Va.	Temple
Juul	Miller	Rhodes	Thomas
Kelly, Pa.	Minahan, N. J.	Ricketts	Tilson
Kendall	Monahan, Wis.	Riddick	Timberlake
King	Mondell	Robison, Ky.	Tincher
Kinkaid	Moore, Ohio	Rogers	Tinkham
Kieczka	Moore, Ind.	Rose	Towner
Knutson	Morgan	Sabath	Treadway
Kraus	Nelson, Wis.	Sanders, Ind.	Valle
Lampert	Newton, Minn.	Sanders, N. Y.	Vestal
Layton	Newton, Mo.	Schall	Vogt
Lazaro	Nolan	Sells	Volstead
Little	Ogden	Stegel	Wah
Lonergan	Osborne	Sinclair	Ward
Longworth	Paige	Slomp	Watson
Luce	Parker	Smith, Idaho	Webster
Lufkin	Parrish	Smith, Ill.	Wheeler
Luhning	Pell	Smith, Mich.	White, Kans.
McArthur	Peters	Smith, N. Y.	White, Me.
McLaughlin, Nebr.	Phelan	Steenerson	Wilson, Ill.
MacGregor	Purnell	Stephens, Ohio	Wood, Ind.
Madden	Radeliffe	Stines	Woodward
Magee	Ramsey	Strong, Kans.	Young, N. Dak.
Mann, Ill.	Ramseyer	Summers, Wash.	Zihlman
Mapes	Randall, Calif.	Sweet	
Mason	Randall, Wis.	Swope	

NAYS—123.

Almon	Drane	Lankford	Rouse
Ashbrook	Edmonds	Larsen	Ruby
Bankhead	Evans, Nev.	Lea, Calif.	Rucker
Bee	Fairfield	Leshner	Saunders, Va.
Benson	Fisher	McAndrews	Sears
Black	Garland	McClintic	Sherwood
Blackmon	Garner	McGlennon	Sisson
Bland, Mo.	Garrett	McKiniry	Small
Bland, Va.	Goodwin, N. C.	McLane	Smithwick
Box	Goodwin, Ark.	Maher	Snyder
Brand	Griest	Mann, S. C.	Stegall
Buchanan	Hardy, Tex.	Mansfield	Stedman
Butler	Hastings	Martin	Steele
Byrnes, S. C.	Hayden	Mays	Stephens, Miss.
Caldwell	Heflin	Mooney	Stevenson
Campbell, Pa.	Hersman	Moore, Va.	Stoll
Cantrill	Hoey	Nelson, Mo.	Summers, Tex.
Caraway	Holland	O'Connell	Tillman
Carss	Hull, Tenn.	Oliver	Vare
Carter	Humphreys	Overstreet	Venable
Collier	Igoe	Padgett	Vinson
Connally	Jacoway	Park	Watkins
Costello	Johnson, Ky.	Platt	Weaver
Crisp	Johnson, Miss.	Pou	Welling
Curry, Calif.	Jones, Pa.	Quin	Whaley
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Tex.	Rainey, Ala.	Wilson, Pa.
Dent	Kelley, Mich.	Rainey, H. T.	Wingo
Dewalt	Kettner	Rainey, J. W.	Wise
Dickinson, Mo.	Kless	Raker	Woods, Va.
Donovan	Kincheloe	Riordan	Young, Tex.
Deughton	Lanham	Romjue	

NOT VOTING—122.

Anderson	Eagan	Kearns	Olney
Andrews, Md.	Eagle	Keller	Porter
Aswell	Elston	Kennedy, Iowa	Rayburn
Ayres	Esch	Kennedy, R. I.	Reavis
Barkley	Evans, Mont.	Kitchin	Robinson, N. C.
Begg	Ferris	Kreider	Rodenberg
Bell	Fess	Langley	Rowan
Bland, Ind.	Flood	Lee, Ga.	Rowe
Booher	Fuller, Mass.	Lehibach	Sanders, La.
Bowers	Gandy	Linthicum	Sanford
Brinson	Ganly	McClulloch	Scott
Britten	Goldfogle	McDuffie	Scully
Browning	Good	McFadden	Shreve
Brumbaugh	Goodall	McKenzie	Sims
Burke	Goodykoontz	McKeown	Sinnott
Byrns, Tenn.	Graham, Pa.	McKinley	Snell
Candler	Griffin	McLaughlin, Mich.	Strong, Pa.
Carew	Hamill	McPherson	Sullivan
Casey	Hamilton	MacCrate	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Fla.	Hardy, Colo.	Major	Taylor, Colo.
Cleary	Harrison	Montague	Thompson
Coady	Haugen	Moon	Upshaw
Crago	Hays	Morin	Walters
Crowther	Hill	Mott	Welty
Davey	Howard	Mudd	Williams
Dempsey	Hudspeth	Murphy	Wilson, La.
Dominick	Hulings	Neely	Winslow
Dooling	Hull, Iowa	Nicholls, S. C.	Wright
Doremus	Hutchinson	Nichols, Mich.	Yates
Dupré	Johnson, Wash.	O'Connor	
Dyer	Kahn	Oldfield	

So the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following additional pairs: Until further notice: Mr. ANDERSON with Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. ASWELL. Mr. BURKE with Mr. AYRES. Mr. CRAGO with Mr. BOOHER. Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. BRINSON. Mr. ELLSTON with Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. DYER with Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. ESCH with Mr. CLEARY. Mr. GOOD with Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. GOODYKOONTZ with Mr. EAGAN.

Mr. HELL of Iowa with Mr. FERRIS.
 Mr. KAHN with Mr. EAGLE.
 Mr. KEARNS with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. GRIFFIN.
 Mr. KELLER with Mr. LEE of Georgia.
 Mr. KRIEGER with Mr. MAJOR.
 Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. MONTAGUE.
 Mr. REAVIS with Mr. MOON.
 Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina.
 Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan with Mr. OLNEY.
 Mr. MORIN with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.
 Mr. SINNOTT with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.
 Mr. WILLIAMS with Mr. SIMS.
 Mr. YATES with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 On motion of Mr. GALLIVAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION OF LABORERS IN CUSTOMS SERVICE.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 11309.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 11309, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11309) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to fix compensation of certain laborers in the Customs Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know exactly what authority this bill confers on the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. FORDNEY. It confers upon the Treasury Department the right to pay the going wages for common labor employed in the loading and unloading of ships. Under existing law the Government is restricted to the payment of 31½ cents per hour for that kind of employment at the present time, and laborers can not be employed at that price.

I might say to the gentleman that the Government has been, contrary to law, paying higher wages, such wages as are paid for that class of work by others; but in December the Comptroller of the Treasury ruled that the Government had been paying those wages in violation of the law. Now the Treasury is restricted to the payment of 31½ cents an hour for common labor, and they can not obtain the necessary labor at that price, and therefore they ask for additional authority to pay such wages as are paid for that class of work to a limited number of common laborers.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does this give the privilege of raising wages as high as Government officials want to raise them?

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say to the gentleman that the wages paid for this class of work vary at different ports of entry. The ports of entry mostly affected by these rates and concerned with this class of labor are named, and if I have the time I will give the gentleman the names of the ports. New Orleans is one of the ports. The wages there range from 50 cents to 75 cents an hour and a dollar per hour. Now, the Government, by the ruling of the Comptroller of the Treasury, is restricted to 31½ cents an hour, and can not find the employees at that price.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has the gentleman from Michigan investigated this matter himself?

Mr. FORDNEY. I have thus far: The committee requested from the Treasury Department a statement, copy of which I have here and which has been printed as a part of the report of the committee, showing the wages paid. I will say to the gentleman that Mr. Shouse, of the Treasury Department, the Assistant Secretary, points out that at New Orleans the wages are 80 cents per hour, and after 4 p. m. the wages are \$1.20 an hour, while under the law the Government can pay only 31½ cents per hour. At Galveston the wages are 65 cents an hour. At Norfolk, from 50 cents to 80 cents. At Tampa the wages are 55 cents an hour, and at Providence from 75 cents to \$1 per hour.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, does the gentleman himself believe that this bill ought to be passed for the good of the public?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; for the good of the public; for the reason that the unloading of sugar at these points from vessels bringing sugar in from Cuba and so on is an important matter. Sugar is an important article of food that is badly needed by the people now. I say that for Government ships the Government can not find labor at 31½ cents when others pay from 50 cents to \$1.20 an hour.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. VARE. The gentleman knows that in all the large cities the lowest price for common labor is 50 cents an hour?

Mr. FORDNEY. I believe that common labor can not be employed in the cities for less than 50 cents an hour—in any city in the land.

Mr. VARE. I wanted the House to know that in Philadelphia common labor can not be obtained for less than 50 cents an hour.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WALSH. Regular order!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is, Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts withhold his objection?

Mr. WALSH. I will withhold it. If there is going to be objection made to the bill, the gentleman can explain it.

Mr. WINGO. Of course, we all agree that at 31 cents an hour under the present conditions it is impossible to get labor. The gentleman knows I would trust the Secretary of the Treasury as much as I would anybody, but I am not in favor of allowing a public official to go out and employ anybody he pleases at any price he pleases. We ought to fix a maximum.

Mr. FORDNEY. If you fix a maximum, that maximum is going to be the minimum immediately. The Secretary of the Treasury asked for permission to pay the prevailing rates to this limited number of laborers, numbering in round figures 176 men.

Mr. WINGO. Let us first ascertain what is a fair wage for this character of work and fix it as we would for any other department of the Government.

Mr. FORDNEY. At what rate would you fix it, and what would you pay for overtime?

Mr. WINGO. If I were the Secretary of the Treasury, I would have an investigation made, and I would say to Congress what I regard as a reasonable and proper compensation necessary to be paid. If he will do that, I will take his statement on it; but I am not going to permit any bill to go through that will authorize any executive officer of the Government to pay any price he pleases.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will say to the gentleman that that is exactly what the Secretary has done, and what he recommends.

Mr. WINGO. Then why not put it in the bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. How can you fix a rate from 40 cents to \$1.20, and fix it by law?

Mr. WINGO. How do you do it in other employments under the Government?

Mr. FORDNEY. You can not do it. You can fix it definitely only in a particular port or city where the labor is employed.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman is a business man and he knows that if he undertook to put that rule into his plants the wages would be going up all the time, and it would, if the money came out of the Public Treasury. I believe in high wages, but I believe we ought to put some stop to the height that you can go, because otherwise the rate will go higher. If one dollar is the proper height, say so in the act, and if \$1.20 is proper, say so in the act.

Mr. FORDNEY. In line 4 I want to insert, at the suggestion of the Secretary of the Treasury, the word "temporary," so that it will read, "authorized to fix the compensation of temporary laborers in the Customs Service as he may think it advisable."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MONDELL. Objection has been made.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to ask if any of these men whose salaries the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to fix are longshoremen who struck at New York some time ago, whereby thousands of tons of food were allowed to rot and be destroyed?

Mr. FORDNEY. The Secretary names the cities.

Mr. BLANTON. New York is not involved in this?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; the Secretary gives the names of the cities, and they are all southern cities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas submits a report from the Committee on Rules, which will be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate joint resolution 69.

Resolved, etc., That a joint commission, to consist of three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House, to be appointed by the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House, respectively, is hereby created to visit the said Virgin Islands and to report fully to Congress as to whether or not the present plan of government of said islands is conducive to their welfare; what, if anything, Congress should do to stimulate industry and agriculture in said islands, and anything else with relation thereto that may be of aid to the American Congress in dealing with the problem of the government and advancement of the people of said islands. There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$2,500 to be used only for the expenses of the members of said commission in visiting the said islands. Said commission shall file its report before the 1st day of January, 1920, and said commission shall end on said date.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That a joint commission to consist of three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House, respectively, is hereby created to visit the Virgin Islands and to report fully to Congress as to existing conditions in the said islands, and particularly to report and recommend action by Congress, if need there be therefor, with reference to whether the present government under executive direction should be superseded by civil government provided by Congress as contemplated by act of March 3, 1917 (39 Stat., p. 1132), said government being now only temporary in character and by order of the President being now vested in officers of the Navy; also, as to whether Congress should at this time provide for a civil government of the island by an organic act; also what, if any, legislation is necessary pending the formation and adoption of an organic act, and as to the general conditions existing in the islands. Said report to be filed at the earliest date practicable, and during the Sixty-sixth Congress. That the expenses of said commission in carrying out the provisions of this resolution shall be paid in equal proportions from the contingent funds of the Senate and the House of Representatives, upon the audit and order, respectively, of the ranking Senate and House Members of said commission, the total amount not to exceed the sum of \$2,500.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this is a Senate resolution amended by the House committee for the purposes indicated in the resolution.

We are now governing the Virgin Islands through the Navy Department. At the time the matter was considered here a few years ago it was the intention of Congress that these islands should at as early a date as possible be provided with a civil government. They are still governed by the Navy Department, and it is the purpose of this resolution to appoint a commission to visit the islands, with a view of ascertaining whether or not there should be a civil government there, and if so, the kind of government that they should have.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question.

Mr. HICKS. Some two or three years ago the Naval Committee visited those islands, and I am wondering why it is necessary now for a commission to go there; because when we were there we found out that the naval authorities were making a thorough investigation of all the conditions on the islands, the sewerage system, the educational system, and everything pertaining to those islands, under the supervision of the Navy Department. Why can not all the desired information be obtained by inquiring of the naval authorities what in their judgment is the best policy to pursue, without going to all this additional expense? [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TOWNER. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York, which is a very pertinent one, let me say that this legislation is at the instance of the Navy Department. I have a letter in my possession which I will not take the time to read unless the gentleman desires. When this resolution came over from the Senate it was sent to the Committee on Insular Affairs. I at once sent the resolution to the Secretary of the Navy. I had a conference with him and a conference with Admiral Oliver, under whose jurisdiction the islands have been governed ever since they were taken over. The legislation which we adopted provided that the occupancy by the military authorities should be only temporary, and it is the desire of the Secretary of the Navy that this be done. In other words, the time has come for the establishment of a civil government there, and that is the only purpose that this resolution has in view. These people down there have asked that this commission be sent there. As you will see this is a very small commission, consisting of three Members of the House and three Members of the Senate. The people of the islands have asked that this commission go down and hold hearings and allow them to be heard regarding conditions and regarding the kind of government they desire.

Mr. HICKS. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, with the permission of the gentleman from Kansas, that I have no doubt

whatsoever that a civil government should be established in those islands. My only point was that, with all the information now possessed by the Navy Department, which has been governing those islands for several years, it would seem an unnecessary expense for this Government to send a commission there to get facts which are now in the possession of the Navy Department.

Mr. TOWNER. In answer to that, I will say that I presume the Secretary of the Navy would be the better judge regarding that matter, and he thinks it very important that this commission be sent there.

Let me suggest also that probably one of the principal reasons that actuated the Secretary in taking this position is the fact that the people in the islands desire to be heard. They desire to have this commission come there and examine the situation and have hearings and allow them to be heard regarding the kind of government that they wish. It is for that reason largely that this inquiry is to be made.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I understand the people of these islands want to be heard by a civil commission which will report directly to Congress their wishes concerning legislation with respect to a civil government there, rather than submit their requests through the military or naval authorities.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. CALDWELL. This bill carries an authorization of only \$2,500, and there are six members of the commission—three from the Senate and three from the House. That is only \$416.66 apiece. Does the gentleman think that will pay the expenses of a commission to make that kind of an inquiry?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am informed that the commission will be able to make the investigation for that amount.

Mr. TOWNER. The Secretary of the Navy expects to make the expense as light as possible by placing at the disposal of the commission, at some port of the United States, a vessel to convey them to these islands. The Secretary of the Navy expects to send down perhaps one or two naval officers to accompany the commission.

Mr. CALDWELL. Are we to understand, then, that this commission will have a battleship or cruiser, at an expense of \$2,500 a day, to take them down there, and that this amount of \$2,500 is not going to cover it?

Mr. TOWNER. No; that is not the expectation.

Mr. CALDWELL. What kind of a ship is going to take them?

Mr. BAER. The *Mayflower*.

Mr. TOWNER. The proposition is that we shall go down to Key West, where some of the smaller vessels of the Navy are cruising, and that the members of the commission can be conveyed in that way to the islands without additional expense. One of the destroyers or smaller vessels of the Navy can take the commission over there without any additional expense to the Government.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, the commission provided by this resolution is in no sense for a junketing trip. The inhabitants of the islands have been urging for some time that they be given a local self-government. As has been said by Judge TOWNER, the resolution comes at the suggestion of the Navy Department. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] concur that this is the proper procedure. The resolution is unanimously reported from the Committee on Rules. I think no further observations are necessary.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say that this resolution comes up as a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules. So that it may not be taken too seriously as a precedent, I want to suggest that, in my judgment, it is not a privileged resolution. However, I believe in passing the resolution. The expense will amount to nothing. It might properly be paid if it amounted to something. This commission will undoubtedly be taken through the islands upon a naval vessel upon one of the trips that the naval vessels make to the islands whether the commission be sent or not.

It is appropriate to the dignity of this country that, having acquired these islands, having given them no permanent form of government, having put a temporary government there purely under the Navy Department, that we should take up for consideration in some way whether there shall be, and if so, what kind of a civil government there. Due dignity of our country to the islands and the people there ought to cause us to send a repre-

sentative of our legislative body there in order to talk with the people and get the local sentiment.

I visited these islands some years ago. Many Members of the House have been there, but I did not go with any committee of the House. When our vessel came into St. Thomas every man on board the ship, every woman and child, were more or less excited about getting ashore to buy things. St. Thomas was then what was called a free port; there were no duties on imports. It was the cheapest place to buy articles that there was on the American Continent, or probably in the Western World anywhere. Whether that continues now I do not know. They met with more or less of a loss when the Panama Canal was opened by changing somewhat the lines of trade, and they met with a serious loss when the war came on.

But we ought to deal fairly with these people. While we have acquired the islands for the benefit and protection of the United States, it is not the desire of the United States at any time to impose upon the local people because of the necessities of the Nation. I believe it would be a good thing if we could all go there, and I am sorry that we can not all go. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, something has been said about the manner of conducting the commission through the islands. I am informed that the Navy sends at irregular intervals its cruisers and destroyers down to that port, which is a naval base. They go at irregular intervals, and it is the intention that this commission shall go upon one of those trips, which will add nothing to the expense of the trip. The commission will only have the expense of traveling to the port at which they embark.

I suggest, as was suggested by the gentleman from Illinois and every gentleman here, that these people are entitled to the dignified consideration of the American Congress. We purchased these islands and the people with them. They have never seen a commission from the Government of the United States. They know nothing of the United States, except through the naval authorities. They have the right to know whether or not they are to be governed by a civil government or whether they are to continue under military rule.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Can the gentleman state what the population of the islands is?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The population of the three islands is about 75,000.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. When did we buy them?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. We purchased them of the Danish Government in 1917 at an expense of \$25,000,000.

Mr. LAYTON. Was it by the determination of these people inhabiting the islands that we acquired control of the islands?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; we bought them for our own protection. We bought them for the purpose of keeping Germany from getting them. Now, we ought to give them a chance to tell the commission and Congress what kind of a government they would like to have.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). When this resolution was submitted the Chair was not furnished with a copy, and assumed that it was the usual privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules. When it was read the Chair was clearly of the opinion that it was not a privileged resolution, but no one raised the point of order, and the gentleman from Kansas did not ask unanimous consent to consider it. There was, however, a decided pause, and no one objected or raised a point of order. Therefore the Chair assumed that unanimous consent had been given.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The Chair stated that a privileged resolution had been offered, but, as a matter of fact, I submitted a report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I do not recall whether when the joint resolution was read the amendment changing it from a joint resolution was reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk informs the Chair that it was not.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be modified as indicated by the amendment in the report.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But the resolution has been passed.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings with reference to the passage of the resolution be vacated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the proceedings agreeing to the resolution be vacated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee recommends that the resolution be changed from a joint resolution to a concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman wish to make any motion with reference to the preamble?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I do not care to make any motion in relation to the preamble.

Mr. MANN of Illinois rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry to the parliamentary sharps of the House, after the Speaker has considered it. This is a joint resolution as it comes to the House—

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

We have agreed to a proposition to change that to a concurrent resolution. However, the language has not been suggested as an amendment. I am prompted to make the inquiry I do so that the engrossing clerk of the House may know what he is to do. Will this then read—

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)—

Or will it read—

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is of opinion that we can not change the work of the Senate, and that it would be—

Resolved by the House (the Senate concurring).

It is a Senate joint resolution.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It originates in the Senate, the House amends it and changes it to a concurrent resolution, but it seems to me that the House in making that change would still leave the resolving clause as having originated in the Senate—

Resolved by the Senate (the House concurring).

It occurs to me that that would be the proper mode. I do not think this question has arisen very often, though it has at times in the past.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The language that is left in the resolution as it is now presented to the Chair is—

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

It does not appear in the resolution what the change should be.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I understand, but it did not appear in the amendment. The amendment which we agreed to was the change from a joint resolution to a concurrent resolution. The amendment was agreed to, but the committee did not report the language striking out and inserting, leaving the matter to the engrossing clerk, and I expect the engrossing clerk will know more about it than all the rest of us put together.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that after the Senate has passed a joint resolution the House can so change it to a concurrent resolution, and that the Senate will not have to concur in the action of the House?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, of course the Senate would have to concur in the amendment—that is, if it becomes a law or is passed by both bodies. We can change it. We have changed it, as the man said, when he was in jail.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will permit, I understood him to state that he thought the amendment would make the resolving clause read—

Resolved by the Senate (the House concurring).

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. The Senate would still have to agree to that. Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly. They would have to agree to the amendment if it is passed by both bodies. That is an amendment that is suggested by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is finally on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to and to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT. I understood that all proceedings had been vacated. How far back did we vacate the proceedings?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before the third reading.

Mr. GARRETT. The only thing in my mind is whether the amendment has been adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Both amendments have been adopted and the resolution is changed to a concurrent resolution. Therefore it did not require a third reading.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the other matter has not been acted upon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Virginia rise?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Has the matter been disposed of finally?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution was agreed to and the proceedings by which it was agreed to were vacated. The resolution was then amended, and as amended has been agreed to.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I did not hear it put to the House. Was it put to the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It was.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. How was it decided finally that it should read—

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).

How does it appear in the resolution as finally passed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will appear—

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is the form in which it will go to the Senate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the form in which it will go to the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want just to make a remark, that the thing was disposed of by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MAXN] referring it to the enrolling clerk. That was what became of it at last.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The action of the House was that the amendment be agreed to making it a concurrent resolution.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I understand; but I am asking the form in which it was finally passed. Was it with the House of Representatives concurring or the Senate concurring? That question was raised and discussed, but I never heard it disposed of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is informed by the enrolling clerk that he has it with the House of Representatives concurring.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEENERSON. 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. 11578, the Post Office 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 Post Office appropriation bill, with Mr. WALSH 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. 11578, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11578) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation to assistant postmasters at first and second class post offices, 5, at not exceeding \$4,000 each; 65, at not exceeding \$3,000 each; 15, at not exceeding \$2,500 each; 10, at not exceeding \$2,000 each; 20, at not exceeding \$1,900 each; 70, at not exceeding \$1,800 each; 200, at not exceeding \$1,700 each; 250, at not exceeding \$1,600 each; 250, at not exceeding \$1,500 each; 215, at not exceeding \$1,400 each; 400, at not exceeding \$1,300 each; 650, at not exceeding \$1,200 each; 600, at not exceeding \$1,100 each; 350, at not exceeding \$1,000 each; 50, at not exceeding \$900 each; 50, at not exceeding \$800 each; in all, including increases hereinafter provided, \$5,672,125. And the appointment and assignment of assistant postmasters hereunder shall be so made during the fiscal year as not to involve a greater aggregate expenditure than this sum.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Minnesota a question. The procedure and table on which this compensation for assistant postmasters is fixed I notice ranges from \$800 to \$4,000?

Mr. STEENERSON. The figures here recited are the basic figures submitted by the department, so that the language is the same as it would be if we had not made the temporary increases, but the table is changed so as to correspond with the total of the temporary increases, and therefore we have this clause, "including increases hereinafter provided."

Mr. BEE. Do I understand as to assistant postmasters, for example, 350 at \$1,000 each, that that \$1,000 is the basic salary?

Mr. STEENERSON. That is the basic salary.

Mr. BEE. Added to that is the rate that the House fixed a while back?

Mr. STEENERSON. Certainly; there were two increases.

Mr. BEE. So it brings the increase up to what we gave them?

Mr. STEENERSON. The total will be sufficient to pay according to section 2, to continue the compensation now paid.

Mr. BEE. All right, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this, Mr. Chairman, to get a little matter of brush cleared up in the Record. On October 24 last I called the committee's attention to the fact that a fourth-class postmaster, under the ruling of the department, was required to do first-class work on fourth-class pay for about a year after the receipts showed a first-class office before getting relief.

Mr. STEENERSON. Would not the gentleman just as well wait until we reach the clause for unusual conditions. It is not in order now.

Mr. BLANTON. This is a matter of some importance. I do not like the gentleman to take up what little time I have.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman has not got any time.

Mr. BLANTON. It is a matter of getting the Record straight concerning a statement made by an official of the Post Office Department put in the Record last Saturday.

Mr. STEENERSON. Of course, the gentleman can not discuss unusual conditions in Texas on a motion to strike out the last word. Would not the gentleman prefer just as well to wait until we reach that clause?

Mr. BLANTON. Proceeding under such unusual conditions as the chairman finds himself in here now, with only a handful of Members present, I am sure he does not care to be fractious about a gentleman correcting the Record concerning a bill which he has in charge. I want to cooperate with the gentleman all I can, I am sure, if he will only let me.

Mr. STEENERSON. But I submit to the gentleman, would it not be proper—

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will just let me alone for a few minutes, I will get through.

Mr. STEENERSON. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, in order that I may not be interrupted, I ask to be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes to get a little matter straight.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I prefer not to be interrupted.

In trying to get relief for the post offices in the oil section of my district, on October 24, 1919, I made the following statement on the floor of the House, to wit:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 7453-7454.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, in company with Mr. Johnson, who is chief clerk in Mr. Koons's office, we went to the office of Mr. Ellsworth, who has charge of the post-office service, and Mr. Ellsworth stated to me that where through receipts a fourth-class post office suddenly increased to an amount authorizing it to be raised to a first-class office, the postmaster was required to continue working for a salary of \$1,000 per annum for a whole year before his salary could be raised. I told him of a situation where a village of about 400 people in my district had suddenly grown to a city of 25,000 people. The post office there was in the hands of a man under the fourth-class status, who was being forced to hold that office with a salary of only \$1,000 a year, notwithstanding the fact that the receipts of the office showed that it was a first-class office. Mr. Ellsworth and Mr. Johnson stated to me that under the law and under the regulations of the department based upon that law it would be necessary for that postmaster to continue to perform the service of a first-class office for 25,000 people for a whole year before his salary could be raised above \$1,000 per annum. I will ask the chairman of the committee if that is not the law? I ask the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the next ranking member on the committee, to state if that is not the law. They are silent. That is a condition that ought not to exist. Mr. Ellsworth stated to me that he had called the attention of our Post Office Committee to this emergency; and even though he had been granted an emergency fund, he could not pay that postmaster one single cent out of the emergency fund over and above his maximum of \$1,000 a year for a fourth-class

post office. Consequently you can hardly get a man to think of holding the office of postmaster in that thriving city. Postmaster after postmaster has tried it and resigned, and the citizens in that district to-day are standing in line two, three, and four hours, and some of them are paying \$2 to get a place up at the front of the line near the window, in order to get their mail. The distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HARDY] stated to me a few minutes ago that this very condition existed at Cripple Creek years ago, and at other places in the mining districts of Colorado. Is it possible that this kind of an emergency has appeared in the past history of this country and that this splendid, efficient Post Office Committee has not taken some steps up to this time to remedy that situation?

Mr. STEENERSON. If the gentleman will yield, I will say to him that neither the Postmaster General nor anybody else in the Post Office Department has ever notified the Post Office Committee of the condition the gentleman speaks of.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Ellsworth stated to me that he had called on Congress repeatedly for a larger emergency fund, and that he could not get it, and that several times his department had called attention to these emergency situations without avail.

Mr. BLACK. If my colleague will yield, I think what he has in mind is that he came before the Committee on Appropriations for a deficiency. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads does not deal with deficiencies, so I am sure it has not been before our committee.

Mr. BLANTON. However uninformed the committee may have been heretofore, with regard to the emergency situations I have mentioned, they can not state that they are uninformed now, because I have brought it to their attention, and I hope they will remedy the situation, so that the people in a city of 25,000 population can get their mail without standing in line three, four, and five hours and paying \$2 for a place every day or two in order to get their mail. Some of my constituents who are business men have been forced to order their mail sent to another post office 25 miles away, and to send their automobiles for it every day. This is an emergency that could happen in any part of the country. Five years ago it was never dreamed that oil was in this section, and to-day in two counties in my district there are 200,000 barrels of oil flowing out of the ground every day.

Mr. PARRISH. Can the gentleman suggest any way by which we can run the post offices in our section of the country so that the postmasters can get this increased compensation without having to wait for a year?

Mr. BLANTON. There is no way to do it until we change the existing law. My colleague who has just interrogated me represents another district in the same fix. The wonderful oil fields have been developed at Burkburnett and other places in his district, and he has postmasters doing service for a first-class office with first-class receipts, but still receiving a fourth-class postmaster's salary. It is simply outrageous and should be remedied immediately.

Mr. Chairman, the only mistake I made in the above statement, was that I stated that my conversation was with Mr. Ellsworth, when I should have said that it was with Mr. W. S. Ryan, who is Mr. Ellsworth's assistant, who was then in charge of Mr. Ellsworth's office. Hence, naturally, Mr. Ellsworth denied having the conversation.

My colleagues will remember that the office of Mr. J. C. Koons, the First Assistant Postmaster General, is on the fifth floor of the administration building, and that we do most of our business concerning post offices with either Mr. Koons or his chief clerk, Mr. J. W. Johnston. It is rare that we go to the subordinates. Mr. Ellsworth's office is on the fourth floor. On this occasion last October when Mr. Johnston took me to Mr. Ellsworth's office in my effort to get relief for the Desdemona postmaster I of course expected to see Mr. Ellsworth, but he being out our business was transacted by Mr. Ellsworth's assistant, Mr. W. S. Ryan.

So in speaking of the interview later on in the House on October 24, 1919, it was the most natural thing in the world to mention the name Ellsworth, as the information came from his assistant in his office.

And on last Saturday my good friend from Minnesota, the chairman of this committee [Mr. STEENERSON], because I had humiliated him a little bit in calling attention to the fact that he had an unlucky number here, only 13 of his colleagues, in the consideration of this great supply measure, got a little affronted and attempted to trip me up by putting into the RECORD the statement of the Postmaster General that Mr. Ellsworth disclaimed having the said conversation with me.

Now, the good chairman ought to be a better sport than that. He ought to be a good sport and take his medicine, like we good Democrats did when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] administered it to us so often during the Sixty-fifth Congress. But while the good chairman was attempting to trip me up he ought at the same time to have printed in the RECORD the statement signed by Mr. W. S. Ryan, which was also attached as a memorandum to the said statement of the Postmaster General. Although attached thereto as a memorandum, it was not printed with the Postmaster General's statement, but was segregated therefrom and put in his desk by the chairman and was not printed in the RECORD. Why did not my good friend from Minnesota put it in the RECORD? Let me call your attention to some excerpts—

Mr. STEENERSON. The time had expired. I did not have time to read the letter, even.

Mr. BLANTON. We permitted you to print it, and you might just as well have printed all the memorandum as to print Mr. Ellsworth's. That was a memorandum.

Mr. STEENERSON. I gave it to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. Not until I specially requested it this morning. I did not fall out with my good friend about that, but I want to get the record straight. My good friend did give me Mr. Ryan's statement when I went to him this Tuesday morning and demanded it.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman did not demand it. He asked me for it.

Mr. BLANTON. I requested it politely, because I knew that was the way to get it. But it was a demand in effect.

Mr. STEENERSON. I did not know it or you would not have gotten it.

Mr. BLANTON. I went to Mr. Ryan yesterday, and found that he had made this statement, and that it should be attached to the statement of the Postmaster General. I was surprised that it had not been made public. Mr. Ryan did not deny having had the said conversation with me in October. He remembered every detail of it as I went over it with him. And, fortunately, one of my colleagues now seated here in the House happened to be present in October and heard it. Let me read the following excerpts from Mr. Ryan's statement:

[Excerpts from statement signed by W. S. Ryan on Nov. 11, 1919.]

I explained to Mr. BLANTON that the Post Office Department is without authority to increase the salaries of presidential postmasters except at the beginning of each fiscal year, and that such increases are based on the postal receipts of the previous calendar year. I explained to him also that a fourth-class post office must remain in that grade at least four quarters and that five quarters must elapse before reclassification can be made, except that a fourth-class post office, after remaining in the grade for four quarters, could be advanced to a higher grade at the commencement of any quarter when the compensation of the postmaster reached as much as \$1,000 and the receipts amounted to at least \$1,900 during that period.

Regarding the refusal of the department to grant sufficient amounts out of unusual conditions to conduct the offices in his district affected by the oil industries, it was explained to Mr. BLANTON that his postmasters had been granted every request since July 1 of this year; that during the last quarter of the last fiscal year it was necessary to curtail allowances for this purpose for the reason that Congress had seen fit to grant a less amount than was requested of the Appropriations Committee for unusual conditions.

Mr. STEENERSON. What committee?

Mr. BLANTON. The Appropriations Committee, he states here. He did not tell me that then. He said "Congress." Let me show you what else he says:

In reply to his question as to whether this matter was brought to the attention of Congress he was informed that the same provision appeared in every bill, and it was presumed that Congress was fully acquainted with its provisions. He stated that he was not aware of the fact that the Post Office Department is without authority to do the things he thought should be done, and that he was sure Congress did not understand the conditions. He was told that the matter had been brought to their attention in each appropriation bill framed for the Postal Service.

It was pointed out to Mr. BLANTON, from records in this division, that every request made by the postmasters in his district, either for rental or clerical allowance, had been complied with, and that in some instances mentioned by him no correspondence was on file from postmasters making request for either clerical or rental allowance.

(Signed) W. S. RYAN.

Now, Mr. Chairman, who frames the bill for the Postal Service? What does Mr. Ryan mean when he says "that the matter had been brought to their attention in each appropriation bill framed for the Postal Service"? Are not such bills framed by the Post Office Committee?

He misled me. I am not responsible for that. That is what he told me, and I had a right to act on his information and to call the attention of the committee to what he told me. It is just a mere matter of his misleading me on the question.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of the few Democrats in this House who has ever been ready and willing to defend the Postmaster General and his administration. I have been criticized for so doing. In nearly an hour's speech I defended him against the assault made upon him by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. The Postmaster General is from my State, and I am a loyal Texan. But when he says that "every request made by the postmasters in the seventeenth district, either for rental or clerical allowance, had been complied with," and he intimates that he has had no serious trouble in filling vacancies caused by resignations in my district, and further says that "the service in that section has been and is at this time as good as could reasonably be expected," I can not defend him longer.

Such are not the facts, and every man in my district knows it, and every employee in the whole Post Office Department in Washington ought to know it. Postmasters have resigned from such places as Breckenridge, Caddo, Strawn, Ranger, Desdemona, Gorman, Lueders, Stamford, and other splendid towns, and only loyal patriotism has kept the other postmasters on the job in my district. It has been a very difficult matter to get men to apply for such vacancies.

At the very time these communications were written by Postmaster General Burleson, Supt. Ellsworth and Asst. Supt. Ryan, the postmasters and chambers of commerce at Cisco,

Gorman, De Leon, Eastland, Merkel, Breckenridge, Desdemona, and a number of other places were imploring the department for additional help, equipment, and assistance, and they are all still in dire need of it. Mr. Ellsworth tries to excuse himself by stating that he has had only six visits from men in the last six months. He does not attempt to state the numerous trips I have personally made to the First Assistant Postmaster General's office to see Mr. Koons and to see Mr. Johnston with regard to getting help for these offices.

Now, when Mr. Ryan told me in October that he had complied with the request of every postmaster I wrote the postmaster at Ranger, Tex., so informing him, and asking him to advise me if it were true, and, if not, to tell me what he still needed in order to give proper service to the 25,000 people in Ranger, Tex. He wrote me back that the department had not furnished him with the needed requirements, and gave me a specific list of his needs and necessities. At this time people in Ranger were paying \$1 and \$2 merely for a place in the line to get their mail, which was perfectly outrageous. I sent this letter to the department, and later on, to my great surprise and mortification, I found that the department had written an insulting letter to this loyal postmaster, who was serving more as an accommodation to his people than anything else, and had threatened him with suspension for having called on Congressmen for help, when, as a matter of fact, such Congressman had invited the communication.

Let me read you what the department wrote this loyal postmaster:

In view of the facts above quoted it is not understood why you should consider the Congressman's influence with the department necessary in order to secure authority for the employment of necessary clerical assistance. Furthermore, your statements to him are so grossly inaccurate as to raise the question as to your integrity. Ordinarily such conduct would subject the offender to summary removal. However, your record prior to the date of your letter to the Congressman has been good and you have evidenced an earnest effort to maintain the service at Ranger on a satisfactory basis. Therefore no action will be taken pending your reply to this letter, which you will be expected to submit promptly to me under personal cover.

J. C. KOONS,
First Assistant.

Now let me read you the letter from this good postmaster and the copy of his letter replying to First Assistant Postmaster General Koons:

RANGER, TEX., December 8, 1919.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MR. DEAR MR. BLANTON: You will pardon me for again writing you, but I am in receipt of a letter from the department in which they make this statement:

"It is not understood why you should consider the Congressman's influence with the department necessary to secure authority for the employment of necessary clerical assistance. Furthermore, your statements to him are so grossly inaccurate as to raise the question of your integrity. Ordinarily such conduct would subject the offender to summary removal. However, your record prior to the date of your letter to the Congressman has been good and you have evidenced an earnest effort to maintain the service at Ranger on a satisfactory basis. Therefore no action will be taken pending your reply to this letter, which you will be expected to submit promptly to me under personal cover."

(Signed) J. C. KOONS.

Now, Mr. BLANTON, I took this office at a financial sacrifice in order to try to get the service on a basis that would be satisfactory to all concerned, feeling that I would be rewarded by the cooperation of both the patrons and the department, and that the salary would increase as the office progressed until I would not be wholly unpaid for the effort expended and the loss sustained.

Now, in view of the fact that I have been accused of grossly misrepresenting matters and unlawfully soliciting legislative influence to secure service at this place, I feel, Mr. BLANTON, that if I am guilty of these charges that I am not a fit personage to hold this responsible position, and I believe it your duty to ask that I be removed from the place. But if there is a doubt in your mind as to the correctness of these charges (copy of my reply to which are inclosed) I respectfully refer you to any of the following persons of Ranger, Tex.:

M. H. Hagerman, mayor; Gray Powell, chasier First National Bank; C. H. Butler, vice president Bank of Ranger; Mr. Chenowith, president Texas Bank & Trust Co.; George T. Hemmingson, secretary of the chamber of commerce; Dr. M. S. Alexander; Dr. L. C. G. Buchanan, or any prominent business man in this city, and after your investigation you find that I am worthy to remain in this position as acting postmaster, I ask that you will kindly place this communication in your wastebasket and forget it.

Thanking you for your many favors granted to your people through your acting postmaster, I am,
Very sincerely, yours,

F. O. KELLY.

RANGER, TEX., December 8, 1919.

J. C. KOONS,
First Assistant Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.:

Replying to yours of December 2, initialed SSH, I submit the following:

Refer to my two letters of September 24, wherein I made my first recommendation for clerical and carrier assistance for the quarter ending December 31, 1919. There had been no other allowance asked for this quarter's business, and I made this as soon as I was notified that I had been selected by the surities of the late postmaster to succeed O. R. Cooper as acting postmaster, and in these recommendations I asked for the following:

There had been allowed 11 regular clerks. I asked for 16 additional, to bring the total to 27 clerks, and gave designations to which they

would be placed. Also, I asked for 2 additional carriers, to make a total of 5 foot carriers and 1 parcel-post carrier; also asked for a department-owned delivery truck for the parcel post. I stated that this was necessary for the proper conduct of the office and to give the patrons satisfactory service, and if you will follow the record of progress you will find that I was correct in every detail.

Then, on October 18, your letter stating that I had been allowed 7 additional clerks—3 at \$1,500, plus 15 per cent, and 4 at \$1,200, plus 15 per cent—and with the 5 auxiliary clerks granted this made a total of 23 clerks. All right. In the same mail with this letter I received from the Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, Member of Congress, a letter stating that you had informed him that I had been granted all that I had asked. This letter from the Congressman of this district came to me unsolicited, so far as I was concerned. His statement that you had granted me all that I had asked and his request that I advise him at once if there was anything else needed to give his people service were in a letter dated October 17. I held this letter, waiting advices from your office as to whether I would be granted carrier help you had promised him to grant, or, rather, according to his letter, that you had stated had been granted ("the department advises me that it has now furnished you with everything you asked for"). Very good. On November 24, 60 days after my request for relief in the city-delivery section, not having received any word from you in regard to same, I, at the request of Dr. M. S. Alexander, who had just received a letter from Congressman BLANTON, his personal friend, stating that he had not had a reply to his letter addressed to me, I could do nothing else than answer the Congressman's letter, and in answering same I gave him a plain statement of facts as they confronted us, and I have on file sufficient evidence to prove the correctness of every statement I made.

Your letter (pardon me for the statement) was not written granting the extra help for the city delivery until November 22, 58 days after I asked for same and 35 days after the Congressman's letter to me stating that I had been granted everything I had asked.

That part of your letter in which you state that my statements to the Congressman are so grossly inaccurate as to raise the question of my "integrity," if you can prove that any statement I have made to you or to Congressman BLANTON are not true, I am sure that Congressman BLANTON is man enough to ask that I be removed.

In appreciation of your statement that my record had been good and that I had evidenced an effort to maintain satisfactory service, allow me to say that I am here for the good of the service and am trying to give everyone a square deal, and run the office as near to the postal law and regulation as possible, and without fear or favor to anyone.

Any additional information you wish on this matter will be cheerfully given.

F. O. KELLY,
Acting Postmaster, Ranger, Tex.

I merely want to call this to the committee's attention. It is the duty of a postmaster, when he makes complaint to the department that he needs facilities to furnish service, and that department does not furnish them, and the people are clamoring at him, and he is holding that office just as a favor to the community, to call it to the attention of his Congressman.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Is he still in office?

Mr. BLANTON. He is still in the office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more in order to fully explain the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. STEENERSON. Reserving the right to object, it is understood the gentleman will not ask for any more time?

Mr. BLANTON. I will not ask for any more.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will not interrupt. I want to know if this is the last five minutes he is going to ask for?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. If the Post Office Department wants me to defend it against criticisms hereafter, it must not write any more such uncalculated, insulting letters to the loyal citizens who are trying to serve the people as postmasters in my district. The Army may scare soldiers into keeping their complaints away from their Congressmen in war times, but the Post Office Department is going to have awfully rough sailing in trying to assume such ironclad discipline in denying to postmasters the right to appeal to their Congressmen for proper and needed assistance required to render their patrons decent service in peace times.

I am the personal friend of the Postmaster General, of the Assistant Postmaster General, and of the men in their departments, and have no personal feeling in this criticism. Because west Texas is about 2,000 miles distant, these gentlemen must not assume that the good people there are not entitled to proper service. They have stood great inconveniences a long, long time. It is true that the department has until recently been handicapped for want of emergency appropriation. But with the emergency appropriation provided for in this bill, to meet these emergency conditions in the oil section of west Texas, there will be no further excuse for the department to longer withhold proper necessities from the many post offices needing immediate assistance in the oil belt.

I want to thank my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], for his kind consideration in looking after this emergency, and I want to thank each and every member of this committee for their kind consideration. I wish for each of them, and their people, the prosperity that comes with oil abundantly flowing from the ground, and hope that Dame For-

tune may similarly smile on their districts, and then they may better understand the problems which have beset my colleague [Mr. PARRISH] and myself, for lo, these many months.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have tried hard to satisfy the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who has just addressed you. On October 24 last he made the statement, in criticism of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, that the department had told him that they had frequently called the attention of that committee to the fact that there was not legislation sufficient to take care of these unusual conditions arising by reason of the oil developments in Texas. I stated then that the Post Office Department had never called the attention of the Post Office Committee to it, and Judge Moon corroborated my statement on the floor of the House on that date, October 24, and we let it rest.

The fact is, that there was at that time no bill introduced by anybody seeking to change the law in regard to unusual conditions. These, as I said on Saturday, had existed in some cases for a year and a half. Now, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, when it took up the appropriation bill, concluded to do a thing that was unusual.

This is not a legislative bill. This is an appropriation bill, and the rules of the House forbid that we should have any legislation as a rider on this bill; but because of the representations of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], who enjoys the confidence and respect of everybody on the committee, and I believe of everybody else who knows him, we yielded to his solicitation to change this law, and decided to report a section changing it, and I included it in the rule so as to make it in order. You will find it referred to in the rule making this provision in order, for the correction of the conditions referred to by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. It was brought in when the bill was reported, and I thought one of the most pleased men in the House would be the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. Instead of that, to my great surprise, he began to lambast the Republicans for not being here in great numbers. I thought that whether we were few or many, as long as we were bringing in a bill for his benefit, he ought to be satisfied. I did not think he ought to lash us. All that I have said was in defense of the Post Office Committee, to wit, that the department had never called our attention to the matter or asked for any legislation in regard to the matter. I wrote to the department and asked if they had called the attention of the committee to the matter and if they had asked for such legislation, and the letters were read here on Saturday. The letter of the Postmaster General was read, all except the last clause, when the time expired, and at the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] the whole letter was printed in the Record. I tried to have it read in full.

It is true that there is an exhibit referred to in that letter, but I did not think that was very important. It was simply corroborative of what was stated before. The gentleman asked for it and I gave it to him, and he has read part of it, but not all. The substance of it is in corroboration of what Mr. Burleson says in his letter, and of what Mr. Ellsworth says in his letter, to wit, that they had not called the attention of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to this matter at the time they wrote, and that they had not asked for this legislation at that time. In fact, I think the Postmaster General's letter says that they did not need the legislation. However, upon further consideration the committee was satisfied that the conditions were such as to require legislation. We reported it, and I got a rule to make it in order as a rider on the appropriation bill. It is pretty hard to do anything more than that. I hoped that the gentleman from Texas would be satisfied. I tried to get him to wait until this clause in the bill was reached before taking up this personal controversy. I have no interest in the controversy between the gentleman from Texas and the Postmaster General. He can criticize the Postmaster General all he wants to. I am sure he will not think I had any intention of stopping that when I tried to limit him to 10 minutes.

Now, as I want to pass this bill at as early a moment as possible I hope this controversy may be ended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing certain documents in connection with this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by including certain documents. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, assistant superintendents of stations, bookkeepers, cashiers, chief mailing clerks, chief stamp clerks, examiners of stations, finance clerks, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 3,300, at not exceeding \$1,800 each.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota if this same rule applies to this as applied in reference to the previous inquiry?

Mr. STEENERSON. Exactly the same.

Mr. BEE. And the aggregate will give all of them the amounts that we have allowed?

Mr. STEENERSON. The aggregate is sufficient to give them the temporary increase in addition to their basic salary.

Mr. BEE. That information is satisfactory to me. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation to clerks in charge of contract stations, \$1,350,000.

Mr. WATSON. I move to strike out the last word, in order to ask the chairman of the committee how many contract stations there are distributed throughout the country.

Mr. STEENERSON. I would have to look at the hearings in order to tell the gentleman that.

Mr. WATSON. What is a contract station?

Mr. STEENERSON. A contract station is a drug store or other store where they have a post office, and the department makes a contract with the proprietor of the store to attend to the business without regular clerks being appointed.

Mr. WATSON. This item is for compensation of clerks at contract stations. What salaries do you pay these clerks, and how many were employed last year?

Mr. STEENERSON. I would have to consult the record; it varies. I do not carry the figures in my head. There are quite a large number employed.

Mr. WATSON. I queried how the committee arrived at the amount of \$1,350,000 unless they had some data.

Mr. STEENERSON. We have exact figures which are given in the hearings. The number is quite large. The gentleman will bear in mind that in the large cities, like New York and Chicago and even Washington, they have these stations mostly in drug stores.

Mr. WATSON. You do not mean substations, do you?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not mean substations, but contract stations, where they do not have regular quarters; they do their business in drug stores or stationery stores or other such places.

Mr. WATSON. I wanted to know if the gentleman could state the average pay.

Mr. STEENERSON. That varies very much. In some places they do it for nothing.

Mr. WATSON. Then the amount of salary each clerk receives is unlimited?

Mr. STEENERSON. The department has full authority to make a contract and to pay anything it sees fit.

Mr. MADDEN. Up to \$1,000.

Mr. STEENERSON. The trouble is not that they pay them too much, but too little. There is a limitation of \$1,000, as the gentleman from Illinois has stated.

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For temporary and auxiliary clerk hire and for substitute clerk hire for clerks and employees absent with pay at first and second class post offices and temporary and auxiliary clerk hire at summer and winter resort post offices, including increases hereinafter provided, \$9,750,000.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. We are now on paragraph lines 13 to 17, page 11, appropriating \$9,750,000 for temporary clerks and employees at summer and winter resort post offices. How much is that an increase over last year?

Mr. STEENERSON. Quite a large increase. We have changed the compensation from 40 cents an hour to 50 cents an hour.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does this provide for the additional help?

Mr. STEENERSON. It is an increase of \$3,250,000.

Mr. CALDWELL. Did the committee cut down the department's estimate?

Mr. STEENERSON. No, sir; we are satisfied that the growth of the business is such that they will need all they ask for.

Mr. CALDWELL. The reason I ask the question is because we find an appalling situation along the water front in New York State in the summer resorts. The post offices have been without the necessary labor to handle the mail during the past

year, and they have not had enough money to take care of it. I wanted to know whether the committee had allowed all that the department had asked for.

Mr. STEENERSON. We gave the department all it asked for. Mr. CALDWELL. All right; if they do not give us better service next year we will curse them and they can not curse us.

Mr. ROUSE. This appropriation provides for 60 cents an hour and the last appropriation provided for 40 cents an hour. The Clerk read as follows:

For rent, light, and fuel for first, second, and third class post offices, \$8,000,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the Postmaster General may, in the disbursement of the appropriation for such purposes, apply a part thereof to the purpose of leasing premises for the use of post offices of the first, second, and third classes at a reasonable annual rental, to be paid quarterly for a term not exceeding 20 years.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. STEENERSON. That is covered by the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule provides that this paragraph shall be in order.

Mr. TILSON. Then I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the gentleman the reason for making this extension to 20 years. Is it necessary to make the rental for such a long period in order to get the best terms?

Mr. STEENERSON. We had extensive hearings on that subject. Mr. Koons explained with minuteness the reasons for this. The parcel post has so increased in late years, in large cities especially, that they are crowded for room, and it is almost impossible to do the business. In order to get private capital to build suitable quarters, they will have to have assurance that they will be rented for a longer term than 10 years.

I will say to gentlemen that I expect to offer a similar amendment under the railway provision, because at many railway terminals the department has great difficulty in getting space enough to do the business.

Mr. TILSON. Is it the intention to erect or contract by lease for sensible buildings for conducting the business or is it to continue the policy of having ornamental buildings, as we have in the past, more for looks than for use?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; that is the intention, to have a business building; and the man that builds it furnishes the money and the departments rents it at a reasonable rental. They reserve the right in every lease to cancel it in case of an emergency.

Mr. TILSON. The policy of the Post Office Department should be to secure buildings whenever practicable in the vicinity of railroad stations so as to avoid the long haul of the mail to and from the post office.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; that is one of the developments and improvements in the Post Office Department.

Mr. MADDEN. Take it in the city of Chicago, we have several terminals, with 39 trunk-line railroads coming into that city. Each of the terminals has a separate distribution point. The proposition there would be to put all the terminals into one building and have the trains run into that building on the first and second stories. If that were done, the Government would save \$605,000 in overhead charges alone.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For vehicle allowance, the hiring of drivers, the rental of vehicles, and the purchase and exchange and maintenance, including stable and garage facilities, of wagons or automobiles for, and the operation of, screen-wagon and city delivery and collection services, \$10,250,000: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, in his disbursement of this appropriation, apply a part thereof to the leasing of quarters for the housing of Government-owned automobiles at a reasonable annual rental for a term not exceeding 10 years.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, after line 19, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to contract for pneumatic-tube service in the cities of New York and Brooklyn, in the State of New York, to the same extent and under similar conditions and provisions as was in force under the contract for this service prior to June 30, 1918."

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we all recall when the Post Office bill was before the House in 1918, the great arguments, pro and con, for this very valuable service. At that time the complaint against its continuance was made largely on the ground that it had not met with success in some places, but it was never questioned that it had been a success in New York and Brooklyn, either by members of the committee or the postal authorities themselves. This House has on every occasion when the Post Office bill containing the pneumatic-tube appropriation was under consideration, voted in favor of it. The various commissions and the committees of both the

House and Senate appointed to investigate the efficiency and the usefulness of this system to the Post Office Department, have voted not only for its retention but its extension.

I have offered this amendment, and ask for the reinauguration of the system in New York and Brooklyn, because we believe—and in this I am indorsed by the Harlem Board of Trade, the Washington Heights Civic Association, the New York Chamber of Commerce, the government of that great city, and the citizenry in general—that it is needed, that it is efficient, that it is very much desired, and that it should be restored.

We have 54 miles of this service, and I particularly speak of it because I represent that section of the greater city—Harlem and Washington Heights—which was greatly benefited by the system. One hundred and twenty-fifth Street, in New York City, and thereabout north, is a city in itself. It is a community center, so to speak, and from that point radiates a large volume of mail. We find that by reason of the suspension of this service we are handicapped in the collection and distribution of the mail. New York City has spent \$400,000,000 for the construction and the submersion of passenger transportation to relieve the great congestion of vehicular traffic on the streets. It means little in money for the Post Office Department to relieve the greater city, by the reinauguration of the tube service, but the use of the tubes, now in existence, will add greatly to the comfort of the citizens and reduce in a marked degree the dangers encountered, owing to the speed with which the autos now in use must necessarily travel in order to reach their destination on schedule time.

I urge the House to give this amendment serious consideration, with the hope that if you can not subscribe to the reinauguration of the system in some of the cities, that at least you will permit its restoration in Manhattan Island, where no complaint has been made either by the postal authorities or any of the committees. [Applause.]

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order?

Mr. STEENERSON. It is not authorized by law and it is a change of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fees to special-delivery messengers, \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, deliver special-delivery matter without obtaining a receipt therefor.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the proviso in this paragraph, or I will reserve the point if the gentleman desires.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think it is subject to the point of order. This is made in order by the rule, is it not?

Mr. CRAMTON. There is nothing in the rule with reference to that language.

Mr. MADDEN. I think there is.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have not been able to find it.

Mr. STEENERSON. No; I do not think it is in the rule.

Mr. BLANTON. Perhaps the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has a supplementary rule in his hip pocket.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the situation under existing law is this: A special-delivery messenger is required when he undertakes to deliver a special-delivery letter to take it back with him if there is no one there to receive it and give a receipt for it. It has been proved by experience that that in a large measure discommodes the business public; because it frequently happens that the special-delivery messenger can not find the person to whom the letter is addressed. The result is that he leaves a note, in which he says that an attempt was made to deliver the letter and that the letter can be found at a certain station, or, if it be not called for at that station, that it will be delivered in the next regular mail.

The request has been made by a very large number of business people throughout the United States that receipts for the special-delivery letter ought not to be required under the circumstances that are described, and that the letter should be put under the door or put into the office in some way where it is addressed. That is what this language is for.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that it seems to me that any patron of the Post Office Department who pays a special price for a special service is entitled not only to have that service but to know that he has it.

There is a tendency in the Post Office Department gradually to do away with everything in the form of evidence as to its failure properly to function.

Mr. MADDEN. That is not this case.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit. They have ceased to postmark the letters to indicate the time that they arrive at the city of destination so that they can pass the buck along from one office to another if a letter is unduly delayed in its delivery. In the handling of registered mail there is a very fine rule in the Post Office Department, so that if I pay a special fee for the registration of a letter or parcel in order to be sure of its delivery to the person addressed, unless I expressly state on the card that I want that letter or parcel delivered to the person addressed—that is what I paid for—unless I expressly state that it must not be delivered to anyone else, they deliver it to anybody they find, so that the result is often that packages are lost and the department denies liability. Now, there is a case of failure to secure the service to which the public is entitled. Now, there is not one person in a thousand—if the gentleman will permit—not one patron of the post office in a thousand who knows of that regulation so that he can expressly call for what he wants.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for this question—

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say to the gentleman, if he will permit, I see in this case of special delivery there is some excuse for this legislation, although I realize—

Mr. MADDEN. I was going to ask the gentleman this question: Would he prefer to have a letter left at his office if he is absent for an hour, sent there by special delivery, without a receipt, or if he would prefer to wait until the next day to get it? That is what this legislation is for.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think there is merit in what the gentleman suggests. I think it carries with it the danger that they will hold it around for a week and then make delivery, and if they have no record showing the time of delivery they may say that they delivered it a week sooner.

Mr. STEENERSON. I would like to read the gentleman what Mr. Koons says about it.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have great respect for Mr. Koons.

Mr. STEENERSON. This is what Mr. Koons says; I asked him this question:

The CHAIRMAN. Your rules permit that after one attempt they either call for it or you send it by the regular official?

Mr. KOONS. Yes. There is one suggestion I want to make regarding the next appropriation, which really covers the matter we have been discussing—special-delivery messengers. At the present time an attempt is made to deliver a special-delivery letter or parcel, and if no one answers the bell a notice is put under the door that an attempt to deliver it has been made, and that the letter will be delivered by ordinary mail on the next regular carrier delivery. If that would be made at this hour of the day (4 o'clock), there would not be a regular carrier delivery before the next day, and you have either got to send to the post office to get that letter or wait until the regular delivery to-morrow morning, the same as was mentioned with regard to the box package.

If we could have a provision added onto this appropriation "that under such rules and regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, he may deliver special-delivery mail without taking a receipt therefor," the advantage of that would be that if the boy came to your house to deliver a letter, and there was no response to the bell, he could drop it in the letter box at the house or put it under the door and report to the postmaster when he returned to the office that he had delivered the letter without taking a receipt for it. We would prescribe a form for that. When you returned home you would have the letter, which is what you want. As it is now, you get a notice and have to go to the post office for it or wait until the next regular carrier delivery. It would be very satisfactory to the patrons. We would not abandon taking receipts where they could be obtained.

Mr. CRAMTON. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For travel and miscellaneous expenses in the Postal Service, office of the First Assistant Postmaster General, \$1,000.

Mr. STEENERSON. 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. WALSH, 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. 11578 had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 7752. An act relating to detached service of officers of the Regular Army; and

H. R. 484. An act to provide for the erection of a Federal office building on the site acquired for the Subtreasury in St. Louis, Mo.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BROWNING (on the request of Mr. ACKERMAN), for seven days, on account of illness.

To Mr. McDUFFIE, for three days, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Wednesday, January 14, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report for fiscal year 1919, showing exchanges made in department and bureaus of typewriters, adding machines, etc. (H. Doc. No. 593); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting deficiency estimate of appropriations required by the Navy Department to compensate owners for a tract of land on Paris Island, S. C. (H. Doc. No. 594); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting statement of receipts and expenditures in connection with the operation of the sewerage system at Fort Monroe, Va., fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 595); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation required for "Construction and operation of railroads in Alaska," fiscal year 1921 (H. Doc. No. 596); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 597); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required for "Photolithographing, Patent Office," fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 598); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required for public printing and binding and for other expenses of the Government Printing Office, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 599); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a proposed paragraph of legislation authorizing the accounting officers of the Treasury Department to credit in the accounts of the special disbursing agents of St. Elizabeths Hospital amounts paid, or to be paid, in carrying out the provisions of the act of July 19, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 600); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which have been presented to this department and require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 601); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered against the Government by the district courts of the United States, as submitted by the Attorney General, and which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 602); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MINAHAN, of New Jersey, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10689) for the relief of the owners of a drill boat known as drill boat No. 3 and a dredge known as dredge No. 9, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 540), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACCRATE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9794) for the relief of Wendell Phillips Lodge, No. 365, Knights of Pythias, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 541), 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. CARSS: A bill (H. R. 11717) for the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station at Cloquet, Minn., in cooperation with the University of Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 11718) providing that agents be sent into the South American Republics and into China and Japan for the purpose of inquiring into our trade relations with those countries and urging the use of American cotton goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 11719) to provide for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building thereon in the city of Delta, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 11720) to provide for the erection of a public building at Crystal Springs, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WISE: A bill (H. R. 11721) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a post-office building at the city of Monticello, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11722) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a post-office building at the city of Thomaston, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11723) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a post-office building at the city of Jackson, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 11724) to amend the act for the promotion of vocational education in respect to the board created thereby; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 11725) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Bloomsburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11726) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Milton, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 11727) to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Florida at or in the vicinity of the Government cut, Miami Beach, Dade County; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11728) providing for a site for a post office at Jacksonville, Duval County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 11729) to permit traveling salesmen to deduct expenses for meals and lodging in computing their net incomes for income purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 11730) to increase the efficiency of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEE: A bill (H. R. 11731) authorizing the Postmaster General to enter into contracts with telegraph and telephone companies for the transmission of letters by electrical means of communication; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HERSMAN: A bill (H. R. 11732) to provide for a public building at San Jose, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Resolution (H. Res. 435) for the consideration of House bill 10074; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 436) for the consideration of Senate bill 3076; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PORTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 273) directing the President to require the exhumation and transportation forthwith of the bodies of all persons now buried in foreign countries who gave their lives in the late war in the service of the United States or in the service of the Allies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 11733) granting a pension to Ira Fouche; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 11734) granting an increase of pension to Daniel L. Portley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COSTELLO: A bill (H. R. 11735) granting a pension to William Costello; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 11736) for the relief of Reinman & Wolfort; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 11737) granting a pension to Mary Martha Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 11738) for the relief of Nels D. Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCGLENNON: A bill (H. R. 11739) for the relief of William Marzahl; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAINEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 11740) for the relief of Joseph A. Choate; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 11741) for the relief of Mrs. Emma La Mee; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11742) granting an increase of pension to Sylvanus Strang; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11743) granting a pension to Thomas J. Herndon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11744) granting an increase of pension to Peter L. Tremper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 11745) granting a pension to William Eldmond; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 11746) to authorize the President to appoint Capt. Harold K. Hines, United States Navy, retired, a rear admiral on the retired list of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 11747) granting a pension to Leonard H. Hemphill; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

844. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Honolulu Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, favoring the formation of a separate air department to combine the air service of the Army and Navy and increasing the appropriation for equipment and personnel of the aerial forces, naval and military, now stationed in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

845. Also, petition of Edward F. W. Beyer, of Wendel, Calif., regarding the conduct of certain officials of the Government of the United States during the recent World War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

846. By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of Hanson Post, American Legion, Amarillo, Tex., condemning the I. W. W.'s, the Bolsheviks, and the radicals, and their acts and teachings, and calling upon Congress for legislation to punish such exponents of violence and revolution and to deport aliens that are undesirable; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

847. By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, to improve our foreign service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

848. By Mr. CARSS: Petition of Eveleth Commercial Club, of Eveleth, Minn., regarding proposed hydroaeroplane station at Duluth; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

849. Also, petition of M. S. Bersaglieri Society, of Duluth; Societa Italiana, of Hibbing; Society Christoforo Colombo, of Chisholm; Italian Social Club, of Duluth; Piemonte Society, of Hibbing; all in the State of Minnesota, regarding the immigration laws of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

850. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of Malden Post, No. 69, American Legion, asking for extra compensation for service men to the amount of \$1 per day of service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

851. Also, petition of Stoneham Post, No. 115, American Legion, Stoneham, Mass., protesting against the admission of Victor L. Berger to the Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Select Committee on Victor L. Berger Investigation.

852. Also, petition of Melrose Post, No. 90, American Legion, Melrose, Mass., protesting against the admission of Victor L. Berger to the Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Select Committee on Victor L. Berger Investigation.

853. Also, petition of executive committee of Associated Industries of Massachusetts relative to daylight saving; to the Committee on Agriculture.

854. By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of the Cleveland Advertising Club, urging the passage of the soldiers' land bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

855. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Rotary Club of Wausau, Wis., favoring the Davey sedition bill (H. R. 10650); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

856. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the La Salle (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce, concurring in the treaty of peace with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

857. Also, petition of E. V. Price & Co., of Chicago, protesting against the excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

858. Also, petition of the Illinois section of the American Association, favoring a water-supply service in connection with the reorganization of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

859. Also, petition of the Brotherhoods Joint Legislative Board of Illinois, opposing any legislation that will deprive railroad employees the right of collective bargaining and the right to strike; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

860. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Associated Industries of Massachusetts, favoring House bill 11126, introduced by Hon. F. W. Dallinger, entitled "To save daylight in the first zone"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

861. By Mr. McDUFFIE: Papers to accompany House bill 11217, granting a pension to Sadie L. Runyan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

862. By Mr. MAHER: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., for the recognition of the Republic of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

863. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the Pittsburgh Builders' Exchange, of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging a revision of antitrust acts and the enactment of effective laws embodying the principles of arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

864. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., for the recognition of the Republic of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

865. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, for relief of the famished people of central Europe and Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

866. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Lodge No. 1073, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Redding, Calif., relative to the spread of disloyalty and urging legislation to take care of the Bolsheviks and anarchists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

867. Also, petition of general manager of the California Cotton Mills Co., of Oakland, Calif., urging the return of the railroads to private ownership and the arbitration of all labor disputes between the employees and employers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

868. Also, petition of Red River Lumber Co., protesting against House bill 10738, providing for collective bargaining; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

869. Also, petition of Woman's Auxiliary, Local Post No. 64, Post Office Clerks, of Los Angeles, Calif., placing themselves on record as indorsing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

870. Also, petition of Tegner Farm Center, of Turlock, Calif., relative to Japanese immigration to this country; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

871. Also, petition of Parents Teachers' Association, of Placerville, El Dorado County, Calif., indorsing the Smith-Lever bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

872. Also, petition of Leese & Gottfried Co., of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against House bill 8315, the Siegel bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

873. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts indorsing House bill 11126, introduced by Hon. F. W. Dallinger, entitled "To save daylight in the first zone"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

874. By Mr. WARD: Petition of Willard L. Parker and other members of Dairymen's League of Hunter, N. Y., favoring enactment into law of Capper-Hersman legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 14, 1920.

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

Almighty God, Thy law is the law of all worlds and of all time, eternal and unchanging and perfect, and we seek to transcribe Thy law into the customs, manners, and purposes of this great Nation. We come to Thee for Thy guidance and blessing that we may have the inspiration to know the things of God, to write them in the forms of our laws and of our customs in our day. Guide us in the discharge of the duties of this day. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore took the chair.

On request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Harris	Moses	Smith, Md.
Ball	Harrison	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Henderson	New	Spencer
Calder	Hitchcock	Newberry	Stanley
Capper	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Starling
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Sutherland
Colt	Kendrick	Overman	Thomas
Culberson	Kenyon	Page	Townsend
Cummins	King	Phipps	Trammell
Curtis	Kirby	Pittman	Wadsworth
Dial	Lenroot	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Lodge	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	McCormick	Robinson	Warren
Gerry	McCumber	Sheppard	Watson
Gronna	McKellar	Sherman	Wolcott
Hale	McLean	Simmons	
Harding	McNary	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. MOSES. I announce the absence from the city of my colleague [Mr. KEYES] on account of illness in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent due to illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. TRAMMELL. My colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], is detained by illness.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] are detained by illness in their families.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] and the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] are absent on official business.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is detained from the Senate on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 69) appointing a commission to report on conditions in the Virgin Islands, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 484. An act to provide for the erection of a Federal office building on the site acquired for the Subtreasury in St. Louis, Mo.; and

H. R. 7752. An act relating to detached service of officers of the Regular Army.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pratt and Osborne Counties, in the State of Kansas, and of the congregation of the Brethren Church of the southeast district of Kansas, remonstrating against universal military training, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to present a memorial from men who claim to speak for 600 employees of a large manufacturing plant in Atlanta, Ga., urging that in the pending legislation provision be made to prevent any suspension of the operation of railroads. The memorial is short, and I ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

ATLANTA, GA., January 10, 1920.

We, the undersigned, representing more than 600 employees of the Frank E. Block Co., wish to insist that our Representatives in Congress use their utmost influence to put through a law that will make it impossible to stop the operation of a railroad.

We feel that too much time has already been lost discussing the demands of the owners, as well as the demands of labor, and that the time has come when the great mass of American people, consisting of the manufacturers, the employees thereof, the mercantile and the clerical people, and the general traveling public need to have some consideration.

For the past two years the employees and traveling representatives of manufacturing and mercantile establishments have been too often put on the anxious bench by numerous threatened tie-ups of railroads.

We want to be assured of continuous supplies of raw material, so that we can continue at work, and that our food is to be brought to us without delay.

ED. F. LOGAN,

Chairman, Chief Engineer for Frank E. Block Co.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I present also a memorial from Atlanta Lodge, No. 65, Order of Railway Expressmen, of Georgia,