

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 13556) to create a bureau of aeronautics and a naval flying corps in the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PELL: A bill (H. R. 13557) to amend the provisions of laws regulating the collection of taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 332) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULLEN: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, regarding the canals of the State of New York; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 13529) for the relief of I. James Riggin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13530) for the relief of Annie Ellis; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13531) to correct the military record of Thomas H. Caldwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13532) for the relief of William J. Harris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 13533) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Staggers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13534) granting an increase of pension to George F. Portwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13535) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Stricker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13536) granting an increase of pension to John W. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13537) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Clennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13538) granting an increase of pension to James F. Denney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 13539) granting an increase of pension to Charles O. Woensner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13540) granting an increase of pension to Simon E. Foust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 13541) granting relief to Lee M. Allen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 13542) for the relief of the Liberty loan subscribers of the North Penn Bank, of Philadelphia, Pa.; the Santa Rosa National Bank, of Santa Rosa, Calif.; and the Mineral City Bank, of Mineral City, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 13543) granting a pension to Arminta Lary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13544) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 13545) for the relief of Edward C. Jacobs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13546) for the relief of George C. Hussey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 13547) granting an increase of pension to Dwight D. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13548) to correct the military record of A. G. Vincent; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 13549) granting an increase of pension to William Endicott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 13550) granting an increase of pension to Georgia A. Godard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 13551) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Mumm; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 13552) granting a pension to Robert H. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13553) for the relief of Elizabeth C. Abbey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 13554) for the relief of the Garden City (Kans.) Water Users' Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2874. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Columbia Lodge, No. 174, International Association of Machinists, of Washington, D. C., urging relief of the war-time prisoners, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2875. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of members of the First Presbyterian Church of Gloversville, N. Y., urging enactment of legislation conserving integrity of the Government of Korea and affording protection to Christian missionaries engaged in missionary work in Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2876. By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of Henry P. Shupe Post, No. 22, of the American Legion, favoring the passage of House bill 13293; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2877. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of H. J. Heinz & Co., of Rock Island, Ill., opposing House bills 12379 and 12646; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2878. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the National Guard Association of the State of New York, favoring the recognition of the National Guard as a national body of citizen soldiery and urging Congress to provide for the reorganization of the National Guard under the Army clause of the Constitution; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2879. Also, petition of American Association for Labor Legislation, New York City, favoring retirement of civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

2880. By Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY: Petition of the St. Michael Archangel Society, Polish National Alliance of North America, Chicago, Ill., opposing the passage of Senate bill 3718; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SENATE.

SATURDAY, April 10, 1920.

Rev. Richard H. Bennett, D. D., of Lynchburg, Va., offered the following prayer:

Gracious Father, source of all wisdom and God of all power, we acknowledge Thy sovereignty and pray for Thy guidance. Thou hast graciously led us and blest us beyond our deserts. In our feebleness compared with Thy great strength, in our ignorance compared with Thy wisdom, children all in Thy sight, we ask Thy continued guidance and blessing.

We thank Thee for the gracious record of our Nation, and for the possibilities of the future that brighten and glorify the days to come. We pray Thee that the responsibilities of the present may be adequately met and that Thy guidance may be sought and obtained by all our citizenship high and low.

We pray Thy blessing upon Thy servant the President of the United States, that he may be restored to complete health and strength, and that all Thy people in every office may be guided by Thee. We pray Thy blessing upon each of us that we may be delivered from the mistakes that belong to human nature and that we may seek Thy holy will in all our doings.

We thank Thee for the gracious life that the Senate commemorates to-day and for the useful career of our departed friend and father. We pray Thee that the lessons of his life may be handed down, that we may profit thereby, and that the enrichment may come to us from the virtues that adorned his character.

We pray Thy blessing upon every Member of the Senate and upon the homes represented here, that Thy gracious protection and care may be given unto each and every one, that those in sickness may be delivered and strengthened, and that when life shall close with each of us we may look back upon days spent in accordance with Thy plans, to a life used as Thou hast given us wisdom to see it, and enter through the gates into that eternal city where Thy children shall gather when the battles of life are over and we come to the day of rest.

Grant these things in the name of our Savior. Amen.

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.

#### MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR MARTIN.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be read. The resolutions (S. Res. 347) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate expresses its profound sorrow in the death of the Hon. THOMAS STAPLES MARTIN, late a Senator from the State of Virginia.

*Resolved*, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate, pursuant to its order heretofore made, assemble to enable his associates to pay proper tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, we have convened to-day to pay appropriate tribute to the life, character, and achievements of our former colleague, Senator THOMAS S. MARTIN, of Virginia. Having been intimately associated with him for more than 30 years, I appreciate how inadequate are my powers of speech to give expression to the profound esteem, friendship, and admiration I entertained for him or properly to portray his many worth and great nobility of character. Under the shadows of a deep personal loss and sorrow in his death, silence, if permissible to me, would have been far preferable to speech. I am fully sensible that in his death I have lost my best, dearest, and most intimate friend.

Mr. President, Senator MARTIN was possessed of such high qualities of mind and character that he would have attained distinction in any line of human endeavor to which he had chosen to direct his energies. He thought directly, clearly. His mind was never encumbered with subtle distinctions nor beclouded by vague and far-distant deductions. He looked at things with a clear, unblinking vision—almost prophetic. No sophistry, no alluring eloquence could hold captive his strong, sturdy sense or induce him to depart from the tried pathway of prudence and good judgment into the unknown regions of uncertain adventure or experiment. This rugged granite strength made him a pillar of salvation in hours of doubt, panic, and stress. The more others became disturbed or excited, the greater was his composure, his thoughtful consideration. This quality inspired confidence and insured his leadership. No great commander on a field of battle could exhibit at critical times greater calmness, skill, and resourcefulness than he displayed in the many fierce conflicts which marked his long political life.

Senator MARTIN was not a plausible man, but he was a deeply wise one. Plausibility scintillates and shines upon the surface, but does not penetrate an inch beneath. Wisdom without glitter or glare goes to the deepest depths and sees the very foundation of things. He was wisdom personified. His rare good judgment, his prudent discretion, were so marked and well known that his advice was sought far and wide by those engaged in varied vocations. He was the wisest counselor I ever knew. Politicians, lawyers, large business men, governors, Senators, Cabinet members, and Presidents sought with confidence his advice and conclusions upon delicate and difficult matters. The public little knows the many acts of beneficial legislation, the wise solution of many difficult public questions that were due to his unerring judgment and forcible insistence. His opinion was expressed with the utmost frankness—sometimes it was almost brutal in its manly candor and courage. Equivocation and dissimulation were foreign to his mind and were scorned in all his expressions. He loathed a lie. His opinions were fixed and positive, and given regardless of those entertained by others. By nature it was impossible for him to be a timeserver or incense burner to those in high official position. His intellectual integrity, his candor of expression, he scorned to surrender to anyone. I have frequently witnessed exhibitions of this high quality which strikingly displayed his innate greatness and courage. One always obtained from Senator MARTIN the plain, unvarnished truth as he saw it. He was direct, positive, and candid in all dealings with his constituents. He abominated the petty, ingratiating arts of the demagogue and achieved his great political successes by masculine strength and courage.

The people of Virginia passionately admired him as a rugged oak where they could seek refuge and shelter in hours of storm and stress. In his long service in the Senate he never shirked a roll call nor dodged an issue. His conclusions were reached after the most thoughtful and careful consideration and when made were fearlessly expressed and firmly adhered to regardless of all personal and political consequences. He scorned by explanation or evasion to avoid full responsibility for any position ever assumed by him on public questions. He never acted hastily, and hence never apologized for his well-formed and firm convictions. These he could always successfully defend with the most cogent and convincing reasons.

Mr. President, Senator MARTIN was without exception the most indefatigable worker I ever knew. He was a marvel of industry and energy. He had no recreation except such as was obtained from varied but incessant work. Possessed of a splendid constitution, always working orderly and intelligently, the amount of work he could efficiently dispose of was prodigious.

So great was his capacity for work that he could attend to the smallest wishes of his constituency and still find ample time to study and dispose of the large public questions which his important position placed under his direction. He had a genius for detail. He completely mastered all measures which were under his control in the Senate. His knowledge of them was excelled by none. The ease and facility with which he passed so many important measures through the Senate were largely due to the fact that the Senate had full confidence in his judgment and integrity, and knew he was fully informed upon all the details and phases of the legislation he proposed. It was wonderful the great mass of detail his memory was able to retain.

Mr. President, combined with these admirable, sterling qualities was a heart as loyal to every demand of friendship as ever pulsated in human breast. It can be said with equal truth of him, as was said of Old Hickory, President Jackson, "he never failed a friend, he never forgot a favor." No considerations of personal comfort, no apprehension of personal detriment, no promptings of personal profit, could ever induce him to fail a friend or refuse any demand that friendship had a right to claim. This quality was almost a passion with him. How frequently in the political strife of our State have I seen him unhesitatingly and firmly take his stand for loyal friends against excited clamor and when he knew success was not possible. These considerations did not slightly influence him; his loyal heart resolutely determined, despite all personal consequences, fully to meet friendship's demands. This marked characteristic gave him a personal and devoted following equaled by none in our State. Men became attached to him with hooks of iron and steel, which nothing could sever. This firm and enthusiastic following gave him a permanency in politics which can never be attained by those who simply strive to sail with popular breezes. No man when convinced of the rectitude of his conduct could more resolutely face a storm. Another quality which he possessed almost to heroic proportions was the composure with which he could meet unavoidable misfortunes. He bore his own worries and troubles without burdening others. His life was composed of sparkling sunshine and darkened shadows, each of which he passed through with calm courage. He knew his last illness would be fatal, yet he neither quailed nor quivered when brought face to face with death.

In his last hours he forcibly reminded me of the noblest of Roman senators, calmly gathering his robes around him and fearlessly meeting inevitable death, which awaits us all. He entertained no apprehensions of the great future beyond.

Mr. President, Senator MARTIN possessed in a preeminent degree those domestic virtues and that honorable moral character which are so highly cherished in Virginia and which she scrupulously requires of her public men. He was pure in mind, in thought, and in conduct. No stain ever followed his footsteps. No suggestion of scandal, public or private, ever besmirched his fair name. He was the soul of generosity and liberal, honorable dealing. Like Virginians, the ties of blood and relationship were strong and enduring. His personal life was one of service and sacrifice for others. From early boyhood, when the loss of his father left him the head and main support of a large family, to his death he toiled and thought more for the comfort of those near and dear to him than for himself. His deep devotion, his constant care of and attention to his aged mother, form beautiful chapters in the story of his magnificent life. He was a most affectionate and responsive brother, a most considerate, devoted, and unselfish father. He was a husband of rare excellence, possessed of an absorbing love and ever happy in bestowing sweet, loving attentions. Those of us who knew him intimately realized that several years ago the large part of his happiness and most of the sunshine of his life were buried in the grave with his beautiful, brilliant, and charming wife. This man of iron strength and resolution gave new graces to social life, brought new charms to domestic felicity.

Mr. President, Senator MARTIN's success was founded more on solid than shining qualities and was builded securely on the strong foundation of substantial moral character and thorough reliability. These virtues are indispensable to permanent success in public life.

No brilliance of genius, no witchery of oratory, no fascinations of personality can supply the deficiency. The possessing of these sterling virtues in a preeminent degree by Andrew Jackson enabled him to repeatedly defeat the genius of Webster and Clay combined. How strikingly is this truth illustrated in the life of Mirabeau, the great Frenchman. Mirabeau was a marvelous character, endowed with tireless energy, a resolute, courageous heart, a fervid patriotism, a surpassing eloquence. He possessed every virtue but moral character. On account of this defect he was never able to obtain the complete confidence of the French people so as to be able to control and direct

their destiny. In the hours of his greatest power he never had influence sufficient to stabilize the great reforms he advocated and to place France safely in the pathway of sane betterment. Thus poor France had to endure all the terrors of the Revolution, suffer all the vicissitudes of Napoleon, because her greatest man, the one capable and desirous of saving her, was powerless to do so for lack of strong moral character sufficient to inspire the complete trust of the French people, which was indispensable for the accomplishment of the Herculean task. One of the crying needs of the world to-day is more statesmanship founded in rugged moral character, capable of squarely meeting the difficult problems confronting us and dealing with them with firm hand and resolute will. We need to-day brave, unflinching Catos, fearlessly facing troubles, more than eloquent Ciceros, glozing over evils and lulling us with pleasing platitudes and alluring prophecies. The world seems to acquire each year more exquisite flowers, but possesses less rugged oaks for refuge in hours of storm and stress. Many of our public men are like our modern clothes, very beautiful in the gaudy colors of their new freshness, but not able to stand the wear and tear of continual use and soon become faded and threadbare.

But, Mr. President, this was not true of Senator MARTIN. On account of the fierce political contests he was continuously engaged in, no man ever lived more completely than he in the pitiless light of publicity. Enmity and jealousy engaged in every exaggeration of criticism and faultfinding, yet during his long public service each receding year brought him increased confidence, enlarged influence, and greater popularity. Five successive times did the people of Virginia emphasize their trust and affection for him by commissioning him to represent them in this august assembly, the highest honor at their disposal. The last time he had no opposition in the Democratic primary, none in the general election. He was the unanimous choice of the Virginia people. His manly worth, his genuine merit, his sturdy character, his valuable and patriotic service had so deeply impressed the people of Virginia that with one accord they demanded he should represent them in these troublous and perilous times. Virginia has bestowed upon Senator MARTIN honors which she has conferred upon but few of her public men. These honors so generously given by a State made illustrious by so many distinguished sons, coming from a people possessed of lofty ideals and traditions inherited from a glorious past, should fill to full measurement any man's pride and ambition.

Mr. President, a distinguished writer has well observed that the life of every man is as the wellspring of a stream, whose small beginning is indeed plain to all, but whose ultimate course and destination as it winds through the expanse of years only the Omniscient can discern. Is it to be a nameless brook and will its tiny waters commingling with such others only increase the current of some famed river? Or is it to receive such rills as a sovereign and become a large, magnificent river serving and fertilizing large districts, known far and wide? How forcibly is this exemplified in the life of our departed colleague.

Who could have foretold, watching his early beginning, without wealth, unassisted by influential friends, that the day was not far distant when, with only the assistance of his strong arm and resolute will, he would become the most distinguished citizen of the great Commonwealth of Virginia and one of the most influential statesmen of this Nation? The tiny stream born amid the hills of Albemarle had increased and enlarged its current of life until it became a large, famed river, bearing on its bosom rich treasures for his State and Nation. His large, full life presents an inspiring story of continuous effort and honest endeavor. We first behold him as a boy matriculated at the Virginia Military Institute during the latter years of the Civil War. He insisted upon volunteering for service in the Confederate Army, but being a mere boy and too young for enlistment, his father compromised the matter by permitting him to attend this famous military institute in order to prepare him for future military service. During his attendance here he was most studious, stood high in his classes, and was most observant of the rules of strict discipline required. He was loved and esteemed by his classmates and acquired a leadership in college far beyond what could be expected in one so young. The friendships here formed continued through life, and his boyhood associates during his long political life were ever his most devoted and determined supporters. The faculty of forming firm ties of friendship and esteem was as marked in his boyhood as in his later days. When the military pressure upon the Confederacy during the last years of the war became overwhelming the corps of cadets at the Virginia Military Institute were ordered to join the Confederate Army and participate in the defense of Richmond.

Thus, at the age of 16, Senator MARTIN became a Confederate soldier and served as such until the collapse of the Confederacy. As a mere boy he cheerfully endured without murmur or com-

plaint all the severe privations, hardships, and dangers incident to the last year of this great war. Language is powerless to describe the intense suffering to which the Confederate soldier was subjected during the concluding months of this war. Only those who passed through the terrible experience can form any conception of the awful destitution in food and clothing—an army surrendered because the government it served had become powerless to arm, feed, and clothe it. Senator MARTIN served with the Confederate Army around Richmond during the time immediately preceding and following the evacuation of the city and the final collapse of the Confederacy by the surrender of Gen. Lee. When the end finally came and the Confederate Army was practically disbanded and each soldier driven to the necessity of providing for himself, the means employed by this mere boy, amid the general confusions and enveloping dangers to escape capture and to reach his home, form a remarkable record of adventure, daring, and resourcefulness. It evinced that a short army experience had transformed a boy into a capable and courageous man. He was a fine type of the Confederate youth, returning manfully and hopefully to rebuild a prostrate country and to bind up the bleeding wounds produced by a protracted war and to readjust a social and political system which misfortune had overthrown. The rebuilding and development of the South from the ruins of the Civil War is the most marvelous story in the history of mankind and furnishes an enduring monument to the ability and patriotism of the returned Confederate soldier.

Those soldiers, like Senator MARTIN, made brave from burdens borne and overcome, made patient by sacrifice and long suffering, cherishing to a passion the love of State and section for which they had ventured all, fearlessly faced an adverse future and directed all the energies of heart, mind, and body to restore to their beloved South its former prosperity, greatness, and power. The wonderful work achieved bears everlasting testimony to the industry and genius of the architects. The world never possessed a more self-reliant and resolute class of men than those that directed the destiny of the South immediately following the Civil War.

Mr. President, returning home, Senator MARTIN devoted all his energies to the completion of his education and proper equipment for the practice of law as a profession. He attended the University of Virginia, and was noted for his studious habits and strong, lucid mind. Being thoroughly prepared for the practice of law, he was admitted to the bar and located at Scottsville, in Albemarle County, a small town, where he was born and had resided. By industry, strict attention to business, honesty, and frankness in dealing with clients, and his great ability as a lawyer and advocate, he soon acquired a large and lucrative practice in Albemarle and all the surrounding counties. There were few important cases in his section of the State in which his services were not engaged. He regularly attended the county and circuit courts of more than half a dozen adjacent counties. There is no greater school in the world for the development of clear, logical reasoning, cogent and forcible expression, ready resourcefulness, and efficient management of men than that furnished by the practice of law on country circuits.

Far from elaborate libraries and legal authorities, lawyers were compelled to settle intricate and delicate questions of law by force of their own logical reasoning and argument or effective persuasion to court and jury. Legal contests became a severe clash of mind and not a race of industry in collecting authorities and decisions. From this school have emerged our most eminent lawyers, orators, and statesmen. From it came Patrick Henry, the most eloquent and effective of all American orators; Chief Justice John Marshall, the greatest of all modern judges; also Douglas, Lincoln, Andrew Jackson, Clay, and many others, who constitute our most distinguished and successful of public men. Those who are capable of successfully surviving the severe mental contests here daily encountered become equipped for service in any arena.

Senator MARTIN practiced for years in a circuit composed of counties the members of whose bars were noted for their ability and learning, and he attained great preeminence among the distinguished lawyers with whom he came in contact. His reputation for legal ability and learning was so marked that there was a widespread movement to elect him to the court of appeals, the highest judicial tribunal of our State. I am sure this would easily have been accomplished if he had consented. But for his refusal he would have become a member of this high court, and I am sure would have become distinguished as a great jurist, whose legal acumen and learning would have adorned our judicial history.

Mr. President, while assiduously engaged in the prosecution of his legal profession, like all country lawyers Senator MARTIN took a deep and active interest in politics and became the most

potential and controlling factor in the politics of his section of the State. The people of the counties in which he practiced, knowing him intimately and entertaining for him an abiding confidence and esteem, early accepted his leadership, and all through his political career were his enthusiastic supporters and admirers.

From early manhood he took a profound interest in the important public questions agitating his State, and the wise solution of many of these was the product of his brain and bore the impress of his forceful hand. He was largely instrumental in the final settlement of the State debt of Virginia on a basis just and fair to all concerned, and thus brought financial and political peace to the State, which for years had been agitated by unseemly political divisions and unfortunate financial distress.

Modest, unassuming, never seeking publicity, willing to work and let others receive the credit, years before it was generally known he was the guiding spirit in the management of the Democratic Party of Virginia; its wisest and most trusted adviser. The leaders of the party from all sections of the State continuously sought his counsel and assistance. For years, with no prospect of personal advancement, his time and means were unselfishly and unstintingly given to the service of his party. When Mr. John S. Barbour was elected chairman of the Democratic Party of Virginia, under whose leadership the control of the State was rescued from the opposition party, during the years he held this position Senator MARTIN as a member of the executive committee was his closest, most trusted adviser, the man to whom he looked more than all others for guidance and assistance. Senator MARTIN justly received a part of the great credit accorded his able chieftain for the splendid victories achieved.

When Senator Barbour suddenly died many of the Democratic leaders, who were acquainted with Senator MARTIN's valuable and unselfish work in behalf of the party and knew his great ability and industry, united with the party's younger element and insisted that Senator MARTIN should become a candidate for the United States Senate as Mr. Barbour's successor. Not until then had the thought of political preferment stirred Senator MARTIN's aspirations. He consented, and precipitated one of the closest, fiercest political fights ever waged in Virginia, finally winning over Gen. Fitzhugh Lee, a gallant and distinguished Confederate officer, a man of great charm, ability, and deserved popularity. This contest engendered bitterness and produced political divisions which lasted for years. However, when in 1918 Senator MARTIN was reelected for the fifth time to the United States Senate as the unanimous choice of all parties and all the people of Virginia, it was clearly demonstrated that these enmities were obliterated, these party divisions had faded, and that around his strong personality clustered the confidence, esteem, and affection of an entire State. Worth, merit, and service had thus won a great triumph and been properly acclaimed by an appreciative people.

Mr. President, when Senator MARTIN entered the Senate in 1895 the few following years it was composed of men of unusual capacity and distinction. There were times before in its history when it contained a few men of superior merit and eminence, when it possessed towering giants like Clay, Webster, and Calhoun, but never before nor since has the average ability of its Members been surpassed. The Senate was replete with men whose ability, eloquence, and genius would have adorned the legislative body of any age or country. The very mention of their names recalls animated debates, stirring scenes, historic incidents, and important legislation with which they were connected.

Serving in the Senate at the time was Hoar, of Massachusetts, author of innumerable judicial acts, a great lawyer, eloquent and scholarly; Daniel, of Virginia, a great law writer, an orator of marvelous eloquence and polish; Morgan, of Alabama, an encyclopedia of information, possessed of a facility and purity of expression never surpassed; Depew, of New York, able, pleasing, and scintillating with wit and sunshine; Vest, of Missouri, whose every sentence glistened with brilliance, wit, epigram, and sarcasm, the very Rupert of debate; Hale, of Maine, a ready, incisive debater, a most dangerous antagonist; Harris, of Tennessee, the best parliamentarian in the body, sharp and incisive in speech, swift and direct in action, overwhelming in repartee; Blackburn, of Kentucky, genial, lovable, with a copious flow of rich, stirring eloquence; Allison, of Iowa, always calm and composed, logical and persuasive in statement, possessed of unbounded wisdom and prudence; Gorman, of Maryland, most astute manager of men, able and farsighted, leader of the Democratic minority; Aldrich, of Rhode Island, the maker of tariffs, financial expert, whose master mind and skillful hand dominated the Republican majority; Quay, of Pennsylvania,

Platt, of New York, Hanna, of Ohio—three of the most masterful political managers this country ever produced; illuminating the Senate with ability and learning were Teller, of Colorado; Davis, of Minnesota; Proctor, of Vermont; Jones, of Arkansas; and many others whom time will not permit me to mention. It was a splendid body of men, comporting themselves with the dignity and reserve expected of the greatest parliamentary body in the world. While the atmosphere of the Senate was cold and austere, yet its proceedings were conducted with a stately decorum, with such profound respect for the Senate's past high traditions, that the assembly inspired universal confidence and esteem.

This was a body in which sham and pretense could make no progress. Entering the Senate, composed of men of such genuine capacity and character, Senator MARTIN wisely pursued the course that soon brought him the esteem and confidence of the Members. He engaged in no dramatic performances, made no spectacular speeches to obtain publicity or notoriety, but scrupulously and conscientiously discharged every duty assigned him by the Senate. He was constant in his attendance at the daily sessions, and an indefatigable and efficient worker upon all the committees to which he was appointed. He early demonstrated that he was a working, useful Senator, who did things and not merely talked about things. He considered a good piece of legislation silently enacted far more desirable than a brilliant, sensational speech delivered. His efforts ran to useful achievements, not to frequent speeches. He believed the Senate was a legislative body and should promptly enact needed legislation, and strongly disapproved of its perversion into an arena for mere oratorical display to enhance the reputation of the speaker or to serve propaganda purposes. When he spoke he addressed himself directly to the pending question; was sincere, earnest, clear, and convincing, and always had the attention of the entire Senate. The Senate realized that when Senator MARTIN was prompted to speak he had something important to say on a vital question, that he had mastered the matter in all its details and far-reaching effects, and that his acknowledged wisdom and prudence demanded his suggestions should receive the most serious consideration. Without oratorical display or ornamentation, he was a most forceful speaker. When interrupted he was ready and effective in rejoinder, and in debate able and skillful. He never used written, prepared speeches, yet his diction was fine, his words aptly selected, and he studiously avoided all superfluity of expression. His speeches were so correct when delivered that he rarely, if ever, subjected them to revision.

He was most courteous and considerate to all Senators. No Senator possessed in a greater degree the universal good will, friendship, and esteem of the entire body than did Senator MARTIN. From the time he entered the Senate until his death he daily increased in influence and reputation. His was an enduring growth, founded on strength and substantial merit. He sought to shun the meteoric reputation obtained by blazing a few days athwart the skies of public attention and then disappearing forever into the infinity of oblivion.

At the time of his death Senator MARTIN was firmly established in the confidence of the Senate and country as one of our ablest public men, one whose advice and direction were wise and invaluable.

Mr. President, as leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Senator MARTIN had imposed upon him a responsibility, and exercised an influence in the prosecution of the war with Germany second only to that of the President of the United States. A larger part of the appropriations necessary for the conduct of the war emanated from his committee; these bills, and many other important measures, indispensable for a successful and vigorous waging of war, passed the Senate under his guidance and direction.

The great work thus accomplished by him can not be overestimated. To secure the prompt passage of these measures, many of which encountered much opposition, required the exercise of great parliamentary skill and leadership. His tact, his ability to reconcile differences, to propitiate opposition, to unite discordant elements in his own party, were never displayed to greater advantage than during this war; and through the exercise of these qualities so preeminently possessed by him many a bill, the passage of which at first seemed hopeless, finally received legislative sanction. His calm patience, his constant persistence, his restrained silence, secured the passage of his measures with marked ease and promptness. The Senate recognized that when he took charge of a bill its passage through the Senate was assured within a reasonable time and with little change and no mutilation. The facility with which he secured the passage of legislation was almost unrivaled. He was never

known, as others have been, to destroy his bill by his own interminable debate. He studiously refrained from speech except when it was absolutely necessary.

Mr. President, the heavy burdens and weighty responsibilities imposed upon Senator MARTIN by the important position held by him during the war were greater than his strength could bear. His unceasing work, day and night, without rest or recreation, the continuous pressure upon him as leader of the majority, and the anxieties and responsibilities incident to the position undermined his health and left him at the conclusion of the war a physical wreck. Despite the solemn warning his physicians gave him that unless he desisted from his strenuous life fatal results might ensue, and the constant solicitations of his friends not to destroy his health, he firmly refused in the critical time of the war to abandon his post of duty, and thus unselfishly and patriotically sacrificed his life to public service.

It is by the lives and sacrifice of such men as Senator MARTIN that States and nations progress along correct lines and are made strong and great.

A poet has well expressed it:

What builds a nation's pillars high  
And makes it great and strong?  
What makes it mighty to defy  
The foes that 'round it throng?

Not gold, but only men can make  
A nation great and strong;  
Men who for truth and honor's sake  
Hold still and suffer long.

Brave men who work while others sleep,  
Who dare when others sigh;  
They build a nation's pillars deep  
And lift it to the sky.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I had been two years a Senator when Senator MARTIN entered the Senate. We served together for a quarter of a century, and during that time I came to know him very well, our friendship, although we were of different parties, increasing with each succeeding year. There is a large opportunity for the growth of friendship in the Senate, because, after all, it is here that our waking hours are chiefly passed and our fellow Senators are men whom we see every day and with whom we are engaged steadily and for long periods in a common work for a common purpose.

When the contemporary service of two Senators reaches to 25 years, the constant relationship necessarily draws them very closely together. In this way opportunity was given me to know Senator MARTIN very well, and the more I knew him the more attached I became to him. He had never held public office until he came to the Senate, differing in that respect from most of his colleagues, but from the start he showed his large natural capacity for the important work of legislation, and, wholly apart from the party measures, which, after all, do not occupy most of the time, he proved himself a thoroughly good legislator, following all the business and earnest to secure the best results. He was a man of strong opinions which he sustained with great vigor and persistence. This was shown by his service in the Confederate Army when he was a mere boy, and the same qualities went with him through life. He was a thorough American, devoted to his country and his State, and anything un-American not only met with no sympathy from him but roused his energetic resistance. He was attached to all the traditions of the country, to those policies by which the country has been built up and which are distinctively American. Never were such men more needed than at this precise time, and although he had passed the Psalmist's age, his departure leaves a great gap in the Senate to those who had long served with him.

He was always zealous for the prompt transaction of the public business, and the delays which sometimes characterize the Senate tried his patience severely. He often said to me that there was no subject which a man could not discuss sufficiently in an hour, and he did not suffer long speeches gladly, but he could always be depended upon to drive forward the business of the Government and the legislation necessary to carry that Government on properly and efficiently. In all personal relations he was one of the most agreeable and companionable of men and a good friend if there ever was one. He was above all things loyal. In his early days loyal to his State and to the cause which his State then espoused, proud of her great traditions and of the service which she had rendered throughout our history. He was equally loyal to the United States when he became one of the great body which plays so large a part in the National Government. But his loyalty of disposition did not stop at principles of government or the traditions of the Nation and the State. He was loyal to his friends. Whether they were of the same party as he or not made no difference.

If he had once admitted a man to his personal friendship, he was always loyal to him, and I have seen him on the floor of the Senate resent with characteristic warmth a base attack upon a Senator of the opposite party with the same earnestness with which he would have resented an attack upon one of his own political faith. Qualities like these never fail to make a man lovable, and while he had the respect of everyone he also commanded their affection. He rose to be the leader of his party in the Senate, and no man ever filled that responsible position better than he. Such a man whenever death comes can not but be a great loss. It is commonly and probably truthfully said that there are no indispensable men, but there are, nevertheless, those whose place, whether in friendship or in public life, it is very hard to fill and who leave behind them a vacant place of which all men who have been privileged to know them are deeply sensible. The Senate has been deprived by Senator MARTIN'S death of a man who added honor to its long history and who will be sadly missed by the friends whom he made in public life who best knew his worth, his warm affections, and his many admirable and attaching qualities. He worked on despite increasing illness, with no abatement of interest in the questions before him and no diminution in his ruling determination that all duties should be conscientiously performed. Whatever his years, he was always young in mind, in heart, and in feeling. He died as he would have wished to die—in harness, with faculties undimmed, and he faced the end with all the personal courage which had gone with him through life.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, the world will always be the debtor to the State of Virginia for the great men she has given so generously and abundantly to the service of civilization.

Washington, Jefferson, Henry, Madison are the first of that brilliant and imperishable company. And now we have gathered to do honor to another great son of Virginia—THOMAS S. MARTIN.

It is not too much praise to say that in prophetic wisdom, loftiness, and purity of character and exalted patriotism he is without doubt worthy to be classed with those other great characters, now historic, and to whom he was so lately joined.

For THOMAS S. MARTIN grew white and grew poor in the performance of unostentatious, diligent, self-sacrificing service to his country.

There is a wholesome, indeed glorifying, lesson to be learned from his deliberate abandonment of the brilliant professional career, his for the taking, and which promised certain and large returns, in wealth, distinction, and ease, to carry on so faithfully his too often unappreciated public work for his State and his country in this body. Few can fully appreciate or assess the priceless worth of his life and labor for the public welfare.

Throughout it all, gradually growing poorer in worldly goods, he forgot his own advancement, his own loss, in his consuming desire to enrich the world by his efforts. To do his duty in his chosen field, as he saw it, was to him only worth while; that alone was to him priceless. His rugged, healthy, intellectual honesty accepted no compromise where principle was involved. His brains and hands knew no rest when there was work for the Republic to be done.

His loyalty to his convictions, his rare devotion to his many friends, his culture and clean heart, made all who knew him love him and few more than I. His all he gave his country ungrudgingly.

No man could give more; do more.

And we in this Chamber, as do the people of the land, who with us mourn his death, find ourselves powerless, helpless, to fill the unique place he so long held by undisputed title.

Senator MARTIN'S was a nature born to leadership. He was preeminently a leader always, though often without wishing to be. He left his work as leader here reluctantly.

For months with unflinching courage he looked forward to the end, fully realizing his desperate physical condition.

His regret even upon the eve of approaching dissolution was not that he must die, but rather that he must die leaving his task uncompleted, especially that the sort of peace he desired for the world to have must be made by other hands, if at all.

Historians can point to no finer record among English-speaking statesmen, idealized throughout the centuries past, than we have been privileged to see here for ourselves in the character and daily walk of THOMAS STAPLES MARTIN.

His inspiring life and example must in many effective ways persist, and can not fail to stimulate those of us who respect his ideals and love his memory to seek the more earnestly to carry forward the torch that lately fell from our leader's dying hands.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, it has been said, evidently by a somewhat misanthropic person, that human glory is but dust and ashes, and that we mortals are no more than shadows in pursuit of shadows.

But who can say that a man who has lived an upright and useful life for more than 72 years; who has devoted nearly a quarter of a century to the service of the public; who, like Abou Ben Adhem of old, has loved his fellow men, and has been fair and square in his dealings with them—who can say that he has lived in vain, and that when he passes to the great beyond he has left behind only dust and ashes, and shadows vanished and forgotten?

Such a man, possessing the qualities I have enumerated, was our beloved colleague, Senator MARTIN. An American through and through, a devoted worker in the interest of every cause which he believed to be beneficial to his country, and a man of splendid judgment as well, his departure meant a great loss to us personally and to the Senate officially.

All of us here recognized the fact that he was endowed with qualities such as are possessed by all men who follow political activities as a sort of "second nature." His ability to make and keep strong friendships, and to inspire and retain the respect of all who knew him, both friends and mere acquaintances, were among his many splendid attributes.

THOMAS STAPLES MARTIN was born at Scottsville, Albemarle County, Va., on July 29, 1847, where he lived until about 10 years ago. He then bought an estate near Charlottesville, which was his home until death claimed him.

In his youth he was a member of the battalion of cadets of the Virginia Military Institute, and he took part in the military service of the Confederate States, participating in the Battle of New Market and other engagements.

He began practicing law in the year 1869, and during the remainder of his life he devoted much time to that profession.

For more than 24 years he served the people of his State and of the country at large as a Member of the United States Senate, where his usefulness was continuously recognized and greatly appreciated by all of us who have had the honor of serving with him.

As we know, his seniority, as well as his ability and his capacity for hard work, finally brought him to the chairmanship of the Committee on Appropriations, where, during the war period, the great burdens of the country's money problems were constantly present. Senator MARTIN's responsibilities then became far greater than his physical endurance; but, regardless of the advice of friends and physicians, he remained on duty throughout that troublous period of our country's history and until stricken by the serious illness which five months later caused his untimely death.

As a matter of fact, he gave his life to his country in time of war just as our brave soldiers did who made the supreme sacrifice on the battle fields of France.

Such service, while there is nothing dramatic or sensational about it, was of inestimable worth to our Government. Senator MARTIN, a superior man by nature, had also the great assets of long experience as a legislator, years of devoted study of his country's needs, his memory of the lessons taught us by the Spanish-American War, which occurred during his first term as a Member of this body, and a sense of conscientious devotion to duty such as one does not find so keenly developed in the hearts of all public servants. He did not work for name or fame, for gratitude or glorification, but to fulfill his patriotic obligation to his Government to the best of his ability.

I lost a good and valued friend when Senator MARTIN was taken from us, and I shall always cherish in memory the pleasure and satisfaction I derived from service with him during our many years together as fellow committeemen and fellow Senators.

When the great day of judgment comes, the roll call of the State of Virginia will carry the names of many honored and illustrious dead. But present and future generations of the Old Dominion's children will hold no name in higher esteem than that of her beloved son, THOMAS STAPLES MARTIN.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I deem it a privilege to be permitted to say a few words in memory of Virginia's great Senator whom we have gathered to honor to-day.

During the turmoil of life and in the midst of the struggles and controversies of the Senate, we see as through a glass darkly. We are not always able to measure correctly the characteristics, the abilities, and the services of a public man. When death comes, however, and we look back upon the scenes through which we have passed, a clearer light is thrown upon the individual and upon his services, and certain qualities stand out in bold relief. With Senator MARTIN it seems to me to be

peculiarly true that his great value as a public man was due in a large respect to the strength of what we call the homely virtues.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] has delivered a beautiful tribute to his late colleague, and has analyzed his character in a most impressive way. What seemed to me to be the commanding quality in Senator MARTIN's character was his strength, and with that I include his courage, his steadiness of purpose, his determination to do his duty.

In these days, Mr. President, when the people of the United States are perhaps confronted with a danger of shirking duty, the services and the life of Senator MARTIN stand as a splendid example.

It appears to me that one of the consequences of this war has been a sort of moral let down in the Senate, a disposition quite general on the part of each individual to look after himself, to do as little as he can and get as much as he may. Senator MARTIN's life was laid along lines exactly contrary to that. He gave up more than 25 years of that life, more than a quarter of a century in time, to the service of his State, the service of his people, the service of the United States; and when I say he gave it up I am only echoing what has already been said, that his life here in Washington was one of continuous, unremitting toil and industry.

Think of the countless hours he spent in hard committee work; think of the endless days he spent in struggles in this Chamber; think of the thousands of trips he made to the departments here in Washington on public business or representing his constituents; think of all that he did for others during those 25 years, and you will realize that his life was an unselfish one; that it was a life of service and not a life of self-interest and self-promotion.

As has already been said, his work was characterized by a strict adherence to his sense of duty. He had a contempt for anything in the nature of a public shirk. He was brief and to the point. He was quick in reaching his decisions, as well as careful, and he was firm in adhering to them. He had a contempt for insincerity and hypocrisy. He had no use for the insincere man. He was direct and open and frank.

Mr. President, Senator MARTIN represented in an unusual degree a link between the past and the present. In this body there remain only a very few who occupy that position to-day. His life went back to the days of the Civil War, and it came forward to the days of the reconstituted American Republic. He represented the old as well as the new, and not many with that experience still remain in public life.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to count Senator MARTIN as my friend, and there are few men whom I have known whose friendship was more sincere, more disinterested, or more steadfast.

Senator MARTIN represented an element of great value in the public service of the United States. He represented a conservative element. The service he rendered to his country, however, was not confined to the exercise of a conservative judgment, but he became conspicuous and active, as his colleague has shown, in pushing to passage in the Senate the remarkable list of constructive acts of the present administration, done very largely under his leadership.

In mourning to-day the death of this great representative from Virginia the Senate does well to pay tribute to his memory. The great State of Virginia has lost one of her eminent men, one of her men who will be known in history, and the Senate has lost one of its most valuable Members, as his work here during a quarter of a century abundantly testifies.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, THOMAS S. MARTIN became a Member of the Senate on the 4th of March, 1895. Fourteen other Senators began their service in the Senate at the same time. Of this number all but four are dead, and of the living one is still in the Senate; and of the dead the following-named six died in the service of the Senate: Augustus O. Bacon, Stephen B. Elkins, John H. Gear, William J. Sewell, Benjamin R. Tillman, and THOMAS S. MARTIN, who was the last of the number to die and was the longest in the service of the Senate.

In the face of such a list of our departed associates, all men of high character and pronounced ability, we can not avoid reflecting upon the transitory character of human life and human activity, even among the bravest and the best. But while the span of life and activity may be brief and appear perishable, the result of the useful and good done and accomplished survives, though not always and for the moment visible, and is the chief legacy of our existence.

There is in the moral and intellectual world no broader or nobler field of usefulness than in a legislative body such as the

United States Senate, which has jurisdiction not only over domestic affairs but also, to some extent, over foreign affairs.

Legislators approach their duties from two different angles and on two different theories. One class seem to have no pronounced opinions on any important public question, but seek to be guided solely by what they conceive to be the opinion of the majority of the people they represent, without any regard to the intrinsic merits of the question. In other words, they court what they regard as most popular, even if their own judgment tells them it is unwise. Another class take a more serious and conservative view of their duty. While they are not oblivious of the views of the public, the masses of the people, if you please, yet they feel that it is their duty to exercise their own best judgment on great public questions, and if their judgment runs counter to public opinion for the time being they feel that it is their duty not only to act rightly and justly and according to their best judgment, but also to aim to instruct and to lead public opinion into the right channels. In other words, that they should not only be real leaders and guides in legislation but that they should also be real guides and instructors for their constituency. The masses of the public may sometimes, through misinformation or lack of information, go astray. In such a case it is the duty of the representative to give his constituency the necessary information and to guide them into true and just premises and conclusions.

The class I have first mentioned is, in the main, of a more modern type than the other class, and seems to some extent to be an outcome of the evolution that has taken place in recent years in our systems of nominations and elections.

Most of our prominent and leading legislators of former times, of bygone days, appear to have belonged to the second class to which I have referred. These great men of the past did not regard themselves as mere legislative automatons, to register temporary fluctuations of the so-called public pulse. They felt that first of all their constituents were entitled to the exercise of their best judgment and opinion on all great public questions, that this was an important part of their legislative functions. While they were willing to hear all and to counsel with all; yet, like jurymen, they must render their own judgment upon the law and facts of the case in hand and act accordingly. More than this, if it turned out that there was a conflict between their views and the views of their constituents founded on ignorance or misapprehension, then it was their duty to instruct, educate, and guide their constituents into the right channels and proper conclusion. The finest and greatest example of statesmen of this school is found in the men who framed our Federal Constitution. They formulated that great instrument according to their own opinions and upon their own judgment, without listening to clamor or voices from the outside; and when their work was assailed, after its completion, feeling that they were right, they defended it boldly, heroically, and effectively in speech and press against all assaults, and in the end secured its adoption after a great educational campaign.

Senator MARTIN belonged, by mental and moral equipment, to this school of legislators and statesmen. He came from good Virginia stock; had a liberal education in his native State, both of a civil and military character; became a good, sound, and reliable lawyer; and, above all, proved himself independent, trustworthy, fearless, reliable, and of sound judgment, both in private and public affairs. When he entered the Senate he came mentally and morally well equipped for the task, and he assumed the work of legislation in a serious and conservative spirit, determined to bear his full share of the legislative burden and to exercise his best judgment on all public questions.

Experience has long ago made it manifest to us who have been a long time in the Senate, as well as to others, that legislative activity is, in the main, exercised through two groups or classes of Senators. The members of one class are faithful and industrious in their committee work and in formulating and preparing legislative measures for the action of the Senate, while not as a rule participating to any great extent in the debates, beyond giving brief explanations and answering questions. Members of the other class give little or no attention to committee work, but devote their attention to the debate and discussion of legislative measures and public questions, elucidating and expounding the same from all angles and standpoints, and in this manner advising their colleagues as to the merits of measures that may have been overlooked by the committees, and above all keeping the public in touch with what is pending and going on in the halls of legislation. Members of this class, owing to the character of their work, are rather more in the limelight than those of the former class.

Senator MARTIN, in his legislative activity, belonged, in the main, to the first of these groups. He was a most faithful and industrious attendant of all meetings of committees of which he was a member, rendering in all such cases most valuable and

efficient service. I can bear witness to this fact, for I was associated with him on one of the important committees of the Senate during nearly all his service in this body. He was one of the most energetic of committee workers—fearless, thorough, and self-contained. And while his greatest task was in committee work, he was also a good debater. Measures that he had in charge on the floor of the Senate he would expound in an instructive and convincing manner, never failing to meet all questions propounded to him in a candid and convincing spirit.

He was, above all things, fearless and independent. With him it was always a question as to what was for the best of our country. Public clamor, if not based on justice and righteousness, made scant impression on him, and while he was beyond a question devoted to his State, yet his loyalty to the Union, to our common country and its interests, was ever uppermost and foremost in his thought and labors. He was emphatically a most pronounced exponent of the new South. He was actuated by the sentiment—

Let the dead past bury its dead,  
Act, act in the living present,  
Heart within and God o'erhead.

He was not given to what I term mere academic oratory or debate. He was content to confine his discussion to pending of proposed measures, and never indulged in mere political oratory. As a debater he was instructive, sincere, earnest, and convincing, and as such often proved a balm on the flights of oratory of an opponent. He was a pronounced and determined enemy of all shams and of all camouflage. Neither was he a man of lofty airs or high pretensions. He was a plain, hard-working, and most industrious Senator, who was content to do his work and allotted task without the blare of trumpets and beating of cymbals. He aimed at practical and wholesome results, and to this he devoted his energy and his life. A Senate composed of such men as Senator MARTIN would never go far astray and would be more likely to formulate and enact needed measures for the welfare of the country than a mere galaxy of orators, however gifted they might be as such. Mere oratory may lubricate the legislative wheels, but it hardly ever furnishes the real material or the real labor.

During the last year of the Civil War Senator MARTIN was a cadet at the Virginia Military Institute, and as such served in the Confederate forces during the closing days of the war. He and Senator BANKHEAD, who soon followed him in death, were the last survivors of the Confederate armies in this Chamber. Two soldiers of the Union armies are still in our midst, both advanced in years. When they are finally mustered out, which can not be far off, this Chamber will have no longer in its ranks any representative of those mighty hosts which more than 50 years ago so heroically and bravely struggled for supremacy. While the cause of the Union won, the glory of the soldier, Union and Confederate alike, survives. They were all Americans, and all fought as only Americans can fight; and their descendants who fought in the late World War have demonstrated that they could fight as bravely and as heroically, side by side and shoulder to shoulder, as their ancestors did on opposite sides in the days of the Civil War.

Virginia has been represented by many great statesmen and great orators in the United States Senate, men of great renown and famous throughout the land, but none of them has rendered more faithful or more efficient service as a legislator than Senator MARTIN. His work may not have been of that meteoric character, as was the work of some of his predecessors, but in substantial, far-reaching, and beneficial results the burden he bore and the task he performed stand second to none. Virginia can well be proud of such a legislative record of faithfulness to public duty and public trust.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not rise to eulogize but to pay a loving tribute to the memory of a departed friend.

When I entered this body, now over 19 years ago, I found Senator MARTIN here. There was then in the Senate a galaxy of distinguished men, most of whom have since passed away, but whose names are indissolubly linked with the history of the Nation.

Already the then junior Senator from Virginia, just entering upon his second term, had found his way into the inner circles of this distinguished group, and had become a potential factor in the work and deliberations of the Senate. During all the intervening years of his service here his influence, never waning, grew steadily and continuously, finally culminating in his selection to the position of leader of this body, which position he held at the time of his death.

It goes without saying that no man could retain for 24 years the prominent position Senator MARTIN held in this body without being a man of high qualities both of mind and heart. During all these years he enjoyed the full confidence and esteem of

the entire membership of this body, and I am sure I can safely say no Senator enjoyed greater or more universal popularity with his associates. Though his manner sometimes seemed brusque, all recognized it as the brusqueness of a direct and frank nature rather than of ill temper, for no one who knew him well, or came in close touch with him, could fail to discover the kindness and cordiality of his disposition and the innate gentleness of his spirit.

Senator MARTIN, though a convincing speaker and a forceful and resourceful debater, was not an orator. In the Senate he seldom spoke, and never long. Indeed, he seemed rather to shrink from forensic conflict, but he did not falter in this respect if he thought it necessary and expedient in the accomplishment of his purpose, or in the support or furtherance of the interest or position for which he stood, and when he did speak it was because he had something worth while to say, and he said it with a directness and forcefulness that challenged attention and put his adversaries upon their mettle. All of his speeches were characterized by directness, and were never obscure, either in statement or implication.

His industry was remarkable and unremitting. During his whole service in the Senate he was a close attendant upon its sittings. Generally, except when in attendance upon the important committees of which he was a member, he was to be found in his seat. His unflinching interest, energy, and industry in the discharge of every duty and function of his great office were notable and exceptional.

His equipoise was splendid. He was always steady and calm. With tireless patience and industry he pursued the even tenor of his way, giving to every public matter committed to his charge and in which he was interested the most thorough study and consideration; and thus it came about that no man in this body was better equipped than he for the work before him.

Beyond doubt the possession of these high qualities and traits measurably contributed to his usefulness, standing, and position in the Senate; but they were not and could not, of course, have been the main source of his great and long-sustained influence and power in a body which appraises and measures its membership with impartial exactitude. His great influence and success as a Senator and statesman was chiefly due to his open-minded frankness, his moral and intellectual integrity and courage, and his sound judgment and level headedness.

I know of no man who has served in the Senate since I have been here whose counsel and advice was more highly esteemed by his associates and carried more weight than his. "What does MARTIN think?" was an inquiry often made by Senators in connection with their discussions of difficult and mooted questions. The unusual esteem in which his associates in the Senate held his judgment and advice was not due altogether to the confidence entertained in his ability, though that was great, to analyze difficult and abstruse problems, and reach a sound conclusion; but it was in large part the result of their confidence in his moral and intellectual integrity and courage. They knew he was as sincere, courageous, and honest in thought as in action. They knew the opinions which he declared were those which he had reached, and that they were devoid of all elements of subterfuge or dissimulation.

Somewhat brusque in manner, at times seeming a little callous, his spirit was gentle, and his heart beat in unison with that of his fellow man, and nothing gave him keener pleasure than to serve them. No man possessed in a higher degree the spirit of patriotism and service than he. He was not an ambitious man, and cared but little for money; and it was not ambition or lust for power or gain that caused him to devote the best part of his life to the service of his State, his country, and his fellowman.

Thus it came about that the fruitage of his life, the reward of his toils and struggles, were not the things that appeal to selfishness, but the things that were helpful to his fellowmen and his country. While he left but little of this world's goods, though he wrought constantly and had lived frugally, he left what is infinitely more to be desired—a record of splendid and useful achievement, an honorable name unstained, and an enduring sense of gratitude in the hearts of his countrymen.

It is gratifying to know that when the end came he passed peacefully away, and that "like a shadow thrown softly and sweetly from a passing cloud, death fell upon him." It is comforting to his associates here and to those who loved him to have the assurance of our religion that, though dead, he still liveth. "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and if He live I know I, too, shall live."

The day has come, not gone;  
The sun has risen, not set;  
His life is now beyond  
The reach of death or change;  
Not ended, but begun.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, we form our judgments and opinions of men we do not know from the things we hear and read of them. This opinion and judgment is more or less molded by our views of questions we are interested in or by our personal bias. This leads to wrong and oftentimes unjust impressions. The things we hear or read may come from a prejudiced source. They may appeal to our own prejudices, partisan or otherwise, and this often leads us into grievous error. I have known men of national prominence toward whom the popular view was wholly wrong and very unjust. At any rate, a personal acquaintance with them changed my view, and proved to me that they were the reverse of what they were said to be and what the public believed them to be.

To a degree this was my experience with Senator MARTIN. I had met him only casually before I entered the Senate. I had read more or less of him and had seen various references to his work and views in the papers. My impression was not a favorable one. I thought him to be a man of narrow, partisan views, of rather unscrupulous methods, of reactionary tendencies, and what is commonly called a "machine man," with all that that implies. How wholly wrong I was in this opinion I had the pleasure of telling him before he passed away; and I am glad to give this testimony for the RECORD, not only as a proper tribute to him but in the hope that it may cause some one to be slow in passing adverse judgment upon those they do not know, and especially upon public men whose duty it is to consider carefully all phases of the questions upon which they must act and then do what they believe is for the best interests of their country.

I was not long in this body till I became aware of the universal esteem in which Senator MARTIN was held by his colleagues, regardless of party, and those who had known him longest seemed to esteem him highest. It was not long until my views and impressions about him began to change. I looked for those things my impressions led me to expect. I did not find them. He was open, frank, fair, honest, and just in his dealings. Rather brusque in manner, he was withal kind, considerate, and tender. He was firm and positive in his opinions, but you instinctively felt that he was honest and conscientious in his views. He was a strong partisan, but, above all, he was a patriot, and whatever he did was done for his country's ultimate good and with a belief that the action he took was for his country's good.

He was often referred to as a "reactionary" or a "standpat" or a "conservative" Democrat. He was so in the sense that every honest, conscientious, and patriotic man stands firmly for what he thinks is right and refuses to follow what he believes to be wrong. Senator MARTIN may not have agreed with many of the proposals advanced for the uplift of the people, but what he did believe in and the measures he stood for he thought were for their good, and he was as honest and sincere in his opinions as those who disagreed with him. He may not have agreed with those few who would have the Government help and support its citizens, but he stood for and believed in those things that he thought would best promote their welfare. He was an honest man, a faithful legislator, a consistent partisan, a devoted husband, and an intensely patriotic American. He did his duty faithfully as he saw it, and reflected great credit upon the State that honored him so long. His life and work will be a guide and inspiration to those who would serve their State and their country. To us who were favored with a more intimate knowledge of his kindly, genial nature, his sterling mental and moral qualities, and his tender, gentle attributes, his memory will be a precious heritage.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, little can be added to the splendid eulogies thus far pronounced.

If I were to attempt to describe in a phrase the chief characteristic of our friend and former associate, Hon. THOMAS STAPLES MARTIN, I would speak of it as his intense devotion to duty as it was given to him to see it. Loyalty was his watchword. He was loyal to himself, to his family, to his friends, to his State, and to the Nation. True it is that as a boy he cast his lot with his native State in the Civil War, no doubt through a sense of duty to the State of his nativity. The war having ended, the allegiance which he gave to the stars and bars was transferred to the Stars and Stripes. The country was reunited and he was a part of it.

After the war he completed his preliminary education, read law, early rose to a high rank in his profession, and at the time of his death was the first citizen of the Old Dominion State. For five consecutive times Virginia honored him by election to the United States Senate. No other man has ever been so distinguished by the State of Virginia. Only three sitting Members of the Senate have thus been honored by their respective States—



the senior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. LODGE; the senior Senator from Wyoming, Mr. WARREN; and the senior Senator from Minnesota, Mr. NELSON. Only 12 other Senators, if I am rightly informed, in the entire history of the United States have been thus favored by their respective States with five or more elections:

Hon. John T. Morgan, of Alabama; Hon. Shelby M. Cullom, of Illinois; Hon. William B. Allison, of Iowa; Hon. Eugene Hale and Hon. William P. Frye, of Maine; Hon. Thomas Benton and Hon. Francis M. Cockrell, of Missouri; Hon. John P. Jones, of Nevada; Hon. John Sherman, of Ohio; Hon. Nelson W. Aldrich, of Rhode Island; Hon. Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont; and Hon. Jacob H. Gallinger, of New Hampshire.

To state merely the fact that Senator MARTIN was thus elected and reelected to the greatest legislative body in the world is conclusive evidence of the high character of his service and of the abiding affection which his people entertained for him. Surely he was not without honor in his own country.

He did not reach his goal of success by some meteoric flight of fancy. Rather it was an arduous path he trod. When he came to the "hill of difficulty" he climbed it. He did not go around it. Nothing daunted, nothing discouraged him. His was the genius of hard work, added to native ability of a high order. He labored, he did not idle. His eyes were on his work, not on the clock. He thought, he did not dream. His energies were devoted to construction, not to destruction. By his work his colleagues knew him, not by his words.

No honest man ever questioned his integrity or that in all he did or thought he was ever guided by anything but high purposes.

In the nine years of my service in the Senate I know of no one who surpassed him in effectiveness as a legislator or in his consecration to the duties of his high office.

In his legislative work, as in his private life, he took counsel of fact, not of fiction. With him doctrines were not true, because they were new, nor were they false because they happened to be old. As new questions arose he looked forward and took pride in our civic development, but in doing so he did not lose sight of the guiding wisdom of the past. He was a man of vision, not of visions; hence some of the opposition which his course inspired. Senator MARTIN's feet were always on the ground, and his head was never above the clouds. He was not given to much speech making. Few pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are filled with his utterances. But the United States Statutes at Large, and particularly the great appropriation acts, will always remain as monuments to his industry, his intelligence, and his conservative regard for the financial welfare of his fellow countrymen.

Senator MARTIN's face and figure were not familiar to the great body of the people, simply because he did not frequent public places; but his colleagues and his constituents always knew that they could find him either in his office or in his home. Devotion to duty was the secret of his great success.

Now that he is gone, who that ever knew him can ever forget him or the profit derived from his wise counsel and his well-poised mind?

No one ever found him obtrusive in the presentation of his views, but with what firmness and frankness he always spoke. Few men in our legislative halls will be more missed than he. He had passed the threescore years and ten, and necessarily we could not expect him to linger much longer among these scenes of his great labors; but because of his well-stored mind and his broad experience we were wont to go to him for counsel and guidance. Now that he is gone we shall miss him more than words can tell.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, a tall oak has fallen; a monarch of the forest cut down. Trite though the analogy be, it fittingly conveys the thought of the Virginia people when THOMAS STAPLES MARTIN passed away. I wish that I might aptly express in words their high estimate of their fallen chief and the degree of their faith in his capabilities and the extent of their pride in his achievements, thus interpreting in the language of oral speech Senator MARTIN's lofty qualities of mind and heart and ideals as they appealed to those who knew him best and loved him most. Yet, in a lively recognition of my own limitations, I apprehend that the theme can be done scant justice at my hands.

The tidings of Senator MARTIN's death affected the people of Virginia with a consciousness of a real personal loss, producing public sorrow in a degree that has been rarely witnessed at the passing of a public man. The scene at his funeral service when he was laid to rest attested with pathetic eloquence the deep-seated, affectionate loyalty of those who had given their faith to him in the early period of his political prominence and

who had followed him throughout the intervening years. There, at the open graveside of their dead chief, they foregathered, these stalwarts, the old guard of the Martin clans. From city and from countryside they came to pay the last tribute of their devotion to the man who had led them to victory in every political battle that has been waged in Virginia for nearly three decades. And there these men gave compelling manifestation of their deep and lasting attachment for the grim, resolute, masterful leader they had so newly lost. The spectacle then presented I shall not soon forget, nor the thoughts to which it gave rise, in respect to the tenacious hold which Mr. MARTIN had established upon the abiding affection as well as the confidence and admiration of the people whom he served.

With almost exactitude, the years of Senator MARTIN's life measured the distance between two epochs of history. In the first flush of youth he had a place in the ranks of that immortal battalion of the Virginia Military Institute—those young cadets who, with Spartan heroism, endured their baptism of fire at New Market just when the Civil War was being brought near to its conclusion and the beleaguered Confederacy hastening to its fall. Then, after nearly threescore years of ceaseless activity, we see him, but yesterday it seems, standing in this forum as the wise, sagacious, trusted leader in the war cause of his country, against the aggressions of European autocracy; thus in early youth emerging from the strife of Civil War and closing his earthly career in ripe old age at the ending of a World War. The circumstance is both interesting and suggestive. In an important sense it reminds one of the effect of stern environment in developing the character, shaping the career, and molding the destiny of this distinguished Virginian. It recalls the larger demands and opportunities for service and achievement which summoned men of MARTIN's generation to the work of building anew and adjusting to fundamentally changed conditions the political, economic, and social fabric of a defeated and wasted land, of a sadly stricken and sorely menaced civilization. Senator MARTIN's first call as he neared the entrance to active life was a call to patriotic service. The last call was the same; and both translated the terms of public stress and crisis. It is known with what consecration he answered; how nobly his task was begun with his cadet comrades in Virginia; and how as well ended here in the Senate of the United States. These two chapters in Mr. MARTIN's life—the introduction and the conclusion, together with those which lay between, covering more than a quarter of a century of service in this body—are now being recalled by the people of his native State with emotions in which exultation and sorrow blend.

Senator MARTIN was born in Albemarle County, Va., 72 years ago. It was there that he started out upon the building of his fortunes without other aid or influence than that derived from his own courageous purpose to be of some account in the world. And, verily, he builded well, if to be coveted is the structure of a human life securely established upon foundations of wide, enduring usefulness. It is not difficult to suppose that, when entering the province of his manhood, Senator MARTIN caught the message that there was both room and need for him in public affairs; that he felt charged with a distinct mission to serve, and by service to aid in saving, repairing, and constructing anew a land which had been wrecked by the desolating sweep of war. Men who were not of that generation can not understand the difficulties and dangers which either provoked to mute despair or prompted to high and heroic endeavor. Those who did live through the perilous time know best how to appreciate the motives which animated men of the school so fitly typed by Mr. MARTIN and to measure the great service which they wrought.

It was due to his participation in the work of enabling Virginia to stand upon her feet again and advance to the higher and happier state which lay ahead that Senator MARTIN begun to develop the attributes of astute leadership. In the first place, there was something about his personality that seemed naturally to draw men to him and to hold them fast. The increasing years of his public activity steadily added to the number of his friends and admirers, so that at the time of his death he held his post of party leader unchallenged from any source. Within my knowledge no man in Virginia since the days of John Warwick Daniel had an influence more complete and controlling than that of Senator MARTIN. Nor is the reason difficult to apprehend. The Virginia people know it well.

Mr. MARTIN was trained in the school of politics under men rarely experienced in the arts of thorough, searching organization. He undertook party work when Virginia was passing through the gravest, most dramatic period of her history. He brought to his task an intense ardor of spirit, a great love for his State, a calm grimness of purpose, an exceptionally clear, penetrating mind, and an unusual knowledge of men. The

natural order of things was therefore witnessed. Mr. MARTIN advanced stage by stage to station of authority and power among the prevailing individual political forces of the State.

Until the early nineties, however, Mr. MARTIN held aloof from the rôle of aspirant for political preferment. He was content to labor and to wait until the darkness of a long political night had gone forever and Virginia's safety was assured. With that happy consummation, he appeared as a candidate for the first office he had ever sought and the only office he ever held. He was elected to the United States Senate, and for 26 years, without intermission, retained his seat in this body.

I dwell thus upon Mr. MARTIN's genius for organization as expressed in his political career and upon the service which he rendered in the field of Virginia politics because these things served as the real background of his life; because they revealed the most forceful and compelling traits of his mind and character; because they the more clearly disclose the vehicle through which he translated the exalted aspiration into the thing achieved. But it must not be thought that the dead Virginia Senator was enabled to score in his every political battle solely by virtue of his extraordinary success as a party tactician or organizer. This was not the case. His talents would have counted in vain but for his sensitive recognition of the duties and obligations incident to public service. He was of modest mien and even speech, except when strongly provoked to talk in an emphatic fashion. This he could do unmistakably.

Mr. MARTIN was not of the showy order; he was inclined to regard pityingly those who were. Nor was he skilled in the ways and wiles of the cheap politician. He was big and broad, compelling the respect of his adversaries and never impairing the confidence of his adherents. He never forgot a friend nor a friendly act. His conception of public duty comprehended the minor details as well as the larger and more important features of his trust, and from no Virginian could come a request requiring his attention that would suffer the slightest neglect or indifference at his hands. So being faithful in service, loyal to supporters, true to trust, and strong of intellect, Mr. MARTIN continued to grow in the stature of usefulness from the time he entered the Senate until, with health worn and shattered by the last years of his arduous labors here, he left his seat, never to return.

It is not needful that I should speak of Mr. MARTIN's service in this body. The record speaks for him, although it does not nearly disclose the full extent and scope of his fruitful activity. In committee room, especially as either chairman or ranking member of the great Appropriations Committee, in conference and in council, my lamented predecessor accomplished most of the large sum of usefulness which characterized his labors as a Senator. This much is known: Senator MARTIN was an effective leader on the floor of this body. He marshaled his forces and directed their movements with ability and sagacity. Considering the manifold perplexities with which his post was beset, the many difficulties that obtruded to add infinitely to the burden of his responsibilities, the extraordinary crises in national and world affairs which were precipitated just prior to America's entry into the war, continuing throughout that disastrous conflict, and into the period immediately following the signing of the armistice, Mr. MARTIN, who was in command on this side of the Chamber, measured up to the standards of level-headed, prudent, constructive leadership. Indeed, because of the appalling strain upon the resources of his mind and body, consequent upon the so terrific ordeal, the Virginia Senator's life was probably shortened by many years, making it so that he sacrificed and fell because ready to give his all for his country's sake.

It is inspiring to think that when this grizzled chieftain was making last preparations to answer "ad sum" to the roll call of the Master he had thus rounded out a career of enduring distinction; that from a reserved, unassuming entrance upon the deliberations of a great legislative tribunal he had, by sheer force of his own merit, risen slowly but surely to the eminence of majority leadership in full cooperation with the administration and relied on by the President as a source of support and guidance in the halls of legislation while the Republic was being rocked to its foundations by the convulsions of war. Virginians rightly take satisfaction in the reflection that this was so; that at a time when men of great capacity and militant patriotism and fine courage were most needed in the legislative department of the Government their State gave to the upper branch of Congress the leader of the dominating party.

Senator MARTIN interpreted an order of Americanism which was stalwart in genus, vibrant in patriotism, robust in fidelity, impatient of aught that smacked of timeserving or cant. Greatness is a relative term; men are wont to employ it with a carelessness and lack of discrimination so crude that the tribute

which it is really designed to convey often becomes obscure and bedimmed in meaning. But, guarding carefully my words, it seems to me that elements of greatness may readily be imputed to Senator MARTIN, if greatness can be measured in the scale of service or by the test of the sum of the things which he did, the ends which he achieved, the purposes which he wrought, during the time in which it pleased God that he should walk the ways of usefulness here on earth.

In his private and domestic relations of life Mr. MARTIN exemplified those lofty ideals which appeal directly to what is best and highest in human standards. He was the fond, devoted husband, the tenderly solicitous and affectionate father, the good neighbor, the public-spirited citizen.

Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator MARTIN, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 12, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, April 10, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father in heaven, who holdest in the hollow of Thy hand the destinies of men and of nations, give us as individuals and as a people religious grace and strength to meet the strenuous and exacting duties of life, through sunshine and cloud, through calm and storm, through sorrows and joys.

Let Thy healing touch be upon the Member of this House sorely stricken.

Help us to conserve our physical and intellectual energies, that our service may be lengthened and our work be acceptable in Thy sight and redound to the good of our fellows. In His name. Amen.

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

### BUDGET OF THE BRITISH NAVY.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by putting in the Record the official statement of the English Admiralty, containing the budget and plans for the English Navy for the next fiscal year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. His remarks about what?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I merely wanted to extend my remarks by putting into the Record an official statement of the English Admiralty on the budget and plans for the English Navy for the ensuing fiscal year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I was asking is what remarks you are extending?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The statement made by the First Lord of the Admiralty of England.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is all of it, is it?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is all of it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

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

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa in what way that will help and assist us?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It will show that England has reduced her expenses down to nearly a prewar basis.

Mr. BLANTON. Is that to shame us for not further reducing ours?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I hope it will have some effect in further reducing ours.

Mr. BLANTON. If it will, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the statement referred to:

[From the Times, Tuesday, Mar. 16, 1920.]

#### NAVY ESTIMATES—MR. LONG'S STATEMENT—£84,372,300.

The statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty, explanatory of the navy estimates, 1920-21, was issued last night as a white paper (Cmd. 619).

The estimates for 1920-21 amount to £84,372,300 as compared with 1919-20 estimates, together with the supplementary estimate, amounting to £157,528,810.

This total provides for—

(a) The liquidation of the terminal expenses of the war, which consist of expenditure already incurred or to which the Admiralty are committed, estimated at £19,077,000;

(b) Separation allowances, estimated to cost £3,915,000;

(c) Expenditure of abnormal or quasi war character arising out of temporary obligations, such as the maintenance of an adequate force in the eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea until peaceful conditions are reestablished in those regions, estimated to cost about \$500,000; and

(d) The maintenance during the coming year of a fleet of the minimum strength which, in the opinion of the Board of Admiralty, can be regarded as providing in present circumstances for the security of the Empire.

Owing to the great increase of salaries, pay, wages, and pensions, and in the prices of materials of every description since 1914, a direct comparison with the prewar estimates is of little value. An analysis, however, of the gross expenditure of £96,490,181 estimated to be incurred in 1920-21 shows that it can be approximately divided into—

(a) Nonrecurrent war liabilities or terminal charges.....	£19,077,000
(b) Recurrent expenditure, due to war conditions; e. g., increases in prices and in rates of wages, pensions, etc., and separation allowance.....	40,023,000
(c) Normal expenditure on basis of prewar rates and prices.....	37,489,981

On this basis, the following comparison of the gross estimate for 1914-15 with the gross estimate for 1920-21 can be made:

1914-15.	
Gross estimate.....	£53,573,261
Deduct amount included for new construction.....	18,373,000
	35,200,261
1920-21.	
Gross estimate.....	96,590,181
Deduct war liabilities, including new construction.....	£19,077,000
Deduct recurrent expenditures due to war conditions.....	40,023,200
	59,100,200
	37,489,981

The increase of approximately £2,290,000 over the provision required in 1914-15 is due mainly to the following causes:

The grant of clothing allowances to men of the fleet.  
Provision of larger hospital ships.  
The extension of scientific research and of technical training.  
Reduction in the hours worked by the industrial staff.  
Increase in nonproductive charges.

The above comparison takes no account of the greater extent to which stocks will be used without replacement during 1920-21, as compared with 1914-15. Against this, however, must be set the fact that a considerable expenditure will be incurred in 1920-21 in building up reserves of victualling and clothing stores, medical stores, oil fuel, and in the provision of new types of shell and ammunition consequent on experience gained in the early part of the war.

The number that we propose shall be voted in vote A for the maximum number of the personnel of the fleet to be borne on any day during the financial year is 136,000, as compared with 151,000 in 1914-15. The numbers at the date of the armistice were 407,316, and by November, 1919, had been reduced to 157,000. The actual number required for the reduced fleet which it is proposed to maintain during the year is 127,500; but the provision under vote 1 for the pay of the fleet has been based on the assumption that 131,000 officers and men will still be borne at the end of the year, as it can not be expected that all those who are surplus to our reduced requirements can be disposed of during 1920-21.

There is great difficulty in suddenly effecting large decreases or increases in naval personnel, and the reduction of over 25,000 officers and men in the 17 months from last November to April, 1921, will, if accomplished, as we hope, be a remarkable feat. It must be remembered that the crew of a ship is made up of numerous small groups of individuals of many trades—gunnery ratings, torpedo ratings, engine-room ratings, signal ratings, electricians, armorers, mechanics of many kinds, and so on, each group possesses entirely distinct qualifications and having an entirely distinct duty, but each absolutely essential to the fighting efficiency of the ship. In every adjustment of naval personnel provision has to be made for each of these numerous branches of skilled men to be kept up to strength in every ship all over the world; any attempt to wash out naval personnel with a broad brush at once immobilizes far more units of the fleet than was ever intended.

The time is opportune for an explanation of some of the principal decisions which the board of admiralty have taken and of the motives by which they have been guided while framing these estimates, which may, perhaps, be described (in spite of the considerable provision for war commitments which they embody) as the first of the new series of peace estimates. I therefore append some notes on naval policy and a note on dockyard policy. It should be understood that these statements do not purport to be exhaustive even of the decisions already taken, still less of the matters which are engaging the attention of the board.

The statement which I issued on December 1 last to accompany the estimates for 1919-20 (Cd. 451) contained a summary of naval activities since the armistice. I have thought it unnecessary to present any detailed record of the work of the Navy and Admiralty during the short period which has since elapsed

WALTER H. LONG.

ADMIRALTY, March 12, 1920.

#### THE BUDGET.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes for the purpose of asking a question or two on this very subject.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, during the last presidential campaign both the Democratic and Republican Parties put a solemn plank in their national platforms promising the American people the prompt enactment of a budget system. It is true that during the war, throughout the Sixty-fifth Congress, we were so busy that we could not follow it up, but soon

after the 19th of May, 1919, when Congress was convened in extra session and this Republican House was organized, we appointed a Select Committee on the Budget, and I have been and am very greatly gratified to be a member of that committee. Our committee went to work promptly under the very able leadership of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon], and let me say that Congress and the country owe him a debt of gratitude and commendation for his energy and efficiency in securing as witnesses the most eminent experts on the subject in the United States, and in conducting the hearings we were favored by the advice and suggestions of some 40 of the most profound students of the subject in this country. Our hearings extended from September 21 to October 9, 1919, and made a printed volume of 788 pages and exhaustively covered the subject. As a result we prepared a bill (H. R. 9783) and introduced it, brought about its prompt and thorough consideration by the House, and on October 22, 1919, the House passed the bill on a roll call vote of 285 yeas to 3 nays. The bill went to the Senate on October 22, and apparently no action was taken on it until December 15, on which date the Senate committee to which it was referred held a short hearing on it. Then nothing was done for another month, when on January 14, 1920, another short hearing was held, all the hearings containing only 195 pages and being mostly documentary material and a restatement of their views by some half dozen witnesses who had appeared before the House committee and whose statements were fully printed, and from January 14 to this good hour nothing whatever has apparently been done with the bill.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I understand that the Senate committee has either reported the budget within the last day or two or anticipates doing it in a day or two, and I understand it is their intention to take it up within a week.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It has been reported.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; it has been reported, as the gentleman from Tennessee says.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I ask to proceed for one minute more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think the gentlemen are misinformed about the Senate committee having reported out the budget bill. I understand that committee contemplates reporting it out some time next week. But be that as it may, the question is, Why has this tremendously important measure been sleeping in a Senate pigeonhole for eight months? What is holding it up? Why has not the party in control of the Senate and House given this law to the country many months ago? What are they waiting for? I see by the newspapers nearly every day that Gov. Lowden, of Illinois, and Gen. Wood, and the junior Senator from Illinois, who is the chairman of the Senate committee that has this bill in a pigeonhole, and various other prominent Republicans are making speeches somewhere, loudly extolling the marvelous virtues and imperative necessity of a budget system in this country at this time, all of them trying to make campaign thunder, promising the people a budget system if they are elected. Why do not you Republicans keep the faith and do it now? Now is the accepted time. We have, all of us, promised the people this law. We have all the information necessary. Why wait another year or two? Why regale the people with more promises? Why do not the steering committee of this House put that budget bill right straight onto an appropriation bill as a rider, right now, and on this fortifications bill, and bring in a rule making it in order, and put it through this House now, instead of letting it sleep in the Senate and promising the American people to enact a budget system some time in the future if they are elected next November?

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I only have a minute and can not, unless I can get more time. I am not criticizing this House, because we have performed our full duty in this matter. And I will not criticize the Senate, because that would be unparliamentary, but I will criticize the leaders of the party in power in both the Senate and House for their utter failure to enact this solemnly promised and vitally needed legislation, as they should have done many months ago. They have no right to hold this bill up to allow some prominent gentlemen to make campaign speeches about it and try to monopolize that subject as a campaign issue. Let us establish it now. With the exception of 3 votes, there was no opposition to this bill by any Democrat

or Republican in this House, and there ought not to be any opposition in the Senate or any politics about it. I want to see this Congress keep the faith and pass this bill and establish this budget system in this country at this session and before we adjourn for the summer. The country needs this system now a hundred times more than it ever has. With the high cost of living going higher, with taxes and prices going to the blue sky, with waste, duplications, and unnecessary governmental expenditures as shown in the hearings there is no earthly excuse for delaying this bill all these months while prominent candidates are trying to make campaign thunder out of clamoring for a budget system.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my friend and neighbor from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] on his enthusiasm for the budget system, an enthusiasm which is shared by all the Members of this House and, I think, by a very great majority of the Members of the Senate. It is a very large question, which requires careful consideration. The Senate will in a day or two report the budget bill. They propose to take it up very soon. The gentleman from Colorado knows that the budget system, no matter when the bill we passed months ago becomes a law, can not become operative and effective upon the transactions of the Government until the executive departments begin to prepare their estimates, which are to be presented in October, so that if the budget bill is a law—which I trust it will be within the next 30 days—any time soon it will have been provided within abundant time to make provision for the earliest use that could possibly be made of it. As everybody knows, it passed the House months ago.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman to say that within 30 days we will have a budget-system law on the statute books?

Mr. MONDELL. I feel quite confident of that.

Mr. GARNER. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the parliamentary situation, as suggested by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR]. If he is not perfectly confident of that, there is no reason why it should be put on an appropriation bill. It has had thorough consideration by the House and thorough consideration by the Senate committee and the Senate, and it ought to go to conference now.

Mr. MONDELL. Nobody is more insistent about this thing than I am, and I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I have no sort of doubt but that before this Congress finishes its labors, which I hope will be the 1st of June, there will be a budget bill on the statute books.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

#### MEDICAL AND SURGICAL HISTORY OF THE WAR.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes, in which to have read a very short article on the subject of the medical and surgical history of the late war. This article is from the Journal of the American Medical Association.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to have read, in two minutes, an article on the medical and surgical history of the late war. Is there objection?

Mr. KNUTSON. Does this deal with lancing also?

Mr. LAZARO. No, sir.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is just pure surgery?

Mr. LAZARO. I think the information is worth something to the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### THE MEDICAL AND SURGICAL HISTORY OF THE WAR.

The Surgeon General, with the approval of the Secretary of War, is asking for an appropriation, in the sundry civil bill, for the publication of the medical and surgical history of the World War. In its projected form, this medical history will be more than an account of the rapid expansion and administrative achievements of the Medical Department; it will be a collective study of the many problems of hygiene, medicine, and surgery which were involved in the efficient medical care of the Nation's armies—in fact, a system of medicine and surgery based on the experience and observations of the physicians who guarded the health of our soldiers. The knowledge which was gained in hospitals and on the battle field, and the vast amount of medical research carried on during the war, can be made of immediate value to the medical profession and the public only by prompt publication of the medical history. There can be no question of the merit of such a work; as a scientific record alone the data will be of permanent value, irrespective of considerations regarding their utility as a source of information in future emergencies. The first volume of an unofficial history of the Canadian

Army medical corps appeared last year; steady progress has been made on the official British medical history, and the history of German participation in the war will be issued in nine volumes late in 1920; much of the material for the American history is already collected, and publication waits on the action of Congress. Nothing can be gained from procrastination and delay; the appropriation requested by the Surgeon General should be allowed promptly. The medical and surgical history of the War of the Rebellion was delayed through 20 years. It is to be hoped that a similar fate does not await the publication of the medical history of the World War. If Congress does not, within a short time, make the appropriation necessary for the printing of this available material, the failure will be tantamount to an order for its destruction. In a few years this material would be of archaic but not of scientific interest.

ARTHUR WENDLE ENGLERT.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 795, for the relief of Arthur Wendle Englert, a House bill passed by the Senate with an amendment, and that the House disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference thereon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up H. R. 795, and moves to disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—  
The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think it is subject to objection.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman is asking for a conference.

The SPEAKER. He moves for a conference.

Mr. WALSH. It is not in order to move for a conference. I should like to ask the gentleman if the Senate amendment increases the amount of this claim?

Mr. EDMONDS. It increases it \$250.

Mr. WALSH. Over the House bill?

Mr. EDMONDS. Over the House bill.

Mr. WALSH. Or over the amount of the claim?

Mr. EDMONDS. Over the House bill.

Mr. GARD. What was the amount in the House bill?

Mr. EDMONDS. The amount in the House bill was \$500. We reduced the amount asked for by the claimant from \$748 to \$500. The Senate put back the amount originally asked for by the claimant. The bill as it passed the House this year was reduced to \$500, but the claimant last year asked for \$748.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS].

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. EDMONDS, Mr. LITTLE, and Mr. STEAGALL.

#### LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record briefly.

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

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, upon what subject?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Very largely giving the reasons why I voted as the gentleman did last evening on the peace resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Was it not made in order yesterday for five legislative days for anyone to extend remarks in the Record on the peace resolution?

The SPEAKER. It was.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I may touch briefly on some other things.

#### USE OF T. N. T. FOR PEACE-TIME PURPOSES.

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a privileged resolution from the Committee on Printing, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the report of John Swenhardt, of the College of Agriculture of the University of Wisconsin, giving scientific and experimental data for the practical use of T. N. T., a war-salvaged explosive, for peace-time purposes, be printed as a House document, and that 5,000 copies be printed for the use of the House document room.

Mr. KIESS. I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, how much will this printing cost?

Mr. KIESS. This printing will cost the large sum of \$45.10.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How many copies are you going to print?

Mr. KIESS. The usual number, 1,345, and 5,000 additional to go to the document room.

Mr. STEENERSON. Would the committee have any objection to making it three times that number? I can use almost all of that edition for my own district. There is a large area of cut-over land which they desire to clear, and this will be a very

valuable document for them. I should like to ask unanimous consent to have the number doubled.

Mr. KIESS. The document is a valuable one, and if the House feels like increasing the number to be printed, there will be no objection from the Committee on Printing. The cost of 10,000 additional copies would be \$41.54.

Mr. MILLER. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask how are these documents to be disposed of?

The SPEAKER. This is a privileged resolution. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. KIESS. Yes. I will answer the gentleman's question. They are to go to the document room, as there are many Members who will not be interested in this particular document. For that reason it is best to send it to the document room, where those who want the publication can get it.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution as reported by the committee.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

#### NITRATE OF SODA.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. J. Res. 180, with a committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a Senate resolution, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. GARD. May we have the amendment read also?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That in order to meet the existing emergency in the shortage of fertilizers the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to turn over to agricultural fertilizer distributors or users in this country such quantity of the nitrate of soda held as a reserve supply by the War Department as, in his opinion, can be spared consistently with the military needs of the Government, such stocks so turned over to be replaced by such fertilizer distributors or users with an equivalent amount of nitrate, the turning over and replacement being under such guaranties as the Secretary of War may prescribe.

With the following amendment offered by Mr. HULL of Iowa:

Strike out all after line 4 on page 1, and insert the following: "To sell for cash at the prevailing market price, at the time of the sale thereof, to such distributors or users thereof, in the United States, as shall request the same, and in such quantity to each, as he shall see fit, not to exceed in the aggregate 50,000 tons of nitrate of soda, now held as a reserve supply of the War Department, the proceeds of such sale to be repaid to the proper item of the current appropriations, originally made for such purposes."

Mr. LONGWORTH. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman a question. Was this nitrate of soda secured during the war or before the war?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. During the war. It is in reserve now. There are something like 300,000 tons of it held by the War Department, and it has been thought advisable to allow the sale of 50,000 tons, which they can spare, to relieve a very pressing emergency that exists in the agricultural districts of the country. Owing to insufficient shipping facilities and the slides in the Panama Canal, the supply that should be in the country to-day has been delayed, and this is to meet that situation. The Committee on Military Affairs thought it would be better to sell it, and let the Government accumulate the profit themselves, than to transfer it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman's amendment provides that it shall be sold at the current market price; that would be considerably less than the amount paid for it.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No; the market price to-day is more than the War Department paid.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The Government paid \$84 for the last shipment and the prevailing market price is higher than that. The Government supply was purchased for \$56 up to \$84, and the prevailing market price will mean a profit to the Government.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then there is no loss to the Government by this provision?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; on the contrary there should be a profit.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. There will be a profit, because the current price is a great deal higher than what the Government paid for it, and higher than what they can buy it for in Chile and have it shipped here.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am surprised that the price is less now than it was during the war.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. During the consideration of the deficiency bill we had the matter up and we provided for

the construction of a scoop in the earth at Savanna, Ill., for the storing of our reserve supply of nitrate of soda.

This resolution should reduce our storage expense. We are now paying \$13,000 a month for storage of nitrate of soda in commercial warehouses, and if the War Department will construe this action as the War Department should, they will sell the nitrate of soda now stored in commercial warehouses, where they are paying 35 cents a ton, and they will save the storage and at the same time sell at a price much higher than the average price paid by the Government. The average cost price paid by the Government is below \$80, and the market price is nearer \$90. If the War Department exercises the discretion that it should exercise, and sells the nitrate of soda which is stored in Jacksonville, where we are paying 30 cents per ton, in Galveston and several other points, instead of taking it out of the Government-owned buildings and out of warehouses where we are paying only 10 cents a ton, a very considerable profit will come to the Government.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under these conditions I withdraw my reservation to object.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will.

Mr. DENT. I wish to add to the statement made by the gentleman from South Carolina that the War Department accumulated an excessive reserve supply of nitrate in anticipation that the war would last longer than it did. So that now it has no use for this nitrate and can dispose of it at a profit for the benefit of the farmers at this particular time, the shipment of nitrate having been delayed 30 days.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Why confine it to 50,000 tons if that be so?

Mr. DENT. I will state that I do not think it ought to be confined to 50,000 tons. The Secretary of War stated to the committee that he would limit it to 50,000 tons.

Mr. WALSH. Why do they want to keep the balance?

Mr. DENT. I see no reason for it, and I would be willing to have the limit raised.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will.

Mr. BEGG. Does the resolution provide that it shall be sold to the consumer or the jobber?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Either one; it is to be distributed among the users.

Mr. BEGG. Is there any serious objection to a provision safeguarding it so that it will not be sold by the War Department to jobbers and then resold to the consumer at enormous profit? I happen to know that the War Department sold a vast number of buckets for 30 cents apiece the other day, and the man to whom they were sold never touched them, but resold them for \$1.10 each. If we do not safeguard these sales, we are going to give them the opportunity to do the same thing right over with the nitrates.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. We have safeguarded it as far as possible. The Secretary of War was before us and said that he would safeguard it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Would the gentleman have any objection to adding a provision that the names of the persons to whom the nitrate is sold shall be reported to Congress?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I think that is unnecessary. We can find the names at any time.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not think it is necessary, but I sometimes have suspicions of the way things are done.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the situation is acute with reference to the supply of nitrate for fertilizer. Within the last few days there was a hearing before the Agriculture Department in reference to the spread of the pink bollworm in the States of Texas and Louisiana, which brought to the National Capital representatives from all over the country, and especially from a number of the Southern States. I attended this hearing myself to help, if I could, to have taken appropriate action to safeguard the cotton interests and prevent the further spread of this pink bollworm pest. Those representatives attending this hearing told us in conferring with us about general agricultural conditions of the acute situation as to fertilizer. I assure you the situation as to fertilizers is very acute and everything possible ought to be done to improve the present situation, and I sincerely hope there will be no objection to this resolution, but that it will receive immediate consideration and be promptly passed in order to stimulate production and to meet the situation, at least to the extent it will furnish the relief so necessary and so much desired by the farmers. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.  
Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this same matter was added as a Senate amendment to the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. It is a Senate amendment which the conferees on that bill have considered. I think I can safely say, although the conferees have not finished their work, that this amendment now offered by the gentleman from Iowa is practically in the form which the conferees think it should be. But it occurs to me that the last two or three lines of the amendment of the bill are a little uncertain as to what is to be done with the proceeds of the sale. Reading from the bill, it says:

The proceeds of such sale to be repaid to the proper item of the current appropriations originally made for such purposes.

That may be the regular, orderly, proper way of providing for the disposition of money which comes into the hands of an official of this Government, but if it is I have not understood it to be the way. I have supposed the money should be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts or placed to the credit of a particular fund, to be used for a particular purpose. I suggest that some attention be given to the last sentence of this amendment to see if it is right in providing the method in which the proceeds of the sale shall be handled.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Do I understand that the proposed amendment provides that the proceeds from these sales shall go to the credit of some particular appropriation?

The McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The amendment reads:

The proceeds of such sale to be repaid to the proper item under the current appropriations originally made for such purposes.

It is a little irregular, it seems to me, although from my limited knowledge of these matters I would not be justified in demanding a change.

Mr. WALSH. It sounds as if that was in aid of Muscle Shoals.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That was put in there so that the appropriation would go back, so that if thought advisable they could purchase with this same money some more nitrate of soda.

Mr. WALSH. What do they want to replace it for when the gentleman from South Carolina says that they have no use for this now that the war is over?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Oh, the gentleman misunderstood me, if he got that impression.

Mr. WALSH. I meant the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT]. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. May I say this: The statement of the officials of the War Department is that they do need it. They take the position that in this country it is essential that they maintain a reserve of 300,000 tons of nitrate of soda, which is used in the manufacture of high explosives; that because of the Chilean situation as it developed at the beginning of the war it would be unsafe for this country to be without this amount, and that is the reserve settled upon. The officers of the Ordnance Department are very earnest in their statement that it would be very unsafe for this Government to reduce its stock much below that reserve. That is their position.

Mr. WALSH. That was to be the reserve when the country was at war.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; this is the position taken by the department at this time. Once we are in war, the only place from which we can secure nitrate of soda is from Chile. If we control the seas, it can be secured, and if we do not we are cut off from that supply, and therefore they say it is essential that that supply be on hand, and they have figured it out with a great degree of care and declare it is dangerous to reduce that reserve much below that amount. I think their position ought to be stated to the House.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Speaker, following the line of inquiry of my friend from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], do I understand that this resolution would allow an individual farmer, or an association of farmers, to put in an order for a ton of nitrate of soda and obtain the same consideration that a jobber would have?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is supposed to be the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. LAYTON. There is no limit on the amount to be sold?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. There is no limit on it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk again reported the joint resolution, together with the amendment offered by Mr. HULL of Iowa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALSH). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. LONGWORTH: Add at the end of the amendment the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of War shall report to Congress not later than December 6, 1920, the names of all purchasers of said nitrate of soda, together with the prices for which sold."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment. I want to strike out the words that give the Secretary of War the right to fix quantities. I can not quote them, for I have not a copy of the amendment before me. I think it provides in such quantities as he may see fit. I want to leave the amendment in such a way that if a farmer wants to buy 1 ton the Secretary is compelled to send it to him, and can not refuse to do so upon the ground that he is selling it only in 100-ton lots.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEGG to the committee amendment—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I submit that the amendment as detailed by the gentleman from Ohio is not in such form that the Clerk can report it. The gentleman had better get this drafting board to help him draw it up.

The SPEAKER. But the Clerk is reporting it. The Clerk will continue to report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEGG to the committee amendment: Strike out of the committee amendment the words "as he shall see fit," so that it will read: "to sell for cash, at the prevailing market price at the time of the sale thereof, to such distributors or users thereof in the United States as shall request the same, and in such quantity to each, not to exceed in the aggregate 50,000 tons," etc.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, the only thing I want to say on that proposition is this: I believe every man has an honest intention to make it available to the farming communities, if they shall want to use it and buy it, without its going through the hands of a commission man. If we leave in the words that I am seeking to have stricken out it is very easy for the Secretary of War to make a ruling that he will not sell it in any quantities other than 100-ton lots or more, and no farmer, or group of farmers, can afford to buy that amount at one time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman think there ought to be a minimum amount fixed—some reasonable amount?

Mr. BEGG. I would not object to a reasonable amount at all. The only thing I am anxious to do is to fix this so that it is available to the average farming community. I will eliminate even the little user.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the gentleman's intention is good, but there ought to be a minimum limit, or they would pester the War Department to death.

Mr. BEGG. What limit would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know enough about it to say.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, while I am not an agriculturist, yet the point suggested to me by the inquiry of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is that some one under the gentleman's amendment might write in and ask that 25 pounds of the fertilizer be sent to him by parcel post, and the War Department might be compelled to deal it out in that way.

Mr. BEGG. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the gentleman and say that his experience in farming, if he ever had to farm any, would very readily relieve his mind of any embarrassment of sending for a 10-pound sack of fertilizer.

Mr. DONOVAN. If the gentleman will permit, I had in a small way, and I know there would be somebody in this country who would think that 25 pounds would be sufficient.

Mr. BEGG. I would willingly accept a minimum of 1 ton.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the gentleman will yield, I think I understand the gentleman's purpose, but I want to ask if he does not believe that the profiteering in here that may be carried on by the jobber in selling to the farmer could better be protected by

fixing the per cent of profit that the distributor may charge over and above the Government price?

Mr. BEGG. In reply to that I want to say to the gentleman that if this is safeguarded so that the farmer can buy in small quantities at the same price the Government buys at there will not be profiteering and you do not need to put a maximum profit the jobber can make, because the very fact that the farmer can buy from the Government will preclude any possibility of any man buying it and charging an exorbitant price.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I understand and should approve the result the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] wishes to reach. There should be some way by which farmers and other small purchasers can acquire this nitrate of soda; but some one must determine quantities in which it shall be sold. Under the resolution as presented by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], that determination is to be by the Secretary of War. If left as the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio would leave it some one else will have that authority or privilege. It may be that the first one who makes an offer satisfactory in price to the Secretary will be able to buy all he wishes. I can see no better way for large purchasers to acquire practically all of this nitrate of soda than to take from the Secretary of War all discretion and control over it, and practically leave it to the purchasers to make their offers, which the Secretary will have no right, on the theory advanced by the gentleman from Ohio, to refuse. It might be for half or all the quantity that the Secretary had to sell.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that there is a very small proportion of nitrate of soda used as a simple ingredient for use on the soil, and is it not a fact that this nitrate of soda will have to be taken to a fertilizer plant and mixed with other ingredients before being sold to the farmer at all?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. In answer to what the gentleman from New York says, it is true that only a small quantity of nitrate of soda is used as a fertilizer by a farmer; it is used in combination with other fertilizing ingredients. A farmer or anyone else who has the ingredients can mix them himself; it is not necessary for this nitrate of soda to go to the fertilizer factory to be made up or mixed by the manufacturer. It was suggested before the conferees on the Agricultural bill that the word "manufacturer" should be included, but the sense of the conferees was, and the sense of the Committee on Military Affairs is evidently the same, that purchases should be made only by "distributors and users," those who come after the manufacturer. And I insist, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution should give some official of the department authority to determine the quantities in which this nitrate of soda shall be sold. If we divest the Secretary of War of all authority in that respect, we may be placing it in the hands of those who will purchase or who offer to purchase, and the large purchaser may acquire all of it.

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman will yield further for just a moment, I want to thank the gentleman for the information. It is my understanding, however, that very few farmers do buy nitrate of soda and mix it themselves.

Mr. LAYTON. My experience has been otherwise.

Mr. SNYDER. I am speaking of my own section of the country; those are the only farmers I am familiar with. If what the gentleman says is true, I think with him there should be a limitation on the amount the farmers ought to be permitted to buy from the Secretary of War.

Mr. RHODES. If the gentleman will permit, where is this surplus of nitrate of soda located?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It is stored at different places, as has been stated by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]—Galveston, Savannah, and other places.

Mr. LAYTON. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. LAYTON. I desire to say to the gentleman that my only interest in this bill is to see that under the provisions of this bill this nitrate of soda is made available for the individual farmer. In reply to what the gentleman from New York said, I want to say that it is not true that nitrate must go through the hands of a corporation or fertilizing company. I have used it myself. Farmers buy the various ingredients—fish screenings, nitrate of potash, and so forth—and they mix it themselves, according to the proportions they get from the agricultural colleges. And now, this matter ought not to be left in any dispute or concluded in such a way that we can not know that this nitrate will reach the man who needs it, without going into the hands of the profiteer.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Well, I will say to the gentleman that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio should be adopted all control over it, as to quantities in which it will be sold, will be taken out of the hands of the Secretary of War; and suppose some distributor or user offers to make a large purchase, what control over the matter has the Secretary of War? Absolutely none. He has no authority to refuse the offer. It may be a favorable offer as to price, and under the law, as it will read if the amendment be adopted, he must accept it.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Who fixes the price for this nitrate of soda?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The Secretary must sell at the market price prevailing at the time. That is, the best price that anyone wishing to buy is willing to offer. I suggest it is dangerous to take away from the Secretary of War all control over the matter as to the quantity in which it shall be sold.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have very little self-interest in the passage of this resolution. The State I come from uses as little as any other State. However, every State uses some of it. My only interest is to make it possible for the users—the farmers—to get hold of this and use it on this present season's crop in order to produce food. We have gone over it in the Committee on Military Affairs of the House and the Senate and also in the Agricultural Committee of the House and of the Senate, and after consultation with all of them we have brought out this resolution in its present form. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio will be defeated, because I believe it will delay the possibility of getting this to the farmer. We want the farmer to get this at once so he can produce food with it and thereby lower the cost of living.

Mr. LAYTON. If the gentleman's purpose is that distinctly, that is all I am interested in.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield to me one minute?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. At least 50 per cent of this nitrate of soda in its crude state is used by the farmer. This sale by the Government is not a new departure. For two or three years the Department of Agriculture has been selling nitrate of soda directly to the farmers, and there was no complaint about it going into the hands of middlemen. I ask the House not to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio for this reason, that if there is any danger of it being sold to one man that is cured to a great extent by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], which has been adopted, and which provides for submission to Congress of the names of the persons to whom it is sold. And discretion must be placed in the Secretary of War in the administration of the law. It must be placed in that department and not left to one person to purchase all of the 50,000 tons which would be possible under the amendment. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] will be defeated.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. The gentlemen of this House know that I am not a farmer. But it seems to me that putting the limitation upon the distribution or sale and bringing it down to certain amounts that the Secretary of War or his subordinates are permitted to dispose of of this material is entirely out of order and not in keeping with good business principles. No one can tell here just what quantity or amount of nitrate of soda should be fixed so that it would be universally satisfactory to all the farmers that might need it, and it seems to me you have got to trust somebody somewhere. Four hundred and thirty-five men have usually got 435 different ideas about how a thing ought to be done, and you have got to leave the actual details of managing affairs of this kind in the hands of some one.

And I believe, while I have a very high regard for the judgment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], his amendment is contrary to good business and it will interfere with this ingredient, that is so much needed by the farmers, getting to them, and will reflect against the best interests of the country. Therefore I shall have to vote against the amendment.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Certainly.

Mr. LAYTON. Do you not think that the bill ought to indicate a minimum quantity?

Mr. SNYDER. I do not think it ought to indicate a minimum quantity. I think that no one will want to buy the whole 50,000 tons of nitrate of soda, nor will anybody want to buy less than several thousand pounds. Anywhere between there that you

might want to fix as a maximum or a minimum would be entirely out of order to be fixed by this House. I think that ought to be left to the man in charge of the proposition.

Mr. LAYTON. There are plenty of people in the country who would like to buy the whole 50,000 tons in order to make a profit on it.

Mr. MACCRATE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. MACCRATE. May I suggest to the gentleman that by adopting the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] you are not taking away the discretion from the Secretary of War at all. As a matter of fact, as I see it, if the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio is adopted, the Secretary of War can sell it all to one person.

Mr. SNYDER. I would not care to have any restriction put upon the Secretary of War as to whether he should sell it to a million people or to one person. I am not so sure if it went to one person, if that person had the facilities to distribute it throughout the country, it would not be the best thing to do.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not require unanimous consent. The gentleman can withdraw it.

Mr. BEGG. I withdraw the amendment, and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer another amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his amendment and offers another one.

Mr. BEGG. I would like to offer an amendment following the word "each" in the fourth line, in the following words:

Not less than 1 ton or more than 100 tons to any individual purchaser.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BEGG to the committee amendment: After the word "each," in the fourth line of the committee amendment, insert the words "not less than 1 ton or more than 100 tons to any individual purchaser."

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to take out the word "individual," so that it would read "any purchaser."

Mr. QUIN. Reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment: Insert after the word "each," in line 4, the words "not less than 1 ton or more than 100 tons to any purchaser."

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I yield.

Mr. QUIN. I am very strongly for this, but I want to know why the gentleman wants to limit the amount to less than a ton? Some man might want to buy half a ton.

Mr. BEGG. I will reply to the gentleman by saying that if there is any reason for the passage of this bill it is an economic reason, to try to increase production. I doubt seriously whether there is any producer other than a small gardener—who is not a producer for the country to any great extent—that would want less than a ton. If there were such, two fellows could go together and buy a ton. It seems to me—

Mr. GARD. Does not the gentleman think it would be better to have in his amendment the word "one" instead of the word "purchaser"?

Mr. BEGG. I do not see any advantage or disadvantage in that word. I would not object. It would not make any difference.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] as amended.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, this question, raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE], is a matter that this Congress will have to take notice of, in my judgment. The purpose of this amendment is to prevent profiteering in this surplus material which the Government will permit to be sold.

Now, what are we doing about it? There has been a clamor for the War Department to sell the surplus of all its accumulations, and yet we have put no restriction upon that surplus. You are letting it be sold every day down here by the thousands of dollars' worth, and yet you put no restriction upon the purchaser to prevent profiteering, when that was the purpose, as I understand, of the Congress when you called for the sale of this property; it was in order to help bring down the high cost of living. Now, I wonder why a resolution of some kind should

not be passed by this Congress in order to take care of the situation, not merely in the matter of the sale of this nitrate to farmers but all this other property that is being sold every day.

I want to say that it has come back here to the ears of some of us from France that some of the property that we sold in France was sold by the French Government, and it got into the hands of the profiteers of France, and the French people themselves, for whom this property was sold at a low price, are not getting the benefit of it. I think, gentlemen, it is a serious matter that Congress ought to deal with. I know it is a hard matter to deal with, because we try to get on behalf of the Government the highest price possible for the property. That is commendable on the part of the officers of the Government, to procure the best price possible; and yet at the same time we permit this property to go unrestricted into the markets of the country and without any restraint against profiteering.

Gentlemen, I favor this amendment and favor this legislation, but I think it ought to go further and reach other property that is being sold by the United States Government.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, right there?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. QUIN. Do you not think that particular thing would be properly handled so that it got into the hands of the right people?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; but the gentleman knows that this material is being sold in such large quantities and we have constant complaints from people who desire to purchase small quantities that they have had no opportunity to buy this property, which was purchased with the proceeds from the sale of Liberty bonds, which these people purchased. This is a commendable provision, and I am not objecting to a provision to fix a reasonable price and allow the material to be sold to small purchasers.

Mr. QUIN. I am with the gentleman on this and all other matters. We tried to do that very thing.

Mr. McKEOWN. Has the gentleman's committee reported out a resolution effecting the sale of all this other surplus property that is being sold down here now?

Mr. QUIN. Yes. Small quantities are being sold, and even shipped by parcel post now.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this resolution calls for the sale of 50,000 tons.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. I understand that the Government is paying \$13,000 a month for storage. Why not sell 100,000 tons?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman that, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection; but, at the same time, the War Department recommended that only 50,000 tons be sold. I believe that we ought to take the advice of the War Department and limit it to 50,000 tons. That is all they ask for.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to strike out "50,000" and insert "100,000."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS of Illinois: In the fifth line of the committee amendment, after the word "aggregate," strike out "50,000" and insert "100,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS].

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

Mr. MURPHY. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 35, noes 17.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

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

On motion of Mr. HULL of Iowa, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.



## POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Post Office appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up the conference report on the bill H. R. 11578, the Post Office appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report.

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.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I think some of these amendments ought to be read before the conference report is considered, and it is not any longer than the statement. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 15, 19, and 20.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 25, and 28, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the words "to be available immediately," insert the following: "And the Secretary of War is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to turn over to the Postmaster General, without charge therefor, such buildings or parts thereof as may be desired by the Postmaster General and now located at Watervliet Arsenal, N. Y. And the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to cause said buildings or parts thereof to be removed to said land and to be reassembled or reconstructed thereon for the use of the Post Office Department"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Provided, That whenever the office of a postmaster becomes vacant through death, resignation, or removal, the Postmaster General shall designate some person to act as postmaster until a regular appointment can be made by the President, and the Postmaster General shall notify the Auditor for the Post Office Department of the change. The postmaster so appointed shall be responsible under his bond for the safekeeping of the public property of the post office and the performance of the duties thereof until a regular postmaster has been duly appointed and qualified and has taken possession of the office. Whenever a vacancy occurs from any cause, the appointment of a regular postmaster shall be made without unnecessary delay"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the word "aeroplane" and insert in lieu thereof "aircraft"; and in line 5 strike out the word "materially"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$1,415,000" named in said amendment insert the following: "\$1,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended paragraph insert the following:

"For transportation of foreign mails by steamship, aircraft or otherwise, including increases hereinafter provided, \$4,700,000: Provided, That not to exceed \$100,000 of this sum shall be expended for carrying foreign mail by aircraft."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "of which \$500,000 shall be available immediately"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 3. That the Secretary of War is authorized hereafter, in his discretion, to turn over to the Postmaster General, without charge therefor, from time to time, such motor vehicles, aeroplanes, airdromes and parts thereof, and machinery and tools to repair and maintain the same, as may be suitable for use in the Postal Service; and the Postmaster General is authorized to use the same in the transportation of the mails and to pay the necessary expenses thereof, including the replacement, maintenance, exchange, and repair of such equipment, and the transfer and refabrication of such airdromes, out of any appropriation available for the service in which such vehicles, airdromes or aeroplanes are used: Provided, That the Postmaster General shall not use such aeroplanes or airdromes on any other routes than the one between New York, N. Y., and San Francisco, Calif., herein provided for."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Renumber the section to read: "Sec. 4"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Renumber the section to read: "Sec. 5"; in line 1 of said amendment, after the word "That," insert the word "hereafter"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Renumber the section to read: "Sec. 6"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"(c) The commission shall investigate all present and prospective methods and systems of handling, dispatching, transporting and delivering the mails, and the facilities therefor; and especially all methods and systems which relate to the handling, delivery and dispatching of the mails in the large cities of the United States.

"On or before March 1, 1921, the commission shall make a report to Congress containing a summary of its findings and such recommendations for legislation as it may believe to be proper."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"(d) For the purposes of this section, the commission shall have power to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence, and to administer oaths."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the second paragraph of said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 7. That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, at his discretion, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to loan to any State of the Union, when so requested by the highway department of the State, such tractors as are retained and not distributed under the act approved March 15, 1920, for use in highway construction by the highway department of such State: Provided, That all expenses for repairs and upkeep of tractors so loaned and the expenses of loading and freight shall be paid by the State, both in transfer to the State and the return to the Army."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Renumber the section to read: "SEC 8"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HALVOR STEENERSON,  
MARTIN B. MADDEN,  
W. W. GRIEST,  
JOHN A. MOON,  
A. B. ROUSE,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

CHAS. E. TOWNSEND,  
THOMAS STERLING,  
LAWRENCE C. PHELPS,  
J. C. W. BECKHAM,  
CHARLES B. HENDERSON,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreement of the House to the amendments of the Senate to H. R. 11578, entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees as to each of said amendments:

The Senate recedes from amendments Nos. 15, 19, and 20.

Amendment No. 15 struck out the words "printing presses" in the appropriation for miscellaneous equipment under the Office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General.

Amendment No. 19 rewrote the section 2, continuing the increased compensation under House joint resolution 151, and omitted the words "unless otherwise provided by law."

Amendment No. 20 authorized the property and equipment of the pneumatic-tube companies in the post offices in the different cities where located to remain until June 30, 1921.

The managers on the part of the House agree to amendments Nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 25, and 28.

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2 merely corrected the phraseology in the appropriation for the purchase of land for the equipment shops.

Amendment No. 5 added a clause repealing the limitation of \$500 for rent and \$100 for fuel and light allowable for post offices of the third class.

Amendment No. 6 struck out \$60,000,000 in the appropriation for inland transportation of mail by railroads and inserted \$59,886,822.

Amendment No. 9 merely inserts the word "further" after the word "Provided" in the paragraph relating to Railway Mail Service.

Amendment No. 10 strikes out "\$932,156" and inserts "\$1,032,156" in the appropriation for terminal railway post offices.

Amendment No. 11 strikes out the word "however" in the paragraph relating to the appropriation for transportation of mail by electric and cable cars.

Amendment No. 13 strikes out "\$965,000" and inserts "\$765,000" in the appropriation for manufacture of postal cards.

Amendment No. 14 adds a proviso to the appropriation for indemnity for losses or injury of domestic registered, insured, or collect-on-delivery mail, authorizing the Postmaster General to authorize postmasters to pay limited indemnity claims. This is designed to expedite payment of claims.

Amendment No. 17 strikes out a proviso to turning over motor vehicles, aeroplanes, etc., by the Secretary of War, which proviso in slightly different form is reinserted in section 4 of the bill as amendment No. 21.

Amendment No. 25 authorizes the payment of the expenses of the commission created under section 7 of the bill.

Amendment No. 28 directs the executive departments and independent establishments of the Government, when directed by the President, to furnish the said commission with information and records in their possession.

The House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 3, 4, 7, 8, 12, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, and 30, with an amendment to each, as follows:

Amendment No. 3: After the words "immediately available," for the appropriation for the purchase of land for the equipment shop, there is added a provision authorizing the Secretary of War to turn over to the Postmaster General, without charge therefor, buildings, or parts thereof, as may be desired by the Postmaster General, now located at Watervliet Arsenal, N. Y., and authorizes such buildings, or parts thereof, to be removed and reconstructed on said land for the use of the Post Office Department.

Amendment No. 4: Rewrites the provision proposed by the Senate authorizing the Postmaster General whenever the office of postmaster becomes vacant through death, resignation, or removal to designate some person to act as postmaster until regular appointment can be made by the President.

Amendment No. 7: Strikes out the word "aeroplane" and inserts the word "aircraft" and strikes out the word "materially" in the proviso relating to contract air mail service, the effect of which is to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for an aircraft mail service between such points as he may deem advisable and designate, where such service is furnished, at a cost not greater than the cost of the same service by rail.

Amendment No. 8: Reduces the appropriation from \$1,415,000, proposed by the Senate, to \$1,250,000 for aeroplane mail service from New York, N. Y., to San Francisco, Calif., via Chicago, Ill., and Omaha, Nebr.

Amendment No. 12: Changes the amendment of the Senate which enlarged the appropriation for the transportation of foreign mails by inserting the words "by steamship, aircraft, or otherwise," so as to read as follows: "For transportation of foreign mails by steamship, aircraft, or otherwise," including increase hereinafter provided, \$4,700,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$100,000 of this sum shall be expended for carrying foreign mail by aircraft.

Amendment No. 16: In the appropriation for the equipment shop of \$2,090,000, the Senate amendment proposed to make the whole amount immediately available, but this was modified so as to make \$500,000 immediately available.

Amendment No. 21: Changes the language of section 4 proposed by the Senate relating to the turning over of motor vehicles, aeroplanes, and airdromes to the Postmaster General to be used in the transportation of the mails, and adds a proviso that such vehicles and airdromes and aeroplanes can not be used on other routes than the New York to San Francisco routes.

Amendment No. 22: Simply renumbers section 5 to section 4.

Amendment No. 23: Changes the language of section 6 proposed by the Senate relating to the permit privilege of first-class mail by inserting the word "hereafter" after the word "that" in the first line, making the section permanent law.

Amendment No. 24: Renumbers section 7 to section 6.

Amendments Nos. 26 and 27: Modify the language of paragraphs C and D, relating to the creation of the commission to investigate transportation of mail and the facilities for distribution thereof.

Amendment No. 29: The amendment proposed by the managers on the part of the House strikes out the second paragraph of amendment No. 29, which related to the loan of tractors by the Secretary of War to State highway departments, and inserts a new section numbered section 7 on the same subject. The original proposition of the Senate related to 5 and 10 ton artillery trucks, but as amended the provision authorizes the loan of tractors generally to State highway departments for use in highway construction, such highway departments to pay the cost of transportation, both for the shipment and return.

Amendment No. 30: Renumbers section 3 to section 8.

The net increase over the appropriations as passed by the House is \$1,146,178, making a total now carried in the bill of \$462,674,546.

HALVOR STEENERSON,  
MARTIN B. MADDEN,  
W. W. GRIEST,  
JOHN A. MOON,  
A. B. ROUSE,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the conference report.

I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads what these buildings are at the Watervliet Arsenal, N. Y., which are to be removed or reconstructed for the Post Office Department, as mentioned in amendment No. 3?

Mr. STEENERSON. That is a mistake in the name of the place. It is Watertown, N. Y. Of course we can not correct it in the conference report, but I intend as soon as it passes the Senate to have a concurrent resolution passed authorizing the clerk to correct it in the enrollment of the bill. This amendment was offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and inadvertently a mistake was made in the name of the town. I received a communication from the Postmaster General yesterday calling my attention to the fact that the name Watervliet should be Watertown.

These buildings have been put up for a munition factory.

Mr. MADDEN. I should like to explain that.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to explain it. He offered the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] asks what amendment No. 3 of the Senate means. It means this: The Post Office Department have a repair shop here in the city of Washington. It is not adequate for the needs of the service. The department have had an option on a piece of ground adjoining the shop for about three years. They had to take advantage of the option or not be able to get the ground. Somebody else wanted to buy it. Senate amendment No. 3 provided for an appropriation of \$25,700 to purchase the land. The Secretary of War said to the Postmaster General that he had over at Watertown—and the Postmaster General said it was Watervliet, and that is the reason why the word "Watervliet" is in the report—a building constructed of steel and glass, in sections, that could be taken down in sections, that he had no further use for it, that he would be glad to turn that building over to the Post Office Department. The Post Office Department, anxious to utilize the ground that it is about to purchase, and thereby enlarge the repair shop, is very glad of the opportunity to take advantage of the offer made by the Secretary of War.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Wait until I explain it. The building can be taken down in sections, and the sections loaded on cars, and the building can be reerected in sections without any very great expense. Believing that it is of some advantage to the Government to be able to utilize a building that might otherwise be wasted, and knowing that it would save a large amount of money to erect the building in this way rather than in the ordinary way, the committee were very glad to give their consent to the utilization of a part of the building to be used for the purpose indicated. Now I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. TILSON. Where are these buildings?

Mr. MADDEN. At Watertown, N. Y.

Mr. TILSON. What kind of an arsenal is there at Watertown?

Mr. MADDEN. There is not any arsenal at Watertown. The gentleman from Minnesota just stated that that was a mistake. The Postmaster General, in making the suggestion, as I said, indicated that the buildings were at Watervliet, and "Watervliet" was written into the bill; but it turns out that it is Watertown. The only way that this can be corrected is by a concurrent resolution, which we expect to have passed immediately after this conference report is agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. It is not the only way.

Mr. MADDEN. We could withdraw the report. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROUSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROUSE. The gentleman says this was a Senate amendment. The appropriation was provided for by the House. The Senate amendment made the appropriation immediately available.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; that is correct. That is the whole story. Mr. RAMSEYER. The appropriation by the House simply provided for the purchase of the ground.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if this has been considered by the Post Office Committee.

Mr. MADDEN. This building feature?

Mr. WALSH. This proposition in this amendment.

Mr. STEENERSON. The purchase of the ground?

Mr. WALSH. No; I mean the proposition in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. No; it has not, but the committee thought it was a proper amendment.

Mr. WALSH. There are a lot of buildings here in Washington that could be moved with less expense.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; but the gentleman does not understand the situation as I understand it.

Mr. WALSH. I admit that.

Mr. MADDEN. The buildings here in Washington would not do for this work at all.

Mr. WALSH. Would not they make good repair shops?

Mr. MADDEN. They would not make good repair shops, because they are not built substantially enough to carry the machinery and the shafting and all that. They have not the material in them that could be so reconstructed as to enable a building of sufficiently substantial nature to be constructed to carry the shafting and machinery. This building at Watertown is particularly fitted for the purpose. That is the reason why we propose to utilize it.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know what this building is at Watertown, N. Y., and how it happens to be under the jurisdiction of the War Department?

Mr. MADDEN. It was a munitions building, a Government building, and the Government has no further use for it, and the chances are it will be thrown away. Since it is built in sections, and can be taken down in sections and put up again, it is an easy matter to remove it and to utilize it.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that under this amendment the Secretary of War will deliver the building on the ground down here free of cost to the Post Office Department?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not understand that.

Mr. WALSH. Then who will pay for the transportation?

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose the Post Office Department will pay for the transportation.

Mr. WALSH. Out of what appropriation?

Mr. MADDEN. Out of whatever appropriation it may have at its disposal.

Mr. WALSH. I did not know that any appropriation had been made for the removing of buildings from one part of the country to another.

Mr. MADDEN. We have not made any particular appropriation for moving the building, but I think the advantage to the service justifies the economy that will result from the transfer of this building.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will say that there is an appropriation available for the construction of this building.

Mr. WALSH. You made an appropriation for the building before you provided for the land to put it on?

Mr. STEENERSON. No; this bill does not carry any appropriation for the building; it carries it for the purchase of the land, which the Senate changed so as to make it immediately available.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman stated that there is an appropriation available for the building.

Mr. STEENERSON. I understood so from the Postmaster General.

Mr. WALSH. They must have made an appropriation for the building before they made the appropriation for the land.

Mr. STEENERSON. If the gentleman will wait until I finish my answer. There is a statute authorizing the construction of the building for this purpose, and when they asked for additional ground I understood them to say that they only needed an appropriation for the additional ground, and that there was a fund available for the enlargement of the building. I did not go into the details and I can not cite the statute. If they had wanted an appropriation for the building as well as for additional ground, they would have asked for it.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I understood the gentleman to say there was a law authorizing the construction of this building.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; passed some years ago. This shop has been in operation many years. About eight or nine years ago there was an authorization for the construction and maintenance of shops.

Mr. WALSH. This proposition, it seems to me, is rather an important one.

Mr. MADDEN. It is important, and that is the reason the committee put it in.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman means the conferees.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; the conferees; and because of the value to the service, because of the necessity for it, because of the economy that will result from it, and because of its utilitarian character; and anything that may be said to the contrary does not change the value of it. It does not change the economy of it; it does not change the utility of it; and if by any chance it were not left in it would be a great misfortune and incur a large amount of unnecessary expense to the Government.

Mr. WALSH. That is all true. I admit everything the gentleman from Illinois has said; but it is a matter put in by way of an amendment, clearly legislation, without any consideration on the part of the Post Office Committee, simply as the result of a request made by the Postmaster General. I doubt whether we ought to encourage the heads of departments in procuring legislation on an appropriation bill simply upon request. I have no doubt that if this were submitted to the Post Office Committee, the distinguished chairman of the House committee, with the able assistance of the gentleman from Illinois, would possibly get favorable consideration from the Post Office Committee. I am not opposed to the project, and I agree that it will probably be an economy and give the department an adequate building for the purpose. But I dislike to see the House assent to this way of putting through legislation—simply writing a letter to members of the conference committee, and then jump in what they want on an appropriation bill without the appropriate committee having time to consider it or without the House having a chance to carefully consider it.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. STEENERSON. This matter is in the nature of an emergency, because neither the Post Office Committee nor the department was advised of the existence of this building that was adapted especially for the use for which they want to erect a building on the additional ground. We held a hearing on the purchase of the land, and at that time I assumed that the Post Office Department had not found out about this opportunity. Now, they were informed that there was a building especially suited for this purpose, and the committee on conference had the matter inquired into and postponed it for a day or two in order to let the gentleman from Illinois inquire into the merits of it. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will not insist on his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Has the gentleman or the managers on the part of the House given any consideration as to what the expense would be for moving this building and reconstructing it down here—what the saving would be by doing this over building a new structure?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will say that the managers on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate had this matter under consideration and the facts were explained. But being somewhat of a business proposition we referred it to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who is a business man and a builder. He agreed to look it up. It did not come up again for a day or two, but he has explained it to the conferees as he has explained it on the floor.

Mr. WALSH. He has not given that information. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois, Can the gentleman state in his judgment what the saving would be, if any, in taking the building from Watertown, moving it here, reconstructing it, over the erection of a new building?

Mr. MADDEN. I looked into it carefully, and my judgment was that it would save \$200,000.

Mr. WALSH. And give them a building that is suitable to their needs?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; and right away, so that they can utilize the investment in the ground besides. We need the additional building space very much for the work that is to be done.

Mr. WALSH. Has the gentleman from Minnesota a letter from the Postmaster General requesting this action?

Mr. STEENERSON. It is in my office.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman be willing to put that letter into the RECORD as a part of his explanation?

Mr. STEENERSON. Certainly, and I will do so.

APRIL 8, 1920.

HON. HALVOR STEENERSON,  
*Chairman Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads,  
House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I note in the report of the conferees on the Post Office appropriation bill that amendment No. 3 authorized the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to turn over such buildings or parts thereof as are now located at Watervliet Arsenal, N. Y. The buildings are located at Watertown, N. Y., at which point there is no arsenal, and the wording of the amendment should be corrected accordingly.

Very sincerely,

(Signed) A. S. BURLISON,  
*Postmaster General.*

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Speaker, very reluctantly I will withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I renew the reservation of the point of order. I want to call attention to another matter in this bill which in my judgment is most unjust and unfair and ought itself alone to be sufficient to prevent an agreement by the House to the conference report. That is, Mr. Speaker, the provision in this bill, written into it in conference, with reference to aeroplane mail service. Members of the House will recall that when we had this Post Office appropriation bill under consideration here the provision for aeroplane mail service was stricken out on a point of order. In the Senate it was put in as amendment No. 8, on page 16, providing for an appropriation of \$1,415,000—between certain cities. The conferees, no doubt with a jealous eye to only certain sections of the country and for the purpose of preventing other sections of the country from having an opportunity to test out the aero-mail service, put in amendment 21, at the end of which we find the following provision:

That the Postmaster General shall not use such aeroplanes or aerodromes on any other routes than those between New York and San Francisco herein provided.

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

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to state to the gentleman for his information why this particular route was established. It was to test all climatic conditions through which a successful air service can be conducted, and the experts in the Army and some other branches of the Government testified very extensively to the fact that this particular line would give more opportunity for the development of successful air service in all climatic conditions than any other route that could be established anywhere

in the United States. It is because of the expert testimony to that effect that this line was established—not that some of us believed particularly in the matter of carrying mail by air, but that we felt that it was important that to the extent that the military navigation of the air could be developed through any system of work for the Postal Service, we should encourage it. For myself, I have never believed that it will be possible to carry the mail successfully by air at any price the people of the United States would be able to pay, but I am a believer in the air service for military purposes and to the extent that the Post Office Department can conduct this service and develop efficiency in the air service for military purpose, I am willing to lend my aid. Otherwise, I should be against it.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, a distinguished member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, is that this appropriation is for military purposes. I would like to know when the Post Office Committee became a committee to look after military affairs. If this item is for the purpose of testing aeroplanes for the Army for military purposes it ought to be in the Army appropriation bill and not in the Post Office bill, where the money must be accounted for to the people for the purpose of looking after the mails.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me again?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, the gentleman knows that he did not quote what I said correctly. I did not say it was purely for military purposes.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman says that he would not be for it except for military purposes.

Mr. MADDEN. I say that again; that is my view, but as a matter of fact this appropriation is for the transportation of mail.

Mr. DYER. But the gentleman says that he is not in favor of it and that it is a waste of money.

Mr. MADDEN. It is for the transportation of mail by air, and I say, and I repeat, that I do not believe you can carry mail by air at any price that the people of the United States would be willing to pay; but to the extent that it does earn and at the same time develops military efficiency in the air, this postal facility ought to be encouraged, and it should be encouraged for that purpose, and that alone, in my judgment.

Mr. DYER. Yes. Mr. Speaker, the Second Assistant Postmaster General told me that they urged that these routes be so made as to include one from Minneapolis by way of St. Louis to Atlanta and New Orleans. Why does not that section have consideration in the determination of whether or not this kind of service is of benefit for the people? If they only want it for military reasons the Post Office Committee has no business appropriating that much money for that purpose.

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

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. ROUSE. The Post Office Department recommended and asked the Post Office Committee for \$3,000,000 for this service, but did not specify any particular routes. The Post Office Committee reported to the House a provision asking for \$855,000, and a rule was to have been asked for making that provision in order.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Did not the representatives of the Post Office Department at the time of their hearing specify certain routes, including Chicago, St. Louis, and certain other points?

Mr. ROUSE. I believe they did, and an extension of the route from New York to Washington and to Atlanta.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. And those facts were under consideration at the time that matter was considered, and they indicated at that time, did they not, that the routes which they would establish first was a route from New York to Chicago and on to Seattle and one by the same route to Chicago and on to San Francisco?

Mr. ROUSE. I do not remember about that particular route. I know they wanted to establish a route across the country, but I want to say to the gentleman that the House never had an opportunity to consider that provision. When that provision of the bill was reached, the point of order was made and the point of order was sustained.

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. ROUSE. And the item went out entirely; the Senate inserted a provision for \$1,415,000.

Mr. DYER. Then the conferees wrote in their amendment No. 21, which, if agreed to by the House and the Senate, even prevents the continuance of the air-mail service already in operation between Washington and New York.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, they have already abandoned that.

Mr. DYER. They would have to quit that and they could not experiment at any other place in the country except upon this one route. St. Louis could not have the opportunity of having the benefit of this service, although it has been represented to the people of St. Louis by the postmaster and other postal authorities that it was the absolute desire and intention to use this service there, and the people went to considerable expense on those representations, getting ready for the use of that service. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to give my permission or consent to having the Post Office Committee write into this bill legislation of this character, discriminating against the section of the country that I come from, and this conference report will not be agreed to with my permission for that very reason.

Mr. MADDEN. But this is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. DYER. I will make a point of order to something that is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. But that will not change this bill.

Mr. DYER. It will give the opportunity to see whether or not the House desires to discriminate against certain sections of the country in favor of other sections.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the gentleman briefly, if he is through.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. DYER. I will make the point of order when the time comes.

Mr. MADDEN. I demand the regular order. If we are going to have a point of order made, it ought to be made now.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman from Illinois has had some time, and I think the chairman ought to have some time.

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, with reference to this aeroplane provision I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] that, as already pointed out, the bill carried an appropriation for air mail of \$850,000 when it came to the House without specifying where. The department had a proposition, then, involving an expense of some \$3,000,000 for St. Louis, Minneapolis, Atlanta, and so on, and for the continuation of the route between Washington and New York. The provision we put in went out on the point of order. The Senate put in this provision from New York to San Francisco. Now, if the gentleman will give me his attention there is this to be said: The House conferees were of the opinion, at least most of them, a majority of them, that as a mail facility the aeroplane service is not a success. We were satisfied that the route between here and New York had not expedited the mail, and it was largely a waste of money. With reference to this proposition of mail from New York to San Francisco there is this in its favor: As a mail facility it would not be justified, but the Senate put it in largely for military reasons. It was attacked in the Senate exactly the same as it is now by the gentleman from Missouri, especially by the gentleman from South Carolina [Senator DIAL], who asked for a route to Atlanta and New Orleans, and when we argued this matter in conference the conferees on the part of the Senate put forth the argument that this was not adopted here mainly because of its postal value but because of its value from the military point of view, and they cited the testimony of Gen. Mitchell before the committee, which is printed in the hearing, in which he at great length showed that this particular route would be of greater service to the military and to the Government than any other. It had the advantage of being a transcontinental route. It would establish landing fields and airdromes at proper distances. It would enable the Government to mobilize their air forces on the Atlantic or Pacific as the case might require. He emphasized the fact that this route would carry them over a high altitude of from 10,000 to 12,000 feet, which they needed in order to develop a certainty of flying at such altitude. They wanted for a military purpose to prove the practicability of a transcontinental route.

Mr. WELLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. In a moment. When he was asked this question: "Now, if you knew that only one aeroplane route could be established, what aeroplane route would you establish?" He answered unhesitatingly, "It would be the route from New York to San Francisco for the reason I have already given." He elaborated upon it that it was of immense value, and, besides that, it was the kind of experiment that could not be performed by the military branch of the Government. They had not the facility to fly across the continent.

A transcontinental line for postal purposes will aid the military branch of the Government more than any other. It will carry a heavier load than otherwise and aid in the experimentation with aeroplanes. This argument on the part of Gen. Mitchell convinced the Members of the Post Office Committee of the Senate that only one route should be put in, and they put in \$1,415,000. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WELLING. Will the War Department or the Post Office Department lay out these routes?

Mr. STEENERSON. I think the War Department will aid the Post Office Department in laying them out.

Mr. WELLING. And select their landing fields and places for airdromes?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; they will be glad to aid, as they are very much interested.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Certainly.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does the Post Office Department expect to have the use of military aviators to carry these mails in this service?

Mr. STEENERSON. The statement is that all the aviators are ex-service men. But when they are flying for the Post Office Department they are employed and paid by the Post Office Department, and they are not under the jurisdiction of the War Department, but they are men who have received their training in the Aviation Service of the War Department.

Mr. BRIGGS. Suppose the Post Office Department wanted to make a change by not finding it possible or expedient to carry this mail by air between New York and San Francisco; would not this proviso absolutely prevent them from doing so?

Mr. STEENERSON. I did not catch the gentleman's idea.

Mr. BRIGGS. Would not this provision in the bill, "Provided, That the Postmaster General shall not use such airplanes or airdromes on any other routes than the one between New York and San Francisco, Calif."—

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, I will explain that in a minute. It is not a new proposition. That is in another part of the bill.

Mr. ROUSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. ROUSE. The gentleman knows this air service was never considered in the House?

Mr. STEENERSON. Not the San Francisco route.

Mr. ROUSE. The gentleman knows that no service was considered; that this item was not considered in the House when the bill was before the House in January?

Mr. STEENERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROUSE. Will the gentleman state to the House why the rule was not asked for making this provision in order when he drew up a resolution for a rule?

Mr. STEENERSON. That was explained in the gentleman's presence here when the matter was upon the floor.

Mr. ROUSE. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. SIMS. And the leader [Mr. MONDELL] stated here that the Rules Committee would not grant such a rule.

Mr. ROUSE. The gentleman knows that the committee directed him to ask for a rule?

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman knows nothing of the kind.

Mr. ROUSE. It is a matter of record.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman knows the committee authorized the chairman to ask for a rule to make the legislation in order, but did not give any direction, and I did not so understand, and if I was mistaken I can not help it.

Mr. ROUSE. Is it a fact the gentleman did not ask for a rule for the Air Service nor for the Motor Truck Service?

Mr. STEENERSON. Before the rule was drawn and introduced I went and asked the leader on this side whether or not the committee would grant a rule on that proposition. He has always favored economy, and I wanted to know before I drew the rule, and he advised me that no rule of that kind would be granted.

Mr. ROUSE. The gentleman obeyed the order from the leader of the majority side and not from his committee?

Mr. STEENERSON. No; I deny that. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that I was one of the supporters of this proposition in conference, and there was a division of votes.

Mr. ROUSE. I supported it in conference, because I am very heartily in favor of the Air Service, and I wanted the House to have opportunity to consider these matters, and that is the reason I was interested in the rule and this item.

Mr. STEENERSON. While I am on my feet I might as well explain the further provisions in regard to the Air Service. The Senate conferees convinced us that this was the most valuable route that could be selected, mainly for the reasons that I have stated, that it was of military value over and above all other routes, and, much to our regret, we did not feel that we were justified in spending any more money than the amount provided. The amount was reduced to \$1,250,000.

Now, I want the attention of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROUSE]. The Post Office officials in the Second Assistant Postmaster General's office have made calculations for the purpose of inducing Congress to grant large appropriations for this service. They

wanted to have lines all over the country. In order to use those lines they figured out they could carry the first-class mail with aeroplanes cheaper than they could in any other way. If you will examine the Record and the speech of the Senator from South Carolina, where he advocated a mail route from Atlanta to New Orleans, you will find he prints a table where the Post Office Department shows that there will be a saving of money instead of a loss in carrying the mail by aeroplane. Now, then, the conferees on the part of the majority did not believe that. We have not been convinced yet, but we take the department at its word, and consequently, under the provisions of the bill in relation to the appropriation for inland transportation of mail, we have put in in conference the provision that they may enter into contracts for aircraft service out of the appropriation of \$59,000,000 for railroad transportation if they can get that transportation at no greater cost than railroad transportation. And I will say that railroad transportation has gone up 50 per cent in the last 60 or 90 days to the Government because of the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

We have also inserted here a clause in regard to the item of transportation of foreign mails, \$4,700,000. We put in the item that not exceeding \$100,000 may be expended in a contract aircraft service. That will cover the route from Key West to Habana, and perhaps two or three other routes equally important. Now, then, if the department is correct in that they can carry first-class mail as cheap or cheaper than by rail, then they can use the part of that \$59,000,000 to carry the mail to St. Louis; they can carry it to Minneapolis, and they can carry it to Atlanta. Now, perhaps, I ought to explain to you why I say that. The reason they advance is that they can do it just as cheap, because first-class mail has to be distributed en route, in expensive railway post-office cars. They have to have in these distributing cases. It occupies a large part of the railway post-office car, for which they pay a compensation of 33½ cents per mile, and they say that with airplanes they do not distribute en route, but that they distribute in terminals and post offices, and with much cheaper clerks, and that the aeroplane goes so fast that they deliver the mail to the end of the route quicker than they could get it by rail. Therefore, they say, they save this car space, which is expensive. Now, if that be true, then you can have your air-mail route to St. Louis and to Atlanta and to Minneapolis. We can not always get what we appropriate for, because last year, as I have explained to the House before, we did appropriate expressly on the assurance that we would get aeroplane service to the twin cities, but after it was appropriated they failed to establish the service. It never has been established, although it should have been established a year ago. We put in this proviso to the appropriation for the transportation of mail by railroad as follows:

*Provided further*, That the Postmaster General may contract with any individual, firm, or corporation for an aircraft mail service between such points as he may deem advisable and designate, in case such service is furnished at a cost not greater than the cost of the same service by rail, and shall pay therefor out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes.

And if they can, as they say, carry mail as cheaply by air as by railroad they will carry mail to those towns—Minneapolis, St. Louis, and Atlanta. There is ample authority for that.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question or two about another matter. I think I have heard enough of that part of the question.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will be glad to yield later on that.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota that he will recall at the time the aeroplane carrying of mail was up for discussion with the Second Assistant Postmaster General I was there and questioned him in reference to the fulfillment of the promise made the year previous for aeroplane mail service from Chicago to Minneapolis, and at the time there was up for discussion a transcontinental route.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. And I asked him if the service from Chicago to Minneapolis was in any way dependent upon the putting through of the transcontinental route.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. And the Postmaster General said, "No; it was not." Now, my attention was called this morning to a paper received from the city of Minneapolis on the 8th of April to the effect that air mail service to Minneapolis was killed by Congress, based upon a telegram from the Second Assistant Postmaster General to the postmaster at Minneapolis. Now, what I want to ask the gentleman is this: If this paragraph 8 referred to in the conference report is adopted and becomes a law, will that in any way restrict or abridge the right of the Post Office Department to use the money that is now

available for the purpose of extending service from Chicago to the Twin Cities?

Mr. STEENERSON. Not at all. The conversation the gentleman has referred to is printed in the hearings on that occasion.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. DYER. On that very thing I talked with the Post Office Department this morning, and they told me they were of the absolute opinion that if the conference report is agreed to they could not use any part of the machinery on any route at any other place than the one absolutely specified in this report, which provides for one from New York to San Francisco by way of Chicago.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman is talking about another matter. I am coming to that in a minute.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman wants to know if Minneapolis was being experimented on.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Newton] was talking about the route to Minneapolis. It was appropriated for, and the money is in the Treasury now, unexpended. The year expires on the last day of June. We appropriated that money on the assurance of the department that the service was to be established to Minneapolis. It has not been established. We have put in a clause here, on the assurance of the department, to take care of airplane mail when it is as cheap as the service by rail, and providing that they can use the money for that purpose. If it is true, as they say, that they can carry it as cheaply by air, they certainly will carry the airplane mail to Minneapolis. We accepted their word last year and now we do the same thing, hoping that they will get their mail by airplane or dirigible to Minneapolis.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I wish to ask this question of my colleague: If the appropriation is not all expended by the 30th of June, is that available for the next year?

Mr. STEENERSON. It is available for two years after the year expires.

Now, as to the matter referred to a moment ago by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Dyer]—that is, amendment No. 21. It is as follows:

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of War is authorized hereafter, in his discretion, to turn over to the Postmaster General, without charge therefor, from time to time, such motor vehicles, aeroplanes, airdromes, and parts thereof, and machinery and tools to repair and maintain the same, as may be suitable for use in the Postal Service; and the Postmaster General is authorized to use the same in the transportation of the mails and to pay the necessary expenses thereof, including the replacement, maintenance, exchange, and repair of such equipment, and the transfer and fabrication of such airdromes, out of any appropriation available, for the service in which such vehicles, airdromes, or aeroplanes are used: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General shall not use such aeroplanes or airdromes on any other routes than the one between New York, N. Y., and San Francisco, Calif., herein provided for.

It was in the last year's bill. It is in the existing law, but it was changed somewhat in the verbiage, so that the Postmaster General was authorized to use such articles in the transportation of the mail and to pay the necessary expenses thereof out of any appropriation available for the service in which such vehicles, airdromes, and aeroplanes are used. We thought they might use the money appropriated for any particular service, including either maintenance or operation of these aeroplanes or machines.

There was doubt expressed by some of the conferees as to whether that would authorize them to establish and operate new routes with airplanes so obtained—operate them out of the funds in that service, whether it was a route to Minneapolis, or Atlanta, or elsewhere; but it was said it was not their intention to do that, and that they were perfectly willing to make it plain that this money should not be used except on the route established to San Francisco. That was the reason for adding the limitation as to the use.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I want to ask a question there for information. This amendment 21 also provides for airplanes and airdromes. I notice in the statement that is printed here that such vehicles and airplanes and airdromes shall not be used on other routes than San Francisco. That is a mistake?

Mr. STEENERSON. It simply applies to airplanes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. There is no intention on the part of the committee to prohibit the use of the vehicles on the other routes?

Mr. STEENERSON. No.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, it has just been stated to me that the Post Office Department is building a lot of new machines now for the purpose of carrying the mail.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. This does not prohibit the use of those machines on some other route?

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. SNYDER. Some of these machines I understand cost as much as \$30,000 apiece.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] reserves a point of order.

Mr. DYER. I make the point of order. I will make it either to the Speaker or to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STEENERSON. Let the gentleman make it.

Mr. DYER. I will make it if I have the opportunity.

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

Mr. DYER. The provision to which I make the point of order—

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I insist on the gentleman making the point of order instead of making a speech. I demand the regular order.

Mr. DYER. Under the rules, Mr. Speaker, I understand the Speaker himself is the one who determines whether or not—

Mr. MADDEN. I demand the regular order.

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

Mr. DYER. Without going into the various items of this bill which are subject to a point of order, I will only mention the first one, which is found on the first page. That is amendment No. 3. In connection with that, I call the attention of the Speaker to the rule, Jefferson's Manual, page—

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

Mr. DYER. The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that this subject matter of amendment No. 3 has not been covered either in the bill that passed the House or the bill that passed the Senate, but it was put in entirely new by the conferees.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] admit that fact? It may save examination on the part of the Chair.

Mr. STEENERSON. We do not admit it, because we think that the subject matter is so closely connected.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will examine the bill. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Minnesota or anybody else on the committee if they wish to show to the Chair that this is in order.

Mr. STEENERSON. As I understand the point of order—the gentleman from Missouri has not stated it very clearly—

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the subject matter was not contained in either the Senate or House bill, and the Chair must admit at first blush that it so appears to the Chair. The Chair will be glad to hear any suggestion from the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STEENERSON. Of course, if that were construed strictly, it would apply to this proviso. The proviso is attached to an appropriation for a building site, and it is to be placed on that building site—this building that we provide for the removal of is to be placed on the said land—and it seems to me that that is sufficiently connected. You can not very well say that that is entirely new legislation.

The SPEAKER. The House has attached a proviso to amendment No. 3. The Chair sustains the point of order, unless there is something further shown which would lead him to rule otherwise.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to be heard on that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the House provided for an appropriation of \$25,700 for the purchase of a piece of land adjoining the repair shop connected with the Post Office Department in the city of Washington, and the Senate made that immediately available. The conferees then provided for the utilization of the land by authorizing the Postmaster General to accept, without cost, the material in the fabricated building from the Secretary of War, which the Postmaster General is also authorized to erect and refabricate. So that, as a matter of fact, the two subjects are related, the one being merely an amendment or an enlargement of the other.

Now, if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] is willing to assume the responsibility of making a point of order to an item in a bill that saves the Government \$200,000 and at the same time furnishes facilities with which to conduct the affairs of the Post Office Department more economically than they are now being conducted, of course the responsibility is his; but I do not believe the amendment is subject to a point of order. I think it was entirely within the province of the conferees to write this amendment into the bill as reported from the Senate, and I think it is perfectly in order for the Chair and perfectly within the rule for the Chair to hold this point of order not well taken.

But let us assume, for the sake of the argument, that it is subject to a point of order. Then let me ask in this connection

whether the gentleman from Missouri is so obsessed with the importance of an experimental air line from St. Louis to Chicago that he is willing to squander \$200,000 of the people's money in order that he may be able to curry favor with a few people in St. Louis, who want an air line that is not necessary? That is what I should like to find out.

The SPEAKER. The Chair regrets very much to have a conference report go out on a point of order and in any case where he felt justified in doing so would overrule the point of order; but the Chair does not see how this amendment can possibly be hung onto the Senate amendment, so as to provide that it shall be immediately available, and the Chair is regretfully obliged to sustain the point of order.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I presume this necessarily requires the bill to go back to conference, and I therefore move that the House further disagree to the amendments of the Senate and ask a conference with the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER. I understand that this point of order being sustained, the whole conference report goes back?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Now, when it comes back, what becomes of points of order to the remainder of the conference report?

The SPEAKER. We can not tell in what shape it will come back the next time.

Mr. MILLER. Will it come before the House in the same condition in which it now is?

The SPEAKER. We can not tell in what shape it will come back.

Mr. MILLER. If the same conference report comes back with the exception of the amendment which went out on the point of order, will it then be in the same parliamentary situation as to the other part of the report?

The SPEAKER. Exactly; yes.

The motion of Mr. STEENERSON was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. STEENERSON, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. GRIEST, Mr. MOON, and Mr. ROUSE.

#### CODE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 8025, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, and I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR FORTIFICATIONS.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the fortifications appropriation bill, H. R. 13555; and pending that, I will ask the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EAGAN] how much time he desires for general debate.

Mr. EAGAN. I have had requests for two hours and a half, but I think we can cut that down to an hour and a half on this side.

Mr. SLEMP. Will that be satisfactory to the gentleman?

Mr. EAGAN. I think so.

Mr. SLEMP. I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to three hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EAGAN] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the general debate on this bill be limited to three hours, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EAGAN]. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

\* There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. SLEMP was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13555) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, with Mr. SANFORD in the chair.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP]. [Applause.]

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, the fortifications bill makes appropriation for the seacoast defenses of the United States, for Panama, for the insular possessions, and for mobile artillery. The estimates submitted to the committee originally were \$117,793,330. These were subsequently reduced by the War Department to \$66,294,114, and it is this latter estimate that was more largely the subject of investigation by the committee. The reduction is about \$98,000,000 from the original estimate and \$48,000,000 from the revised estimate. Inasmuch as there had been reserved in the hands of the War Department a very large sum of money for the settlement of claims arising from contracts for the production of ordnance, and which sum, under the law, was subject to obligation and expenditure prior to July 1, 1920, for ordnance production, it was necessary for the committee to ascertain the status of this fund at the present time and the extent to which it is to be used for ordnance production during the coming fiscal year in order to determine the appropriate amounts in this bill. The War Department responded to the wishes of the committee in this respect, and upon its statement that a little more than \$800,000,000 of previous appropriations would be restored to the Treasury on June 30, 1920, this bill contains a provision preventing its obligation prior to that date. In this connection I wish to thank Gen. Rice particularly for his cooperation and assistance in determining the amount that can thus be returned. I can not thank the members of the subcommittee too much for their unselfish labors and cooperation. The quiet but effective work of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EAGAN], aided by the affable and courteous gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], who uses the rapier with a smile, and whose delicate and friendly suggestions will always assist any chairman, however inefficient, combined with the comforting support of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. OGDEN], who is serving his first term on the committee, are responsible for whatever merit the measure possesses. [Applause.]

The cancellation of previous appropriations to the extent of \$800,000,000 has the approval of the Director of Finance, the Chief of Ordnance, and the Claims Board. It is likely that an additional amount will be returned on June 30 from the balances not recovered, which amount to \$346,333,446.10. The fortifications bill in prewar times carried generally an annual appropriation of from \$5,000,000 to \$9,000,000. The estimate this year of \$117,000,000 and subsequently of \$66,000,000 by the War Department, so much larger than former times, caused the committee to give serious consideration to the amount of money spent on purposes connected with our seacoast defenses during the war, and also to what extent our supply of mobile artillery, including ammunition, had been increased during this period. The Chief of Coast Artillery reports that about \$90,000,000 has been spent on our seacoast defenses since our declaration of war in 1917, an amount almost equal to two-thirds of the entire amount we had expended for that purpose in the previous years, while in mobile artillery and ammunition we have accumulated a quantity never before contemplated by any Congress.

During this period we have practically completed the installation of all 12-inch long-range guns contemplated by our seacoast service; continued the construction of thirteen 16-inch guns and twelve 16-inch howitzers, which had been insisted upon by our experts for many years; acquired 42 new and powerful 14-inch guns; secured about 300 guns on railway mounts, while the mobility of our Field Artillery is such that a large portion of it can in case of emergency be used in repelling an attack on our shores. Incidentally our ammunition supply has been accumulated to an extent greater than had been asked for in any board of review report ever submitted. Our mine project for the harbors of the United States is complete. Our fire-control project almost complete and standardized. Our searchlight program is in a progressive state of development, and our defenses generally are better than we have ever had them before. But apart from all these affirmative conditions the world has just come through the most devastating and destructive war of all the ages. The one nation that endangered the peace of the world in the philosophy it cultivated lies prostrate before the world, its armies disbanded, its fortifications razed to the ground, and its navy at the bottom of the sea. Other nations, with possibly a single exception, burdened with a debt they almost can not pay, struggling to restore the waste places of their countries and fighting to regain their moral, physical, and economical equilibrium, should offer us little concern for the im-

mediate future. Should we listen only to considerations of this kind we should perhaps do less in this bill than we have done. Should we, on the contrary, prepare against every theoretical or possible emergency we might do more. The theory on which this bill is framed is that the United States both for itself, its insular possessions, and Panama should spend some money each year by way of insurance to maintain in an efficient condition the various posts established at so much expense, and to continue our production of war material in a small way so that the art of gun making will not be lost in this country, and in general to continue in such a state of preparedness that at little expense we can expand our productive facilities to meet any national emergency. For considerations of this kind the committee eliminated every unnecessary expenditure from the bill. To compare properly this bill with the previous fortifications bill is difficult, because the last bill carried a provision covering into the Treasury all balances unexpended and unobligated on June 30, 1920; but during this fiscal year expenditures were made of large amounts not appropriated for in the annual bill but carried in previous appropriations. In this bill we have cleaned the slate of all previous appropriations. The amount carried in this bill will therefore be the total amount that can be obligated during the coming fiscal year for the purposes mentioned in the bill. Had we continued the previous practice of continuing appropriations, this bill would have been much reduced, probably carrying not more than \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 as in former years. I wish the committee thoroughly to understand this.

The maintenance items, so far as they relate to our fortifications proper, differ very little from the appropriations carried for that purpose in previous acts. The cost of materials of all kinds is greater, and labor costs are greater, and this is reflected to some extent in maintenance items.

No money is appropriated for purely field artillery.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SLEMP. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LITTLE. Every year for 32 years there has been an appropriation for a Board of Ordnance and Fortification. Some time ago, as chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws, while engaged in that work I discovered that there never had been any authorization for that appropriation. I called the attention of the Secretary of War to that fact, and after careful consideration he informed me that they would manage to get along without the Board of Ordnance and Fortification, and that he would not ask for any appropriation for that purpose. May I ask the gentleman what has been the result of that?

Mr. SLEMP. I will say in reply to the gentleman that the War Department withdrew the estimate of \$58,500 for that board for the coming fiscal year, and will return to the Treasury Department the unexpended balance in that fund of \$230,000, or a total of \$288,500, so that the gentleman is responsible for saving to the Treasury \$288,500.

Mr. MONDELL. That is worth while.

Mr. SLEMP. Our situation in this respect is that we have between 10,000 and 11,000 pieces of artillery, embracing about every standard type from 16-inch down to 3-inch guns, whereas before the war we had fewer than 900.

No money is carried in this bill for field ammunition, the large part of the amount carried for that purpose being for the preparation and care of the ammunition already on hand. This was urgently requested by the Chief of Ordnance.

In seacoast artillery, where the original estimates were over \$14,000,000, \$2,000,000 only is carried. The situation regarding this is that in 1918 the War Department entered into contract for the construction of thirteen 16-inch guns and twelve 16-inch howitzers for our seacoast defenses, perhaps the most useful and the most effective gun in the world, and requested by every expert board from the Endicott Board down. At the end of this fiscal year these guns will be in an advanced state of completion. The committee decided to continue their production, but at a reduced rate.

In seacoast ammunition consideration was given to the supply already on hand, to the obligations already incurred for the manufacture of seacoast ammunition the coming fiscal year, and appropriated a sum very much smaller than requested, but ample in all respects for our needs.

Repair and maintenance items for both seacoast artillery and field artillery are larger than usual, but were made necessary by the large amount of war material still on hand and not yet in shape either to be used or to be stored away. I confidently expect a material reduction in these items in the future.

The committee made appropriation for railway carriages for 14-inch guns. This is requested by every officer of the War Department that came before the committee as being in line



with the progressive development of the use of artillery in substituting mobility for fixedness in our seacoast defenses.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLEMP. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. It was stated some time ago by one of the officers before the Committee on Military Affairs that we had field artillery sufficient to arm an army of 4,000,000 men. Did the committee look into that?

Mr. SLEMP. The statement before the committee on that subject was that we had field artillery sufficient to arm an army of 1,500,000 men. On certain arms we had a surplus for an army of 1,500,000 men. Of the 75-millimeter guns we have more than 2,000 surplus. Of the 155-millimeter we had enough to correspond to an army of a million and a half men. It was stated that we have a tremendous surplus, if you regard the Army from the peace standpoint, say something like 300,000 men; but from the standpoint of 1,500,000 men we have a sufficient amount in nearly all of the standard type and a surplus in some.

In this connection the committee makes appropriation of \$1,800,000—for field emplacement, \$400,000; to complete emplacement of the twenty-four 12-inch long-range guns, which lacks that much of completion, \$400,000; to continue the 16-inch gun emplacement at Fort Michie, in which \$212,000 has been spent and obligated and the remainder to begin the emplacement of the 16-inch guns and howitzers now under construction.

The character of these emplacements is not yet determined. Of the costliest type, these emplacements would cost to finish at least \$70,000 or probably more. The Chief of Coast Artillery assures the committee that a study of this subject will be made this spring in connection with the Chief of Engineers to install the simplest kind of emplacements, securing the protection these wonderful guns afford with minimum cost.

Another point that had the careful consideration of the committee was the request of the War Department for large funds for experimental and development purposes. This applies to all kinds of war material—guns of all calibers and their carriages, ammunition of all kinds, fuses, tractors, searchlights, mounts for guns, and every kind of fighting utensil that should or could be considered by this committee. The War Department spent this fiscal year more than \$2,000,000, perhaps \$3,000,000, on this work alone. The theory of the War Department is that this experimental and development work should best be done now while the knowledge gained from the European war could best be utilized. While in general the committee agrees that this is most important and useful work, yet the committee feels that the development should take place in an orderly way, with fewer types considered, tested, and finally passed upon and then others taken up. The amount therefore asked for this purpose is much reduced, but yet involves a substantial amount.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLEMP. I will.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. This may not be germane, but out of curiosity I would like to know what is the cost of these big guns.

Mr. SLEMP. The cost of a 16-inch gun and carriage is \$550,000. The cost of a 16-inch howitzer and carriage is \$350,000. Guns and carriages under construction will be 60 per cent completed at the end of the fiscal year. The War Department says that all the howitzers will be completed during the next fiscal year, and also all of the 12-inch guns. The appropriations recommended by the committee change the rate of delivery of the 16-inch guns and howitzers.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLEMP. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. What is the maximum range of these large guns?

Mr. SLEMP. That depends on a lot of facts, such as the rifling in the gun, the character of the projectile, and the change of the band, and so on. Recently a change was made in the bands in the production of the smaller type of guns, and that increased the range materially. They expect to be able to have the 16-inch guns have a range of 40,000 or 50,000 yards, and one officer stated as high as 60,000 yards. A 16-inch howitzer may be regarded as having a range of 50 per cent of the 16-inch gun. The reason for the difference in the range of the howitzer is that it fires at such an elevation that it will attack the deck armor of a vessel, while the 16-inch gun will attack the side armor.

What is the absolute effective range of destruction against a battleship seems difficult to determine. They are intended to attack a 13½-inch side armor, and of course a smaller armor on deck, because the deck armor usually runs about 3 inches. The penetration depends upon the angle at which the shot strikes the object. Their effort is to get a range up to 40,000

yards for a 20 per cent degree of impact against the armor. I should say a 16-inch gun would get up to 40,000 yards and the development of a change in the shell would make it between 40,000 and 60,000 yards.

In aviation the committee took action only on the estimates submitted to it. For the Hawaiian Islands the bill carries an appropriation of \$1,300,000 and \$239,000 for Panama, both of which are very essential.

In regard to the Panama item, of the \$239,000, \$230,000 is for the enlargement of France Field and \$9,000 for emergency landing places. It was testified before the committee that several boys had lost their lives on the France Field because of the shortness of the field.

In the Hawaiian item we have the aviation personnel all there without housing or barracks in which to live and without fresh water to drink; the water supply is brackish; they are also without sewerage facilities, and this bill carries the minimum amount, or a reduction of 50 per cent of what the War Department asked.

There are only 65 minor items and 8 legislative items in the bill. About half these items approximate the amounts carried in previous acts and the remainder I have given a general explanation of.

The bill is submitted to the committee by unanimous vote of both the Subcommittee on Fortifications and the full Committee on Appropriations, with the confident hope that it will merit the approval of the Committee of the Whole. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] 15 minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I hope gentlemen will not consider my speech political, although it is in a sense political.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it a corollary to what happened yesterday?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know to what the gentleman refers. I will say that some industrious person has given out a statement—I do not believe it comes from the Treasury Department—that during this fiscal year down to the 31st of March our public debt has been very materially reduced, and for the month of March reduced to the extent of about three-quarters of a billion dollars, which is an error. But that statement has gone out broadcast over the country through the newspapers and has been so changed as to comment favorably upon the work of the administration in reducing the public debt during that length of time.

The administration apparently released a statement to the press April 1 calling attention to the marked reduction in the national debt during the month of March. The publicity given this statement in certain channels points with considerable pride to this reduction and other reductions accomplished by the administration during the current fiscal year 1920.

The following article is typical of newspaper comment on April 2, and purports to be based on statements by Treasury officials:

**\$705,660,000 REDUCTION MADE IN NATIONAL DEBT IN MARCH—CUT IS MORE THAN DOUBLE THAT OF ANY PREVIOUS MONTH AND INDICATES SUCCESS OF FINANCIAL PROGRAM, SAYS TREASURY DEPARTMENT.**

WASHINGTON, April 2.

A reduction of \$705,660,000 in the national debt—more than double the amount by which the debt was lowered during any previous month—was accomplished in March, the Treasury reported to-night. The national debt now stands at \$24,698,000,000.

Officials said this record could not be used as a basis for forecasting further monthly reductions. They regarded it, however, as "sound evidence" of the success of the Treasury program for financing the postwar period when Government expenditures still continue to run high.

March payments on the public debt were confined almost wholly to retirement of certificates of indebtedness issued in anticipation of income and profit taxes.

Reductions by months since August, when the retirements began, were: October, \$15,533,000; November, \$94,478,000; December, \$278,973,000; January, \$168,689,000; and February, \$264,057,000. Heavy payments on the debt in December and February were traceable to the retirement of certificates of indebtedness, but the amount of obligations retired each month, although fluctuating, has been on the increase.

Future monthly reductions will hinge largely on new appropriations and tax legislation, officials said. They expected, however, that operation of the sinking fund would reflect more and more on the gross national debt each month hereafter. None would venture a prediction as to the net reduction for the calendar year.

As the public debt now stands it is made up of \$15,616,800,000, comprising the four issues of Liberty bonds, \$4,422,700,000 of Victory short-term notes, \$2,667,220,000 in Treasury certificates, \$870,000,000 in war-savings certificates, and approximately \$1,000,000,000 in bonds issued prior to the World War.

The greatest single item among those old bonds is the issue of consols of 1930, which aggregate \$600,000,000.

I call attention to the fact that this article states that officials regard the reduction in the national debt as "sound evidence" of the success of the Treasury program. That alleged "sound

evidence," permit me to say, is based on a wholly fictitious reduction of the national debt.

Such claims, if made deliberately, resolve themselves into sheer misrepresentation; misrepresentation which raises false hopes and a false confidence in the public mind. The outstanding fact is that since July 1, 1919, our disbursements have exceeded our revenue from all sources by \$214,207,713.82.

**CASH BALANCE IN TREASURY EXHAUSTED TO REDUCE PUBLIC DEBT.**

Our public debt since June 30, 1919, the close of the fiscal year 1919, has been reduced to the extent of but \$785,934,576.05.

The explanation of this net reduction during a period when our expenditures exceeded receipts is in this: The cash balance, current assets, of the general fund during this period were decreased to the extent of \$1,000,042,289.35.

In other words, the improvement in the status of our funded debt, since June 30, 1919, has been more than offset by the depreciation of a billion dollars in our cash assets.

The situation is summed up in the following table:

Cash balance June 30, 1919	\$1,251,664,827.54	
General fund Mar. 1, 1920	251,622,538.19	
Decrease in cash assets		\$1,000,042,289.35
Public debt June 30, 1919	\$25,484,506,160.05	
Public debt Mar. 31, 1920	24,698,671,584.52	
Decrease in public debt		785,735,575.53
Net decrease in assets		214,207,713.82

For the purpose of showing the comparative condition of the Treasury, the balance in the general fund should be deducted from the gross debt. I will here give the difference between gross debt and net balance, month by month, from June 30, 1919, to March 31, 1920:

	Gross debt.	Balance in general fund.	Difference.
<b>1919.</b>			
June 30	\$25,484,506,160	\$1,251,664,827	\$24,232,841,333
July 31	25,800,033,536	818,700,336	24,981,333,200
Aug. 31	26,596,701,648	1,118,109,534	25,478,592,114
Sept. 30	26,194,996,798	1,191,738,500	25,003,258,298
Oct. 31	26,210,530,269	888,032,521	25,322,497,748
Nov. 30	26,116,051,951	666,107,671	25,449,944,280
Dec. 31	25,837,078,807	987,415,459	24,850,663,348
<b>1920.</b>			
Jan. 31	25,668,389,095	725,770,073	24,942,619,017
Feb. 29	25,404,331,707	395,782,596	25,008,549,111
Mar. 31	24,698,671,584	251,622,538	24,447,049,046

This indicates that the condition of the Treasury is less favorable on March 31, 1920, than on June 30, 1919, by \$214,000,000, and this is in harmony with statement contained in the Daily Statement of the United States Treasury of March 31, 1920, which gives the excess of disbursements over receipts as \$214,207,713.

**WHY DID THE GOVERNMENT CARRY SUCH ENORMOUS CASH BALANCES?**

The Treasury closed the month of March, 1920, with a cash balance of but \$251,000,000. From June 30, 1919, up to the beginning of February, 1920, the cash balances in the Treasury have fluctuated from approximately \$700,000,000 to \$1,250,000,000. During this period the refunding of maturing Treasury certificates by new issues of certificates was constantly going on.

Why the Treasury Department did not exhaust these balances in order to reduce the debt at an earlier date is the question which might be appropriately asked.

In the same connection it should be pointed out that, with the cash balance exhausted, the Treasury Department now recognizes the necessity for new borrowings, through Treasury short-term certificates, to meet expenses for the next two months.

**THE ADMINISTRATION'S POSTWAR EXPENDITURES PROGRAM.**

Real and permanent improvement in the condition of the Treasury can come only from economical administration. The American people had hoped that the current fiscal year 1920 would witness a substantial return to prewar conditions and prewar expenditures. With the signing of the armistice Congress expected that the administration would submit a definite program of retrenchment and readjustment in connection with its estimates, then about to be transmitted, for the fiscal year 1920.

The original estimates, which were transmitted on December 18, 1918—subsequent to the armistice—failed to reveal real effort toward retrenchment. They called for \$8,000,000,000. It was the administration's formal demand for appropriations covering a fiscal year which would not begin until eight months after the armistice. On analysis they appeared to be a mere compilation of departmental requests without reductions, explanations

of increase, or coordination looking toward economy. Their submission followed the customary, formal, and—in the expressed indifference of economy—casual methods of computing requests which had been universally condemned.

In addition to the original estimates calling for \$8,000,000,000, there were submitted supplemental requests not included in the original requests, which amounted to more than \$3,000,000,000. The estimates, original and supplemental, and the appropriations, original and supplemental, for 1920 might be summed up as follows:

Requests:		
a. Regular (original estimates)	\$8,089,667,298	
b. Supplemental and deficiency (not included in original)	3,128,243,372	
Total requests		\$11,218,191,670
Appropriations:		
a. Regular	3,035,151,723	
b. Supplemental and deficiency (including permanent, etc.) (1)	4,328,544,657	
Total appropriations		7,363,696,380

Difference between total requests of administration and allowances of Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses for 1920

	3,854,495,290
--	---------------

In other words, the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses—both of which participated in the original as well as supplemental 1920 appropriations—reduced the appropriations requested by the administration to the extent of 34.36 per cent, more than one-third.

**FAILURE OF ADMINISTRATION TO DEVELOP A POSTWAR EXPENDITURE PROGRAM.**

Economy, retrenchment, and improvement of the condition of the Treasury must be based upon a sane expenditure policy. In the light of requests for appropriations for 1920, calling for \$11,000,000,000—98 per cent of which came from the administration—the taxpayer might well ask: What is the postwar expenditure policy of the present administration?

For months the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses struggled in 1919 with the original estimates, which, in large part, were guesswork—and officials from the departments admitted that hundreds of the guesses were wrong—to determine what the administration's expenditure policy contemplated. Information was not submitted with the estimates. Shifting from a war to a peace basis is largely an administration problem. But it was evident that the executive departments lacked a definite administration program for its accomplishment. It was necessary for the several appropriations committees to develop this information, through hearings, investigations, and independent analyses.

By cutting in this direction and that direction, almost \$4,000,000,000 was eliminated from the original and supplemental estimates.

**COMPARISON OF 1920 REQUESTS (ESTIMATES) WITH 1916 EXPENDITURES.**

The 1920 estimates of the administration furnish no comparison of the amounts asked for with the amounts which had been allowed or asked for before the war. The only comparisons made—and these are fragmentary—have to do with war periods, 1918 and 1919.

TABLE OF COMPARISON, 1916-1920.

The following table furnishes, under the main or primary functions of the Government, a comparison of the amounts actually spent—disbursed—in 1916 with the amounts which the administration requested in 1920, showing the percentage of increase, by function, of the request over the 1916 expenditure. The amounts include not only the original requests, but also the supplemental requests already explained, which were not included in the original estimates:

Classification.	1916	1920	Increase, 1920 over 1916.	
			Amount.	Percentage.
Legislation	\$7,831,241	\$10,344,805	\$2,513,564	32.10
General administration	88,224,854	273,749,580	185,524,726	210.29
National defense	447,616,554	5,732,762,492	5,305,145,938	1,185.20
Civil service	153,108,836	2,747,586,135	2,594,477,299	1,694.53
Judicial	8,355,939	11,850,201	3,494,262	41.82
Local government	13,958,990	20,132,308	6,173,318	44.22
Permanent obligations	22,900,313	1,792,300,000	1,769,399,687	7,726.53
Total ordinary	741,996,727	10,608,725,521	9,866,728,794	1,329.75
Postal (payable out of revenues)	306,228,453	609,466,149	303,237,696	99.02
Grand total	1,048,225,180	11,218,191,670	10,169,966,490	970.21

It is realized that there are legitimate influences and burdens of the war which survive—burdens which would prevent an immediate return to prewar cost of operations. Nevertheless the prewar period furnishes the only accurate base of comparison. It presents administrative activities developed on a basis comparable to what are now being carried on and will be projected during the fiscal year 1921. A comparison of the costs—one against the other—fixes the exact amount of increases by activities and facilitates definite thinking as to the factors involved in the increases.

Eliminating the \$22,000,000 requested for the legislative and the judicial branches of the Government, or but one-fifth of 1 per cent of the entire amount requested, the foregoing statement reveals increases all along the line which are staggering.

COMPARISON OF 1921 REQUESTS (ESTIMATES) WITH 1916 EXPENDITURES.

Furthermore this fact, with respect to the administration's expenditure program for 1921, is even more startling. If Congress allowed for the fiscal year 1921 all the funds which were requested by the administration in the estimates already submitted—and which call for approximately \$5,000,000,000—the Government would probably close the next fiscal year in a worse condition than we will end the current fiscal year.

Glance at the estimates and the reason is obvious. They reveal, in the staggering amounts again requested, the lack of any definite plan of retrenchment.

The present Congress is holding daily hearings and conducting numerous investigations in order to reduce the administration's unwarranted appropriation requests for 1921—which without deficiencies call for \$4,865,410,032—by at least a billion and a quarter dollars—this is its "retrenchment slogan." But no comprehensive reports have been submitted by the administration presenting administrative needs and the expenditure requirements in such a way as to facilitate a discussion of such retrenchment either on the part of Congress or the public.

The following table furnishes under each primary function of the Government a comparison of the amounts actually spent—disbursed—in 1916, with the amounts which the administration has requested for 1921 in the estimates before Congress at the present time, showing the percentage of increase by function of such requests for 1921 over the expenditures for 1916:

	Expenditures, 1916.	Request, 1921.	Increase, 1921 over 1916.	
			Amount.	Per cent.
Legislative.....	\$7,831,241	\$8,402,758	\$571,517	7.30
General administration.....	88,224,854	156,856,785	68,631,931	77.79
National defense.....	447,616,554	2,205,550,085	1,757,933,531	392.73
Civil services.....	153,108,836	750,657,294	606,548,458	396.16
Judicial.....	8,355,939	12,891,131	4,535,192	54.28
Local government.....	13,958,990	25,338,306	11,379,316	81.52
Permanent obligations.....	22,900,313	1,305,000,000	1,282,099,687	5,598.61
Total ordinary.....	741,996,727	4,473,696,350	3,731,699,623	502.93
Postal (payable out of revenues).....	306,228,453	391,713,673	85,485,220	27.92
Grand total.....	1,048,225,180	4,865,410,032	3,817,184,852	364.16

TABLE OF SAVINGS OR REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE YEAR 1920.

The appropriations made by the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses were indeed substantial. The amount of reductions, however, under the requests made by the administration in the original and supplemental estimates are, however, very large. The amount of \$3,854,495,290, or 34.36 per cent of the total amount requested, represents the net result of the effort of Congress to economize and force something in the way of a retrenchment program on the administration.

The following table furnishes under each main or primary function of the Government a comparison of the amounts actually appropriated for 1920—including original and supplemental appropriations—with the amounts which the administration requested for 1920—including the original and supplemental requests. In parallel columns are shown the percentage of decrease or increase of the appropriations with requests:

Classification.	1920 requests.	1920 appropriations.	Decrease, 1920 appropriations under 1920 requests.	
			Amount.	Per cent.
Legislation.....	\$10,344,805	\$10,244,805	\$100,000	0.97
General administration.....	273,749,580	243,858,592	29,890,988	10.92
National defense.....	5,752,762,492	2,205,084,948	3,547,677,544	61.67
Civil services.....	2,747,586,135	2,473,774,537	273,811,598	9.97
Judicial.....	11,850,201	11,850,201	.....	.....
Local government.....	20,132,308	17,116,148	3,016,160	14.98
Permanent obligations.....	1,792,300,000	1,792,300,000	.....	.....
Total ordinary.....	10,608,725,521	6,754,230,231	3,854,495,290	36.33
Postal (payable out of revenues).....	609,466,149	609,466,149	.....	.....
Grand total.....	11,218,191,670	7,363,696,380	3,854,495,290	34.36

SAVINGS TO BE EFFECTED BY CONGRESS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1921.

It is premature to forecast, with any degree of accuracy, the amount which Congress will disapprove in the requests of the administration, which approximate \$5,000,000,000. The last figures, however, on the several appropriation bills which have been reported out of Appropriations Committees indicate that the total saving will approximate \$1,250,000,000, as outlined. This saving will be in accordance with the policy laid down by the majority leader, Hon. FRANK MONDELL, in his statement on the floor of Congress, in the month of January, at the time the first appropriation bill was reported out of committee with a saving of 28 per cent.

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP], chairman of the fortifications subcommittee, did his colleagues on the subcommittee too much honor in his complimentary remarks regarding our industry and service. I think every member of that subcommittee, with the exception of its modest chairman, will agree with me in the statement that he has rendered a very great service to the country and to the Congress by his own extraordinary diligence and because of his unusually keen business intellect. His mastery of the many and intricate details of the estimates on which this bill is based are evidenced on every page of the hearings. He has saved us a very great deal of work and has done the work much better than any of his colleagues on the subcommittee could have hoped to do. [Applause.]

The members of the subcommittee are agreed that he has proven a very worthy successor to his distinguished predecessors in the chairmanship of this subcommittee—Hon. Swagar Sherley, of Kentucky; the late William T. Borland, of Missouri; and to the acting chairman of last year, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The fortifications appropriation bill is perhaps the most highly technical bill with which the Committee on Appropriations has to do. The items which make up the bill have been thoroughly explained by the chairman, and I shall not take the time of the committee in going over the same ground. The original estimates submitted by the War Department totaled \$117,734,830. These estimates were subsequently reduced by the department to \$66,235,614. This bill recommends the granting of \$18,833,442, as against \$11,214,291 carried in the fortifications bill for last year.

The chairman said the members of the subcommittee were in accord with every item in the bill. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and I, however, are strongly of the opinion that a very serious mistake was made in failing to make provision in this bill for continuing and making available the sum of \$9,617,179.38 of the appropriations heretofore made for aviation purposes for use in connection with the seacoast defenses of the United States and authorizing the Secretary of War to expend from said sum about \$596,725, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase or acquisition of land necessary for aviation stations in connection with coast defenses of continental United States. At the proper place in the bill I shall move an amendment to provide for the reappropriation of this sum.

The following table, which will be found on pages 344 and 345 of the hearings, will be of interest in this connection:

Detail of estimates, continental United States.

[No new appropriation is asked.]

	Former appropriation.	Obligation.	Reservation.	Free balance.
Aviation, seacoast defense.....	\$3,600,000.00	\$894,779.14	\$30.00	\$2,705,200.86
Aviation stations, seacoast defense.....	8,000,000.00	1,088,041.48	2,906,750.00	4,005,208.52
Total.....	11,600,000.00	1,982,820.62	2,906,770.00	6,710,409.38

Appropriation less obligation, \$9,617,179.38.

Proposed expenditures.

Construction of one balloon base line on land to be purchased on coast defenses of Narragansett Bay:				
Sachusset Neck.....		\$304,600.00		
Fort Kearney.....		63,000.00		\$367,600.00
Construction of five heavier-than-air stations in coast defenses of (on land to be purchased):				
Long Island Sound.....		\$1,217,282.50		
Narragansett Bay.....		1,162,010.50		
Boston.....		1,158,482.50		
Portland, Me.....		1,134,472.50		
Puget Sound.....		1,062,202.40		5,734,450.40
Purchase of seven parcels of land, as follows, in coast defenses of:				
Long Island Sound, Stonington, Conn., 100 acres.....		\$27,500.00		
Narragansett Bay (3).....		69,000.00		
Boston Harbor.....		351,475.00		
Portland.....		88,750.00		
Puget Sound.....		60,000.00		
Contingencies.....				596,725.00
Grand total.....				11,633.98
Grand total.....				6,710,409.38

Gen. Menoher, Director of the Air Service, testified before the subcommittee that it was absolutely necessary to continue the appropriation and to give the authority to purchase the necessary land. The projects on which the funds have been obligated, reserved, or on which it is proposed to apply the free balances, he said, were the result of a definite and very careful study made by both the Army and the Navy prior to the war for the purpose of carrying into effect the functions of coastal air service assigner to the Army in the report of the Joint Army and Navy Board on March 12, 1917, and as redefined and reapproved by the joint board on January 22, 1920. These projects have had the definite sanction of Congress, as shown by the appropriations made therefor in 1917 and 1918.

I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not know that I shall consume all of the time so generously accorded to me, but I do want to take advantage of this occasion to pay a very just tribute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP], the chairman of the subcommittee which has had in charge the hearings and the preparation of this particular bill. Having been a member of the subcommittee, I am in a position to be familiar with the tireless energy that he has displayed, with the very great labor that he has performed, and with what very great ability and keen business insight he has met the responsibilities which have rested more heavily, naturally, upon his shoulders than upon the shoulders of any other members of the subcommittee.

As the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EAGAN] has said, this is a highly technical bill. I dare say that there is no appropriation bill presented to Congress which is so highly technical in all of its many details, in respect to the character, type, caliber of guns, the various kinds of ammunition, and other features in the bill. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] has mastered this bill in a manner that has not been excelled by any of those chairmen who have served in the same capacity during the time that I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, or for the past 10 years. [Applause.]

I feel it is nothing but fair to him to say that the great merit which I believe is contained in this bill is largely due to the work which he put upon it before the hearings commenced, and also as a result of the very careful hearings that he conducted during its consideration by the subcommittee. I regard this bill, gentlemen of the committee, as a splendid bill in many respects. The fact of the business is I have only one or two objections to it. It is an economy measure, and the estimates have been greatly reduced, but I believe that in the appropriations which are sought to be made we have adequately taken care of our coast defenses during the next fiscal year with a few exceptions, of some of which I shall speak later on. Seacoast fortifications are largely in the nature of insurance. They may be considered somewhat like the insurance that a man takes upon his home. If he insures his house or his building and no fire occurs during that year it might be said that he had lost the amount of the premium by reason of taking the insurance, but he is, of course, protected against any possible loss that may occur during the year and he is willing to pay the premium in order to secure that protection. The country is spending several millions of dollars each year in maintaining our seacoast fortifications. Of course, if no war occurs, if no enemy attacks our coast, it might be said that the money could have been saved, but the difficulty is that we do not know when we are going to be thrown into war or when some enemy may attack us, and it is therefore highly important that adequate provision should be made to protect these important cities upon our coasts and the important harbors upon our coasts, so that in the event of trouble with some foreign country an enemy may not have an opportunity to work serious loss upon the property of this country and take possession of our harbors and points of strategic importance. The gentleman from Virginia has very fully discussed the main provisions of this bill.

The estimates have been largely reduced, as stated by the gentleman from Virginia. The first estimates submitted were \$117,000,000. Later on the officials of the War Department revised their estimates and cut them down to something like \$66,294,114. The committee, after a very careful and thorough hearing further cut those estimates, and this bill carries a little less than \$19,000,000.

The original estimates were submitted last fall. A more thorough and more recent consideration of the needs for next year resulted in the officers themselves voluntarily reducing their first estimates in the sum of about \$51,000,000, and this very fact emphasizes the very great importance of budget legislation, for if it had been made the duty of some central authority to examine and revise the estimates before they were first submitted, I have no doubt but that not only the reduction

named would have been made at that time, but that even greater reductions would have been made and the committee would have been thus aided in its effort to reduce the appropriation to the lowest possible sum consistent with the good of the service.

There are only two features of this bill to which I desire to very briefly call attention. One is in reference to the railway mounts that are provided for in the bill. We have a number of 14-inch guns which were placed in construction during the war which the Government now has on hand and which are not provided with proper mounts or carriages. The department estimated for \$3,000,000 to provide 12 railway mounts for 12 of those 14-inch guns. This bill carries a provision which makes it possible to provide three railway mounts or 25 per cent of the amount asked for. My own idea is, and I think the War Department is clearly of that opinion, that more attention should be directed along the line of making our seacoast artillery mobile rather than fixed, and if properly developed along that line it would not only, in my opinion, afford more adequate defense to all portions of the coast line, but in the end it would result in greater economy because we would necessarily be able to do without so great a number of fixed emplacements, cannon, and other methods of coast defense. Gen. Coe stated that 14-inch guns are now considered necessary to an adequate coast defense.

Hence my idea is that, having these 14-inch guns on hand now belonging to the United States Government, something should be done toward putting them into service, so that in the event during the next fiscal year or the year following an enemy should threaten our shores they would be ready for use in order to protect our cities, our harbors, and our coasts.

Unless these guns are provided with mounts they will be entirely useless in the defense of our country. Officers tell us that they are needed and that they are the best type of seacoast guns, having an effective range of 40,000 yards. If the carriages are not provided, they must be stored away, and in case of a sudden or reasonably sudden attack they could not be used in the defense of our country and to prevent an invasion. We have the railroads on the coast and we have the guns. Why not provide railway carriages, so they may be quickly moved here and there and thus afford added protection to our cities and our shore lines with an ultimate less expense?

The other matter to which I wish to call attention is the failure of this bill to make proper provisions for aviation stations at certain fixed emplacements. Two or three years ago the committee recommended and the Congress adopted a provision providing for eight aviation stations. The estimates, submitted with the approval of the Secretary of War, at that time were for 16 of those stations, to be located at various places named. After a consideration of the matter the committee recommended to the Congress that these 16 stations be reduced to 8 stations, and the sum of \$8,000,000 was appropriated to construct those 8 aviation stations, it being stated that the stations would cost on an average of a million dollars a piece. The war came on and nothing was done to any extent toward constructing any of those aviation stations. I may say that one was to be constructed at Portland, Me., the nearest port to Europe, one at Boston, Narragansett Bay, the eastern end of Long Island, Staten Island, Langley Field, San Francisco, and Puget Sound, all being places recognized as of very great strategic importance and very liable to attack in case of trouble on either coast.

Mr. SLEMP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do.

Mr. SLEMP. Langley Field had already been constructed out of another appropriation and was not one of the eight.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. What was the place, if the gentleman recalls?

Mr. SLEMP. I can not give it, but there were eight besides Langley Field.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am glad to have the gentleman correct me.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Could I inquire if that meant just the station itself?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Just the station—the necessary buildings or barracks and hangars or accessories of an aviation station, including such land as will be required.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. The gentleman may explain later on about the maintenance of these stations, but does that include anything in regard to maintenance?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The sum I have named is the money that will be necessary actually to construct these particular stations for the various balloons and aeroplanes which were to be used. It does not include maintenance.

Mr. SLEMP. To acquire the necessary lands.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And to acquire the necessary lands for the stations, as the gentleman from Virginia suggests. As I stated, due to the war, nothing was done by the service toward establishing those aviation stations, except that negotiations were under way and contracts were actually made for the purchase of some land at an enormous figure up here at Staten Island. That was the status of the matter when the committee met a year ago for the purpose of framing the bill for the current year. It appeared at that time that the service had an unexpended free balance of something like, as I recall, \$11,000,000. The subcommittee on fortifications at that time took no action upon the matter, but left that money in the hands of the service for the purpose of constructing these eight stations, which had been theretofore approved by Congress. Under the law as it existed then and under these appropriations as made, the service had authority to acquire the necessary land on which to construct these stations; and all the stations required the purchase of land except the one at San Francisco, which was to be constructed upon a Government reservation at Fort Scott, and a balloon station at Narragansett Bay, where the Government already owned the necessary land. So at the time the last fortification bill passed the service had sufficient money with which to erect these stations and to acquire the necessary land—

Mr. OGDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. OGDEN. If this bill should pass, it would not be declaratory of a policy to decrease the number of stations from eight to three, would it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No. I do not think it would necessarily declare that that was the policy of the Congress, but that would be the result so far as the next fiscal year is concerned.

Mr. OGDEN. There are two of those stations uncompleted, I believe?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. OGDEN. Would it not be advisable to permit them to be completed or advanced further in the course of completion before providing for additional stations?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, I do not think it is necessary to permit those stations to advance toward completion before providing for these other stations, because those who appeared before the committee stated—

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

Mr. EAGAN. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. SLEMP. Would the gentleman also incorporate in his statement there the amount that would be expended at Staten Island and at the Presidio?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am coming to that.

That was the status of the matter when last July Congress passed the Army appropriation bill, in which a provision was included directing that no appropriation for military purposes should be expended for the purchase of land unless it had theretofore been contracted for. The service therefore found it was in the situation after the passage of that bill that it could not acquire the necessary land at five of these stations, and the result was that it has not been able to do anything in the past year toward completing the stations at those places. It had acquired, as I say, the land at Staten Island. The Government owned land at Langley Field. It owns land at San Francisco, on which the station there is to be constructed, but it did not own the land required at Puget Sound, Portland, Me., Boston, or Narragansett Bay, or on the eastern end of Long Island, and the service found itself unable to expend the money which had been provided for this particular purpose. Gen. Menoher came before the committee and asked it to reappropriate the sum then in hand and authorize the purchase of the necessary land, which amounted to less than \$600,000 in all. The committee declined to reappropriate the money in hand, amounting to something like \$9,000,000 or more.

Mr. SLEMP. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. SLEMP. The free balance is not \$9,000,000 but \$6,000,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand. The \$9,000,000 includes \$2,000,000 and some hundred thousand dollars of money already obligated, and certain reservations, which can and will be used at Staten Island and San Francisco, and \$6,710,000 in round numbers—a free balance in the Treasury. So the result is that the service will be deprived of \$6,710,000 with which to continue the construction of these aviation stations at the points named. And Congress, by the adoption of this bill, will to that extent for the next fiscal year repeal its former action, when it

authorized and directed the construction of eight aviation stations.

Now, gentlemen, it is unnecessary for me to talk to you about the importance of aviation stations where you have guns which have a range all the way from 15,000 to 60,000 yards. As was stated, the 16-inch guns that are placed at some of these stations, and which are proposed to be placed at others, have an effective range of 50,000 to 60,000 yards.

If it was important to permit the work to go on at Staten Island and San Francisco, which are provided with 12-inch guns, then it is equally important to have the stations provided for at the other five places, which are also provided with 12-inch guns. On the other hand, if these stations are not needed at the five places, then they are not needed at the three places referred to, and it is useless and wasteful extravagance to permit the expenditure of two and a half millions of dollars in their construction. It will possibly take two years to complete all of this work. If they are needed to adequately defend these places, then we are assuming a great risk, just as the man who neglects to insure his building for two years takes the chance of losing his all when he least expects it. Fortifications are said to be our second line of defense. The Navy is the first, although it was stated by a very high officer that in 15 or 20 years the airplanes would constitute the first line of defense and navies would be obsolete. If our Navy is dispersed or if it is at some other place along our long coast line when enemy ships appear, then the defense rests wholly with the fortification defenses. If an enemy ship stands off 40,000 yards and out of range of direct observation and begins to bombard centers of population, to enable our gunners to shoot effectively you must give them the eyes to locate the ship and observe the effectiveness of their shots. This can only be done by directional wireless telegraphy from airplanes. Hence, I repeat that these five stations, including Portland, Boston, and Puget Sound, must be equipped with airplanes before it can be said that they are anything like adequately protected. The last Congress provided for the adequate protection of these places. This bill withdraws that protection, and as a result no steps will be taken at least during the next fiscal year to make the defenses at these places adequate and effective. We must rely on Army officers as to what is necessary to make our seacoast fortifications effective. They state that these long-range guns are useless without airplanes.

Mr. EAGAN. Is it not a fact that if the money is reappropriated they can then use the major part of it, if not all of it, in this work during the coming fiscal year?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is my understanding. It would certainly start, and a great deal of it would be completed, if not all of it.

These 14-inch guns have an effective range of 40,000 yards, and the 12-inch guns a range of 27,500 yards, far beyond the range of direct observation, and unless you provide aeroplanes by which the fire can be directed by wireless, to enable those in charge of these guns to know where the target is located, and to know in what direction to shoot, and to know where their shots are landing, these guns are absolutely ineffective, and these defenses are inadequate. So I contend that even though you may have 14-inch guns or 16-inch guns, or even 12-inch guns at Portland or Boston and these other important places, unless you give them the aeroplanes to serve as the eyes with which to see the target and know in what direction to range their guns they will prove absolutely inadequate and ineffective. And that was the testimony submitted by Gen. Menoher and Gen. Mitchell, who appeared before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would give me five minutes more.

Mr. EAGAN. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Gen. Menoher, when asked about it, made this statement:

I think that matter has been gone into very carefully not only at the time they were originally proposed but since then, and I do not think there is any division of opinion as to the necessity for air defense at those various points. Later on it will probably be desirable to extend this service to some other stations along the coast.

Mr. SLEMP. These particular stations are subordinate to the coast defenses proper, and are not looked upon as major projects?

Gen. MENOHER. No, sir.

Mr. SLEMP. It does not involve powerful battle planes or the equipment of this service with such airplanes as you would have in the Navy?

Gen. MENOHER. No, sir; not at all.

Mr. SLEMP. It would include the offensive power—

Gen. MENOHER (interposing). Equipping the Nation with the air weapons like you would have the Navy, for instance.

Mr. SLEMP. Equipping with air weapons like the naval vessels are equipped?

Gen. MENOHER. Yes, sir.

Gen. MITCHELL. That is really a part of the Coast Artillery; the Coast Artillery could not function without this air service.

Mr. BYRNS. It is the eyes to them?

Gen. MITCHELL. Yes; this has nothing to do with the other air defenses of the country.

Gen. MENOHER. Now, it is a well-known fact, well known to every artilleryman, that there is no use shooting your guns unless you can see where the shells are falling, unless you are firing from a big vessel lying 30 or 40 miles out of New York and having them hit Manhattan Island, say. So it is necessary, in order that the coast defenses may function efficiently, to have eyes, as Mr. BYRNS suggested.

Gen. MENOHER. Yes, sir. Actual construction on the major portion of these projects had to be postponed on account of the fact that the Army appropriation act approved July 9, 1919, prohibited the expenditure of funds on hand for the purchase of land, notwithstanding the fact that Congress had specifically given authority for the purchase of land for these stations.

Mr. SLEMP. They gave that, though, General, with the restriction that wherever possible these stations should be put on land already owned by the Government, and that no new land should be acquired except with the actual approval of the Secretary of War.

Gen. MENOHER. That is correct; and all these so-called lighter-than-air stations mentioned in here—the balloon base lines—except one, are on Government-owned land. The one for which new land is required is the balloon base line at Narragansett Bay. We wish to purchase a small tract of land at Sachusset Neck and on the western shore of Narragansett Bay near Fort Kearney, and they are the only ones that are on land to be purchased, the only ones of the lighter-than-air stations.

Hence the necessity for continuation of the appropriation and the authority to purchase land which is now being sought. That is the whole object of our hearing. The project on which these funds have been obligated, reserved, or on which it is proposed to apply the free balances, have not been hastily prepared; but, on the contrary, are the result of a definite and careful study made by the Army and Navy prior to the war for the purpose of carrying into effect the functions of coastal air service assigned to the Army in the report of the Joint Army and Navy board dated March 12, 1917, and as redefined and reapproved by the joint board January 22, 1920. These projects have had the definite sanction of Congress, as indicated by appropriations made therefor in 1917 and 1918.

So that if Gen. Menoher and Gen. Mitchell and other officers who appeared before the committee know what they are talking about, it is clear that these places to which I have referred, where defense was considered so necessary that 12 and 14 inch guns have been placed, should also be provided with proper air service. The city of Portland, the nearest port to Europe; the great city of Boston and Narragansett Bay, the eastern end of Long Island, and Puget Sound on the west during the next fiscal year will not have that amount of construction which those qualified to speak say is necessary to adequately defend and protect them from the incursions of an enemy; and when you take into consideration the fact that it did not require the appropriation of a single dollar of money, but simply the reappropriation of money already appropriated and in the Treasury, it is really false economy not to give them the money with which to provide this adequate defense. [Applause.]

Not only these stations should be provided for, but there should be some on the southern coast, which will prove an inviting point of attack in event of trouble with a formidable naval power. I do not favor a large standing Army, but in the absence of a covenant or a league of peace with the other nations of the world, I do believe that an efficient Navy and adequate coast defenses along the great length of our coast line must be maintained in the interest of our future safety and security. This bill fails to carry the reappropriation referred to because of the desire of the Republican majority to make a record of economy before the next election. They know full well that it will not save the people one cent, for the appropriation will be made next year, but in the meantime credit will be taken for the saving of the amount of money necessary to construct these stations. It is but another evidence of the hypocrisy of the majority and its readiness to sacrifice for the time being not only efficiency and the proper service of the Government to its citizens but also to risk our national security and defense in the hope of securing political advantage through its alleged claims of economy.

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

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, referring to the bill now under discussion, H. R. 13555, it seems to me that the membership of this House and the people of this country are to be congratulated upon the work of this subcommittee under its able chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP]. And it seems to me that it must be apparent to the people of this country that this House under its able leadership is really practicing the strictest economy, inasmuch as every appropriation bill that has been brought in during this session of Congress has been greatly reduced as compared to the estimates presented by the

various department heads. And notwithstanding these great reductions that have been made by the various appropriation committees, every necessary activity of these various departments has been cared for by appropriations not only sufficient to operate them successfully in peace time, but in most cases the appropriations are more than double what they were in the days before the Great War.

In this particular bill the original estimate of the department was, in round numbers, \$117,000,000, subsequently reduced to \$66,000,000; and as the bill is presented to us it carries \$18,000,000, or \$98,000,000 less than the original estimate. It will be seen that the amount appropriated in the bill is approximately three times the average amount appropriated annually for a period of years before the war.

I have always been an advocate of sufficient appropriations to put not only the borders of our own country but the borders of our colonies in proper defensive position. I believe that this measure carries a full and adequate amount for all necessary purposes in peace time and will eventually bring our fortifications up to a standard that will make them approximately impregnable.

Another feature of this bill which is very attractive to me is the fact that it requires there should be covered into the Treasury, upon its approval, over \$800,000,000 of unobligated balances of appropriations heretofore made for fortifications, and that the appropriations provided for in this bill are for the coming fiscal year only. I think it is highly proper legislation that appropriations should not, except for emergencies, be made immediately available. Neither should appropriations, in my judgment, be made available until expended.

I think the committee has shown great wisdom in this respect and I have no doubt that it will bring about great savings to the country in the future.

The watchword of this House during this session has been "economy," and, in my judgment, it is the most important word of all, and we should keep it always in mind, and every estimate should be cut to the actual needs of the project in hand. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back two minutes.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

Mr. EAGAN. I understood I was to have the opportunity of yielding time next.

Mr. SLEMP. My understanding was that the gentleman to whom time would be yielded would follow the gentleman from Connecticut.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I request that during my preliminary statement I be not interrupted. When I pass from this I shall court interruption and shall be glad to have as many questions asked as possible.

Mr. BLANTON. But before the gentleman begins the preliminary statement will he permit an interruption?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I just want to commend the appropriateness of the gentleman's subject; that is, our defensive problems, following our action of yesterday. It comes in very appropriately.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman from Texas is right, because I speak for a peace-time military program. The gentleman should recall that, according to the teachings of our first President, in peace is the time to make preparation for war. It is for such preparation as I believe our first President would approve that I speak.

I would next apologize for the small number of my exhibits, but perhaps they are sufficient to defend myself against the somewhat attenuated audience that I must face. I hope to have time in which to explain the exhibits, although the time granted to me is only half what I had expected.

Mr. Chairman, I would tell very briefly a mere fragment of the story of a great giant who was drawn into mortal combat at a time when he had failed to take care to keep his armor and weapons in order. I would call to mind as a lesson to be remembered how he was compelled to spend almost \$25,000,000,000 in preparation for the conflict, how more than a quarter of this fabulous sum was spent for ordnance material alone, and how not even a tithe of the material for which it was expended was ready in time to be of use in the struggle.

One of the most outstanding facts in connection with our participation in the Great War is that the United States had to spend seven billions of dollars for ordnance material and airplanes that had not yet materialized when the war closed, while we fought the war with about a half a billion dollars worth of ordnance purchased from France and Great Britain.

Let it be understood at the outset that what I am saying is not in criticism of anyone, but rather by way of recalling a few well-authenticated facts for the purpose of setting them down for the guidance of those who come after us. I feel that it is a great pity that no one has yet attempted to set out with historical accuracy what we did in the war and how we did it, and at the same time set out with equal care the things we failed to do and the reasons why we failed. It would be an interesting as well as valuable historical document.

We are now in the midst of the great quadrennial contest for control of the civil side of government for the next four years. It is a time when men are prone to point with pride or to view with alarm according to their political leaning. In what I shall say to-day there will be no time consumed in doing either of these things except so far as the facts themselves may serve that purpose.

I have feared that between those who seek only to praise and glorify all that took place during the war and those who are disposed to find fault with everything that was done, those who come after us will not get an accurate picture of what happened. So far as I am able to make it so that picture shall be not only accurate but constructively helpful to the student of these matters in the years to come.

I was much impressed a few weeks ago by some remarks of the very able gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. Referring to the so-called embalmed-beef episode of the Spanish War, he unsparingly disapproved of those who in such great crises would make such petty scandals their stock in trade political argument. I thoroughly agree with him. Nothing makes me more inexpressibly weary than the inane cry of "embalmed beef" made occasionally by some ignorant partisan who seeks thereby to cast discredit upon those who had the task of carrying on the Spanish War. Even if the beef were all that the yellow journals described it to be—and it was not, for I was there and both saw it and ate it—still it would probably not rightfully discredit more than a single careless inspection officer. No sensible person would claim that it involved Secretary of War Alger or President McKinley.

I happen to know upon first-hand information of an instance in France of beef known to be scarcely fit for human food, which was nevertheless issued to soldiers and eaten by them. I refer to this case here because it happens to relate to beef. It was far worse than was ever charged against the embalmed beef of 1898, and I think the officers responsible should have been called to account if possible. Yet who would be so silly as to charge or to think for a moment that Secretary Baker or the administration of his party had anything whatever to do with such dereliction of duty. Such instances could probably be multiplied in this and every other war. It is nauseating to see partisans trying to make political capital out of such occurrences, whether they be sheer accidents or careless blunders on the part of some subordinate official.

In an undertaking so stupendous as our preparation for participation in the Great War there were inevitably both wonderful achievements and colossal blundering, more than enough of either to consume all the time that a busy House or an impatient public would spare to a speaker or writer on the subject. There were a great number of noteworthy performances which entitle those responsible for them to lasting credit and renown, and should assure them grateful remembrance by the American people. Among these none are entitled to greater credit than officers of the Ordnance Department. It would be pleasant to speak of the achievements only, but to do so would be to ignore some of the most useful and needful lessons of the entire war.

I shall speak for the most part of arms, ammunition, and other essential weapons of warfare, articles usually included under the term ordnance and used in fighting. Instead of trying to cover the entire field of ordnance, which is now a very broad field, I shall take a sufficient number of essential articles to serve as types of the whole.

If I needed a text for my remarks, Kipling's oft-quoted "Lest We Forget" would serve appropriately. During the years 1917 and 1918 we were taught, at most fearful cost, some very important lessons, which it would be a great pity, in fact, a calamity, for us to forget. As many of you will readily recall, for some time prior to our entering the war it was my privilege, as I conceived it my duty, to stand upon this floor and try to explain to my colleagues our true situation with regard to the very vital subject of national defense. I sought to make clear what our plight must inevitably be should war come. Not content with calling attention to the condition and to the probable consequences if not remedied, I went further, and attempted in some measure to point the way toward a possible solution of the problem. Whatever might have been the final results of efforts

along this line, war came too soon to permit the fruition of any adequate plan.

It is therefore well to admit the fact, quite discreditable to us as a progressive Nation, that at the outbreak of the war in Europe we were woefully unprepared for war, whether it should be for attack or defense. I am not going into the controversy as to who was most to blame for this condition of affairs. In certain important respects, to which I shall refer later, we were somewhat better prepared when the war came to us in 1917. As a Government we can claim no credit whatever for this improvement in our situation, for even in the face of a world conflagration, liable to reach us at any time, we, as a Government, sat supine and did nothing toward increasing or improving our fire-extinguishing apparatus until the flames actually reached us.

Assistant Secretary of War Crowell, in his book on America's munitions, says:

When the war touched us our strategical equipment included plans ready drawn for the mobilization of men. They were on file at the Army War College in Washington; detailed plans for defending our harbors, our coasts, and our borders. There were also certain plans for the training of new troops.

It is worthy of note, however, that this equipment included no plan for the equally important and equally necessary mobilization of industry and production of munitions, which proved to be the most difficult phase of the actual preparations for war.

There should have been such plans. Students of military problems, outside as well as inside of the War Department or the Army, not only saw that this would be the more difficult phase of preparation but had called attention to the fact.

Assistant Secretary Crowell further says:

The war taught us that America can organize, train, and transport troops of a superior sort at a rate which leaves far behind any program for the manufacture of munitions.

This is absolutely true in the situation this country was in when war came, but it ought not to be true and would not be true if we had a proper plan and the necessary preliminary preparation.

The Assistant Secretary also informs us that the war upset the previous opinion that adequate military preparedness is largely a question of trained man power.

Many of you can testify that I had been for several years before the war thoroughly trying my throat and lungs, as well as the patience of my fellow Members of this House, in a continuous effort to uproot any such opinion.

When the war came to us in 1917 it was also the prevailing popular belief that not many men would be required of us, but that our great and important part of the joint task would be to furnish munitions, which we were supposed to be able to provide without stint. Exactly the reverse happened. American men were most needed. We sent men in surprising numbers, and, strangest of all, they had to fight with foreign-made munitions.

Again, I say that there is no disposition on my part to find fault or criticize. Given the situation as it existed when we entered the war, the result was the natural, almost inevitable, consequence. That it is a fact, however, that our men had to use foreign-made munitions can not be controverted.

Maj. Gen. William J. Snow, Chief of Field Artillery, in his report of the activities of this arm of the service during the war, says:

One of the great lessons that our people should learn from this war is that it requires much time to manufacture guns. On November 11, 1918, with the exception of twenty-four 8-inch howitzers, manufactured upon plans which had been used by the Midvale Steel Co. in the construction of howitzers for the British Government, there was not in the firing line a single field or heavy artillery gun manufactured for us in the United States after our entrance into the war—a period of 19 months. Had it not been for the matériel furnished us by the French and the British it is believed that the war would have been lost.

In making recommendations for the future based upon the experience of the war Gen. Snow makes this additional statement along the same line:

It is indispensable that an adequate reserve of material and equipment, particularly of ordnance, for our needs upon the outbreak of war be accumulated and maintained in time of peace. Had we not been able to obtain ordnance from the French and the British we would have been a negligible factor in the war until the end of 1918. When the armistice went into effect, 19 months after we entered the struggle, with the exception of twenty-four 8-inch howitzers made from British plans by the Midvale Steel Co., we had in line not one single piece of divisional, corps, or army artillery manufactured in America after our entry into the war.

Gen. Pershing in his final report says:

The task of the Ordnance Department in supplying artillery was especially difficult. In order to meet our requirements as rapidly as possible we accepted the offer of the French Government to supply us with the artillery equipment of seventy-fives, 155-millimeter howitzers, and 155-millimeter G. P. F. guns from their own factories for 30 divisions. The wisdom of this course was fully demonstrated by the fact that, although we soon began the manufacture of these classes of guns at home, there were no guns of American manufacture of the calibers mentioned on our front at the date of the armistice.

It is a familiar saying that hindsight is better than foresight. As we look back now we can see numerous places where mistakes occurred. Unfortunate decisions were made among the many and momentous decisions necessary to be made. Incorrect estimates were made and acted upon with the inevitable result. Unexpected difficulties were encountered, causing heartrending delays. Inexperience explains many untoward happenings. Remember that there were less than a hundred ordnance officers at first and 11,000 at the end of the war. Some of them were doubtless poor officers, not only inefficient but incompetent and incapable. It would have been a miracle had it been otherwise. It is pleasant to believe, as I do believe from personal knowledge of hundreds of representative ordnance officers met during the war, that no arm of the service produced a more efficient or competent personnel.

To the lasting credit of the Ordnance Department it should be said that its spokesmen did not indulge in any optimistic dreams that were put forth as promises. It was stated quite frankly at the outset that so far as guns for the Artillery and shells for the guns were concerned it would be 1919 before they would be well started in quantity production and that the full program would not be in operation prior to October 1, 1919. While seemingly insurmountable difficulties were encountered, this promise was more than kept, so that in a number of cases guns and shells were beginning to come through before November, 1918, though not in quantities that were adequate.

The story of our preparation for the war may be summed up and explained in a few sentences. We declared war on April 6, 1917, and Germany signed the armistice on November 11, 1918. We raised and trained an Army of 4,000,000 men, who by their deeds of valor turned the scale of war during the last six months. No praise can be too extravagant for such a performance. Within a period of a little more than 12 months we had created from our raw material of American manhood a substantial force of men ready for the final training to be acquired only by contact with the enemy. What of the weapons and other material with which they must fight? These things we did not have, and it was not physically possible to produce them, or any substantial part of them, within 12 months. We entered upon the task with a will and determination worthy of a great people engaged in a noble cause and without regard as to what it might cost, but neither high and noble zeal nor all the gold of Ophir can accomplish the impossible. Nineteen months passed and the war ceased without our front-line troops having seen, in the shape of fighting material, the results of our great labor and expense.

The cause is not far to seek. The arms and ammunition used in modern warfare are as a rule complicated and delicate machines. To be effective they must function with precision. To produce such articles requires time. Above all, the preparation of the tools, inspection devices, and other special appliances necessary for the accurate and rapid production of such articles not only requires time but technical skill possessed by a comparatively limited number of men. Herein lay the worm at the core of such small preparation as we had hitherto made for national defense. When the crisis came there was no provision for a rapid expansion of production, and the expenditure of no amount of money whatsoever could then make up the loss.

In one important instance, to which I have already alluded, we were saved in large measure from the legitimate consequences of our own lack of wisdom and foresight. I refer to the production of shoulder rifles. We had developed the best service rifle in the world—the new Springfield—and through a number of years had accumulated a total supply of about 600,000 of these rifles. This number now seems small, but the substantial ground for criticism lies not in the small number on hand but in lack of capacity for producing more if needed. Probably the maximum capacity of our two small arsenals under any condition would not have exceeded 1,200 rifles per day. I should say that the capacity was not limited by buildings, machinery, or men, but largely by the lack of special tools, dies, gauges, and fixtures, which it was estimated would require at least 18 months to produce. Therefore had it been necessary to fight the war with our own excellent rifles it would have been necessary for us to persuade the enemy to wait 18 months, until we were ready to produce rifles.

Fortunately for us our private manufacturers were called upon to make rifles for Europe.

The allied countries able to reach America came here for munitions. They had the right to come, and our industries had the right to supply them. It proved to be no easy task. Time was the most essential element involved, for the munitions were sadly needed, but a great deal of time was consumed in making the tools and other devices to which I have referred before

our most capable and progressive manufacturers were able to respond to the demand. The primary ordnance essentials at that time as at all times were infantry rifles and cannon, with an abundance of ammunition for both. Early orders were placed in the United States for large numbers of rifles and great quantities of rifle ammunition.

Urgent as was the demand for rifles few were delivered within 18 months. Two years saw the contracts well along, and two and a half years saw them well nigh completed. Full capacity production reached about 15,000 rifles per day. The rifle produced here in greatest quantities was the modified Enfield, which had been designed by the British but not put into production. It was originally designed for a high-power cartridge, much like our own, and therefore could be readily modified to use our ammunition. This was done and proved a veritable godsend to our munitions program. No decision made during the war was more important or far-reaching in its effects.

All the machinery, special tools, fixtures, dies, jigs, and gauges for making the Enfield rifle for Great Britain were in the hands of our manufacturers. It was a comparatively small task to procure such new tools and appliances as were made necessary by the modification to use American ammunition. Within three or four months this was accomplished, and a satisfactory rifle was being turned out in quantities. As I have said, the decision to make and use the modified Enfield rifle chambered for our own ammunition was an important one. Any other would have meant a scarcity of rifles such as Great Britain suffered from during the first two years of the war and a dependence upon our associates in the war for the arm which, although the most essential, is at the same time the most difficult to produce.

The three men who, in my judgment, deserve the highest credit in connection with this momentous decision and for thereafter making the rifle program an unqualified success are Mr. John E. Otterson, president of the Winchester Repeating Arms Co.; Mr. Harry S. Kimball, president of the Remington Arms & Union Metallic Cartridge Co.; and Mr. C. H. Schlachs, general manager of the Eddystone rifle plant. These men are great captains of industry who led others through difficult and baffling problems the right solution of which was absolutely vital. Their preeminent executive ability coupled with technical training of a high order directed along practical lines made their services invaluable in the crisis then at hand.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. I am very much interested in the gentleman's discussion. I would like to know if any changes were made between the English rifle and our pattern of it?

Mr. TILSON. Only the changes necessary to make it fit our cartridge. Ours is what is known as the .30 caliber, whereas the cartridge used in the British rifle is the .303. Our cartridge case has a cannellure by means of which it is fed into the chamber and ejected after firing, while the British has the old-fashioned rimmed head.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman speaks of the small number of pieces of American-made ordnance that were on the battle front in France at the time of the armistice. Is it not a fact that we sent to France many forgings which materially facilitated the ready production of ordnance so that France could supply it?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; and some to the British. Before we entered the war we were producing ordnance for some of the Allies, and this, of course, we went ahead with. The reason why we completed 24 of the 8-inch howitzers that Gen. Snow speaks of in time to get them to the front was because we already had the plans and were making them for the British.

The point I wish to bring home is the time it takes to develop a gun and put it in actual production. Wherever we were prepared to make guns we did it rapidly. It is the time required for the preparation that looms largest in the way.

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

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. When the gentleman says we were making some ordnance will he particularize who "we" were?

Mr. TILSON. I mean our private manufacturers. Of course, our Government made nothing for foreign Governments. It could not properly do so in time of peace. Our private manu-



facturers, however, were manufacturing these things. The Midvale and the Bethlehem companies were two concerns that were specially engaged in making the heavy guns, while the three plants to which I have alluded—the Winchester Repeating Arms Co., the Remington Arms & Union Metallic Cartridge Co., the Eddystone plant—and others, were actively engaged in making rifles.

Assistant Secretary Crowell, in his book on American munitions, states clearly why it was necessary to adopt the modified Enfield rifle instead of our own superior Springfield. I quote:

To produce Springfields on a grand scale in private plants would imply the use of thousands of gauges, jigs, dies, and other small tools necessary for such a manufacture, as well as that of great quantities of special machines. None of this equipment for Springfield rifle manufacture had been provided, yet all of it must be supplied to the commercial plants before they could turn out rifles.

Accurately expressed. His statement as to why this condition of affairs existed is not so fortunate, because it is entirely at variance with the well-authenticated facts. I quote from this statement:

Why, then, was not the manufacture of Springfields extended to private plants? Some antebellum effort, indeed, had been made looking to the production of Springfields in commercial plants, but lack of funds had prevented more than the outlining of the scheme.

Members will recognize at a glance the old time-worn dodge of trying to lay the blame upon Congress, but it will not work in this case. There was an earnest antebellum effort along the lines indicated by Mr. Crowell in this statement. Many of the present membership of the House will recall the part played in that effort by the Member now addressing you.

Section 123 of the national defense act, which was written by me and placed in the bill as a result of my efforts, and also the appropriation authorized by that section and carried in the Army appropriation bill passed in the summer of 1916, will serve to refresh the memory on this subject. The undisputed facts in the case are that Congress appropriated all the funds for this purpose that the War Department could be persuaded to accept, and that none of the funds appropriated were used. If there be blame in connection with this matter, it should be placed where it properly belongs.

The modified Enfield rifles were produced in sufficient quantities to not delay or hamper military activities in any respect, and as this was the only part of our munitions program of which this could be truly said, we are justified in feeling a reasonable degree of pride in it, although we should recognize the fact, as Mr. Crowell says, that it was due to "a condition in our small-arms industry in early 1917 that now seems to have been well-nigh providential."

In order to give a clearer idea as to just what the problem was and what progress was made toward solving it, I here submit certain tabulated data relating to typical articles in the ordnance program, which will serve to give a general idea of the whole. The tables are, for the most part, taken directly from War Department sources and are substantially accurate, although in some cases the totals of articles completed since the armistice may need to be increased. However, they are sufficiently accurate for present purposes.

Figures concerning the production of airplanes are omitted purposely. There has been so much controversy upon this subject that I doubt if anything I might contribute would furnish additional light, and I do not desire to add anything to the heat of the controversy. It is sufficient for my purpose here to refer to the uncontroverted fact that, although more than a billion of dollars were expended, American-made airplanes did not make their appearance at the fighting front in time to be of any appreciable service in winning the war. I say this because it ought not to be left unsaid in remarks touching upon this subject, having for their purpose, not criticism of the past but the unbiased narration of certain facts which may serve in some small measure as a reliable guide for the future. The national defense through the years to come is for me infinitely more important than the question whether one man may deserve praise or another man deserve blame for something done or something left undone in the war just ended.

Passing rapidly to the statistical charts that I have brought in I shall be compelled to be very brief in explaining them. Fortunately they are largely self-explanatory. After I have referred to them I shall be glad to have anyone ask me questions in regard to them.

In the case of rifles, machine guns, pistols, and revolvers I have shown in the charts the rate of production and the totals. In case of the larger guns and other articles something of the magnitude of the program is shown by giving the number ordered as well as the number completed, whether before or after the war ended.

## SERVICE RIFLES.

Chart 1 shows the total rifle production during the period of the war, the period included in the year 1918 being given by months.

It should be understood that the two Government arsenals at Springfield, Mass., and Rock Island, Ill., made and were able to make only the Springfield rifle, while the Winchester, Ilion, and Eddystone plants produced the Enfield.

The time consumed in changing over from the manufacture of the Enfield chambered for British ammunition to the same rifle chambered for American ammunition was so short that it can be explained only by the fact that some of the far-sighted manufacturers evidently discounted the decision to make the change and began preparation in advance of the decision. Winchester made the first delivery of rifles on August 18, 1917, Eddystone on September 10, 1917, and Ilion on or about October 28, 1917.

CHART I.  
RIFLES.

Months.	Eddy-stone.	Win-chester.	Ilion.	Spring-field Ar-mory.	Rock Island Arsenal.	Total.
Before August, 1917.....				14,986	1,680	16,666
Aug. 1 to Dec. 31, 1917.....	174,160	102,363	26,364	89,479	22,330	414,696
1918.						
January.....	81,846	39,200	32,453	23,890	7,680	185,069
February.....	98,345	32,660	39,852	6,910	2,460	180,227
March.....	68,404	42,200	49,538	120	420	160,682
April.....	87,508	43,600	36,377	2,631	.....	170,116
May.....	84,929	41,628	54,477	3,420	550	185,004
June.....	104,110	34,249	52,995	6,140	619	198,113
July.....	135,080	35,700	60,413	14,841	2,038	248,072
August.....	106,595	20,030	65,144	27,020	1,597	220,389
September.....	110,058	31,550	58,027	29,770	3,813	233,218
October.....	100,214	33,700	53,563	35,920	3,256	226,653
Nov. 1 to 9, 1918.....	30,659	9,100	16,338	10,500	808	67,405
Total.....	1,181,908	465,980	545,541	265,627	47,251	2,506,307

The small number of Springfield rifles produced at the Government arsenals during the first months after our entry into the war is explained by the considerable number of components produced and used as spare parts to replace defective parts in certain rifles already on hand.

Mr. OGDEN. Does the gentleman expect to insert these charts in the RECORD?

Mr. TILSON. I expect to insert them in the RECORD, where they will serve as a source of information for anybody who may care to examine them.

## MACHINE GUNS.

The next subject of which I shall speak is the production of machine guns. Chart II shows the production up to January 1, 1918, in the first column, and after that the total number of guns of all kinds manufactured up to December, 1918. It appears that we had at the first of 1918, 2,031 Vickers guns, 2,500 of the Colt guns, and 2,209 of the Lewis guns, besides 750 of the Lewis guns chambered for the .303 British ammunition. There were a few of the old Benet-Mercier type of gun in the hands of the troops. My own regiment was supposed to be adequately armed with four of these guns during our tour of duty on the Mexican border in 1916.

CHART II.  
AUTOMATIC ARMS.

	To Jan. 1, 1918.	1918					
		January.	February.	March.	April.	May.	June.
<i>Ground machine guns.</i>							
Browning, heavy.....					12	922	2,620
Vickers, field.....	2,031	1,021	951	1,386	1,341	1,208	1,349
Colt.....	2,500						305
Lewis, field.....	2,209	291					
Lewis, caliber .303.....	750				300		
<i>Aircraft machine guns.</i>							
Marlin.....	12	3,134	3,850	3,419	5,750	6,250	219
Lewis, flexible.....	6	540	1,085	1,568	1,333	2,629	4,342
Vickers, 11 mm.....							72
<i>Automatic rifles.</i>							
Browning, light.....			15	548	363	1,822	3,876
Total.....	7,508	4,986	5,901	6,921	9,099	12,831	12,783

CHART II—Continued.  
AUTOMATIC ARMS—continued.

	1918						Total.
	July.	August.	September.	October.	November.	December.	
<i>Ground machine guns.</i>							
Browning, heavy.....	4,225	9,182	8,838	14,639	6,654	9,516	56,608
Vickers, field.....	1,565	789	381	103			12,125
Colt.....	11						2,816
Lewis, field.....							2,500
Lewis, caliber .303.....							1,050
<i>Aircraft machine guns.</i>							
Browning.....				211	363	6	580
Marlin.....	6,356	7,269	1,691	50			38,000
Lewis, flexible.....	4,338	5,595	3,973	5,857	3,792	4,142	39,200
Vickers, caliber .30.....			307	575	373	1,221	2,476
Vickers, 11 mm.....	263	95	254	117	161	276	1,238
<i>Tank machine guns.</i>							
Browning.....					3	1	4
Marlin.....		103	9	316	460	582	1,470
<i>Automatic rifles.</i>							
Browning, light.....	8,196	12,517	6,896	13,687	11,368	10,672	69,960
Total.....	24,954	35,447	22,340	35,239	22,714	23,834	226,557

In May, 1917, it was decided to adopt the Browning gun, the light automatic rifle, and the heavy gun for the field gun, and a supreme effort was begun to put these guns into production. It is almost marvelous that in a single year we were able to produce a few of each type. It was early in May, 1917, when it was decided to adopt this gun. In May, 1918, the Winchester Co., at New Haven, had turned out about 1,200 of the automatic rifles. By June, 1918, the Marlin-Rockwell Co. was ready to begin making them, and by July, 1918, the Colt Co. was producing them. At the end of the war the War Department reported the acceptance of 52,238 of the light Brownings. About 40,000 of the heavy Brownings were accepted during the same period. Do not suppose that any considerable number of these guns reached the firing line. A few of them had finally gotten through to the front, but probably if you ask all the men who served at the front whom you may meet for six months whether they saw a Browning gun, they will all probably tell you that they did not. This is because it took some time to assemble the guns in this country, prepare them for shipment, transport them to Europe, issue them there, and then train the men in the use of them. You must remember that the final campaign of the war began on the 26th of September, 1918, so that practically none of our Browning rifles reached the front in time for effective use. I saw a single report of their use at the front about the middle of September, 1918. The officer who sent in the report was enthusiastic concerning their use.

Mr. McKEOWN. What is the advantage of the Browning gun over the Lewis gun?

Mr. TILSON. It seems to be very generally claimed by our Army ordnance experts that it is superior, and I am prepared to believe that it is a better gun. It is claimed that it operates with less difficulty under all sorts of conditions. The Lewis gun is a good gun, however. My own judgment is that we ought to have produced more Lewis guns and more Marlin guns, not because they were the best that had been designed, perhaps, but because at the time we entered the war they were the only guns that were in actual quantity production in this country. Being the only guns that were in full production so that they could be made rapidly, we should have made more of them. In other words, we should have made the only guns that we could make, and we should have made them rapidly enough to supply our troops in camp for training purposes and at the front for fighting.

Mr. SNYDER. We all have a very high regard for the gentleman's opinion, but when he states that the Browning gun is a better gun than the Lewis gun, he does not state that from actual experience of the two guns, because the facts are that in the war, so far as England and Germany were concerned, there were 50 Lewis guns used to 1 Browning.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman from New York is entirely correct, and what I have stated is really the opinion of most of our ordnance people, which I am not prepared to controvert, that the Browning is the superior gun.

Mr. SNYDER. I just want it to appear in the RECORD that the Lewis gun was the gun that was used.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman is correct in what he says. The Lewis gun was successfully used in great numbers, while the Browning was not used at all in any appreciable numbers. The Browning gun was not sufficiently tested out in the war itself

to enable anyone to say from sufficient actual war experience that it is a superior gun. Upon such tests as it has had it is believed to be a superior weapon.

Mr. SNYDER. The Lewis gun is manufactured in my district, and in view of that fact I am deeply interested in having the facts appear, and I want it clearly in the RECORD that what the gentleman has stated is purely a matter of opinion.

Mr. TILSON. As I have stated, I do not know whether the opinion is correct or not. The criticism that, in my judgment, should be made is not as to whether the gun adopted was superior or inferior to some other, but of the fact that we waited for the development and preparation to manufacture a gun that required a full year before we could make it at all. I think that just as soon as we entered the war we ought to have procured all the Lewis guns possible by every possible means. We did buy them later on and used them as flexible guns in the Air Service, but we should have had more as we went along of both the Lewis and the Marlin guns.

Mr. SNYDER. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. TILSON. A few words in regard to the Marlin gun. As I have stated, the Marlin gun was the only other machine gun in production on a large scale. For certain reasons of a mechanical character the Vickers gun had never been put into production on a large scale; hence the Lewis and Marlin guns were the only American guns available for our needs. For our ground fighting in France we chose to rely upon the French Hotchkiss and Chaucat automatic, both using French ammunition. The merits of the Marlin-gun were slow to be recognized by the Ordnance Department. The Air Service required for use on the tractor type of airplane, most used in France, a machine gun capable of being synchronized so as to shoot between the swiftly rotating blades of the propeller. The Marlin was found to fill the bill admirably. It was first ordered as a stop-gap, proved to be satisfactory, and finally received the most enthusiastic approval. As early as February, 1918, Gen. Pershing cabled as follows:

Marlin aircraft guns have been fired successfully on four trips, 13,000-15,000 feet altitude and at temperature of -20° F. On one trip guns were completely covered with ice. Both metallic link and fabric belts proved satisfactory.

Again, just before the armistice, Gen. Pershing cabled: Marlin guns now rank high as any with pilots and are entirely satisfactory.

The French Government tried them out also and declared them to be the equal of the Vickers.

PISTOLS AND REVOLVERS.

Now, I pass to pistols and revolvers. Chart III shows the production of automatic pistols and revolvers during the period of the war. Prior to the war only about 20 per cent of our enlisted personnel were armed with the pistol. As soon as our troops got into actual fighting it was found that the pistol, especially the automatic pistol used in our Army, was a great life saver as well as a great life destroyer as used by our men. It proved to be a fine weapon to fight with, and it was at once decided that a very much larger percentage of our troops should be armed with the pistol. Every effort was made to enlarge the capacity for the manufacture of the automatic pistol. When it was found to be impossible to get the tools, gauges, jigs, and other necessary things to increase production capacity sufficiently in time for the purpose, it was decided to include revolvers in the program. Several types of revolvers were used, including the old-type Colt, the new-type Colt, the Smith & Wesson, and others. In fact, it was a case of accepting almost anything that would shoot. When the war ended a number of manufacturers in addition to the Colt Company were tooling up for the production of the Colt automatic pistol, notably the Winchester Co.; so that if the war had lasted over into 1919, as it was generally expected it would, our program for pistols would have been well along.

CHART III.  
PISTOLS AND REVOLVERS.

	Pistols.			Revolvers.			Total, pistols and revolvers.
	Colt.	Remington Union Metallic Cartridge Co.	Total, pistols.	Colt.	Smith & Wesson.	Total, revolvers.	
Apr. 6 to Dec. 29, 1917.....	58,506		58,500	20,900	9,513	33,413	88,913
1918.							
January.....	11,000		11,000	8,700	7,500	16,200	27,200
February.....	14,500		14,500	8,800	8,550	17,350	31,850
March.....	21,300		21,300	11,800	12,400	24,200	45,500

CHART III—Continued.  
PISTOLS AND REVOLVERS—continued.

	Pistols.			Revolvers.*			Total, pistols and revolvers.
	Colt.	Remington Union Metallic Cartridge Co.	Total, pistols.	Colt.	Smith & Wesson.	Total revolvers.	
1918.							
April.....	22,400		22,400	10,400	10,650	21,050	43,450
May.....	35,000		35,000	11,100	12,150	23,250	58,250
June.....	37,800		37,800	11,100	14,250	25,350	63,150
July.....	39,800		39,800	11,600	11,555	23,155	62,955
August.....	40,400		40,400	11,900	13,358	24,658	65,058
September.....	32,160	640	32,740	11,100	12,650	23,750	56,490
October.....	42,300	3,881	46,181	13,500	16,675	30,175	76,356
November.....	45,800	4,102	49,902	11,900	12,660	24,560	74,462
December.....	24,900	4,529	29,129	9,500	11,400	20,900	50,029
Total.....	425,500	13,162	438,652	151,700	153,311	305,011	743,663

37-MILLIMETER GUN.

In the brief time left I wish to speak for only a moment of the 37-millimeter gun, which is a sort of connecting link between the infantry and the artillery. The 37-millimeter gun is a little under an inch and a half in caliber, or, to be exact, 1.45069 inches. The whole outfit weighs about 340 pounds. It is hauled along by a single horse or mule on a sort of cart. It is so arranged that the wheels and axle can be taken off and left behind. By putting the sponge staff through the barrel two men can carry it, while two other men of the squad carry the trail. The remaining four men of the Infantry squad carry the ammunition. The guns of this type used by our troops were bought from the French. We started to put them in manufacture in this country and had ordered 2,597. These were just beginning to come through at the end of the war. I think that a few of them had been assembled for shipment overseas.

The 37-millimeter was used as an antidote for the "pill boxes" and to clean out machine-gun nests and other strong points of this kind. It was called the Infantry cannon, being used entirely by this arm of the service.

75-MILLIMETER GUN.

The gun that played the largest part of all the field or other heavier guns in the war was the 75-millimeter gun. Its importance is indicated by the fact that it makes up numerically practically one-half the artillery program and requires very much more than half the total number of rounds of ammunition. Prior to the war no one outside of a few French ordnance officers had ever seen the 75-millimeter gun—that is, the interior of it—although it is not a new gun, being known as the 1897 model. The secret of the recoil mechanism had been preserved for 20 years, carefully kept from the public and from everyone except a few special ordnance officers in the French Army.

CHART IV.

75-MILLIMETER GUNS.<sup>1</sup>

Unit.	Contractor.	Number ordered.	Number completed, 1919.
75-mm. gun carriage, model of 1916.	Rock Island Arsenal.....	472	185
	Bethlehem Steel Co.....	455	25
	New York Air Brake Co.....	400	97
75-mm. gun carriage (French).	Willys-Overland Co.....	2,927	1,299
75-mm. gun carriage (British), complete.	Bethlehem Steel Co.....	2,868	921
75-mm. gun carriage limber (British), complete.	.....do.....	968	1,010
75-mm. gun carriage limber, model of 1918.	Bethlehem Steel Co.....	436	441
	American Car & Foundry Co.....	3,661	3,661
75-mm. gun caisson, model of 1918.	Bethlehem Steel Co.....	1,686	831
	American Car & Foundry Co.....	20,356	13,301
75-mm. caisson limber, model of 1918.	Bethlehem Steel Co.....	1,916	1,916
	American Car & Foundry Co.....	20,675	20,675
75-mm. cannon, model of 1916.	Symington-Anderson Co.....	640	416
	Wisconsin Gun Co.....	160	116
	Watervliet Arsenal.....	294	192
	Bethlehem Steel Co.....	340	2
75-mm. cannon (French).....	Symington-Anderson Co.....	4,300	860
	Wisconsin Gun Co.....	2,050	190
75-mm. cannon (British).....	Bethlehem Steel Co.....	2,868	909
75-mm. recuperator.....	Singer Manufacturing Co.....		2,083
	Rock Island Arsenal.....		

<sup>1</sup> 19 model 1916 and 124 British model were sent to France for training purposes.

The recoil mechanism of the 75-millimeter and other guns of its general type is called the recuperator. Something of this kind is necessary to absorb and neutralize the tremendous force of reaction caused by firing the piece. The French believe, and this belief was quite generally concurred in, that the recuperator of the famous 75 was the most perfect and effective in the world. As I have said, its secret had been carefully guarded for years. French joy at our coming into the war was manifested, among other ways, by turning over to us without restriction the wonderful 75 with its marvelous recuperator. A first study of the mechanism led to an attempt to Americanize the method of production, which was not entirely successful. American perseverance finally overcame all obstacles, so that a considerable number of these recuperators were finally completed; but, like most of our other preparations made after the war began, they came too late to be of service in the war.

4.7-INCH GUNS.

Chart V shows the number of 4.7-inch gun units ordered and the number finally completed:

CHART V.  
4.7-INCH GUNS.<sup>1</sup>

Unit.	Contractor.	Number ordered.	Number completed 1919.
4.7-inch gun carriage, model of 1906.	Rock Island Arsenal.....	303	183
	Studebaker Corporation.....	380	175
	Walter Scott Co.....	250	57
4.7-inch gun carriage limber...	American Car & Foundry Co.....	433	433
	Maxwell Motor Co.....	479	250
4.7-inch gun caisson.....	American Car & Foundry Co.....	1,848	848
4.7-inch cannon.....	Ford Motor Co.....	1,001	400
	Northwestern Gun Co.....		417
	Watervliet Arsenal.....		

<sup>1</sup> 16 of these units were floated for overseas up to Nov. 11, 1918.

The 4.7-inch gun is the one weapon used in the war with which our troops were familiar. We had the stupendous number of 48 of these guns when the war began, only a fractional part of the number needed for training purposes alone. Sixteen more were completed in time to be sent to France before November 11, 1918. Had the war lasted until the spring of 1919, an appreciable number of these guns would have been on the firing line. Orders were given early for the guns, carriages, caissons, and limbers, but the usual difficulties were encountered, and some additional ones, so that deliveries had only just begun when the war ended. One of the serious difficulties was the result of the great difference in cross section between the breech and muzzle ends, which made difficult the proper necessary heat treatment.

The 4.7-inch gun, with its heavier missile and longer range, was counted upon for very effective use against the German 77. With a 60-pound projectile and an elevation of 15 degrees, the 4.7 has a range of 4½ miles. By using a 45-pound projectile and the same angle of elevation, the range can be increased to 5½ miles. A still greater range is possible by depressing the trail into a hole in the ground, thus giving a still greater angle of elevation. A new design of carriage with a split trail, giving both a wider traverse and a greater elevation, was developed, and the first one was undergoing tests at the proving grounds when the war ended.

155-MILLIMETER HOWITZERS.

Like most of the best weapons used in the war, the 155-millimeter howitzer was not a new weapon. With the famous 75 it shares the great honor of being one of the most used as well as most useful weapons used in the war. It was designed and manufactured by the great firm of Schneider et Cie. and considered by the French as one of the finest examples of the gun builder's art. American skill rose to the occasion, however, and duplicated it quite successfully, though not in time to be sent to France.\* Since the armistice a considerable number of these howitzers have been completed, as shown in Chart VI. These will doubtless serve as an important part of our armament in any future program of preparedness.

The 155-millimeter howitzer weighs less than 4 tons and is conveniently mobile. The projectile used weighs 95 pounds and its range is more than 7 miles. The recuperator is of the hydropneumatic type and returns the piece into battery quickly, making it possible to fire several shots per minute.

CHART VI.  
155-MILLIMETER HOWITZERS.

Unit.	Contractor.	Number ordered.	Number completed 1919.
155-mm. howitzer carriage.....	Osgood Bradley Car Co.....	1,150	462
	American Rolling Mill Co.....	1,270	26
155-mm. howitzer carriage limbers.	Rock Island Arsenal.....	172	700
	Maxwell Motor Co.....	2,575	700
155-mm. howitzer cannon.....	Rock Island Arsenal.....	100	.....
	American Brake Shoe & Foundry Co.....	.....	1,789
155-mm. howitzer caisson.....	Ford Motor Co.....	8,937	8,937
155-mm. recuperator.....	Dodge Bros.....	.....	1,601

155-MILLIMETER G. P. F. GUNS.

The same difficulties were met and the same obstacles had to be overcome in reproducing the 155-millimeter G. P. F. guns in the United States as were encountered in duplicating or reproducing in any form the other French types of weapon. One of these monsters complete weighs 20,000 pounds. It hurls a 95-pound projectile more than 10 miles. Motor traction is used and an additional caterpillar arrangement is designed which makes it possible to traverse soft ground. It has a split trail, a very low carriage, a wide angle of traverse, and a high angle of elevation.

CHART VII.

155-MILLIMETER G. P. F. GUNS.<sup>1</sup>

Unit.	Contractor.	Number ordered.	Number completed 1919.
155-mm. gun carriage, model of 1918 (Felloux).	Minneapolis Steel & Machinery Co.....	1,446	800
155-mm. gun carriage limber, model of 1918 (Felloux).	do.....	1,446	800
155-mm. gun cannon.....	Bullard Engine Works.....	1,400	250
Do.....	Watervliet Arsenal.....	760	68
155-mm. recuperator.....	Dodge Bros.....	.....	880

<sup>1</sup>16 were actually floated to be equipped with recuperators in France.

Our program for the production of this gun [Chart VII] was quite ambitious, but like the others did not materialize in time. It is expected that a total of nearly 1,000 of these huge pieces will be completed and become a most valuable part of our permanent armament. A later report than that given in the chart shows 954 units have been completed and that 39 more are to be completed later.

8 AND 9.2 INCH HOWITZERS.

The 8-inch howitzer has the honor of being the only piece of American ordnance manufactured in the United States during the period of the war to make its appearance on the fighting line in Europe before November 11, 1918. On April 14, 1917, just eight days after our entry into the war, an order for 80 of these howitzers was placed with the Midvale Steel Co., which had been producing the same gun for Great Britain. In consequence of this fortunate circumstance the Chief of Field Artillery was able to state in his report that six batteries of this gun were in line on the day the armistice was signed.

CHART VIII.

8 AND 9.2 INCH HOWITZERS.<sup>1</sup>

Mark.	Size.	Contractor.	Number ordered.	Number completed, 1919.
VI.....	8-inch howitzer.....	Midvale Steel Co.....	195	195
VIII.....	do.....	do.....	100	34
Model of 1917.....	9.2-inch howitzer.....	Bethlehem Steel Co.....	100	1

<sup>1</sup>96 of the Mark VI 8-inch howitzers were shipped overseas before the close of the war, of which 24 reached the front before the armistice.

The 9.2-inch British howitzer is only a fraction of an inch less in caliber than the 240-millimeter French howitzer, and is not considered equal to the French weapon in any respect. The British were supplying us with this type. It might seem strange that in addition to our somewhat liberal program for the 240-millimeter we should also order 100 of the 9.2's to be made in this country.

A sufficient explanation lies in the fact that the Bethlehem Steel Co. had been making this gun for Great Britain and was ready to produce them. With this capacity available it was deemed the part of wisdom to utilize it. Therefore an order

was given to the Bethlehem Steel Co. for 100 guns of this type. None of them were finished in time for use abroad.

240-MILLIMETER HOWITZERS.

Although but a fraction of an inch larger than the British 9.2 and still in the same class as the British 8-inch, nevertheless it was believed that the French 240-millimeter howitzer was so much superior to the other two that it was adopted. A glance at Chart IX will disclose something of the magnitude of the undertaking. To Watertown Arsenal alone was allotted \$17,500,000 as the estimated expense for turning out 250 gun carriages complete for the 240-millimeter howitzer. Another order for nearly four times as many more gun carriages of the same kind was given to the Standard Steel Car Co. One unit was completed before the armistice, but was not sent abroad.

CHART IX.

240-MILLIMETER HOWITZERS.

Units.	Contractors.	Number ordered.	Number completed, 1919.
240-mm. unit complete, except howitzer.	Watertown Arsenal.....	250	41
240-mm. howitzer carriage units, except recuperators.	Standard Steel Car Co.....	964	67
Windlasses.....	Dodge Manufacturing Co.....	1,125	350
Rammer trucks.....	do.....	1,205	375
Shot trucks.....	do.....	3,214	1,000
240-mm. howitzer cannon.....	Watervliet Arsenal.....	.....	240
240-mm. recuperators.....	(Otis Elevator Co..... Watervliet Arsenal.....)	.....	426

The exact size of the 240-millimeter is 9.45 inches. The projectile weighs 356 pounds and carries a bursting charge of almost 50 pounds of high explosive. Its range is about 10 miles. By separating the complete unit into four parts, each part can be drawn by a 10-ton tractor, thus rendering the weapon mobile. A small crane is carried along for use in setting up the gun.

RAILWAY ARTILLERY.

The program for railway artillery in the war was one of mounting guns already in existence. The task was one of such magnitude as to require time beyond what the period of the war afforded. The Ordnance Department took up the task in a large way and some noteworthy results were achieved, but the same story must be told as in the case of nearly all of our gun program—the war ended before any of the guns were on the fighting line.

The 7-inch Navy guns were not intended for use overseas, but were mounted for the protection of our own seacoast against the heavy guns of the German submarines.

There were available, that could be spared from our seacoast defenses, ninety-six 8-inch guns of 35-caliber length. It was decided to construct 47 mounts. Three large contractors attempted the job and made such progress that three complete units were shipped overseas. These mounts were equipped to run on either the standard gauge or the omnipresent 60-centimeter road of the fighting zone. If the war had lasted till the spring of 1919 it is believed that these guns would have proved a factor.

CHART X.

MOUNTS FOR RAILWAY ARTILLERY.

Source whence obtained.	Number of guns.	Size, inches.	Length, calibers.	Number complete, 1919.
Navy.....	12	7	45	12
Seacoast defenses.....	96	8	35	33
Do.....	129	10	34	22
Do.....	49	12	35	1
In manufacture for Chile.....	6	12	50	3
Seacoast defenses.....	1,150	12	10	45
Navy (60 more ordered).....	21	14	50	11
Seacoast defenses (61 more ordered).....	1	16	20	.....

<sup>1</sup>Mortars.

There were 129 of the seacoast 10-inch guns of 34-caliber length available for war use. It was decided to mount 36 of them on the Schneider sliding mount and 18 on the Batignolles type of mount. Three large contractors undertook the work of fabricating the parts of the Schneider mounts to be assembled in France. A few parts had been fabricated before the armistice. None of either type were finished, and the contracts were canceled.

Of the 12-inch guns found to be available for mounting 6 were being made here for the Republic of Chile when we came

into the war. Their great length, 50 calibers, gave them a very long range. Three mounts were ordered and almost completed before the armistice. One of these mounts requires four railway cars, has a total length of 105 feet, and weighs 600,000 pounds.

One of the biggest jobs of the entire program was the mounting of the 12-inch mortars. The buildings and tools for a single plant cost \$3,500,000. When the armistice was signed the castings, forgings, and structural parts were ready and 45 units were completed later.

None of the 14-inch Navy guns were finally mounted by the Army, and the contracts were canceled after the armistice. Under the supervision of the Navy Ordnance Bureau 11 of these guns, on hand before the war, were mounted on railway cars, and later on 6 of them were turned over to the Army. These 6 guns figured as the only very large semimobile artillery of American make on the line during the war.

There was one American 16-inch howitzer forged, finished, and ready for mounting at the outbreak of the war. It was decided to place this monster on a railway mount and use it in France, but it was not finished in time.

## TANKS.

It does not seem to be fully settled just who it was who first invented the tank, if, indeed, it can be properly called an invention. An American contrived the caterpillar tractor. A Frenchman claims the honor of evolving the portable fortress to be carried by the tractor. The British were the first to use it in the famous drive at Cambrai.

CHART XI.  
TANKS.<sup>1</sup>

Item.	Number ordered.	Number completed, 1919.
6-ton Renault.....	4,440	950
Mark I.....	1,000	.....
3-ton Ford & Co.....	15,015	15
Mark 8 A. A., components.....	1,500	1
Mark 8 U. S., complete.....	1,450	29

<sup>1</sup> 6 Renault and 10 Ford tanks were shipped to France.

No manufacturer in America knew anything at all about producing tanks. Fortunately they do not come within the same class with guns for difficulty of production. I shall therefore make but brief reference to them here.

It was first decided to equip our forces with two sizes of tanks. The very large British tank had proved satisfactory in battle, so it was adopted for the large size, while the 6-ton Renault used by the French was accepted for the smaller type. A working agreement was made with the British by which we furnished the engines and driving mechanism, while Great Britain furnished the hull, guns, and ammunition. The wisdom of this arrangement is apparent. We could make engines and driving mechanisms, but our production of guns and ammunition had not yet reached a satisfactory stage.

The large tanks had not yet materialized at the time of the armistice, but a few of the smaller size were about ready for use when the end of the war came.

A small 3-ton two-man tank was devised, and the Ford Motor Co. set about building them in the summer of 1918, but only a few were completed and none in time to be used.

There are many other features of our war-time ordnance problem that I should like to dilate upon, such as trench mortars, grenades, bombs, and many varieties of ammunition, but I have already referred to enough to indicate the general character of the problem. I shall refer to but one thing further, which will serve as typical of the Artillery ammunition program.

## 75-MILLIMETER HIGH-EXPLOSIVE SHELL.

The high-explosive shell for the 75-millimeter gun will best serve to illustrate the stupendous task of supplying Artillery ammunition, because practically all calibers use the high-explosive shell in part or in whole, and a larger proportion of high-explosive shells were used in the Great War than ever before. A very thorough study of the production of the 75-millimeter high-explosive shell during the war has been made by the statistics branch of the General Staff. The results of this study are embodied in Report No. 5, Statistical Summary Series, a most interesting, illuminating, and valuable document, the examination of which is recommended to anyone desirous of a thorough understanding of this subject. I shall submit the substance of but a single page of this report, Chart XII, in order to show the difficulty of keeping to a paper program when laid out in an untried field.

CHART XII.  
PRODUCTION OF 75-MILLIMETER HIGH-EXPLOSIVE SHELLS.  
(Figures represent millions.)

	Status Apr. 1.	Status Aug. 1.	Status Dec. 1.	Above or below program Aug. 1. <sup>1</sup>	Above or below program Dec. 1. <sup>1</sup>
Primers.....	7.8	22.2	30.6	+ 2	+10.4
Cartridge cases.....	4.8	17.1	26.8	- 3.1	+ 6.6
Fuzes.....	.4	4.8	12	-15.4	- 8.2
Shells.....	.3	3.9	13.9	-16.3	- 6.3
Boosters.....	.04	2.2	10.9	-18	- 9.3
Complete rounds.....		.5	4.8	-19.7	-15.4

<sup>1</sup> The Government program called for 20,200,000 complete rounds by Sept. 1, 1918.

The program finally adopted called for the production of 20,200,000 complete rounds on September 1, 1918. The different components were assigned to a number of manufacturers, each of whom set to work to turn out his particular part as soon as possible. No one knew just how long it would require. The result is shown in the chart. It shows what might be called a very badly unbalanced program. Primers were easy to make, while boosters were found to be very difficult and slow. Cartridge cases lagged behind primers, but were far ahead of fuses or shells. Since the slowest ship necessarily determines the speed of the entire fleet, so the number of complete rounds must fall below the number of boosters.

On August 1, 1918, a month before the date set for the consummation of the program, primers had been accepted to the number of 22,200,000, or 2,000,000 beyond the mark set, while boosters ready on the same date were only 2,200,000, or 18,000,000 below the program. Meanwhile the number of complete rounds lagged still further behind, with the result that only 1,600,000 rounds of light field gun high-explosive shell of American manufacture reached France, and this arrived so late that practically none of it could be tested, authorized for issue, and used before the armistice was signed.

The report referred to very appropriately adds in connection with the time required to produce the 75-millimeter high-explosive shell—and it applies as well to many other articles—“Some of the causes of the delay in manufacture were peculiar to the circumstances of this war. Others would occur in almost any future war. It is of vital importance for future military plans to know what the causes of delay were, how far they were peculiar to the occasion, and how far common to every program of munition manufacture.”

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record the charts here displayed by me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by placing some charts in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TILSON. I ask for one minute more. [Turning shotgun toward the Republican side of the House.]

Mr. SLEMP. I will yield the gentleman one minute. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILSON. I have brought in as an exhibit the weapon which I now hold in my hand, because it was at one time a matter of international interest. This is the famous sawed-off shotgun, against the use of which the Kaiser protested as not being in accordance with international law. So far as my knowledge of international law goes there is nothing that would prohibit the use of such a gun. It is simply a short shotgun with a bayonet fitted to it. The ammunition used is a cartridge containing nine buckshot. It is by no means a new gun, this one being one of model 1897. It has been called a riot gun, and would doubtless be quite effective for such a purpose. It was probably first intended to be used in France to guard prisoners. It was tried in the trenches and found to be useful in close-range fighting. Gen. Pershing ordered more of them, and there were sent over to him about 30,000 or 40,000 of them. They were not all used for guarding prisoners.

These guns were made by private manufacturers entirely and were never made in the Government arsenals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. EAGAN. I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. TILSON. This little gun which I now hold in my hand was captured from the Germans. It is a pistol, using the wooden holster for an extension butt to the stock. Placing it to the shoulder in this way [illustrating] gives the weapon a steadiness in holding and aiming that in shooting gives to it practically the effectiveness of a rifle for short distances. It

is one of the very excellent pistols carried by officers of the German Army, and I am told that it is a very accurate-shooting pistol, though I have not yet had the opportunity of trying it out for myself.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. How many cartridges does it carry?

Mr. TILSON. I believe that the chamber and magazine together hold 10 cartridges. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding to me the extra time and the Members present for their helpful attention. [Applause.]

I would add but a brief conclusion to my remarks. Fortunately the charts which I extend in the RECORD with my remarks speak far more eloquently than any mere words that I might utter. They tell in typical instances something of the story of our mighty, though necessarily hasty and wasteful, effort to prepare for war in time of war. Fabulous as has been the cost it will not have been expended in vain if we and those who come after us shall learn from this experience, and not allow them to be forgotten, the very obvious lessons it has taught.

There were no plans, we are told. The next five years will be the very best years in the century to make plans. The lamp of actual experience, a heart-rending experience in many respects, will be a light to guide us.

Scarcely has the noise of the thundering guns ceased to reverberate along the Meuse before we begin to hear the senseless chatter, time worn and oft refuted, that all wars have now ceased forever. The prophets Isaiah and Micah in identical language foretold the day when men would beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. This prophecy is now being fulfilled in this country under our very eyes. It was likewise fulfilled after 1865 and again after 1898. In fact, the periodical fulfillment of this beautiful prophecy makes it a somewhat unsafe foundation upon which to build a policy of national defense. Nevertheless we are proceeding upon a theory which for the time being and until war comes fulfills that other prophecy, "Neither shall they learn war any more." Oh, if by simply wishing we could make things so!

Let me not be misunderstood. I would not maintain a huge Military Establishment in time of peace. In fact, I have always favored a small standing Army, knowing full well that in the future as in the past our wars must be fought by citizen soldiers. For their own sakes as well as for the sake of the country whose defense is their most sacred duty they should have the benefit of an elementary military training; but as I have here tried to show, the most serious obstacle to be overcome by us in the Great War was not the lack of trained man power, important as this was. The mobilization of our industries for the production of munitions was the really big problem. The war lasting 19 months was too short to solve it. The return of peace gives another opportunity to attack the problem in an orderly, systematic, and scientific fashion. The future welfare and safety of the Republic demand that we perform our part of the task now. We of this day and time shall prove ourselves unfaithful servants if without an earnest effort to prevent it we permit ourselves to drift back into the same old fool's paradise in which the war found us.

To prevent such a relapse is not so much a matter of expense as it is of attitude on the part of Congress and the people and of far-sighted, practical making of plans, and, so far as may be, carrying them into execution on the part of those charged with responsibility. A tithe of the sum that was wasted in the frenzied effort made during the war if properly expended would go far toward insuring against the possible recurrence of the necessity for such an expenditure. For one, I shall not cease to urge and to assist wherever I may that the house of our national defense be put in order and kept so for the benefit of our own posterity, as well as for the good of all mankind.

By unanimous consent, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Mr. TILSON, Mr. SLEMP, and Mr. EAGAN were given leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 61 minutes remaining.

Mr. EAGAN. I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL].

THE COTTON FARMER, THE COST OF PRODUCTION, AND THE PRICE OF HIS PRODUCT.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, the merchant properly bases his selling price upon the cost price. Why should not the cotton farmer? If the merchant does not get his price to-day, he rightly holds his goods until to-morrow. Why should not the cotton farmer? The merchant has the goods the people need,

the farmer has the cotton the world needs. In the two cases the economic conditions are identical.

Cotton growing is expensive. It demands practically 12 months of the year to grow and harvest a crop. Other crops require much less time. Cotton is the one staple crop that must be cultivated and harvested entirely by human hands. Tobacco is another largely handled by hand. Other crops are cultivated and harvested by machinery. Cotton is planted by hand, or by some simple device requiring the planting of each row separately. It is cultivated by human hands with hoe and plow. It is picked by hand, human fingers touching every lock and boll of the entire crop; then it is loaded on wagons by hand and again handled at the gin, requiring the maximum of human energy. Wheat land is broken by machinery; it requires no cultivation; the crop is harvested by machinery, thrashed and sacked by machinery, requiring the minimum of human labor.

Cotton was originally produced by slaves, when neither the cost of labor nor the living conditions of the laborer were considered an item in the legitimate cost of production. To some extent this conventional opinion prevails to-day among those in the trade who seek cheap cotton and who, while demanding their "pound of flesh," are not humanly interested in removing the wretched privations that were suffered until recently by those who performed the manual labor in the cotton fields.

It has been charged by the press of New England and of Europe that cotton-land owners are making excessive profits, as shown by the great increase of the deposits in southern banks. These critics are evidently ignorant of the fact that, owing to the rich and versatile soils of the South, with a wealth of sunshine and climate, the cotton crops produced last year only one-fifth of the \$10,000,000,000 of revenues derived from the southern farms. In the other four-fifths, not in the cotton crops, over 30 per cent of which were produced at loss, are found the profits the South realizes from its agricultural activities. The South is, of course, increasing in wealth and power, but its profits have come not from cotton but from other agricultural products which make cotton growing possible, and from its vast increasing oil, mineral, and timber resources. If the South, deprived of its timber, oil, and minerals, under present high prices of farm equipment and cost and scarcity of labor, were to-day compelled to grow cotton exclusively, even at prices that now prevail, its bank deposits would disappear and bankruptcy would inevitably follow. You may give a young man the best college agricultural education and he can not with his own hands earn a decent living growing cotton alone. He must grow other crops also. Cotton is his cash crop, but under present prices does not yield a profit. The money value of his corn, peas, potatoes, hay, pastures, vegetables, beef, pork, milk, butter, chickens, eggs, interest, taxes, and depreciation of improvements, implements, and live stock, to say nothing of his labor, used during the whole year required in growing and harvesting a cotton crop is greater than the money value of the cotton grown.

CRITICS ANSWERED.

These well-known facts conclusively answer the critics who claim the price of cotton paid the producer is too high. Then, too, authoritative estimates show that of the service men who left the cotton fields to enter the service only one-tenth have returned to cotton production, while there is a steady and increasing movement of laborers from the cotton farms because they can earn from three to four times more in other callings.

The present price of cotton does not permit the cotton-land owner to pay prices sufficiently high to arrest this movement away from the cotton fields. These laborers have not in great numbers left the South. They have only left the cotton fields. The problem that confronts the South and is vital to the world, now in need of clothing, is how to bring this labor back to the cotton fields. It will be illuminating to note that dependable white labor and not uncertain negro labor, as usually presumed, produces the major part of the cotton grown. So in bringing labor back to the cotton farms you are dealing with the dependable white man, the white American, ambitious and resolute in purpose to have a wage and living conditions equal to men in other industries. I myself have picked cotton at 35 cents a hundred pounds when lint cotton was 8 cents a pound. Texas last year paid \$3 a hundred pounds, and the average cost of harvesting the crop over the belt was above \$2 a hundred. In this ratio a fair price for the crop of 1919 is well above 50 cents a pound. But even the high prices paid for harvesting the crop in 1919 failed to attract laborers to the cotton fields and much of the crop was wasted. Clearly, then, the remedy is to increase the price of cotton to the producer, so that he may secure an adequate, dependable supply of labor. Cotton growing in 1920 will be even more expensive to the producer.

THE TENANT FARMER.

The records show that 2,000,000 families in the South are engaged in growing cotton. The average production per family in 1919 was 5½ bales. The average in each family is a fraction over 5 persons. Sixty-two per cent are tenants, paying one-fourth rent to the landowner. This means that each tenant family has 4½ bales of cotton to support 5 persons during the year, an average of 3 of whom work in the cotton fields. The income is as follows:

4½ bales.....	\$643.50
2.07 tons seed.....	186.30

Total annual gross income for entire family..... 829.80

No argument is needed to show this means, under present living prices—shoes, for example—a meager existence. Who among you would, even if you could, depress the price of cotton received by the producer under conditions such as these? Will it not be better for the country if the laborer is encouraged by sympathetic effort to increase his output per acre that he may be stimulated to a larger degree of efficiency?

THE SMALL LANDOWNER.

Gentlemen of the House, the situation of the small cotton farmer who owns and cultivates his own land is no less serious to the cotton industry. He is becoming forward looking, and he is standing up fighting with the spirit of a thoroughbred. He is rightly placing a new value on his own and his wife's labor and his invested capital. He demands right living conditions for his family and proper advantages for his children. If he fails to get a fair profit from his cotton, he will grow something else. The price of cotton is no longer determined by the necessity of the producer. It is now the necessity of the consumer.

RECORDS OF COST.

In 1919 the United States Department of Agriculture made a thorough study of the cost of producing cotton in 1918 on 842 cotton farms in 4 Southern States. An analysis of this report reveals that taking the average yield and the average cost per pound of the 842 farms reported on and applying it to 160 pounds, which was the average yield over the belt in 1918, it figures the cost of growing cotton for that year was 35½ cents a pound. The average selling price for the crop of 1918 was 28½ cents a pound. With the advanced cost of production since 1918, it is clear that the crop of 1919 should sell well above 50 cents, and the cost of growing cotton is still advancing.

An exhaustive study of the average cost of producing the 1919 crop in Texas was made through a committee of cotton specialists by the department of agriculture of that State. The investigation covered the entire State. The average cost of production for the whole State was shown, by an itemized statement, to be 44 cents. The average selling price of cotton by the producer in the belt for 1919 is 31.2 cents. So, the average crop in Texas was produced at an average loss of 12.8 cents a pound.

AVERAGE TENANT COTTON FARM OF 20 ACRES.

To be exact, I give an accurate detailed statement, dated July 20, 1919, from Mr. W. W. Morrison, of New Orleans, one of the highest authorities in the world on the cost of cotton production:

It is perhaps well to say that the writer has had many years of practical experience in growing cotton, and that the items in the estimate below are generally concurred in by all of those with whom he has discussed the matter who have had a like experience. The figures below are based upon a 20-acre cotton farm. It will take all the time of one laborer and one plow animal to do the plowing required in cultivating such a farm and the outside work necessary to its general upkeep and such recreation, it should be emphasized, as every American citizen is entitled to. While more can be cultivated in some parts of Texas and Oklahoma, less can be cultivated in a good part of the belt east of the Mississippi River. Twenty acres seem, therefore, a fair average. The estimate is based upon 160 pounds of lint per acre:

Estimate cost cotton crop 1919.

Rent 20 acres land, \$7.50 per acre.....	\$150.00
Rent one plow animal.....	65.00
Feed one plow animal.....	279.00
Ginning 9,600 pounds seed cotton, 30 cents per hundred.....	28.80
Transportation farm products and supplies.....	30.00
Deterioration of farm implements.....	20.00
Labor one man, one year, \$75 per month.....	900.00
Extra labor hoeing over crop three times, 75 days, \$2.50 a day.....	187.50
Picking 9,600 pounds seed cotton, \$1.50 per hundred.....	144.00
Gross expense.....	1,804.30
Less 3½ tons seed at \$90 per ton.....	288.00
	1,516.30

Twenty acres at 160 pounds, 3,200 pounds lint, net expense \$1,516.30; cost 47½ cents.

The current prices on which this statement is based can be too easily ascertained to make any discussion of the items in detail necessary. It may, however, facilitate investigation to state that the scientific feed for one plow animal for one year is 53 bushels of corn, 53 bushels of oats, and 3 tons of hay. This cost the consumer—corn, \$2 per bushel;

oats, \$1 per bushel; hay, \$60 per ton for No. 1 timothy. The estimate is based on country hay at \$40 per ton. Labor is also based on a wage of \$75 per month, or \$2.50 per day. Much evidence in the hands of the writer indicates that it may average \$3 per day for the year. The evidence also indicates that picking may average \$2 instead of \$1.50 for the season. No charge for fertilizer is included, as its reduced use during the last four years makes it an unimportant factor in the general average cost.

Retail merchants' books and local market quotations approximate, with much more accuracy than any other records, the price the growers of cotton have to pay. These records show that from 1913 to May, 1919, the price of these commodities advanced 273 per cent—labor during this time advanced 240 per cent, most of it during the last 20 months.

As labor makes up, according to the best authorities, about 50 per cent of the cost, these figures show an increase in the cost of growing cotton during this period of 256 per cent, or 34.56 cents per pound. In other words, cotton to-day would have to sell at 48.06 cents per pound to bear the same relation to the expense involved in its production that it bore in 1913, when the average price was 13½ cents.

MEXICAN PINK BOLLWORM.

Gentlemen, the appearance in Louisiana and Texas of the Mexican pink bollworm, unless crushed in its incipiency, threatens disaster. It means that unless drastic measures are immediately adopted the world's supply of cotton may be in peril. The expense of immediate action to eradicate the pest, the burden of this calamity, let me pause to say, should not be borne alone by the cotton producers. It should be borne by the Federal and State treasuries. When the cotton farmer fails, his farm laborer, his preacher, his school-teacher, his doctor, his dentist, his lawyer, his banker, his merchant, and his commission merchant alike suffer, as do the stock raiser, the wheat grower, the wheat dealer, and the cotton consumer in other sections of the country. The question is not sectional. It is national in its serious import and should be handled vigorously—and handled now—as such. The need is constant, close, and cordial cooperation between the Federal and the State authorities. Investigation, direction, and control should be financed by the Federal Government, while reparation or compensation to individual cotton growers for crops prevented or destroyed is of necessity a State matter. With the boll weevil working ruin in wet weather and the pink bollworm working ruin in dry weather, the cost of growing cotton will of necessity be vastly increased within the next year or two.

OTHER FARM PRODUCTS.

The following comparisons of average yearly prices of certain important farm products is shown by the records of the Bureau of Labor Statistics:

	1913	1919	Per cent of increase.
Cotton, New Orleans.....	\$0.127	\$0.319	151
Flaxseed.....	1.349	4.533	236
Corn, No. 2.....	.625	1.597	155
Corn, No. 3.....	.616	1.580	157
Winter wheat, Kansas City.....	.877	2.418	176
Spring wheat, Minneapolis.....	.874	2.566	194
Calfskins.....	.189	.685	263
Pacific coast hops.....	.172	.555	223
Wool (fine fleece, scoured basis).....	.589	1.728	190

Of the nine commodities listed above, cotton showed a smaller increase from 1913 to 1919 than any other commodity.

ARTICLES THE COTTON FARMER HAS TO BUY.

The increase in the price of articles the farmer has to buy is vastly greater than the increase in the price of cotton. The War Industries Board price list No. 48, issued in 1919, shows the increase in the cost of certain fertilizer materials from 1914 to 1918:

	1914.	1918.
Acid phosphate (16 per cent phosphoric acid).....ton.....	\$7.20	\$17.75
Slaughterhouse tankage.....do.....	26.27	57.50
Muriate potash.....do.....	39.24	302.50
Kainit.....do.....	8.43	40.00

Potash advanced 670 per cent during the war period. If the proposed Republican protective tariff on potash is enacted into law the price of the most commonly used fertilizer will be wholly prohibitive to the cotton farmer, thus further reducing the yield per acre and greatly advancing the cost of production.

The Boot and Shoe Recorder, in its issue of January 24, 1920, shows that since 1913 shoe leather and shoes have advanced in price as follows: Glazed kid, 850 per cent; calfskin, 600 per cent; calf leather, 450 per cent; shoes (men's and women's), 275 per cent.

STARTLING PROFITS IN OTHER INDUSTRIES.

The press carried the following news item:

BOSTON, March 24.

A stock dividend of 100 per cent to shareholders of the Amoskeag Manufacturing Co. was recommended to-day by the trustees.

The Pittsburgh Tin Plate and Steel Corporation said, in a letter of March 22:

Every operating tin-plate and sheet-steel mill has made enormous fortunes for their stockholders, many of the common stocks selling at 1,500 per cent premium. A steel company organized by the head of this corporation earned 77 per cent in one year, and the holders of original common stock made a profit of over 1,000 per cent.

#### INCREASING WORLD COTTON SHORTAGE.

Gentlemen, the seriousness of these conditions becomes evident when it is recalled that the cotton crop of 1919 was only 11,030,000 bales, while all dependable statistics and estimates show the world, needy and half-clothed, calls upon the South to produce over 15,000,000 bales in 1920. Under present conditions, how can there be big crops unless at higher price?

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, how can the additional 4,000,000 bales be produced, with labor only 60 per cent efficient and with a 25 per cent shortage, unless the price paid the producer is advanced sufficiently to attract an adequate, dependable, and efficient labor supply for intensive cultivation? Let critics of the cotton producer in and out of Congress supply the remedy, or else yield without quibble to the present logical economic situation which demands a fair price to the grower of raw cotton so urgently needed to clothe a naked European world, which is not less urgent than to feed a starving world.

Since the real problem of the cotton farmer is to increase, not the acreage but the yield per acre, the situation becomes even more difficult of solution when it is recalled that during 1910-1914, the five-year period immediately preceding the war, the South produced 73,518,000 bales, while during 1914-1919, the period of the war, the total production was 61,094,000 bales. During the first period the total acreage was 176,652,000, while during the war period the acreage was 168,759,000. This means the reduction in acreage was  $\frac{4}{5}$  per cent, while the yield per acre fell off 17 per cent. The cotton farmer no longer gets an average yield per acre of 250 pounds of lint; he gets an average of only 158.2 pounds. The average yield in 1919 in Louisiana, on account of the ravages of the boll weevil and excessive rains, was only 93 pounds. This means necessarily an average one-third increase of labor and equipment to cultivate and harvest the necessary acreage and a much higher cost of production in 1920.

#### THE COTTON FARMER REFUSES TO BE STAMPEDED.

The spinners of New England and of Europe periodically seek to frighten the southern cotton farmer into accepting ruinous prices for his product. The motive behind the propaganda is apparent. One moment the southern cotton farmer is viciously attacked for holding his cotton. Then the press announces that shiploads of cotton, on account of foreign exchange conditions, are being rejected by England and returned to America. Then it is heralded that England has raised \$75,000,000 to stimulate cotton production among her colonies. For 100 years this propaganda has from time to time gone out from spinners, and especially from England, but the southern cotton farmer now refuses to be stampeded. He knows the world must have cotton and that the South is fully able to supply the world, if only prices guarantee a fair profit to the producer. This one thing—a fair profit—in the future he will certainly demand and receive. He knows, on account of soil, climate, and industrial conditions elsewhere, that other countries can not compete with him. He knows that in the South there are over 50,000,000 acres of unreclaimed cotton lands, the finest in all the world, capable of producing 50,000,000 bales annually, sufficient to supply the world for generations to come. He knows that these lands, in easy reach of storage and transportation facilities, can, with modern machinery, be readily reclaimed. He knows that for 100 years the South has been developing a vast industrial organization of skilled cotton growers, banks, storage, and transportation facilities which make the threat of competition from Europe a delusion. No such cotton-growing organization is found or can be created within a generation anywhere else in the world. Why should he not be undisturbed and unafraid?

#### PROFITS.

The southern cotton farmer gets a smaller share of profits from his product than does the farmer in any other country in the world. He is willing for others to make profits from his cotton, but he has decided to demand his fair share.

The records of the Department of Agriculture (Department Circular 56, dated August, 1919) show that the cotton mills of the State of North Carolina consume about as much cotton as that State produces, about 800,000 bales. The records show that the mills of that State paid an average of \$11.60 per bale more than the average price received by the farmer on the same date for cotton of the same grade and staple. After deducting \$2.50 a bale for freight and drayage, the farmers of

North Carolina received \$7,280,000 less than the mills paid for their cotton. The farmers will find a way to share these millions. Why should they not?

Again, the records show that the average price of cotton received by the individual producer in the United States in 1919 was about 4 cents a pound, or \$20 a bale less than the cotton mills paid for the same grade and staple. This means that the mills paid, including storage, freight, and drayage, \$220,600,000 more for the crop than the farmers received for it. On this basis, the farmers of Louisiana sold their crop of 300,000 bales for \$6,000,000 less than the mills paid for it. Do you wonder that the cotton growers are becoming alive to the situation to demand that these profits be reflected back proportionately to the farmer? [Applause.]

When the cotton farmers realize fully that the price is below the cost of production, they will hold their cotton as much as possible off the market until a living price is offered. What else can they do? What else would you have them do? Heretofore they have been financially unable to do this; to-day with their improved banking facilities they are less dependent.

#### PROFITEERING ON THE FARMERS' COTTON.

Gentlemen, excessive profits in the trade have barely begun to appear when the cotton reaches the spinner. Hearings before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on February 28 revealed (1) that during the past six months cotton yarns at the mills have advanced in price more than 100 per cent, while raw cotton and labor at the mills advanced only 15 per cent; (2) cotton yarns are selling at \$4 a pound, while the spinners pay 40 cents a pound for cotton; (3) New England spinning mills are making profits ranging from 250 to 600 per cent. A proper step was taken when by House resolution, April 5, the Federal Trade Commission is directed to investigate the increased price of cotton yarn from 1914 to 1919, inclusive. The spinners of England, there is ample evidence to show, have accumulated fabulous fortunes in the past 12 months profiteering on American cotton.

No equitable adjustment of world conditions is possible, nor can this country ever return to normal trade relations, unless the price of cotton paid the producer is adjusted properly to meet present conditions.

The cotton farmer sells his cotton at the lowest price that cotton brings; he then has to buy cotton goods at the highest price that goods bring. He goes to a dry-goods store and buys 6 yards of gingham, at 75 cents a yard. It costs him \$4.50. He then notes that he sold the cotton in the gingham for exactly 25½ cents, while he pays \$4.50 for the same cotton when it comes back to him in cloth. Should he not share this advance of 1,700 per cent? He then buys a 25-cent handkerchief, and finds he had sold the cotton in it for 1½ cents, which is an advance of over 1,500 per cent. When he takes his cotton to market he usually does not know its grade or its value. He accepts what is offered him. Then he has no part in naming the price of the goods he has to buy. The farmer can improve these conditions both for himself and his merchant, and he will.

#### PUBLICITY.

These are abnormal times and the inequalities in profits are said to be caused by the high cost of living, but these conditions will be adjusted. The greatest need now is pitiless publicity. The Bureau of Markets of the Department of Agriculture has done some good work in this line and is planning to do better work. The statistical information heretofore sent out from the Department of Agriculture by an expert is so technical that it takes three experts to interpret and translate the statistics into intelligible English. [Laughter.] The Bureau of Markets, charged with that duty, should collect and send out each day in simple, readable, intelligible form definite information showing what the farmers in each section of the country are receiving for their products and what the consumers in definite towns and cities of each section are paying that day for the same commodities. These figures should be published in the newspapers and sent by telegram to farmers' organizations, women's clubs, labor organizations, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, and so forth, throughout the country. These organizations will gladly distribute the information by telephone to the individuals. The people have a right to know not only what the prices are but where the best daily markets are. [Applause.] If the information is properly distributed, using a standard basis in giving quotations, the people themselves will settle the question of profiteering. This principle holds good in the cotton industry. Widespread accurate information as to prices, grades, and classes of cotton and cotton fabrics is imperative if the cotton grower is to be successful.

#### MONEY VALUE OF TEACHING COTTON CLASSING.

Gentlemen of the House, the first suggested step in the movement to disseminate accurate information on cotton is further to coordinate the Federal Board for Vocational Education, the



States Relations Service, and the Bureau of Markets with various State and county agencies in the cotton section.

During the summer months of this year the Bureau of Markets should furnish prepared standards—sample types of the various cotton grades or classes—and expert demonstrators in cotton classing to hold in each cotton State one or more schools of instruction of at least one week at such place or places, in connection with summer schools, as may be designated by the State authorities. The principals of the Smith-Hughes agricultural schools and the county agents should be required by the State and Federal authorities to attend. The principals and teachers of other agricultural schools should be requested to attend. Farmers and pupils should also be invited to attend.

In this way a beginning can be made and the foundation laid for the teaching of this important subject in the Smith-Hughes schools, where the pupils of these schools and the farmers may learn inexpensively properly to class their own cotton and know in advance the grade and market value of their cotton.

The Department of Agriculture will furnish the standard samples at cost to the Government. The State authorities should forthwith make provision for the regular teaching of cotton classing in the agricultural and mechanical colleges, and in the Smith-Hughes agricultural schools in the cotton section. A course of instruction covering a period of six weeks will enable a high-school pupil to become a successful cotton classer. The equipment for such course of instruction consists merely of standard samples and other raw cotton for comparison. The value of this instruction at this time to the cotton growers of the present and the future can not be estimated.

The Bureau of Markets has succeeded in arousing such interest in parts of the State of Texas that the farmers, upon their own initiative, have begun in a limited way the study of classing their cotton. The Department of Agriculture estimates that these Texas farmers have already profited \$1,000,000 by this study; one farmer having this information increased the selling price of his crop \$30 a bale.

It is clear that each farmer, if he is to follow business usage and hold his own as a business man, should know the various standard classes and the value and quality of his cotton before he offers it for sale. Having this information, he will strive to produce such grades as will be most remunerative. He will grow interested in improving his cotton seed. Why should he select his seed unless he knows the different classes of cotton? He will more carefully handle his cotton and see to it that it is properly ginned and baled to avoid the usually large output of low grades. In this way he will rapidly raise the standard and value of his product. A great opportunity for real and definite service for which they were created is now presented to the Smith-Hughes agricultural schools. This call to duty is unmistakably clear. The States through these schools should promptly respond. The Vocational Board and the Department of Agriculture, through the Bureau of Markets and the States Relations Service, have pledged their hearty cooperation when the State authorities take the initiative.

The proposed plan for teaching the classes of cotton should be adopted in the grain States. Cotton and grain are the only agricultural products that have been standardized by the Government.

#### COTTON FARMER NOT A STRIKER.

Gentlemen, the cotton farmer's vocation differs from other callings. He has few vacations. He can not go on a strike for a week or a month and resume work, losing only the wages for the idle period. His is a yearly business. He must plow in season, or there is no planting. He must plant in season, or he has no harvest. He must harvest in season, or he has nothing to sell. He must sell at the proper time, in the right way, at a fair profit, or he has no returns for his labor. He runs the risk of drouth, flood, and pestilence. No one guarantees him either price or profit.

#### A FAIR CHANCE.

He can not and he does not desire to restrict trade or corner the market to form an unreasonable monopoly. There is no reason, justice, or defense for proposed legislative restrictions on his plan of cooperative buying or collective bargaining. His thrift and enterprise thus to improve his market should certainly be encouraged. All he demands—a wholly righteous demand—is a fair return from the labor of his hands, a fair chance to earn an honorable living for himself and his family. This means that he properly demands that the price of cotton be high enough to enable him through industry and economy, with the proper market facilities, to live comfortably, not in a shack, but in a home with modern conveniences, with enough money to support his church, educate his children by properly paid trained teachers, purchase wholesome literature for his

family, enjoy the use of telephones, good roads, and proper mail facilities.

He rightly demands enough income to send his children, now in the cotton field, into the schoolhouse and the women out of the cotton field back to the home. He has a right to demand a fair remuneration for his labor, a reasonable interest on his invested capital with a chance to improve his farm equipment, live stock, and soil, and to live as comfortably as the man in any other industry. The cotton growers are getting together to stay together, and they will not always have to call upon the "other fellow" to name the grade and price of cotton.

The American Cotton Association promises to become a potent influence for good in the cotton industry throughout. In rightly defending the cotton growers' economic life its provisions for properly marketing the cotton crops at prices fair to the producer or hold them off the market until world needs force an adjustment will protect the spinner against himself and guarantee to him the necessary output from the cotton fields for a dependable supply of cotton for his mills. If the spinners were unrestrained in their avaricious desire for cheap cotton, they would unwittingly destroy themselves by so depressing the price and decreasing production that their own mills would be forced to close. [Applause.]

#### A NEW DAY.

For 50 years, often without his knowing it, the cotton farmer received less than one-half the cost of producing cotton. He was a slave, with his wife and children toiling under the grinding heel of poverty and despair. He had a hopeless task, resulting in crushing his spirit, deadening his vitality, and destroying his initiative to construct for himself and his home. But, thank God, a new day dawns! The cotton farmer rising out of his 50 years in the wilderness has a new vision, a new perspective. He will force a new adjustment. He sees the profits made by others of 300 to 1,000 per cent on his product. He sees the farm lands of the North and West valued from \$300 to \$500 an acre and yet yielding enormous annual profits with boundless prosperity everywhere in the grain regions.

The cotton farmer rejoices to see his brother farmer in other sections of our great country prosperous and happy, but he himself refuses longer humbly to be driven by the lash of poverty thrust upon him by an unequal distribution of profits from his cotton when his own blessed South is the most abundantly favored land in climate and resources in all the world.

If he is not permitted to grow cotton at a profit the world problem of the future will not be how to get cheap cotton, but the question with the cotton mills and the consumer will be how to get cotton at any price. The cotton-consuming world can not and will not permit this to be. The sooner the purpose of the cotton farmer is known throughout the world the better will it be for all concerned and the easier will the adjustment be. In his decision to demand simple justice in the future the cotton farmer is loyally supported by men in all other activities in the cotton section. The banker and the merchant are his faithful supporters and friends.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, men of the South understand and fully appreciate the emergency of this hour; but let the cotton spinners of New England and of Europe, critics, oppressors, and profiteers everywhere, in the interest of their own business and for the good of humanity, pause to recognize that in the South the awakening is at hand. The mission of our great country is, with calmness and courage, to stand for individual and national liberty. No section leads the South in her spirit of patriotism and Americanism, but she claims the right to enjoy the liberties for which she gave her sons, the liberties she labors to give others. [Great applause.]

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, early this afternoon I called the attention of the House to the present status of the legislation intended to bring about the enactment of a law to establish a national budget system in this country. I am sorry that the distinguished leader of the majority is not on the floor at this time, because I asked him a question or two as to why practically no action has been taken on this bill during the past eight months, and he protested quite earnestly that the Senate budget committee had just reported the House bill out to the Senate in some form. I had often inquired about the bill ever since we passed it last October, and I had not noticed in the Record any report of that committee acting, so after having the colloquy with the gentleman from Wyoming, I called over the phone the clerk of that Senate committee and was informed that they had not made any report on the bill, but that the committee was expecting to take up the matter next week some time and report out a bill. Mr. Chairman, my thought

about the matter is this: Of course, I can not with legislative propriety criticize a coordinate branch of our Government, no matter how negligent it may be, but the party in power is responsible and is subject to just criticism for not passing this bill several months ago. And now, when there is talk of Congress adjourning in June, I feel, as a member of the House budget committee, that this matter ought not to sleep any longer. The House has performed its full duty, but unless some very vigorous action is taken very soon this bill will not be enacted before next February, if it ever is.

If there ever was a time in the history of our Government when we needed a budget system, when we needed thorough business economy and efficient methods in our financial affairs, it is right at the present time. In view of our present financial conditions, the unparalleled conditions left by the war, every thoughtful person who knows anything about these conditions and the fiscal policy of our Government must have a very deep-seated realization of the importance of this measure, and I feel that with the way the matter has been allowed to drag along during the past eight months the chances are there will not be anything accomplished this year. I notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 16, 1919, pages 619 to 621, a magazine article by a distinguished Member of another body, who is chairman, I may say, of a budget committee in that other body, in which article the first sentence is, "The business men of the country are crying out for a national budget."

If that is so, why does not he do something to give it to them? He then goes on to criticize very severely the bill passed by this House, and says that it is not a budget system, and that it postpones the day when a true budget system may be obtained. His closing sentence is, "We have the information, the experience, and the occasion for applying drastic remedies, as did Hamilton. Let us do nothing less." To be consistent he ought to have omitted the last word. In another sentence he asks, "What have we done?" Echo answers, "Nothing." It seems to me that with the many distinguished Republican gentlemen hippodroming around over the country making loud and eloquent speeches, clamoring for a budget system, promising a budget to the people of America if they are elected next fall, that it is about time something was done by this Congress. What is the sense of waiting until a year or so from now or until after election next fall to enact a budget system? You Republican gentlemen have a good working majority right here in both the Senate and House. There is no opposition by the Democrats. We are for it. You have a splendid bill to operate on that passed practically unanimously through this House on October 21, 1919, seven months ago, and which now is sleeping peacefully in a pigeonhole and has been for all these seven months. That is not the way to keep faith with the American people. Both of our party platforms promised this legislation. The business interests of the entire country demand it. The financial welfare of our Government demands it. Every Member of this Congress knows, or ought to know, that this measure is imperative at the earliest possible moment. I believe that the Republican membership of this House owe it to themselves and to the people of the country to bring in the necessary rule and put that House bill on one of these appropriation bills. I think it ought to be put on to this one under consideration at this time. At least it ought to be done before all these bills are passed, and nearly all of them have been passed already, and another body, if necessary, should be forced to override any personal vanity or pride of individual opinion, if there is any, and accept the budget system in that way. The party should not allow itself to be held responsible for whatever is causing this delay.

I feel that I ought to correct the impression that the bill has been reported out by the Senate committee, because that is evidently a mistake in information on the part of the majority leader. In my reference to Gov. Lowden and Gen. Wood, who nearly every day in their public speeches and public statements are advocating a budget system—I do not mean to criticize them, because I have a very high regard for both of them; I know them both. But they have no copyright on the budget system. Neither has anybody in the Senate. It is not a partisan measure, and they have no priority of appropriation on its advocacy. The Democrats supported it as actively and earnestly as the Republicans did. The report of our Budget Committee was unanimous. And acting in good faith, I feel the obligation to take the lead in this matter devolves upon the other side of the House, and they ought to take whatever steps are necessary to promptly adopt this system that has long ago been adopted by practically every civilized nation in the world. [Applause.]

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON rose.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman begins will he yield to me for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I could not resist.

Mr. WALSH. I take it, in view of the fact that the gentleman is going to talk for 15 minutes, that he has attended to his marketing to-day. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. Although this Saturday evening is marketing day, and it is now late, and almost marketing time, I can not resist making a few remarks on a vital subject before we adjourn.

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLANTON. Not yet; I will directly. I must first get something before my friends present.

Mr. Chairman, if there could be anything more farcical than the proceedings we had yesterday and the day before it is the proceeding which has been going on here several hours this afternoon. We are in general debate on a great supply measure of this Government, the fortifications appropriation bill, and there are only nine Republican Members now on the floor, representing the great majority party of this House.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. REBER. The gentleman said there are nine Republicans. Why does he slight the Democrats?

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to get to them. If it was not for our loyal, patriotic Democratic colleagues, who stay here with our distinguished leader [Mr. CLARK] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and others of us who stay here and keep the Government business going, God only knows what would become of the business of this Government. Are you gentlemen not ashamed of yourselves, pretending to be in charge of the Nation's business and keeping such a measly handful of Republican Representatives of the people here to pass legislation? This bill is supposed to be debated for three hours. Almost that time has been consumed, and with no audience. Simply because estimates have been cut down by the committee is no reason why there should not be any interest in the bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] referred to the fact that I did not ask that we adjourn earlier today to give our employees a chance to go to market. I did not do that because we had to finish this bill this afternoon so that we can pass to the great Graham constructive measure that is to come in on Monday, which after we have debated and passed upon it will be just as meaningless to the country as was the result of the two days' waste of time which occurred yesterday and the day before. How long is this going to keep up? Four hundred and thirty-five Congressmen drawing big salaries from this Government, and you can not keep a handful here to attend to the Government's business. Do not you Republicans know that the people are not going to stand for it? Do not you Republicans know that the people are going to bring you to account in November? You are going to hear from this on the hustings, and you are going to have to answer.

What are you going to answer? Can you not control your Members? Can not your majority leader and your good, energetic Republican whip, with whom I have controversies sometimes, and yet whom I love, keep them in line and make them attend to their business?

If you can not, you might as well give up. Why, there is another party here ready to take charge of the business of the Government and run it on a business basis. We Democrats are willing to again take charge.

Mr. EDMONDS. It did not use to do so.

Mr. BLANTON. If you would only let us do it. The proposed budget system has been mentioned. But what good is a budget system going to do? It will be good as far it goes, but something else is necessary. We are going to have one. We have already passed a budget measure. It is a splendid measure. The people are to be congratulated that we are going to have one as a result of the magnificent effort and work done by such men as Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Sherley, whose presence we need now. But that is not going to save the Government money of itself. Do you know what it is going to take? It is going to take hard work by Members of Congress and personal investigation of these various departments and their estimates by Members of Congress. We do too little work in that respect. We take for granted too much. I do lots of investigating. You have got to know more about your Nation's business if you keep these estimates down properly. I commend this distinguished committee, and I think it needs commendation more than any committee of this House, for it has cut down the estimates over \$98,000,000 on this bill. They deserve commendation; but that is no reason why we should just accept their act here and not give this bill our careful investigation in general debate on this

floor. I wish I had time. I would call attention to several items in this bill that need further cutting and could be cut without doing harm to the fortifications of this country, but I must discuss another subject. I congratulate our great Secretary of Agriculture. Do you know he has helped some of us bring about one of the greatest little reforms that I know of that have occurred in a long time? He has helped us to get rid of this measly, nasty, little old insignificant congressional seed distribution graft that has been going on in this country for so long.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Of course the conference report on that bill has not been presented.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, but the Republican conferees do not dare to overturn that action. Let me read you the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture on that point. It is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, March 23, 1920.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BLANTON: I think you will be interested in the inclosed copy of a letter which I recently wrote to Senator GRONNA, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, recommending that the appropriation for the "congressional seed distribution" be eliminated from the bill. It seems to me that this appropriation can well be discontinued in the interest of economy. Certainly the money now devoted to it could be much more advantageously utilized in the prosecution of urgent and important work on problems of crop production. I sincerely hope that the Senate will confirm the action of the Senate committee in striking the item from the bill and that it will be agreed to by the conferees.

I am also taking the liberty of sending you a copy of my letter of March 1 to Senator SMOOT, chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing. May I not call your attention especially to the suggestion that the present edition of the Yearbook, which, as you know, is an annual publication, might well be reduced and that the farmers' bulletins, four-fifths of which are now allotted to Members of Congress, should be handled entirely by the Department of Agriculture? As you perhaps know, only 30,000 copies of the Yearbook are allotted to the department, the remaining 470,000 copies being distributed through Members of Congress. If only a few thousand copies were issued, as suggested in my letter, a considerable saving could be effected. So far as the farmers' bulletins are concerned, I am convinced that much better results would be secured if the matter of their distribution were placed entirely under the control of the department. Under the present arrangement, when four-fifths of the bulletins are available to Members of Congress, it is possible for the department to comply with only a very small portion of the demand for them. I do not know what action the Joint Committee on Printing will take with reference to these matters, but I sincerely hope that the recommendations I have made will receive favorable consideration. Our appropriation for printing is carried in the sundry civil bill, which has not yet been reported out by the House Committee on Appropriations.

Very truly, yours,

E. T. MEREDITH,  
Secretary.

Does the gentleman from Massachusetts mean to insinuate that after the Secretary of Agriculture had agreed with us and requested the Senate to get rid of this little old measly and pernicious graft that the Republican conferees of this House, who have control of this legislation in its finality, are going to put that pernicious measure back into the bill? I do not believe it. I dare them to do it. The majority leader is not going to let it be done. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is not going to let it be done. For it saves \$300,000 annually for the people.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Do not take up all my time.

Mr. MONDELL. Personally I am inclined to think that the seed-distribution appropriation ought to go out, but I notice the Secretary of Agriculture—

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad to hear that, because the gentleman was not in favor of keeping the 13 surveyors general out of the bill and had them put back—

Mr. MONDELL. The Secretary of Agriculture, while he is in favor of not giving Congressmen any seed to send out, asks for a few million dollars to employ useless and unnecessary folks to run around over the country bothering the farmers when they ought to be busy gathering their crops. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BLANTON. I do not commend the Secretary for that. I hope this will not be taken out of my time. I can not be discourteous to my good friend, the distinguished and magnificent majority leader, who, when occasion arises, advises the use of the snickersnee, but when the Appropriations Committee uses the snickersnee and cuts 13 surveyors general out of a bill he comes back on the floor of the House with his persuasive qualities and induces his Republican colleagues to put that \$181,000 and the 13 surveyors general and their 13 corps back into that bill, because he does not want Wyoming, his own State, to lose the expenditure of that appropriation of public money; this same distinguished gentleman from Wyoming, our majority leader, who, when the wintertime was on, after we had already appropriated thousands of dollars to feed his elk out in Wyoming, came here on the floor of the House and forced his col-

leagues to give \$35,000 more to feed the elk out in his State of Wyoming, when human beings were starving to death for want of food.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry I can not. I want to get to another matter. I am with the gentleman from Wyoming seriously on this question of economy. I prod him for economy; I am helping him to secure economy. He needs my help.

I want to call his attention to another subject upon which he can economize. Take the letter from the Chief of the Efficiency Bureau of this Government, Herbert D. Brown. What does he say? Let me again read you that letter, excerpts of which I put in the RECORD on March 5, 1920.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by putting this letter in the RECORD.

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

Mr. BLANTON. The following is the letter:

UNITED STATES BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY,  
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1920.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: I have just received your letter of March 2, in which you make certain inquiries concerning personnel conditions in the executive departments in Washington. I will quote your questions and undertake to answer them in the order in which they appear in your letter:

"(1) Both Congressman MADDEN and myself estimate that there are now in Washington 40,000 idle, unnecessary clerks still on the pay roll, whose services could be dispensed with without crippling the service. Is this true or not?"

I do not know whether your figures are correct or not, because I have not had the opportunity to find out. I know that there are a great many unnecessary clerks in Washington (literally thousands), but whether the number of them is 20,000, 40,000, or some other figure, I can not say. I know that there are very many superfluous clerks in Washington, because investigations made by the Bureau of Efficiency in certain offices have disclosed that fact. Whether this condition is general throughout the departments I am not prepared to say without making a comprehensive survey of the whole service. With the limited force of investigators at my disposal, I am unable to make such a survey at the present time.

There is no doubt in my mind but that it would be possible for administrative supervisors to reduce the number of their clerical assistants very greatly: (1) Because the volume of work in the departments to which they are attached is considerably less than it was during the period of the war when many of these clerks entered the service, and (2) because, now that the war strain is over, time can be found in the departments for improvement of methods. Whether the resulting reduction in the force would amount to 40,000 workers, which would be approximately 40 per cent of the total number now engaged, I am not prepared to say.

It is only fair to the administrative officers to say that present conditions have grown out of unusual circumstances. The war emergency made it necessary to organize many new offices and to expand practically every existing governmental agency overnight. The times were abnormal and heads of departments and independent establishments were placed at the enormous disadvantage in handling organization problems. Ordinary principles of efficiency could not always be applied under these circumstances. The departments have, however, now passed the peak of the war load. It should, in my opinion, be possible at this time to institute a program of strict economy.

"(2) May we expect efficient service generally from our employees as long as they are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor?"

I believe that the affiliation of Government employees with labor organizations must, of necessity, result in a reduction of efficiency in the departments. I am of the opinion that such affiliation has an unfortunate effect on the morale of the service. The employee comes to feel that his success depends not so much on his individual effort as on the political strength of the organization to which he belongs.

"(3) Is there not fully as much reason for separating our Government employees from strike organizations as there was for separating the police and firemen from such organizations?"

Yes; quite as much reason, and even more. In the event of police strikes or strikes involving a fire department it will always be possible, because of the relatively small number of people involved, for residents of the community to assume the burdens laid down by the striking policemen or firemen, and while it is true that inexperienced persons would not be able to safeguard the public interests to the same extent as could regular policemen or firemen, yet the danger to the community could be kept within reasonable bounds and situations of this sort could be taken care of with a relatively small loss to the public. In the case of a strike of Government workers, which might involve not merely a few employees, but practically the entire force in the Government service, the damage to the public interest would be far greater. Such a strike would practically result in the suspension of all the functions of the Federal Government. It would affect not merely a few people, or a few thousand people, but, practically speaking, the entire population of the country.

"(4) I call your attention to the attack made upon you in the Federal Employee, the official magazine of the National Federation of Federal Employees, for February 28, 1920, page 3 thereof, suggesting your demise, by reason of your late activities for efficiency. Is this veiled threat of the official organ of Government employees going to stop your activities and cause you to 'lay down'?"

My answer to this inquiry is, "No." I shall continue to work for economy and efficiency in the Government service without regard to threats that may be made by any person or organization.

Very sincerely, yours,

HERBERT D. BROWN,  
Chief Bureau of Efficiency.

The Federal Employee, the official mouthpiece for all organized Government employees, for February 28, 1920, devoted pages 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 to an unwarranted

and vicious attack upon Chief Brown of this United States Bureau of Efficiency, because of his late efforts to bring about efficiency, and is trying to ruin him.

You will note he makes certain recommendations in that letter that I do not see how on God's earth our distinguished Republican leader of this House and the Republican steering committee can afford to ignore, with a deficit of \$3,000,000,000 staring us in the face. You have just granted these employees a raise of \$50,000,000. Why do you not back up Chief Brown in his efforts to secure some efficiency in their service? They have tried to get the Senate lately to legislate Chief Brown's position out of existence—to get rid of him.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. MONDELL. My recollection is that the affiliation of Federal employees with the labor organizations came about through the approval of our President.

Mr. BLANTON. And that is one matter upon which I do not agree with the President, and I am willing to say that with an election staring me in the face. I think the President of the United States is the biggest man in this Nation to-day, and you know it. And down deep in your heart you think it, too. It is his greatness that is keeping you fellows awake at night. As I said yesterday, it somnambulates every one of you Republicans. You can not sleep. It bothers you in the morning and at noontime, and in the evening, and late at night. You can not get rid of the greatness of that man. And yet I do not agree with all of his policies. I voted to pass the prohibition bill over his veto; I voted to pass the daylight-saving bill over his veto; I am against the proposed wet plank in the San Francisco platform, and I am against some of his other policies. Nevertheless, he is the greatest man we have in the United States to-day, and you Republicans realize it.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS].

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced this bill in the interest of an American marine insurance market. Marine insurance is an absolute necessity for the successful conduct of foreign trade. It is more than a fundamental agency of commerce, and its importance extends beyond the commercial function of protecting property and credit and of stabilizing banking, commerce, and shipping. Our leading commercial rival has used it for years as a competitive weapon in international trade. Marine insurance has served as a powerful weapon to comb out profits in international trade and to meet competitive situations. Possession of sufficient marine insurance facilities is also absolutely necessary to the United States for the proper safeguarding of commercial information, as was so well demonstrated by our recent experience with German insurance and reinsurance companies. Underwriters know the cargoes, consignors, consignees, carriers, trade routes, destinations, financial affiliations, and leading contract terms of our commercial transactions. By supinely letting foreign underwriters do our marine insurance we simply open our books and our trade secrets to our rivals to be used against our merchants and our merchant marine.

The recent investigation of marine insurance by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries shows that an independent American marine insurance business does not exist. American interests have lost their grip on this type of insurance. No other vital branch of American commerce has passed so extensively under foreign control. A mere handful of companies do two-thirds of the business, and nearly one-fifth of the American marine insurance companies are foreign owned or very closely allied by having directors or leading stockholders resident abroad.

Two-thirds of all the marine insurance written in the United States—hull and cargo insurance combined—is controlled by foreign underwriters, and of hull insurance more than three-fourths is thus controlled. American companies also placed one-half of all their reinsurance with alien underwriters, mostly because of necessity. Your committee was also convinced that foreign interests are making a determined effort right now to undermine American marine insurance, small though it be, with a view to reducing it to still smaller proportions. The great majority of American companies reported to the committee that they did not and could not emphasize hull insurance, a very large proportion of which is exported directly to the foreign market without appearing in any of the records on this side. They have frankly stated their handicaps, and among these excessive taxation, based on a wrong principle, easily ranks as first.

Such a state of affairs is not to the credit of this Nation. It is a peril so great that we should be aroused to immediate action. Strenuous rivalry in international trade is already upon us, and will soon be unsurpassed for keenness. The immediate future requires that our foreign-trade equipment be

strengthened in its three great departments—shipping, banking, and insurance. As contained in the report of the Merchant Marine Committee:

There can be no doubt, judging from the manner in which our competitors are now seeking to undermine this branch of underwriting, that marine insurance will be used, as probably never before, as a national commercial weapon for the acquisition and development of foreign markets. Failure to act now in strengthening our marine insurance facilities and placing them in an independent position, free from foreign control, can not be regarded otherwise than as the neglect of a duty and of an opportunity. The loss of the present rich opportunity will soon be bitterly regretted, but it will be too late to undo the mischief.

But the worst of the whole miserable affair is that the existing plight of American marine insurance is due to our own making and our own folly. Legislative obstacles upon obstacles, entirely unnecessary and exceedingly harmful, have been heaped upon the business. The investigation of your committee has made this clear and the facts and conclusions have been published in the committee's report.

Of the burdens now resting on marine insurance none are greater than the excessive and incredible taxation. No other essential and strategic business has suffered so cruelly from unwise and unmerciful taxation as the insurance business. A carefully prepared compilation for the committee absolutely proves this statement. The taxation, for example, imposed upon the marine insurance business of the 12 leading American companies, writing 61 per cent of the net marine premiums retained by all American companies, amounted to 7.69 per cent of their net marine premium income during 1918. In other words, for every \$100 of marine premiums received and retained by the companies the Federal and State Governments took nearly \$8, and this before any allowance is made for loss payments and expenses. The total taxes and fees paid by these companies for a single year amounted to 39.5 per cent of their capital stock, 68.5 per cent of their dividends plus the total increase in surplus for the year, 180 per cent of the dividends paid to stockholders, and 11.4 per cent of their total capital and surplus. Stated in another way, these companies paid taxes in a single year amounting to over 11 per cent on their assets over and above liabilities, to nearly 40 per cent on their capital stock and nearly 69 per cent on their profits. Moreover, for every dollar of dividends paid to stockholders during the year the American taxgatherer took nearly \$2. Again, when I state that the taxation amounted to nearly 69 per cent of the profits, it should not be forgotten that the income of these companies is derived very largely from their investments, as distinguished from underwriting profits. Leading underwriters testified before your committee that they are well satisfied, over a period of years, to make underwriting profits equal to 5 per cent of the gross premiums received. Judged from this standpoint, present taxation is equal to 100 per cent and more of the entire underwriting profit.

Such folly is not perpetrated by our leading commercial competitor, despite the fact that she is in much greater need of revenue than we are. She fosters the business, because she realizes the vital and strategic importance of marine insurance in its relation to the whole structure of foreign trade. British taxation on marine insurance is not only much smaller but is levied on net profits, thus recognizing the fact that a premium written may result in a loss, without, however, any consideration being shown under a gross premium tax, which is the principal method of insurance taxation in this country. As an illustration of England's more reasonable attitude, despite her heavier need for taxation, I might mention the fact that a hull insured for \$100,000 at 5 per cent in the United States pays a tax on the premiums of approximately \$200 against about \$25 in England. We, on the contrary, forget the broader and more vital aspects of the situation, and our vision is limited to revenue, revenue, and more revenue. We act as though marine insurance is a public nuisance to be restricted by taxation in the interest of the public welfare.

The American shipowner and merchant must pay this unreasonable tax bill in the long run or seek his insurance in foreign markets where such burdens do not exist. This they have done to the great discomfort of our own underwriters. Our underwriters do not object to paying taxes on their profits like any other business. They are paying their just income and profits taxes under our present Federal system of taxation. But it is beyond comprehension why insurance was singled out for an additional tax, over and above income and profits taxes, of 1 per cent on the gross premiums. This is equivalent to an extra income tax of between 15 and 20 per cent. If the marine insurance business were local in character, the tax could be shifted easily to the consumer, who must buy the service in that local market. But marine insurance, among all the forms of insurance, is peculiar in that it is not local, but national and international in character. It is easily cabled abroad, and over

half of all our hull insurance is thus exported to the foreign market. The Federal tax of 1 per cent on gross premiums can not be shifted. It remains as a handicap to our companies, in addition to their numerous other handicaps, in their competition with English underwriters. These underwriters have enough advantage as it is, and by retaining this tax we simply give them an additional advantage. It increases the differential against our companies and to that extent enables foreign underwriters to underquote our own and obtain the business. I am therefore earnestly urging the repeal of this tax in so far as it pertains to marine insurance. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has unanimously recommended the repeal. Such repeal will be in direct line with our effort to also reduce excessive State taxes on the marine insurance business. No one opposes fair taxation. But what we have before us is not fair, but iniquitous. The loss in revenue resulting from the passage of this bill will be a mere inconsequential item as compared with the direct and indirect benefits resulting from the establishment of a strong and independent national marine insurance institution as an integral part of our foreign trade equipment.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GOODYKOONTZ].

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the majority may have been guilty of some mistakes, and the majority leader may have been at fault once in a while; but the majority have never made the mistake of undertaking to suppress the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. We have appropriated a lot of money to suppress the boll weevil down there, but we have never done anything to preclude the gentleman from Texas from speaking in extenso whenever he saw fit.

The minority leader from Texas sometimes attacks the President, but he is never able to get any following from the minority side. Whenever an appropriation bill is brought here and a motion is made to reduce an expenditure, the gentleman from Texas votes for the motion; but those he is supposed to lead vote in favor of increasing the appropriation, so that his leadership has never helped us any, but the combined effort of the minority on frequent occasions has had the effect of carrying appropriations when 90 per cent of the membership of the majority have voted in the other direction.

But I had no purpose to advert upon this subject; my thought was that if I were permitted to speak for awhile on this bill this afternoon I should speak in a more friendly vein in regard to the membership of the House. When I came to this Congress I was presented to my distinguished friend, the great veteran leader from the State of Illinois [Mr. CANNON], and he said, "GOODYKOONTZ"——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

Mr. SLEMP. I can give the gentleman only one minute.

Mr. EAGAN. I will yield to the gentleman one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. He said, "GOODYKOONTZ, you have come to the greatest school in the world." I was also presented to Mr. MANN, the other great leader from Illinois, and he said, "Mr. GOODYKOONTZ, this is the greatest legislative body in the world." And when I heard the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill explain and present to you the matters that arise upon that measure, I thought this: That whereas there are some great men in charge of the committees in this House, yet no man has spoken more clearly or shown a greater fund of information or has ordered his words with more precision or has provided more general information to those inquiring in regard to it than the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP]. [Applause.] And then I thought of the fact that when he graduated at the Military Institute of Virginia he reached the highest grade that had ever been attained by any student in that distinguished school of the South. So that this body is made up of many men of many minds, Representatives who come from every section of the country.

I should like to go further, but I shall content myself with asking to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has eight minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, sometimes I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]; quite frequently I agree with his views. I even agree with him in the matter of attendance upon the House. I have long regretted that we did not have a more generous attendance on the ordinary proceedings of the House. But I want to calm his fears relative to any decadence in the House by telling him that the condition that he has witnessed since he has been here is about the condition that we have had for many years, including the last eight years, when his party had the leadership and the majority here.

I sometimes do not blame the gentlemen of the House because they do not always attend the general debates. They realize that there is to be no vote taken; they do not know for certain that they will be entertained by the gentleman from Texas; they may even fear that I am going to speak, and so they stay away. [Laughter.] But we do have a very excellent attendance generally in the House when the House is really doing business. And let us remember this: That neither this nor any other legislative body could properly carry on its business, consider its legislation, and do the work assigned it if there was always a majority in attendance during the legislative sessions. There is so much work to do in committee; there is so much that Members must do toward informing themselves with regard to legislation, in attending committee hearings, and meetings and discussions, that if we had a majority here on the floor all the time we would not have that close, careful, and thorough consideration of legislation that is absolutely essential. After all, the work on the floor is more or less the dress parade after the work is done. Of course, that does not apply to the speeches of my friend from Texas, which are always interesting and generally to the point. I am willing to admit that mine are not always so interesting.

I want to congratulate the Committee on Appropriations, the House of Representatives, and particularly the members of the subcommittee that considered this bill. It is something of an undertaking to persuade departmental officers that they can reduce their own estimates from one hundred and seventeen to forty-seven millions; and then it requires very careful consideration and very thorough and exhaustive work for a committee to take the estimates thus reduced and reduce them from forty-seven to seventeen millions. This committee has reduced the original estimates under this bill \$98,959,808.88, and I have no doubt that the reductions have been made with understanding, with knowledge, with appreciation of the needs of the service, and without in any particular or at any point reducing the estimates below what is required for the necessary work of the service in the line of fortifications and defense. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] is entitled to very great credit for his work. [Applause.] And his colleagues on the subcommittee are entitled to very great credit for their work. We have made some very heavy reductions in estimates during this Congress, but in no case so heavy a reduction has been made as in this bill. And the important thing to remember is that it has not been a reduction simply for the purpose of making a reduction. It has not been a thoughtless reduction. It has not been a reduction without regard to the needs of the service. It has been an intelligent reduction, made in view of the absolute necessity at this time of bringing our expenditures as a people within our income.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three minutes remaining.

Mr. MONDELL. In that time I want to refer to another matter.

The Public Ledger of the City of Brotherly Love this morning brings up the much discussed question of raising Army and Navy pay, and it says that the failure to increase Army and Navy pay is due mainly to the hostility of FRANK W. MONDELL, majority floor leader, and that a tacit understanding exists that nothing shall be done at the present session.

Now, whether or not the fact that we have not increased Army and Navy pay is in anywise due to my attitude in the matter be true or no, the remainder of that statement is without any basis or foundation whatever, at least so far as I know. I have never said, I have never thought, I have never believed that we should adjourn this session of Congress without giving some consideration to the general question of increases of pay in the Military and Naval Establishments. I think before we leave we must also give consideration to increases in the pay of some of those in the civil establishment. I do not know what the Congress will finally conclude to do, but I think those things must be considered. The trouble is that the House having passed an emergency bill relating to a few men in the Naval Establishment, certain gentlemen in the Naval and Military Establishments are insisting that the House shall allow its conferees to raise the pay of all the officers of the Army and the Navy in a sum amounting to about \$75,000,000 per annum without the House having passed

on the matter. The bill necessary to increase the pay of the petty officers of the Navy and of the Coast Guard could become a law any day if certain gentlemen would cease their insistence that before this absolutely essential legislation goes on the statute books the whole question of advances in pay in all branches of the Regular Military Establishment shall be considered. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SLEMP. Let us begin the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. McKEOWN. I will withdraw the point until one paragraph of the bill has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, namely:

FORTIFICATIONS AND OTHER WORKS OF DEFENSE.  
ENGINEER DEPARTMENT.

For construction of gun and mortar batteries, \$1,800,000.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum present.

Mr. SLEMP. 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. SANFORD, 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. 13555) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 202. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent in fee simple to the county of Huron, in the State of Michigan, for a certain described tract of land for public-park purposes;

H. R. 1275. An act for the relief of W. L. Rose;

H. R. 1791. An act for the relief of O. W. Lindsley;

H. R. 3211. An act for the relief of Emma J. Spear;

H. R. 5213. An act for the relief of occupants and claimants of unsurveyed public land in township 8 north of range 2 west of Salt Lake meridian, Utah;

H. R. 6136. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands to school district No. 21, of Fremont County, Wyo.;

H. R. 6291. An act for the relief of E. Willard;

H. R. 6413. An act granting the sum of \$549.12 to Clara Kane, dependent parent, by reason of the death of William A. Yenser, late civil employee, killed as a result of an accident at the Philadelphia Navy Yard;

H. R. 6772. An act authorizing and directing the transfer approximately of 10 acres of land to rural high-school district No. 1, Lapwai, Idaho;

H. R. 6773. An act for the relief of Albert C. Burgess;

H. R. 10207. An act providing for service of process in causes removed from a State or other court to a United States court;

H. R. 12711. An act to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act; and

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to dispose of surplus dental outfits.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

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

To Mr. MASON (at the request of Mr. MURPHY), for one week.

To Mr. FULLER of Illinois, for one week, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, April 12, 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 Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required for the service of the current fiscal year by the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, Mountain Branch, at Johnson City, Tenn. (H. Doc. No. 721); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation required by the Federal Board for Vocational Education for the fiscal years 1920 and 1921 (H. Doc. No. 722); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriation required for the Post Office Department for the fiscal years 1918, 1919, and 1920 (H. Doc. No. 723); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, from the Select Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 515) referring certain hearings and a report of the Select Committee on Expenditures in the War Department to the Department of Justice, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 816), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 324) authorizing and directing the accounting officers of the Treasury to allow credit to the disbursing clerk of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance in certain cases, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 817), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5983) granting a pension to Jane Philpot, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 13558) for the purpose of improving the facilities and service of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and of further amending and modifying the war-risk insurance act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 13559) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the Colonel Cooper Unit, No. 3, of the United Veterans of the Republic, of Mount Vernon, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 13560) to permit distilled spirits to be transferred from the original packages into bottles while in any bonded warehouse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Resolution (H. Res. 515) referring certain hearings and a report of the Select Committee on Expenditures in the War Department to the Department of Justice; to the Select Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

By Mr. MOON (by request): Resolution (H. Res. 516) to print 500 copies of a manuscript entitled "Scots and Scottish Influence in Congress," by Arthur McDonald; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Resolution (H. Res. 517) for the immediate consideration of House resolution 515 and Report No. 816; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 333) to loan tents and cots to certain sections along the Mississippi River which are liable to be overflowed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 334) providing for the repeal of existing war legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, regarding the canals in the State of New York; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### 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. 13561) granting an increase of pension to Morgan Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13562) granting an increase of pension to George F. Bostwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 13563) granting an increase of pension to Presley Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13564) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Clemens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13565) granting a pension to Cynthia Timberlake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 13566) granting an increase of pension to George P. Vance; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 13567) granting a pension to M. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 13568) granting an increase of pension to John Hartzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 13569) granting a pension to Clara Mahoney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 13570) granting an increase of pension to David R. Fenton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VENABLE: A bill (H. R. 13571) granting a pension to John H. Isiley; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2881. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of residents of Selma, Calif., favoring the passage of House bill 10925 and Senate bill 3259; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2882. By Mr. BURROUGHS: Petition of the members of General Phil Sheridan Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, Somersworth, N. H., S. L. Curley, S. D. Hourrihan, James Morrison, and Hannah R. Wallace, corresponding secretary, denouncing the murder of Lord Mayor MacCurtain, of Cork, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2883. By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the Silk Association of America, of New York, favoring an adjustment of the revenue system of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2884. Also, petition of William Ezra Spencer Post, the American Legion, Jay, Okla., regarding legislation for ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2885. Also, petition of the National Guard Association of the State of New York, regarding National Guard legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2886. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, relative to the operation of the barge service on the New York State Barge Canal by the Federal Government, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2887. By Mr. EVANS of Nebraska: Petition of sundry citizens of Plainview, Nebr., opposing compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2888. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the National Americanization League of the United States, favoring the revision of the revenue laws, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2889. Also, petition of the American Association for Labor Legislation, favoring the Sterling-Lehbach retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

2890. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, for the withdrawal of Federal Government from barge canal affairs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2891. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, relative to the transportation and express situation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2892. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the J. Henry Miller Co. (Inc.), of Baltimore, Md., urging the passage of House bill 13390; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2893. Also, petition of George G. E. Cross, M. D., of Baltimore, Md., relative to the Army increase pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2894. Also, petition of the Simpson & Doeller Co., of Baltimore, Md., relative to the excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2895. Also, petition of the Newark Shoe Stores Co., against House bill No. 12976; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2896. Also, petition of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, also the Myers-Hicks Co., of Baltimore, Md., protesting against House bill 12379; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2897. By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the United Societies of Bridgeport, Conn., urging the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2898. By Mr. PARRISH: Petition of ex-soldiers of the Dennis-Anderson Post, American Legion, of Gainesville, Tex., transmitting a tentative draft of a bill, amending the Federal farm-loan act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2899. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Charles W. Merrill, of San Francisco, urging the passage of the Nolan bill, House bill 11984; to the Committee on Patents.

2900. Also, petition of the United Cloth Hat and Cap Makers of North America, of Los Angeles, Calif., urging the passage of Senate joint resolution No. 171 and Senate bill 1233; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2901. Also, petition of the R. H. Arnold Co., of Washington, D. C., urging the passage of House bill 13390; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2902. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, protesting against the allocation of American ships to German routes and urging the utilization of idle tonnage; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2903. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of the American Legion Post No. 341, relative to compensation for the ex-service men and women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2904. By Mr. WINGO: Petition of J. B. Sullivan and numerous other citizens of Howard County, Ark., protesting against compulsory military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2905. Also, petition of N. Simpson, and other citizens of Polk County, Ark., protesting against compulsory military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2906. By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of employees of Cordis Mills, Millbury, Mass., favoring daylight saving; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2907. Also, petition of protest of Central Labor Union of Milford, Mass., against certain policies of the Bureau of Immigration, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### SENATE.

MONDAY, April 12, 1920.

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

Almighty God, we are Thy workmanship, created unto good works, called to the stewardship of a great service that has been committed unto us, a responsibility that we dare not meet except by the divine guidance and blessing. But as Thou hast smiled upon us as a people, led us by the hand unto a large place, so we trust Thee to lead us on to accomplish Thy divine purpose in us. Forgive our sins. Save us from fatal mistakes. Give us a due regard for the divine will. Help us to fulfill our mission. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

On request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11578) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, further insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate, asks a further con-