

## MISSISSIPPI.

John L. Hallmark, Belmont.  
Alma M. Furniss, Hollandale.  
Andrew R. Shelby, Lauderdale.  
Florence Brady, Lula.  
Benjamin H. Chatham, Montrose.  
Laura L. McCann, Norfield.  
Alma S. Evans, Overtt.  
Benjamin C. Feigler, Philipp.  
Frances C. Williams, Sunflower.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

Lars B. Ness, Edingburg.  
Rolfe H. Hesketh, St. John.

## OKLAHOMA.

Bruce Hueston, Kellyville.  
Roscoe C. Fleming, Tishomingo.

## OREGON.

John N. Williamson, Prineville.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

Lemuel L. Bosserman, Barnesboro.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

Irene E. Jackson, Lebanon.  
Edward M. Schmida, Letcher.  
Arthur Griffin, Selby.  
James Gaynor, Springfield.  
John D. Smull, Summit.

## WEST VIRGINIA.

Godfrey B. Beebout, New Cumberland.  
Robert E. Horan, Summersville.  
John W. Mitchell, Wayne.  
Roger T. Price, Widen.

## WITHDRAWAL.

*Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 21 (legislative day of March 16), 1922.*

## POSTMASTER.

Nana Michaels to be postmaster at Argo, in the State of Illinois.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 21, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, wilt Thou come unto us in kindness and rebuke, in chastisement and in blessing, and stoop to our needs. Show Thyself strong and good, for Thy mercy's sake. Interpret unto us our own necessities, and make us to see great things out of Thy law. Grant newness of zeal, of opportunity and hopefulness to all. Teach us how the good may prevail, and help up to hold on to its achievements. Descend upon our fellow citizens with many blessings; and may they know the riches of life, its vast outlooks, and its wondrous joys. Through Christ. Amen.

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

## THE FOUR-POWER TREATY.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for a minute and a half.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to address the House for 90 seconds. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there is pending before the Senate of the United States a very important treaty, vitally affecting the future of mankind, but upon which one-half of the California delegation there has taken an attitude which I feel to be in direct opposition to the will of the vast majority of the people of California, and particularly to those of the ninth congressional district, which I happen to represent, I desire to have read in the remainder of my time a telegram from my constituency, which is typical of many expressions which I have received, and which I believe to be the almost unanimous sentiment of the people of California on this very important matter. I refer to the so-called four-power treaty now pending before that great body, the United States

Senate. Although I realize that this House has no voice in the making of treaties, I desire to add to the sentiments expressed therein my heartiest approval.

The Clerk read as follows:

LONG BEACH, CALIF., March 19, 1922.

Maj. WALTER F. LINEBERGER.

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Board of directors adopted following resolution:

"Realizing the tremendous burdens borne by our own people and those of other world nations because of national ambitions to excel in naval and military strength, and believing that world problems never will be satisfactorily settled by force of arms but rather by an agreement between nations and national leaders, therefore we deeply appreciate the spirit and vision of President Harding in calling the world nations together in the disarmament conference, and we congratulate our own and other interested peoples on the spirit, the wisdom, and the actual accomplishment of the conference; and we hereby call on our United States Senators and Representatives in Congress to cooperate in every way with President Harding and the disarmament delegates, Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes, Hon. Elihu Root, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, and Senator Oscar W. Underwood, in securing the approval of the United States Senate to the splendid agreement reached at the disarmament conference, which is a far greater accomplishment than most of our people considered possible, to the end that the United States as well as other nations may limit military and naval expenditures, and thus have available huge sums for constructive development, as well as to enable all the nations to develop good will and the policy of settlement of problems and disputed questions in friendly conference rather than by armed force with all attendant evils."

LONG BEACH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
CHAS. S. HENDERSON, President.

[Applause.]

## CHARGES ON RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill H. R. 9606 for printing under the rule.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, what is the title of it?

Mr. KINKAID. Extending the time for payment of charges due on reclamation projects.

## WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. ANTHONY the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 10871, making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill, parts of which were passed over.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, the understanding was that we would start where we first left off.

The Clerk read as follows:

## FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

## PAY, ETC., OF THE ARMY.

Pay of officers: For pay of officers of the line and staff, \$26,896,200: *Provided*, That the sum herein appropriated for the pay of officers shall not be used for the pay of more than 11,000 commissioned officers on the active list, of which number there shall be not to exceed 1 general, 21 major generals, and 46 brigadier generals of the line; the general officers authorized by law for chiefs and assistant chiefs of branches; the number of officers of the Medical Corps now authorized by law of six and one-half for every thousand enlisted men, the number of officers of the Medical Administrative Corps now authorized by law of one for every 2,000 enlisted men, the number of officers of the Dental Corps now authorized by law of one for every thousand officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army; not to exceed 109 commissioned officers of the Veterinary Corps; one chaplain as now authorized by law for every 1,200 officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, exclusive of the Philippine Scouts; professors at the United States Military Academy; the military storekeeper; and those belonging to branches whose names are carried on the promotion list to be distributed in grades as follows: Not to exceed 4 per cent in the grade of colonel, or 389; not to exceed 4.5 per cent in the grade of lieutenant colonel, or 437; not to exceed 15 per cent in the grade of major, or 1,458; not to exceed 30 per cent in the grade of captain, or 2,915; not to exceed 28.5 per cent in the grade of first lieutenant, or 2,769; and the remainder in the grade of second lieutenant: *Provided further*, That officers found surplus may be recommissioned in the next lower grade in accordance with their standing on the promotion list, or on the relative list if their names are not on the promotion list, or those of less than 10 years' commissioned service in the Regular Army may be discharged with one year's pay, or those of more than 10 years' commissioned service and less than 20 years' service may be placed on the unlimited retired list with pay at the rate of 2½ per cent of their active pay multiplied by the number of complete years of such commissioned service, or those of more than 20 years' commissioned service in the Regular Army may be placed upon the unlimited retired list with pay at the rate of 3 per cent of their active pay multiplied by the number of complete years of such commissioned service, not exceeding 75 per cent; all under such regulations as the President may prescribe.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a point of order also on the whole paragraph and each proviso of the paragraph.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. KAHN. The number of officers of the Medical Corps is now authorized by law 6½ for every 1,000 enlisted men. The number of officers of the Medical Administrative Corps is now

authorized by law, 1 for every 2,000 men of the Regular Army; not to exceed 109 commissioned officers of the Veterinary Corps, and so on. One chaplain is now authorized by law for every 1,200 officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, exclusive of the Philippine Scouts.

Section 10 of the act of June 4, 1920, the present law, provides 6½ for every 1,000 of the total enlisted strength of the Regular Army authorized by law, and this section is a change of that provision. The comparison is the same as to the Medical Corps, except that the number is 1 for every 2,000, and in the Dental Corps the provision in the bill is for 1 for every 1,000 officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army; but section 10 of the act of June 4, 1920, says 1 for every 1,000 men of the total enlisted strength of the Regular Army authorized from time to time. That is a different proposition from what this bill calls for. In other words, the law fixes the number of men in the Medical Corps and in the Dental Corps at so many for every thousand men in the Army, and that number changes from time to time; but this provision in this bill fixes a definite number, which can not be changed under the provisions of this bill. I submit that it is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add something. The number of officers in the Army is prescribed by law. This changes the number. It does not merely change the appropriation. It determines the number of officers that there shall be in the Army. It says the appropriation shall not be used for the pay of more than 11,000 commissioned officers on the active list, of which number there shall be not to exceed so many; and when you get down to line 22 it says:

And those belonging to branches whose names are carried on the promotion list to be distributed in grades as follows: Not to exceed 4 per cent in the grade of colonel—

And so forth. If there are more of various grades, it orders them reassigned, and then it says how many officers there shall be.

Now, I take this proviso also to be absolutely connected with the second proviso, which is necessary for its existence; and that second proviso provides what is obviously out of order on an appropriation bill, a means for turning out of the Army and for demoting to lower grades various officers who are in the Army.

Let me read the proviso and see whether there is anything about appropriation. I read, beginning at line 8, page 16:

*Provided further*, That officers found surplus may be recommissioned in the next lower grade in accordance with their standing on the promotion list, or on the relative list if their names are not on the promotion list, or those of less than 10 years' commissioned service in the Regular Army may be discharged with one year's pay, or those of more than 10 years' commissioned service and less than 20 years' service, may be placed on the unlimited retired list with pay at the rate of 21 per cent of their active pay multiplied by the number of complete years of such commissioned service, or those of more than 20 years' commissioned service in the Regular Army may be placed upon the unlimited retired list with pay at the rate of 3 per cent of their active pay multiplied by the number of complete years of such commissioned service, not exceeding 75 per cent; all under such regulations as the President may prescribe.

Now, I respectfully submit that that proviso is not only a proviso as to the management of the Army and not for appropriation, but it is likewise absolutely connected as a part of the first proviso, reducing the number of officers in the Army to a certain number, and not merely reducing the number that should be paid. My point is, first, that the whole of the two provisos should be taken together; and, second, that the first proviso is a proviso for the number of officers that there shall be; and, third, that the second proviso is certainly a proviso which reduces the number of officers in the standing line of the Army, and therefore is entirely out of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas if it is the contention of the committee that in lines 11 and 12, where it says "the number of officers in the Medical Corps now authorized by law of six and one-half for every thousand enlisted men," is the number now authorized by law?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is exactly the number authorized by law, and the committee intends to make no change whatever in the number authorized by law in the Medical, Dental, Veterinary, or the Chaplain's Corps, to which the gentleman from California has made the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. This is a limitation on the expenditure of the money. If this is the number authorized by law, which I am advised it is not, what is the necessity of using any language in stating the number? Why not say the number of officers in the Medical Corps now authorized by law?

Mr. ANTHONY. Because the War Department has appointed a number far in excess of the number authorized by law. For instance, it has appointed 1,148 officers in the Medical Corps, and the law authorizes 793.

Mr. WALSH. Has the gentleman the language of the legislation which fixes the number of officers in the Medical Corps?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. The legislation or law fixes the number of officers in the Medical Corps at six and one-half officers for every thousand enlisted men.

Mr. WALSH. But there is something that follows after that.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will read the entire paragraph:

The number of officers of the Medical Corps shall be six and one-half for every thousand, and of the Medical Administrative Corps, 1 for every 2,000 of the total enlisted strength of the Regular Army authorized from time to time and within the peace strength permitted by this act. The number of officers of the Dental Corps shall be one for every thousand of the total strength of the Regular Army authorized from time to time and within the peace strength permitted by this act.

The War Department took the position that the total authorized strength of the Regular Army was 280,000 men, and that therefore they could appoint the full authorization of officers. They seem to have willfully ignored the provision "as authorized by Congress from time to time." Last year Congress put a limit on the size of the Regular Army of 150,000. The committee contends that the War Department has no right to exceed the limit fixed last year.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that the Appropriations Committee is fixing the size of the Army in this legislation?

Mr. ANTHONY. The Appropriations Committee is limiting the amount of money which may be expended for the pay of officers and enlisted men.

Mr. WALSH. That is within the jurisdiction of the committee, but the committee has no jurisdiction to insert in an appropriation bill a change in the authorization of the law by which the number of officers is fixed. They can reduce the appropriation, but I submit that they can not by legislation change the law fixing the ratio of the officers and enlisted men, and that is what this change of language is attempting to do, because the authorization of the size of the Army is fixed by legislation and not by an appropriation bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I want to make this statement. As I understand it, the point of order is made by the gentleman from California against the language which repeats the present law as to the Medical Corps, the Administrative Corps, the Dental Corps, and the Corps of Chaplains. The language inserted by the committee in the bill is exactly existing law, not one word changed as far as I can see. The general idea of the committee in limiting the appropriation for the pay of the officers of the Army is that we contend it is in order under the Holman rule, because it is plain on the face of the measure that the proposition is to reduce the total number of officers in the Army. The average pay is \$3,300 per annum at the present rate of pay, which is a saving of over \$6,000,000 which would be effected by the adoption of the committee's limitation.

As I understand it, no point of order has been made against the reduction from the present number of 13,000 to 11,000, but, Mr. Chairman, the point is made entirely on the language in reference to the Medical Corps, the Dental Corps, the Medical Administrative Corps, the veterinarians, and the chaplains. I contend that the number fixed by the committee is exactly that now authorized by existing law and does not change it one particle.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order. I call the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to the fact that the point of order lies against the entire paragraph as it was read, and under the admission of the chairman of the subcommittee that it does reduce the number of officers now authorized by law, I claim that the entire paragraph is clearly subject to the point of order, and it is not within the provisions of the Holman rule. I shall read briefly the summary of the opinion of the Chair in a case of a similar nature on an appropriation bill, where it was attempted to compel the Army to transport troops over certain railroads where they were getting a lower rate than over other railroads, and it was a clear saving to the Government in a way. It is a mere matter of argument as to whether it is a saving of money to reduce the amount appropriated for the Army officers and thus compel a reduction in the number of officers authorized by law. Seriously speaking, I say that it is a waste of money; it is a loss of money to this country to do away with what we have already built up at so great an expense.

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

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman says that it is a loss of money. On the face of the fact what is it, a loss or a saving?

Mr. CRAGO. On the face of the fact, as it appears to me, it is a loss.

Mr. MADDEN. What is it on the face of the bill?

Mr. CRAGO. Not in the total figures, no. On that very point I contend that this legislation, if it should come before this House at all, must, under the rulings of the Chair in all such cases, come from the committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter of the legislation, and the decision to which I wish to cite the Chair reads as follows:

The Chair is of opinion that a motion of that kind should come from a committee having jurisdiction, and can not be brought before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union as an integral part of an appropriation bill reported by the regular Committee on Appropriations.

Anything which has to do with legislation in this bill must of necessity come from a committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter on which we are legislating, and under the decision in this case which I have cited, it takes the attempt out from under the provisions of the Holman rule, and I contend that the entire paragraph is subject to the point of order because it is argumentative as to whether it reduces the final expenditure of the Government. It does not come within the Holman rule because it does not come from a committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter, and, therefore, it has no place on an appropriation bill.

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

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What did the gentleman say of paragraph 2 of Rule XXI, which reads as follows:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill: *Provided*, That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee or any joint commission authorized by law or the House Members of any such commission having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such amendment, which amendment being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures.

What does the gentleman say to that?

Mr. CRAGO. I say to the gentleman that that is a limitation which was properly placed on a committee when a committee had jurisdiction of the subject matter of the bill bringing in a bill in accordance with that provision.

Mr. MADDEN. Under that section of Rule XXI this committee has complete jurisdiction, and it has not invaded the jurisdiction of any other committee of the House. It is within the power of the committee to report the legislation proposed under that section of the rule, because on the face we prove beyond a doubt that we are reducing the number of officers, and we are reducing the amount of the appropriation, and we prove the case by the very facts on the face of the bill.

Mr. CRAGO. But you are only doing that in this bill by legislating on a subject matter which belongs to another committee, and the decision which I have read, the decision of the Chair in that case, where obviously on the face of it there was a saving to the Government in the matter of transportation, clearly holds that since it is legislation reported by a general appropriation committee it is not in order, because it does not come from a committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, on page 6, line 9, I find that whatever may be the pretext of authority under the Holman rule for making a legislative policy regarding the Military Establishment in an appropriation bill, the Committee on Appropriations certainly has gone outside of its province when it adopts language such as the following:

That officers found surplus may be recommissioned in the next lowest grade in accordance with their standing on the promotion list—

And so forth.

On the face of it, clearly this is a concrete legislative proposition directing the War Department how it shall reestablish the grades of the officers in the military service, and as to what shall be done with them, and under what conditions and circumstances. For instance, under existing law there is no authority to demote people in the military service after the manner contemplated in the lines which I have read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. In just a moment. There is involved in that very language a question of military policy, which is exclusively a matter of jurisdiction on the part of the legislative committee, as to whether men, having once been established in certain grades of military rank and authority, shall under any form of policy be demoted so that they are put into

a different grade or rank and authority over their subordinates. There is, as everybody who has made any study of the administration of military affairs knows, a very serious moral factor involved there.

But it is, I say, a suggestion in a provision that establishes a military policy, a legislative policy, and not a question of economy at all. And yet in just this same fashion this old Bluebeard of an Appropriations Committee will take the other committees of the House one by one and ravish them and lock them up in its room and itself report matters in their jurisdiction.

Mr. STAFFORD. And there are eight—

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. And some day somebody will get the key to the door—look out for it. I have nothing to say except in the utmost good nature about this old Bluebeard. They are taking the Holman rule as a clever subtle provision for establishing a legislative policy for the Regular Military Establishment. You may be able to justify the figures you put in here somewhere through this bill on the strength of the Holman rule, but there is not any question at all in my judgment that in this language, beginning on page 16, line 8, you have assumed jurisdiction over matters that are entirely outside the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee dealing with the policy of military legislation and—

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Certainly.

Mr. ANTHONY. In making the statement the gentleman has made, the language to which he refers was included because it contains the necessary authority to carry out the economies which are to be made.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Oh, well, if we mean that and are held to the doctrine of sequences, you can analyze anything down to a protoplasmic globule and claim authority over it.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman knows there are only two ways for officers to get out of the Army, and that is by a court-martial and discharge or by resignation, unless you provide for a method of getting them out.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Exactly. The gentleman admits that the bill carries a provision of legislation for some machinery and he adds to the machinery—

Mr. ANTHONY. In order to achieve the saving.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. And the gentleman is inventing machinery to get men out of the Army.

Mr. ANTHONY. Absolutely.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is not part of the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee; it belongs to the legislative committee.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph consists, first, of an appropriation and, second, of two provisos. Of course, the regular law provides for the Army of a considerable size, but that does not obligate the Congress to appropriate for an Army of that size. Everybody will admit that. We appropriate for a lesser number of officers than are authorized by law to be appointed. Then follows the first proviso, which is part of the limitation that the sum herein appropriated for the pay of officers shall not be used for the pay of more than 11,000 commissioned officers on the active list, apportioning them among the various branches of the service. It is not within the power of the House as a limitation to prescribe the exact number of officers who might be paid out of appropriations in each branch of the service. It is not within the power of the House or the committee reporting it to provide a method of ascertaining the number of officers who shall be paid out of the appropriation. The first paragraph does not change in any way the number of officers who may be appointed in the Army. It only provides the number who may be paid under the appropriations made by Congress. That is a pure limitation. The law would still stand. The second proviso, I think, comes within the Holman rule. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO] insisted that this should come from the legislative committee—the Committee on Military Affairs. Under the proviso in the Holman rule the Committee on Military Affairs could offer as an amendment a proposition entirely revising the law as to payment of officers in the Army. This does not attempt to do that. This does not go to the question that the Committee on Military Affairs might report an amendment. But the Holman rule provides that the amendment is in order which proposes a reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States. That is what the second proviso proposes to do, and that is all it does. It would be in order under the Holman rule to provide that hereafter there should be only 11,000 officers in the Army, although that is not what the bill does. It would be in order under the Holman rule to do that, and it is also in order under the Holman rule to provide by law for a reduction, as it would

be in order to provide that the salary of a Cabinet officer should be reduced from \$12,000 a year to \$10,000 or the salary of any other official whose salary is fixed by law shall be reduced.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I follow that clearly; but this second proviso, the one to which the gentleman refers, does something more than change the salaries. It changes the scope of authority and jurisdiction of these officers by placing them in different grades from those which we have legislated upon and their military authority and responsibility have been changed.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the number of officers in the Army is fixed in the first paragraph of the bill. The second paragraph of the bill reduces the number of these officers who are supernumerary, and without the second proviso they might be officers in the Army without pay, and the second proviso only provides a method of reducing the pay of officers of the Army.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does not the gentleman concede, beginning on page 15, line 8, that officers found surplus may be recommissioned in the next lower grade, and so forth; that, for instance, that takes a man away from, say, major, and puts him where he is no longer a field officer, no longer subject to the certain responsibility which attaches to the office of a field officer?

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, we appropriate for clerks of the first, second, third, and fourth grades. We do not have to appropriate for the number that are in the service. We can appropriate for a less number and provide for their demotion by an appropriation bill reducing their pay.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. These clerks do not have an original status and responsibility in law which the Army officer has.

Mr. MANN. It is not the same, but a similar responsibility.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Would the gentleman contend that the clerks in a department have that original and initial authority?

Mr. MANN. The departments run the Government. Does not the gentleman know that?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes; and the organizations outside run Congress.

Mr. MANN. They may run Congress, but the clerks run the Government and have just as much responsibility as officers of the Army who attempt to run Congress.

Mr. CRAGO. I think the point the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] wants to make is that the law recognizes a distinction between a field officer and a commanding officer. You may change the status of that man where the law gives him certain duties as a field officer.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. This man has a distinct constitutional status which is recognized by the fact that his appointment goes to the Senate and is confirmed there. He is established in a certain grade of authority.

Mr. MANN. I know a whole lot of people who believe—and I do not wonder at it—that a man who is appointed as an officer in the Army is fixed for life, so that nobody can change his status.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not believe that.

Mr. MANN. I think Congress still has power over them.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Nobody is contending that in connection with this point of order. The contention is, that while it may be done by Congress it ought not to be done and can not be done through the Committee on Appropriations, but a committee that has legislative authority.

Mr. MANN. The Committee on Appropriations has legislative authority under the Holman rule to make a reduction in compensation, not merely an appropriation. It has the legislative authority under the Holman rule when it makes a reduction in the compensation and number of persons employed. So the gentleman confuses the idea that we may appropriate only for smaller amounts with that we may legislate under an appropriation bill in reducing compensation.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. You legislate in the reduction of the compensation, but can you change the status in law of the office to be filled according to existing law? Can you change that law?

Mr. MANN. I think we can. Certainly we can. We have done it frequently.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Then I think the gentleman will at least agree with me on this—

Mr. MANN. You say it would be a mere matter of appropriation. The Holman rule gives authority to legislate on an

appropriation bill when the purpose, as evidenced, is to change compensation.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman, then, give me any reason why the legislative committees in this House should be maintained now that "Bluebeard" is at work?

Mr. MANN. Some of the legislative committees, if they would go to work, would be of great value to the House. Some of them that are always standing aside and saying they have not the power are not of much use to the House. They have power enough if they work. I am not seeking to cast any reflections upon the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Not seeking to do so, but you are kind of aiming straight.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman has said that we have frequently in the House done this very thing of demoting officers from one grade to a lower grade. Can the gentleman give a single instance in this House where we have reduced men from the grade of major to the grade of captain?

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether we have had such a case or not.

Mr. KAHN. That is the point that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] was making.

Mr. MANN. I am not going to keep the floor very much longer, but—

Mr. KAHN. This changes absolutely the status.

Mr. MANN. Of course; I understand that.

Mr. HUSTED. Has the Committee on Appropriations, under the Holman rule, any authority to introduce a new provision of law which is not necessarily involved in the process of reduction?

Mr. KAHN. That is the point.

Mr. MANN. Whether or not it is necessary is not for the Chair to determine.

Mr. HUSTED. Unless on its face it is involved in the process of reduction.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If the gentleman will permit me to supplement that, the language on page 16 that was read and to which I have referred, goes into a variety of detail by which a certain legislative policy may be accomplished which does not relate to economy at all. It does not bear upon the principle involved of cutting down the increase for the pay of the officers. This is a supplementary thing which tells how you can get rid of officers.

Mr. MANN. Everybody knows, including my distinguished friend from Vermont, that this is the very basis of the reduction proposed in the Army.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman permit? If Congress can discharge an officer, why can it not demote an officer? Certainly that goes to a less extent, and they could discharge him and turn around and recommission him the next moment.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Congress can. The question is whether the Committee on Appropriations can.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is the point. The question is whether the Appropriations Committee is Congress. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California makes the point of order against the entire paragraph, including the appropriation itself and both provisos.

The Chair thinks we should construe the entire paragraph as one concrete whole, especially as it is quite evident that the second proviso is necessary to carry out the first. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO] raises the question of the jurisdiction of the committee. The Chair does not think there is any question about that. The Committee on Appropriations certainly has jurisdiction to bring in an appropriation bill for the pay of the Army, and it may also bring in a paragraph containing legislation, provided that that legislation is in accordance with the rules of the House in considering an appropriation bill. Of course, there is legislation, in the Chair's view, in both provisos, though he thinks he might hold the first proviso in order as a limitation. But there is legislation in both provisos, and the only question is whether this provision of the Holman rule is applicable to the paragraph under consideration:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

The present occupant of the chair has been called to rule quite a number of times on the Holman rule, and he is one of those who believes that it should be construed strictly. In other words, the present occupant of the chair must see to his

satisfaction that the provisions in the bill actually and evidently on their face do reduce expenditures in either of the three ways provided under the Holman rule. It seems to the Chair entirely evident that this provision does reduce expenditures of the Government by a reduction of the number of officers and by the amount of money carried. The Chair thinks that this provision is in order, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of offering an amendment. But before I do it I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he does not think it would be more logical that we first offer an amendment as to the size of the Army rather than at this time to offer an amendment as to the number of officers? I think the most logical thing to do would be, first, to let the House determine the number of men that they will have in the Army. These other things follow. Of course, I know it is not absolutely an *et sequitur* that the number of officers would be absolutely determined by the size of the Army, but to a certain extent that is true, and therefore, unless the chairman of the subcommittee has some objection, I would be very glad if, by unanimous consent, we might first go to the size of the Army, determine that, and then return to the number of officers and determine that.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that, so far as I am personally concerned, and as I think the members of the subcommittee are, the number of officers would be fixed independently of the size of the enlisted strength, and I would rather proceed in the regular way.

Mr. Sisson. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, in line 4, page 15, strike out the figures "\$26,896,200" and insert "\$21,863,800," and in line 6, strike out "eleven" and insert "nine." There will be another amendment offered in the event this is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Sisson: Page 15, line 4, strike out the figures "\$26,896,200" and insert "\$21,863,800," and in line 6, page 15, strike out the word "eleven" and insert in lieu thereof the word "nine."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. Sisson. I have no objection to the gentleman asking a question.

Mr. KAHN. If one desires to offer an amendment to increase the amount carried in the paragraph and also the number of officers, must it be offered as a substitute for the existing provision or can it be offered after a vote has been taken on the existing amendment?

Mr. MANN. May I suggest to the gentleman from California that if the amendment offered to reduce the number is agreed to there could be then no amendment offered to increase it, but if the amendment to reduce the number is not agreed to, then any amendment could be offered to increase or reduce it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Why not offer a substitute?

Mr. MANN. The shortest way would be to vote on an amendment to reduce the number first.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I call to the attention of the committee that in discussing this question we should take into consideration not only the number of officers but the number of men we desire in the Army. It is very difficult to discuss this question without discussing the two together. This amendment which I offer provides for 9,000 officers instead of 11,000. That makes more officers than we had at any time before the World War. If this amendment prevails, or whether it prevails or not, I shall offer an amendment to reduce the number of men, which occurs in the following paragraph, from 115,000 down to 100,000.

Now, I want to discuss briefly that amendment as to the number of men. This will save in the neighborhood of \$10,000,000 on this item of the bill alone, and there are a number of other items in the bill that will follow and be reduced as a matter of course if you should adopt the amendment reducing the number down to 100,000 or reduce the number of officers to 9,000.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, I do not believe that this country can afford to ignore what is going on in the world. I do not believe you can afford to say to the balance of the world that we are unwilling to disarm to a considerable extent on land after calling the first world conference. Prior to that time we called the nations together in Europe and they there

agreed upon the League of Nations, the purpose of which, as understood by the people of America, was to reduce armaments, and the manifest and declared purpose of America, and the stated and declared purpose of the President in calling the nations of the world together in this conference which has just adjourned, was that we might remove from the people the burdens of taxation brought about by the large military establishments of the nations of the world. If you Republicans and your President are sincere in what you say, you will agree to my amendment. Do not fool the people; make good your promises.

Now, let us look at what our neighbors are doing. I invite your careful attention to this. I do not think a more important vote will be taken in this House during this session of Congress than the vote you are going to take on the size of the Army and number of officers. I think it means not only millions of dollars to the taxpayers, but it means a great deal toward defining the policy of this Government and the future policy of the world with reference to military matters; and if you are conscientious and if you feel about this matter as I do, then certainly you will give this your very careful attention.

Now, let us see what England is doing. The English Government has a budget now pending which calls for an army of 210,000 men. This does not include the troops in India. They have an army in India of 70,000 men, but all of that army is paid for out of the Indian treasury. Now, even the most ultramilitarist in control of affairs in England is calling for only 210,000 men, and the committee having that bill in charge are themselves willing to reduce that number by 33,000 men.

There was a committee appointed to look over the entire budget in England, that committee being known as the Geddes committee.

The committee consists of Sir Eric Geddes, M. P. (chairman); Lord Inchcape; Lord Faringdon; Sir Joseph Maclay; and Sir Guy Granet.

The following were the terms of reference: To make recommendations to the chancellor of the exchequer for effecting forthwith all possible reductions in the national expenditures on supply services, having regard especially to the present and prospective position of the revenue. In so far as questions of policy are involved in the expenditure under discussion, these will remain for the exclusive consideration of the cabinet, but it will be open to the committee to review the expenditure and to indicate the economies which might be effected if particular policies were either adopted, abandoned, or modified.

The committee finds that in 1914-15 all ranks, British, native, and colonial troops, were 181,000, and the 1922-23 estimates 210,000. The committee complains that there is a material increase, both in cost and numbers, and this applies both to officers and men, and to British as well as native troops.

The units also from the point of view of fighting efficiency are far more powerful than they were in 1914-15. Owing to the production of machine guns, the fire power of an infantry battalion is given as six to eight times as much as it was before the war, and that of a cavalry regiment four times as much as it was before the war. The introduction of heavy artillery, gas, and tanks has increased the fighting power out of all comparison with the number of men engaged, and officers who are intended to increase the efficiency of the army have increased disproportionately to the men. Moreover, there has been added to the defense force of the empire the very costly and highly specialized arm of the air. There will, therefore, be a more powerful army than we had before the war.

This committee also recommend a reduction of the army by 50,000.

We are convinced from our survey of the war office estimates that there is great room for economy in men and money without in any way endangering the defense of the empire.

#### CONCLUSIONS.

As a result of our consideration we are of the opinion—  
(1) That man power has been estimated on a lavish scale for 1922-23, and that a reduction of 50,000 officers and men could be made without in any way reducing the forces employed by the war office on foreign service.

(2) That the introduction of new arms and corps and of the air force, which have been created with the object of increasing the fighting efficiency of the defense forces of the empire, is not reflected in corresponding reductions in other directions, and that savings could be made in that account.

(3) That there has been an increase in all the ancillary and auxiliary services of the army which the country can not afford and in which drastic economies should be made.

(4) That the abnormal reserve of mobilization equipment and arms now held is costly to store, guard, and maintain, and that the effect of holding it results in heavy additional indirect cost.

(5) That the army estimates for 1922-23 should be reduced from £75,197,800 to £55,000,000 for that year, and that in the subsequent year still lower estimates should suffice.

In this recommendation no account is taken of possible further reductions resulting from a review by the Government of our military requirements at home and abroad, normal and abnormal.

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

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, this is the most important feature of this bill. There will be a good deal of discussion on it, and I trust I may have unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. KAHN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Now, gentlemen, I am going to talk as rapidly as I can, because this is a great big question and I have much that I want to say. If I had time I would read to you the whole recommendation made by the Geddes committee, which was a committee appointed to review the entire budget of England. It is admitted that those in charge of the English budget are willing to reduce the size of the army by 33,000, and it is a certainty that there will be that reduction from the 210,000 originally reported; but this Geddes committee, made up of five of the most distinguished statesmen in England, recommend and urge that the peace conference ought to mean something to the taxpayers of the world, and they recommend the size of the English Army be reduced 50,000 instead of reducing it 33,000—that is to say that the present budget provides for 160,000 instead of 210,000. Now, take into consideration what England has to guard. In the first place, she has to guard South Africa and her other African possessions. She has to guard her islands in the sea. She has to guard the Suez Canal, Egypt, and Gibraltar, and Canada. She is not yet quite through with the war in Ireland. She has to guard Scotland and England. It seems to me, therefore, that England's Army is 100 per cent more important to her than our Army can possibly be to us. She is exposed everywhere. We are exposed nowhere, except in the Philippines.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Is it not a fact that Australia and New Zealand and South Africa, as well as India, have their own troops to guard their possessions?

Mr. SISSON. Yes; and it is equally true that every State in this Union has its National Guard to control its possessions. [Applause.] It is equally true that the Philippine Islands have the Philippine Scouts. Oh, that is a dodge which I did not expect my friend from California to assume. On the contrary, the principal purpose of England's standing army would be to prevent revolt from her authority, and the fact that the colonies have these large armies would be a splendid excuse for the British Empire to have a strong army in addition to her colonial troops. But I know that my good friend from California [Mr. KAHN] is the avowed friend of militarism—

Mr. KAHN. Oh, no.

Mr. SISSON. I know that he speaks for the militarists of the country. I know that the militarists throughout the world listen to his words. I know that he models his views to meet the approval of all the Army officers. I know that his views meet approval wherever big Army men exist, not only here but everywhere. I know all that. But I want to say to my friend that I do not believe the country will follow him now in time of peace.

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman from California was in favor of universal military training.

Mr. SISSON. Yes; my friend from California wanted universal compulsory military training. He believes wholly in the Prussian idea of an army.

Now, gentlemen, do you know that when you have 100,000 men in the Army now you have a military strength equal to 800,000 men as compared with the Army at the outbreak of the war? Did you know that? Did you know that the experts in England and our own military experts here estimate that under the modern method of arming soldiers with rapid-fire guns, with machine guns, with gas, and with tanks, one soldier is six times as efficient as he was before the World War? In other words, for police purposes within the Nation, the Army is easily worth eight times what it formerly was, man for man. The Geddes committee in England states that it is conservative to say that a soldier now is equal to eight soldiers before the war. If that be true, then with 100,000 men you have the equivalent of 800,000 men before the war. This certainly ought to satisfy even my friend from California [Mr. KAHN], if, indeed, an Army ever was big enough for him.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. SISSON. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is true if you can put one man in eight different places in continental America at the same time. That is the proposition that is involved.

Mr. SISSON. I am glad my friend raised that question. This House has repeatedly passed a bill to reduce the number of military posts in the United States. We have now 169

places, in round numbers, which are supposed to be guarded by soldiers. During the Indian wars in the early days we had these posts out West. I believe the President and the Secretary of War have the authority to get rid of these posts. I do not agree with my friends that Congress can not have anything to say about the disposition of troops, but I have not time to discuss that. And I do believe that under his authority as Commander in Chief of the Army he may abandon these posts.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. When did we first provide in this country for an Army of 100,000 men?

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman means as a limitation down?

Mr. MANN. Up.

Mr. SISSON. We never did have, unless it was just before we entered the war, as many as 100,000 men.

Mr. MANN. I was under the impression that the limit of the Army to 100,000 men was about 20 years ago.

Mr. SISSON. I think that is true.

Mr. MANN. There has been since then not only some increase of population but a considerable increase in the activities of the Army.

Mr. SISSON. I think that is true.

Mr. MANN. Assuming that the limit of 100,000 men was about right 15 or 20 years ago, would it not be perfectly right and proper to add 25 per cent to that number?

Mr. SISSON. I do not think so; I think 100,000 men are infinitely more efficient to-day than they were then; and let me say that we did not have 100,000 men in the Army; for a long time we had much less than 75,000; and while Mr. Hay was chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs the limit was raised to 90,000; but we never had that number in the Army.

Mr. MANN. We never have had anything like the number in the Army that was authorized.

Mr. SISSON. That is true.

Mr. MANN. We had a limit of 100,000 nearly 20 years ago, and since then we have added the Chemical Warfare Service, the Air Service, and a number of other services that I suppose required quite a large number of men.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. In 1903 Congress passed the reorganization bill. That was after the Spanish-American War, and the Congress authorized the maximum number of 100,000 enlisted men. Congress did not appropriate for that number, and for quite a number of years we went along with 50,000, 60,000, and even 70,000 men. We finally got up to 100,000 men just before we passed the national defense act.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I want to suggest to the gentleman that there is a statute in full force and effect which provides that the Secretary of War may at any time abandon any post or arsenal of the Government.

Mr. SISSON. I am glad the gentleman has called my attention to that law; I had overlooked it.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. The fact that we have never had more than 60,000 men is one of the strongest arguments in support of the gentleman's contention.

Mr. SISSON. Yes; and I want to say in answer to my friend from California that we never at any time had anything like the number of men authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may have 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Now, gentlemen, in view of the fact that after the Spanish-American War and when we were in a race with the other nations of the world in building up arms and armament, we never had as many enlisted men on the average as 60,000 men in the Army. Now, if we mean what we say by this conference, then we are going to reduce our Army. Have we attended a conference in which we agreed that there shall be a reduction of arms and armament here, and then immediately turn our backs upon that and proceed as if we had never done so? Because the contention was that the largest Army that England had prior to the war was 171,000 men, the budget was submitted for 210,000, and after the conference here

the committee propose to reduce the 210,000 men for all England, including all of her colonies except India, down to 160,000. England did not propose to be placed in a false light by going before the world with that increase. That matter is now being considered in Parliament.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am at a loss to know what conference the gentleman has in mind. The gentleman spoke of a conference agreeing to a limitation of armament.

Mr. SISSON. Where has the gentleman been for the last few months?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have been right here, and I am present with the gentleman this morning.

Mr. SISSON. Is the gentleman serious in his inquiry?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes. What conference has there been agreeing to a limitation of land armament?

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman is going to be so highly technical—we agreed to reduce our Navy, and are you to say that we are not to reduce the Army, that there has been no agreement to reduce the Army? The British Government is acting in good faith and we want to act in good faith.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Perhaps the gentleman has alluded to the Geddes conference.

Mr. SISSON. No; I was speaking of the conference here in Washington.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Can the gentleman remember what the authorization for this country was at the time of the peace conference, or what the appropriation for last year was?

Mr. SISSON. The authorization last year, as I recall, by special act of Congress, was 175,000 men.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. And we appropriated for how many?

Mr. SISSON. One hundred and fifty thousand men.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Does not the gentleman think, in view of the fact that when the peace conference was in session we had an Army of 150,000 men, that a substantial reduction of 35,000 would create a very favorable impression in England?

Mr. SISSON. I do not think so. While 150,000 is authorized, the total enlisted strength at present of the Army is only about 130,000. If I had my way about it, I would go lower than 100,000, but I was hoping that we might reach 100,000 as a compromise and as a settlement of the matter.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. How low would the gentleman go?

Mr. SISSON. I do not know just how low I would go. I have not considered my minimum at all.

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

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. I want to correct a statement the gentleman made. He said that we had 175,000 men authorized, and that we reduced the number to 150,000. We have an authorization for 280,000.

Mr. SISSON. I know; but a resolution providing for only 175,000 men passed and was the thing that governed and controlled us in making that appropriation.

Mr. KAHN. That was only in the Committee on Appropriations that that was done.

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman from Indiana asked me what we appropriated for, and I answered him correctly.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman has referred to proposed reductions in the British Army as if that program had been adopted by the British Government. Is it not a fact that the figures which the gentleman has used are merely contained in what is known as the Geddes report, and that the Geddes report has not been adopted by the British Government or by the House of Commons?

Mr. SISSON. I have said that several times, but the estimate which they can not now increase is 210,000 men, and the war committee is willing now to reduce it by 33,000, while the Geddes committee recommends that it be reduced by 50,000 men; that is, down to 160,000.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Speaking of the figures of the reduction proposed by the Geddes report and by the ministry, the gentleman has not said that in proportion as they reduce the enlisted men they propose to increase the commissioned officers.

Mr. SISSON. They do not do that, either.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Then I do not know what I am talking about.

Mr. SISSON. The Geddes committee makes no such recommendation.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I did not refer to the Geddes committee. I just made a reference to the policy of the ministry.

Mr. SISSON. The ministry is very much divided upon the question of the size of the Army, but the Geddes committee say, in so many words, that under the proposed army of 210,000, with men and the proposed officers, it is top-heavy in officers. That is the trouble with our Army here. It is top-heavy with officers.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It was not when the war broke out.

Mr. SISSON. No; and I do not intend, so far as my vote is concerned, to keep on the backs of the people the number of officers that you must have while we are conducting a war. What war are you going to fight now? Tell me. There is no cloud that I see on the horizon.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. There was not any cloud to be seen just before that night we met here.

Mr. SISSON. Oh, you people who are enthusiastic with Prussian ideas, the last one of you, from Captain Hobson on down, were pointing for a long time at Japan, claiming that Japan was going to come over and fight us, and then the next thing when they found that Japan would not they adopted Germany, and they saw Germany crossing the Atlantic and fighting us to death.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Well, we got Germany, did we not?

Mr. SISSON. Yes; but we crossed the ocean to Germany. She did not come over after us. There is always a bugaboo every time you want to get money out of the Treasury. I am tired of our being frightened to death with the idea that we are going to have a war every few weeks. Oh, no, gentlemen, when you are looking for ghosts you usually find them. When the Army bill is up ghosts appear and will not down till the bill is passed.

Mr. VAILE. Was Germany a ghost? It seems to me, if so, she was a pretty lively one.

Mr. SISSON. I did not say that Germany was. I say that if you are looking for ghosts, you find one; and you are looking for ghosts now. We had to get Germany. She did not come to us. No nation has ever declared war on us first in our history.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman take into consideration in answering the militarists, that there are 64,000 trained reserve officers ready to take the field within 12 hours' notice to-day?

Mr. SISSON. Oh, you can not ever answer them. It is money they want. They never accept anything unless they see a uniform on every street corner, and I want to remind gentlemen that no nation was ever made strong and great and powerful, either in time of peace or time of war, by multiplying army officers and uniforms. You can not make a nation great in time of war by placing burdens upon the backs of the people so great that they are enervated and weak when the war does come. There is not a nation in this world to-day that is standing strong and foursquare to all the winds that relied on arms of a military character to make her great and preserve her. Where is the boasted German Empire with her supermen? These unprepared nations caused her to bite the dust, and why? Because her own people did not believe in her Government, and if you will continue your policy here of increasing the expenditure and increasing the number of uniforms all over this country, you are going to find that the people will lose confidence in you and in your Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 4, after the word "staff," strike out the figures "\$26,896,200" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$32,631,500." On page 15, line 6, after the word "than," strike out the word "eleven" and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirteen."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I like to listen to my friend from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson]. He has a good voice, and he uses it [laughter] on the floor to good effect. I want to read to the gentleman from Mississippi from his own speech of April 28, 1913, before the World War broke out at all, before they had anything like war in Europe, and before, certainly, this country got into it. Now, I agreed with the gentleman from Mississippi at that time, because I believe any State has the right to

govern certain things in certain ways. This is what the gentleman said:

I maintain as a principle of good government that a nonresident alien should not be permitted to own a foot of land in America. The situation in California is a very critical one, and I trust that I may not say anything that will in the least tend to prevent a friendly settlement or embarrass our State Department in its effort to retain the friendship of Japan; but before I would surrender the right to control a foot of American soil to Japan or any other nation on earth or to permit any other nation to dictate the land laws to one of these sovereign States I would fight—

Mr. SISSON. As the gentleman read it, I did not say "Southern"—

Mr. KAHN. "Sovereign States, I would fight." [Laughter.] I want to show—

Mr. SISSON. I stand by it now. It was good doctrine then, and it is good doctrine now.

Mr. KAHN. As far as I am concerned, I am a Representative from the sovereign State of California, and agree to all the gentleman said; but I respectfully submit that to listen to the gentleman nowadays there is not a particle of fight in his whole composition. [Laughter and applause.] But can the gentleman say positively that we will not have such a question to again confront us? There come times in the history of every country where you have got to defend the rights of the country or sink into abject—

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. No; I want to finish this; and if I have a little time later I will yield.

Mr. McSWAIN. Very well.

Mr. KAHN. I also want to read this statement from the gentleman's speech:

The coercion of the people of California in this right is a precedent for any coercion, however drastic, when in the future the demand shall be made by a powerful government. It will be a miserable piece of cringing cowardice for us to yield now, and I am with the good people of California in their fight, and I am willing to vote the last dollar in the Treasury for the defense of her right to control her sacred soil.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KAHN. I ask unanimous consent to continue for about 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KAHN. Now, I simply call attention to these excerpts from the speech of my friend from Mississippi to show that no government on earth can tell when a country is absolutely safe; and so I have always contended that it is the duty of the Congress, representing the people of the United States, to be so prepared that if anything should happen the country would not be quite helpless. [Applause.] But if we had gotten into war, as the gentleman suggested, how would he proceed to fight without officers or men to fight with? Now, before the World War, as I said the other day, we had only about \$1,000,000,000 of indebtedness. By reason of our utter lack of preparedness we had to expend in 19 months \$24,000,000,000. Of course, we won the war. We won it in 19 months, and yet that 19 months was not all spent in fighting the enemy. Thirteen months of that time our people were getting ready to fight. The other nations—England, France, Belgium, and Italy—were holding the lines while the American officers and enlisted men were being trained. If we had had no help of that kind, how long would we have been able to hold the lines against Germany or any other great militaristic country? That same kind of thing may happen again. We have not settled our differences across the border. Mexico has not been recognized as yet. The President of the United States, President Wilson, had to call out 100,000 men to defend our border in 1916 before we got into the World War at all. Our National Guard went down there, and the training they got down there helped materially when those very men got into the World War a little later. I do not know what country will ever want to fight us. I sincerely hope no country will ever want to fight us. I hope we will have no war at all. The gentleman says I am a militarist. I am not as much of a militarist as he is, because I never said "fight Japan." I never got into that controversy at all. I tried to avoid that very thing, and I think, thank the Lord, that we have avoided that, and that we will be able to settle our differences without the use of arms. I hope so very earnestly. [Applause.] But I still feel that it is an essential thing that my country should be ready for any possible emergencies. The figures I read here to the House a few days ago I think show conclusively that the United States has a smaller Army than any other nation in the world in comparison to population. The conference that was held here not long ago was a naval disarmament conference.

There was no attempt to cut down the Army. The armies were not referred to, and properly. No nation asked for army

disarmament. France, as I recall, through her official representative, M. Briand, made a vigorous protest against army reduction. We took no action regarding the armies, and yet I feel that at this time we are taking a very serious step if we intend to cut down the Army below what is a fair base.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. As I say, our Army is lower than any other nation in the world in proportion to population. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ANTHONY. Do I understand correctly that the gentleman's substitute would provide for 13,000 officers, the number we now have?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Then why is it the gentleman has reported out from his committee and there is pending before the House here a bill which reduces the number to 12,000 officers? Why does he take one position here and another position at another time?

Mr. KAHN. No; I am not taking a different position at all. That bill was introduced at the request of General Pershing and General Harbord, our chief of staff and his able assistant. It would reduce the number to 12,000, but immediately it would build up again to 13,000. It would enable our Army to build up in the lower grades of first and second lieutenants. I do not know but that General Pershing was before the Committee on Appropriations of the House to explain the whole matter.

He certainly was before the Military Committee, and that committee after due deliberation considered that his proposition for the welfare of our country was one that we could well afford to adopt.

I am no more a militarist than is the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson]. He does not look at these things in the same light that I do. Of course, I have never quarreled with him about his position. I know he was directly opposed to things that I advocated during the World War. He had the right to advocate those things, and I think none the less of him for having advocated them. But I see this thing purely from the standpoint of what is best for the United States. The people of this country do not want war, but the people of this country want a certain preparation that will prevent any nation on earth trying conclusions with us and costing us additional enormous sums of money, which the taxpayers of this country will be called upon to meet for many years. We have hard work to pay the taxes now on the \$24,000,000,000. In addition, we are paying the taxes on the additional \$11,000,000,000 that we loaned our cobelligerents. If we had gone to work in 1916 and courageously had passed laws to put this country into a reasonable state of preparedness, the chances are that that World War would never have come to us, and the people of the United States would have been spared the burden of carrying that enormous indebtedness.

Now, gentlemen, I appeal to you not to make the mistake of 1916 again. Be Americans! Stand for the rights of Americans! We ask you simply to support a provision for a reasonable number of officers and men; let us try to keep the peace of the world with the comparatively few that we have. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am not surprised at the argument made by my friend from California [Mr. KAHN]. When the Chief of Staff and his aids appeared before the Military Committee with a bill that called for 13,000 officers and a plucking board, by which all they took off would be put on retired pay and every man that had been in the service for 10 years would draw 75 per cent of his pay, and also the confession and admission from the Chief of Staff that now, having about 13,000 officers in the Army, there is not a single second lieutenant in all that number of thousands of officers, it shows you that they endeavor to promote and put the salary basis as high as possible on the taxpayers of this country.

My friend, the chairman of that committee, and his colleagues, over my protest, voted that sort of a bill out for this Congress to pass, and his amendment to this Army appropriation bill is the purported bill that the General Staff had passed through that committee.

Gentlemen, the amendment of my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] does not go far enough. I am going to vote with him for the 9,000 officers, because he thinks it as low as the House will adopt, but it really ought to be 7,000 instead of 9,000. You have in the United States now, four years after the close of the Great War in Europe, 64,000 well-trained officers of the Reserve Army of the United States. You have fully 4,000,000 well-trained soldiers in the United States. You had a disarmament conference in the city of Washington, called by the President of the United States, where the leading nations of the

earth participated. You had as a result of that conference the leading nations of the world taking down the mastheads from the great battleships, reducing the naval armaments, and our great Government pursuing the sensible policy of agreeing to that and taking the lead.

Those other nations have great countries across their borders. The United States of America is off here by herself, with oceans separating us from any possible enemies. Surely the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] would not consider Mexico as a factor in wanting this country to be armed to the teeth and to the guards all the time. Certainly he would not consider that across the Isthmus of Panama the attitude of many Latin American countries as justifying this country maintaining a large army and large corps of officers? He says we should always be prepared. The American people have enjoyed peace in this country so long as our country has remained in pursuit of peaceful operations and not being armed to the guards. The best way to get into a war is to always have a big standing army and a great growth of Army officers. And the next best way is to have a great fleet, with great battleships and dreadnaughts and admirals, and all that go with it. But, thanks to the results of the disarmament conference, we now see daylight out from under the great Navy burden and the danger of war. It is the duty of the United States of America to lead the way and be the advance guard among the nations of the earth in disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to proceed for 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. QUIN. This great Republic of ours, standing as the chief exponent of peace, and with us having our hearts right, with this Government showing and demonstrating by its conduct, after this disarmament conference, that it is ready to be a disarmed Government, it will cause the other nations of the earth to reduce their armaments in like proportion.

A senator in the Chamber in France the other day made the broad statement that since the war is over the debt of France has increased by half, so that all the wealth of France is staggering under a nominal bonded indebtedness up to 80 per cent of its value. Is it possible that the gentleman from California would want to set the example in the United States of having this Government pursue a similar insane policy? The other nations of the earth are looking to the United States of America to pursue a sensible and sane policy, if we mean what we have been preaching. Since the war was over this Government has endeavored, through public utterances and through party platform pledges, to maintain a position of peace toward the other nations of the earth, and that by a reduction of its arms, both on sea and on land. But if we carry out the insane policy of increasing the Army at this hour, when we have the 64,000 reserve officers, well trained, placing the Army of the United States under a Regular Army corps of officers of 13,000, what can the other nations of the earth expect of us? They know our condition as well as we know it ourselves. And with this country now staggering under all these billions of dollars of bonded indebtedness, with this country needing to call for the saving of every dollar to be put into some peaceful pursuit or enterprise, the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] would propose to have 13,000 officers in the Army and the number of soldiers to justify that. What number of soldiers would 13,000 officers be capable of handling? At least 200,000 men. Perhaps the gentleman from California agrees with the Chief of Staff, that it makes no difference how small the Army might be, you still need 13,000 officers; you still need the full corps of general officers.

He asserts that you will need a full corps of general officers, brigadier generals and majors and all, including 67 generals, but at present the Army has not a single second lieutenant. Sixty-seven generals! This House is called upon to vote and set a standard as to whether this Republic needs to keep faith with the arms conference. Does not the gentleman from California know what every sensible man in the world knows, that when this great reduction of naval forces was agreed by all the big governments of this earth that agreement naturally included with it tacit agreement as to a reduction of the Army? Circumstances were a little different with France, as every well-informed man in this country knows. But so far as this Government is concerned, they know and we know that we do not need any big Army.

The gentleman asks what number we will agree to. We ought not to have a man over 50,000 in our Army. What do we need

them for? The gentleman from California said the other day before the committee that we need in case of an earthquake, as in the case of that calamity at San Francisco, to preserve order. Can we not use the National Guard in such an emergency? It will prove ample. In ordinary times we do not need them except to keep down riots and to preserve order.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. Yes.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. What do you need the 50,000 for?

Mr. QUIN. Just for the same purpose as you need the National Guard, simply to keep order. You do not need an Army to go out and fight somebody that we are not mad with, somebody that is not going to meddle with us. When the agreement was made to reduce the size of navies it was then proclaimed and understood that if any nation tried to transport soldiers to another part of the earth with hostile purpose they would be helpless because of the lack of naval facilities.

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

Mr. QUIN. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Where would the gentleman get the National Guard from if you had an accident like the San Francisco accident? The Army was already there. You could not get your National Guard.

Mr. QUIN. Why, the National Guard of your own State would certainly be able to prevent looting and be powerful in preserving order.

Oh, it is nonsense to want 13,000 officers in order to be ready for an earthquake. [Laughter and applause.] We never dreamed we would ever have any earthquakes in the United States except over there in San Francisco, and I hope we shall never have another one. The gentleman would have that great number of officers and not one single lieutenant. The second lieutenant is the man who gets close to the fighting front. It seems they do not want any of them in the Army, when they are very essential men in the Army.

The second lieutenant is much in demand, and yet the General Officer, which has asked for 13,000 officers, has not a single second lieutenant in the Army to-day, and the gentleman from California knows that, and he heard the Chief of Staff testify to it, and yet he puts in an amendment here asking for 13,000 officers.

Who is going to pay for it? The poor people of the United States, the men who make their living in the sweat of their brows. They would be the men who would have to pay the amount necessary to equip and keep up all these officers and the Army that would go with them. This Government of ours has gone far afield, but now it is time for us to come back to the old landmarks. Let us get close to the standard that the fathers intended. The old Jeffersonian standard is good enough for me, and I believe it is good enough for the great mass of the people throughout the Republic. Instead of following the doctrines and preachments of the distinguished gentleman from California, I believe that this House would do well to take into consideration some of the past history of this Republic, some of the teachings of the philosophers of government who really had some feeling for the hearthstones of this Nation and some sympathy with the sentiments of our people. The attitude of our Republic has never been one of hostility toward anyone. The United States Government, standing as the forerunner, bearing the torch of liberty, and demanding "equal justice and equal rights to all, and special privileges to none"—that sort of a government does not need a great standing Army and a large number of officers to be a burden upon the masses of the people. The humble citizens, and those who toil for their living, should be respected by this House on this vote. I thank you, gentlemen. [Applause.]

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I have never been a large-Army man. I have never been a large-Navy man. Yet my views were at least slightly modified by an experience in connection with the war. I came back from my home one fall while the war was in progress, before we had entered the war, and made a proposition to the House. I had believed for years that "coming events always cast their shadows before," and that no war came suddenly which was not foreseen by the far-sighted statesmen. I think that is true. I do not think war ever breaks out suddenly that has not been foreseen. I thought that if occasion arose, where the United States was likely to be involved in war, the statesmen of our country could easily see far enough ahead to commence to make provision for war, and when I came back here that fall I could see our country entering the war as plainly as I can see the faces before me in the

House. It seemed to me inevitable that we would get into the war in Europe.

I urged this House with all the power I had to then provide for an army of half a million men. If we should get into war, we would need them; if we should not, we could thank God we kept out so cheaply.

If our Democratic friends in charge at that time—and I am not criticizing them for their point of view—had made that provision and we had had an army of half a million men, both regular and temporary, at the time we entered the war, we would have saved \$15,000,000,000 and saved the entering into the Army of more than 2,000,000 American citizens. [Applause.] And I am convinced now that though you can see war in the immediate future a Republic like ours will not provide for it until after it is in it.

Now, that is the case. I am not in favor of a big army, and I am not in favor of the smallest army that is possible. I think we ought to vote down the proposed increase, and then more emphatically vote down the proposed decrease, and stand where the bill provides. [Applause.]

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I know full well that economy of administration is uppermost in the minds of the people of this country to-day. I know they want the War Department to curtail expenses; but I know that they do not agree with the ideas of the two gentlemen from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson and Mr. QUINN] who have just spoken. Over 20 years I lived in the State of Mississippi, and they were the happiest years of my life. I believe I know the point of view of Mississippians, and I do not think they would want to adopt a policy such as has been suggested which would wreck the Army of the United States.

I am against such radical reduction as is advocated by the two gentlemen from Mississippi. I am against the idea of framing practically the military policy of the Nation here on the floor without due consideration. [Applause.] The proposition for a radical reduction, coming as an amendment to an appropriation bill, makes it all the more harmful. In 1920 after coming through the greatest war in the history of the world we spent months in considering what should be the proper military policy of our Nation, and finally Congress passed a bill which became a law and which is now the accepted military policy, and it was the duty of the Secretary of War and of the General Staff to act in accordance with that policy. The provisions of this bill as to the procedure to be taken to reduce the officers is changing completely the present policy and scheme of organization. Army officers without warning are dismissed. A great deal has been said here about Army officers. I want to say that the officers of our Army are as fine men as live in this land. Hundreds of the officers now in the Army were emergency officers who had been attracted to the service by their experience in the war. They read the act of 1920 as determining the future policy of our Nation with reference to its Army, and in good faith they made applications, passed the examinations, and were accepted in the Army.

Now, without a hearing and without due consideration by the committee whose duty it is to study legislation affecting the Army, it is proposed to jam through a measure which cuts off their heads or retires them, after they have chosen the Army as the subject of their study and their work for life. This would not be fair treatment. I am opposed to thus destroying our military organization that has been built up under the policy adopted in 1920 in the reorganization law, simply because of the desire for economy. It seems to me we have already adopted an economical policy. In the bill which has been reported we have reduced the Army, both officers and enlisted men, far below the number recommended by our military advisers, General Pershing and the Secretary of War. When I came here a few years ago I heard day after day taunts at the then administration, the administration that I was interested in supporting, because they had not prepared the Nation for a great emergency. If we were not prepared then as we should have been, how much greater would be the folly of not listening to sound military advisers. Here we are emerging from the war, and we are cutting down and cutting down, and we have the spectacle of our Chief of Staff, General Pershing, appealing to the country against a committee which reports a bill which in his opinion would destroy the morale of the Army and greatly cripple our military organization. Secretary Weeks has likewise appealed to the country. I hope the Committee of the Whole will not accept any such reduction as proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi, but will accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN]. [Applause.]

Mr. CLOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I am in receipt of a telegram which calls me away from the city for a few days. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks referred to are here printed in full as follows:

Mr. CLOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a telegram this morning advising me of the fact that my presence is required in the circuit court of my home city in a case growing out of my efforts to obtain justice for the four and one-half million brave and patriotic men who uncomplainingly, unflinchingly, yea, courageously, offered themselves upon the arena of war in defense of our national honor, our cherished liberty, and the civilization of the world. I welcome an opportunity to defend any assertion that I have made in their behalf, either in public or private, but I regret that this utterly unfounded, if not malicious, suit is to be the cause of my inability to be here and cast my vote for the adjusted compensation bill, which in all probability will be taken up in the House and voted upon before my return. I have this satisfaction, however, that at every opportunity, upon every occasion, and in every legitimate way at my command I have urged upon my colleagues the justness of this legislation, and I leave here under these conditions with an abiding faith that this Congress will exercise the proper judgment and give to our Nation's defenders that which in simple justice they are so richly deserving.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the proponents of this bill have met with the most insidious propaganda that was ever offered in opposition to any legislation in the Halls of this Congress, nor am I unmindful of the fact that most of this campaign of misrepresentation emanates from sinister or political motives. With the few who have registered their opposition to the measure purely from the standpoint of national policy I have no quarrel, but with those who register their opposition from personal, political, or mercenary motives I do have a quarrel, yea, more, a contempt which I shall register here on the floor of this House that my children and my children's children may know that I possessed the moral courage to stand up and fight for common justice toward those brave and courageous men who saved the flag of my country and the civilization of the world in that, the darkest hour of all the ages past.

When war was declared and the trumpet sounded, I can well remember the sights of the brave and stalwart sons as they planted the parting kiss upon the furrowed brow of a loving mother, or caressed for the last time, perchance, a true and devoted wife, and donned the uniform to fight for the principles of eternal right. I can well remember the anxiety with which we waited their arrival on foreign soil, and how with bated breath we awaited the outcome of the first engagement of American troops with the ever-advancing hordes of German assassins. I can well remember the shouts of praise that followed the announcement of their deeds of valor on foreign fields, and I heard, as with one acclaim, "The Nation can never repay them for the sacrifice they have made." Then I can well remember the anxiety felt as we watched their progress for days and weeks and months in that gigantic struggle which meant defeat or victory, and at last, thank God, I remember the glad tidings of "American soldiers break the Hindenburg line and turn the tide to victory." Oh, yes; we said then, but I say now, this Nation owes them a debt which it can never pay. To the patriotic men of my district which furnished the first American blood to be spilled on foreign soil, and which furnished the soldier who was said to be the greatest hero of all the war, to the millions of ex-service men throughout America, I say your sacrifices shall not have been made in vain, and that this Nation will not, can not, and must not turn a deaf ear to your righteous demands.

Ah, we are told now that the sentiment of the people has turned against the adjusted compensation for ex-service men. I deny it with all the vehemence of my soul. The international bankers, the war-made millionaires, the profiteers of America are the ones that most bitterly oppose the payment of a bonus. They are the ones proclaiming the Nation too poor to assume so just a burden, yet they are the selfsame individuals that are willing to see and are urging the United States to cancel the \$11,000,000,000 now due and owing us by foreign Governments. Why, can you imagine, do they cry with one breath a "Nation too poor to pay a soldier," and in the very next urge the United States to cancel a debt that will more than four times over pay the debt to the men that saved their fortunes and their liberty in the greatest war of all the world. Their opposition is based upon mercenary motives. They have loaned to foreigners mil-

lions, yes, billions of dollars, some of which they stand to lose if this Government does not give this huge sum to these nations. I want to say here and now that America will never cancel one cent of that claim with my vote, even though American money hoarders lose every "sou" they have loaned in these countries. There are others, some of whom oppose this bill under the pretext that the financial condition of the Treasury is not such as to warrant the withdrawal of a sum sufficient to meet the requirements of this bill, but conceding the Nation to be burdened—and it is—with a tremendous debt, much of which was incurred as a result of inefficiency, extravagance, and waste; yet this money when paid over to the ex-service men of America will remain in America to increase the taxable wealth of the Nation and in time restore to the Treasury of the United States all and more than the outlay. Some of those who oppose this bonus, and I speak now of my Democratic brethren, were willing to accept a mandate for Armenia after the World War

at the expense of keeping as the least possible number 59,000 American boys on Armenian soil, with a possibility of increasing that number to 200,000 at any time and at a cost of \$276,000,000 for the first year and \$756,000,000 for the five years. You were not only willing to do this but you wanted America immediately following the war to loan to the bankrupt nations of Europe millions of dollars which you knew they could never nor would ever pay, and just why you wanted to do this I do not know, and just why you would do it now if you had control of the Government is beyond my conception. It is sufficient to say that after the signing of the armistice and after the war was over in Europe you did loan to European nations the stupendous sum of \$2,515,853,946.98, and this is a part of that sum which we hear so much about it being our duty to cancel at this time. The dates when these loans were made, the country to whom loaned, and the amount to each is as follows:

Statement showing dates and amounts of cash advances to foreign Governments after the signing of the armistice to November 15, 1919.

Date.	Belgium.	Czechoslovakia.	France.	Great Britain.	Greece.	Italy.	Liberia.	Rumania.	Serbia.
1918.									
Nov. 11									\$400,000.00
12						\$10,000,000.00			
14	\$1,600,000.00					10,000,000.00			
15	3,400,000.00	\$5,000,000.00	\$40,000,000.00	\$50,000,000.00					209,697.70
19	8,215,000.00					20,000,000.00			
21				10,000,000.00					
26				10,000,000.00		20,000,000.00			
27	500,000.00								
29				30,000,000.00					
Dec. 3	2,000,000.00			20,000,000.00					
4	1,100,000.00								
5				30,000,000.00		15,000,000.00			
10			71,427,000.00	25,000,000.00					
11	1,500,000.00								
12				30,000,000.00		10,000,000.00			
17	7,450,000.00			20,000,000.00		10,000,000.00			
19				30,000,000.00		25,000,000.00			
23			5,000,000.00						
24	5,500,000.00			1,000,000.00					
26			10,000,000.00	30,000,000.00		25,000,000.00			
31	14,000,000.00								
1919.									
Jan. 2						20,000,000.00			
7	10,000,000.00			20,000,000.00					
9				20,000,000.00					
13		4,800,000.00							
14	6,100,000.00			10,000,000.00					
16						60,000,000.00			
21	2,900,000.00								
23	1,000,000.00					15,000,000.00			
25			10,000,000.00						
28	4,400,000.00		81,050,800.00						
30						25,000,000.00			
Feb. 4	6,000,000.00								
6	1,500,000.00					20,000,000.00	\$12,000.00		
8								\$5,000,000.00	
10	600,000.00								
11	3,900,000.00								
13			10,000,000.00			25,000,000.00			
18	7,700,000.00								
20			5,000,000.00			15,000,000.00			
21		4,300,000.00	5,000,000.00						6,185,302.31
25	11,200,000.00								
27						19,000,000.00			
Mar. 4	5,500,000.00		10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00					
6	5,900,000.00		20,000,000.00	10,000,000.00		20,000,000.00			
11			30,000,000.00	10,000,000.00					
13			10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00		16,500,000.00		5,000,000.00	
14			10,000,000.00						5,000,000.00
18	5,300,000.00		20,000,000.00	10,000,000.00					
19		8,250,000.00							
20			10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00		12,000,000.00			
22						10,000,000.00			
24						10,000,000.00			
25	3,900,000.00		15,000,000.00			20,000,000.00			
27			10,000,000.00						
31			85,000,000.00						
Apr. 1	5,000,000.00		15,000,000.00						
3			10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00					
4				10,000,000.00					
8		8,650,000.00	10,000,000.00	4,000,000.00					
10	300,000.00		10,000,000.00	20,000,000.00		5,000,000.00			
15	4,000,000.00	190,000.00	40,000,000.00	65,000,000.00		25,000,000.00		5,000,000.00	4,718,608.27
17				9,000,000.00					
22			20,000,000.00						
24	1,750,000.00		20,000,000.00			10,000,000.00			
29	2,000,000.00		10,000,000.00						
May 1	5,000,000.00			10,000,000.00		5,000,000.00			
6			10,000,000.00						
8	8,800,000.00		10,000,000.00			12,000,000.00			
13	1,300,000.00								
15	3,500,000.00		15,000,000.00	30,000,000.00		15,000,000.00			61,857.29
20			10,000,000.00						
22		11,850,000.00		10,000,000.00		5,000,000.00			
27	2,400,000.00							5,000,000.00	
29			10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00		5,000,000.00			
June 3	4,000,000.00								
4		4,000,000.00							
5			10,000,000.00			5,000,000.00			
12						5,000,000.00			
16			5,000,000.00						
17	900,000.00								
18			10,000,000.00						

Statement showing dates and amounts of cash advances to foreign Governments after the signing of the armistice to November 15, 1920—Continued.

Date.	Belgium.	Czechoslovakia.	France.	Great Britain.	Greece.	Italy.	Liberia.	Rumania.	Serbia.
1919									
June 19	\$3,250,000.00								
24	600,000.00								
25				\$7,000,000.00					
July 1			\$10,000,000.00						
3			20,000,000.00			\$5,000,000.00			
8	2,000,000.00		5,000,000.00						
9		\$5,650,000.00							
10			15,000,000.00						
11								\$5,000,000.00	
17			5,000,000.00						
22			5,000,000.00						
24			5,000,000.00						
29			5,000,000.00						
31			5,000,000.00			5,000,000.00			
Aug. 5			5,000,000.00						
7			10,000,000.00						
14						4,175,945.99			
19			5,000,000.00						
21	1,000,000.00					5,000,000.00			
25			10,000,000.00						
28			5,000,000.00			9,100,000.00			
Sept. 2			15,000,000.00						
4			5,000,000.00			17,000,000.00			
10							\$6,000.00		
11			10,000,000.00						
18			15,000,000.00						
25			10,000,000.00						
26			30,000,000.00						
Oct. 1			10,000,000.00						
2						1,146,127.00			
7			10,000,000.00						
14						8,000,000.00			
16						1,000,000.00			
17			10,000,000.00						
21			10,000,000.00						
24							8,000.00		
Nov. 11									
Dec. 2		\$1,634,041.10	10,000,000.00						
8			10,000,000.00						
15					\$5,000,000.00				
16						10,000,000.00			
1920									
Jan. 2			10,000,000.00						
16					5,000,000.00				
Feb. 3			10,000,000.00						
5			10,000,000.00						
Mar. 11			10,000,000.00						
22		2,000,000.00							
Apr. 6			10,000,000.00			418,114.00			
8		200,000.00							
9						5,000,000.00			
May 11			10,000,000.00			5,000,000.00			
June 3		1,000,000.00							
15		2,000,000.00							
July 6			10,000,000.00						
23		1,000,000.00							
Aug. 5			10,000,000.00						
26	10,469,467.89								
31			10,000,000.00						
Sept. 17		732,165.64							
24					5,000,000.00				
28			10,000,000.00						
	175,632,467.89	61,256,206.74	1,037,050,800.00	581,000,000.00	15,000,000.00	586,338,986.99	18,000.00	25,000,000.00	\$16,575,455.35

Not only did you loan this stupendous sum to Europe after war was over, but certain of your leaders are to-day bemoaning the fact that a Republican Congress in 1920 prevented your administration from loaning, or giving, so to speak, to these same countries an additional \$500,000,000. I quote an excerpt from an article appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 1, 1921, over the signature of the chairman of your national organization, Mr. Hull, in which he branded the defeat of the Versailles peace treaty as "the blackest of all the black crimes committed in the annals of the human race," and further commented upon the failure of the United States to continue a policy of giving, loaning and giving to Europe, while our heroic soldiers were dying at our very doors from disease and hunger. He said:

In vain did Henry P. Davidson and other great financiers as late as the early spring of 1920 fairly shout that the crisis is so acute that the situation does not admit of delay except with the possibility of consequences one hardly dare contemplate. Mr. Davidson and many other economists and business men were then urging the creation of a revolving fund of \$500,000,000 by this Government . . . to be placed in the hands of a strong commission of our ablest business men to be utilized as temporary credits to the helpless States of Europe. This plea was received with deaf ears by Republican leaders bent on every sort of pandemonium if it was necessary to enable them later to carry the national election of 1920.

If the defeat of the Versailles treaty was the blackest of all the black crimes committed in the annals of the human race, as he says, then his charges must necessarily be lodged against the fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, comrades and friends of our gallant troops who, by a majority of more than 7,000,000, approved the judgment of the Republican leaders who

were responsible for the defeat of that unholy pact which not only committed the financial resources of this Nation but the blood of our citizenry to the maintenance and protection of the bloodthirsty militaristic nations of Europe.

The financiers of New York were the advocates of the League of Nations; they were the proponents of the \$500,000,000 credits to which the gentleman, Mr. Hull, referred; they were the advocates of this country going to war months in advance of our real participation therein, because the possession of \$5,000,000,000 of allied indebtedness by New York money interests led them to believe that their loans would be worthless if the Allies were defeated, and hence they cried aloud and the people were daily reminded of the insecurity of New York City; they were the strongest advocates of the draft law, and when the boys returned to native soil after achieving the greatest victory of all the world, these same financiers, in order to make sure that their enormous loans were not further impaired, oppose a bonus in any form and simply denounce as infamous any plan that looks to the payment of such a bonus based on the debts now owing us by these foreign Governments to which their loans are made.

Multimillionaires made great fortunes during a few years of war, which were saved from German indemnity by the sacrifices of American doughboys, yet they shout threats because Congress is giving these same doughboys only about what one month of war cost this country. Many months of war were saved to this country and to the world by the heroism of the American soldiers, yet the haughty and selfish financiers and profiteers of New York, who were parading with the throngs

and shouting "Go on, boys," in 1918, have now stepped back into their countinghouses to gloat over their ill-gotten gains and their only cry now is "Go away, boys; the Nation is too poor." For myself, I wish that it were possible to make every cost-plus, profiteering millionaire pay every dollar of this adjusted compensation to the brave boys who fought in the trenches at \$1 per day, three-fourths of which was taken from them in allotments and insurance for the benefit of their helpless and dependent families. This under the Constitution of our country can not be done, but we might well adopt a plan levying a tax on inheritance on all amounts in excess of \$25,000, increasing the tax rate as the amount of inheritance increases. This tax would impose no burdens upon the average man, but would place the burden where it properly belongs. It would impose the burden on the men who through graft and other illegitimate processes gained fortunes while our boys were undergoing the hardships and privations of war. This tax might also be augmented by another form of taxation covering that of gifts where the amount of the gift exceeds \$10,000. These two taxes would produce abundant revenue to meet all the obligations of the soldiers' bonus and would also contribute to the payment of the ordinary expenses of government, thereby making the burdens of the common people rest more lightly upon their shoulders.

Those who so bitterly oppose the granting of any bonus to the ex-service men of America, and who cry the Nation's poverty as an excuse for so doing, might find some consolation in the fact that this administration has through its program of economy lessened the expenses of government until we are able to assure a saving of some \$800,000,000 in taxes for the fiscal year. Through the wise leadership of the matchless statesman, Warren G. Harding, we have restored the Nation to a sound business basis, and as a result of his remarkable diplomacy treaties have been negotiated with the four leading powers of the earth by which we will be enabled to save in the next 10 years in the reduction of armaments a sum estimated at some \$10,000,000,000. This achievement was attained without the sacrifice of our national honor and without assuming the burdens of entangling alliances with foreign powers. Instead of increasing armaments and maintaining an Army of 500,000 soldiers, as was desired by the former administration, we have reduced the number of our standing Army to 150,000, and will, with the passage of the Army bill which is now under consideration in the House, still further reduce the size of the Army to a number not exceeding 115,000. We have reduced the bonded indebtedness of the Nation approximately \$2,000,000,000 in the last 12 months, and have restored the confidence of the people until Liberty bonds, which were selling at an amount far below par during the last year of the former administration, are now bringing from 97 cents to slightly more than their face value. The increase in the market value of Liberty bonds alone, which are distributed among 15,000,000 American citizens, amounts to more than \$2,000,000,000.

In the face of this showing we are led to believe that the propaganda that is being circulated through the press and in paid circulars has no ground upon which to stand other than that the profiteers of America are willing to sacrifice national and individual honor in order to save themselves from a loss on their ill-gotten gains.

I want to see every mother who gave her son to her country's cause and every mother who sent her son to war made happy by a Nation's acknowledgment of their heroic deeds. In the trenches, in the field, in the air their boys met the picked soldiery of the world and carried the Stars and Stripes again and again to triumphant victory. They recovered the lost fields of France; they revived the courage of the Allies; they won for our posterity and for civilization a fight that had been lost; and they saved for humanity the ideals of a liberty-loving people. They laid a surer foundation for the perpetuity of our Government. They deserve the thanks of a grateful Nation, the blessings of a rescued world, and recognition that means more than empty words. They deserve and shall receive a just compensation, and with every dollar thus received the prayers and hopes of the American people that out of their sacrifices shall have come an era of peace eternal and everlasting. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, it is, of course, very obvious that the ground we are discussing and the question we are considering, as to what should be the commissioned personnel to be maintained in the Regular Military Establishment, has been gone over times without number here. I can hear the echoes of my own words as I have repeated at various times the arguments that come to my mind to-day. There really is nothing new about it.

The unfortunate part of it is that at just such a time as this we are suddenly confronted with the determination of a mili-

tary policy for which there has been no general preparation, and I am sure the Members on the floor will frankly admit that fact. It is obvious, too, that most of us come here to this Chamber without much specialization in military affairs. We do not take time to inform ourselves, because in civil life we are not interested in it, although most of the other functions we are called upon to perform here as legislators relate to matters with which we are familiar in our everyday and commonplace experiences back in our private life. We are familiar with the terminology, we are familiar with the relations of things, we are familiar with the reasons for the existence of those various other institutions concerning which we are called upon to legislate, and when we come to act here we act upon that general commonplace knowledge obtained from our everyday experience. We supplement that general knowledge by more specific and direct inquiry into these affairs, and so we act intelligently. But our experience with armies has been limited to seeing a few troops go by in some military pageant on Memorial Day, or with navies to going down to the harbor sometimes to see a distant ship.

People do not pay much attention to the Army. It lives in an atmosphere peculiar to itself. It lives with a language and terminology that most folks do not take the trouble to understand, because they are not interested in it. It has certain traditions, certain customs, a certain philosophy born of the centuries through which men have fought and fought. There are certain lessons of the battle field, even from antiquity, that are part and parcel of the professional life and understanding of these men that are not easily to be made plain to others under the five-minute rule in the House of Representatives, even if one thought one knew something about it.

Now, the theory and philosophy of our present military law are so plain to those who spent months in the preparation of it, and its purposes are so practical, so apparently within the general policy of the United States through all these many years, that it does seem a pity to think that under the technicality of the Holman rule, that camouflage, that pretext may be set up here to juggle with some figures, and underneath it absolutely destroy the military policy established in the Army reorganization act of June 4, 1920.

That military policy was based upon many lessons of the war. The Committee on Military Affairs took 12 months to prepare and put through the House that bill. The preparation of that law included a trip, after the armistice, to our Army in Germany and in France, to the British Army, the Belgian Army, and the French Army. It was seriously done. It was no junketing experience, as any man who accompanied the committee will say. Then back home here, with long consultations and hearings with the representatives of the War Department, with the representatives of the Army of all shades of thought, with representatives of the National Guard, and with men in civil life generally interested in the national defense. Finally a bill was written, and it was hoped and believed that after such mature deliberation it was written with some sense of establishing what might be an enduring policy until a possible future war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. And it was written with the idea that many lessons of this last war should be incorporated into its terms as nearly as might be practicable in any law.

Now, the basic lesson, if one may apply such an emphatic term to it, as far as the personnel was concerned, was one learned out of the World War, and that was the lamentable scarcity of trained and matured commissioned officers when we went into the war, and afterwards in our conduct of it.

War has come to be something besides mere men of the jungle coming to brutish grips. War has come to be something more than it was through so many centuries, pretty much limited to the mere physical struggle of great masses of men. It has come to be a combat between Titans, not only between their bodily natures but their moral forces and the subtle intricacies of modern mechanics and science as well. People do not realize the character and complexity of the education required of a commissioned officer in the Regular Army of the United States to-day. People do not realize that it is a learned and scientific profession. He starts at 21 years old, and he will tell you if he is honest—and that is a part of his code, to speak the truth—"on his honor as an officer and a gentleman"—he will tell you that when he arrives at about the age to retire he has reached a stage when he has some mature knowledge of the art of war.

That is what experienced men say of other professions, and there is much foundation for believing that officers in the Army are quite as sincere and quite as practical about it in their own.

We undertook at the beginning of the last war to prepare young men as commissioned officers for troops in the field by a three months' intensive course at training camps. Everybody knows that that was a makeshift, but we were able to get much bright material and made considerable progress after we got some of the newness rubbed off. And most of those young men afterwards acquitted themselves gloriously in the service. Yet no man will seriously maintain but that that which constitutes a life profession, to be studied daily in long times of peace, would require a larger opportunity than that which was afforded by a hurly-burly scramble to get into the war in three months by men who never had experience in military affairs.

We need officers who are not only learned in the technique of military science but officers who are experienced in the art of command, in the operations of troops; officers who understand men and know how to handle them, how to preserve discipline in a humane way; officers who have become mature minded and seasoned in judgment.

In the new law, therefore, we laid emphasis on the fact that we needed experienced and matured commissioned officers, men who give their lifetime to study, practice, and training in all that pertains to military science and the maintenance of a military establishment. We laid down the foundation without any reference whatever, in a broad sense, to the mathematical ratio as to the number of enlisted men that would be maintained in the Regular Army. The commissioned officers are the only ones who make a permanent Army, the men who make it a life-time profession. The enlisted man may come and go, but the commissioned officer stays through thick and thin, through peace and war.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. No; I am sorry I can not.

Our policy was never to maintain a fighting Army. There is no use to argue about it when men call upon us to reduce the Army just because we had a conference of foreign powers and an agreement to reduce the Navy. That conference had no reference to the military land forces whatever. We never have maintained a fighting Army. We did maintain a fighting Navy, ready to go to sea and fight, but we never have done it with the Army. Everybody understands, and has always understood who has taken the pains to look into the matter, that our Army has been simply a garrison and police and training Army, and that we keep and try to keep only those numbers of men that would suit those three functions in an economic way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has again expired.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Vermont be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Our theory is wisely to maintain as comparatively limited a professional force as we can to sustain those three functions. We have necessary garrisons. No matter how much we may whittle them down, there are some always that we must have, in order properly to police the country. When the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] said that one soldier to-day was equal to eight soldiers before the war because he had equipment and armament that make him eight times as powerful, he failed to mention the fact that, notwithstanding all of these inventions of man, the Almighty had not made the soldier eight times as ubiquitous, and that he never could do any better than to be in one place at one time; he can not possibly be in eight places at one time, and he can not be all over this continental America at the same time. That is the reason you can not compare our figures with European figures.

The gentleman from Mississippi cited figures of the British estimates. Britain is providing for an army in a small, circumscribed, insular area. We have to expand our Army over a great continental area, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific. And yet Great Britain, recognizing the theory of what we are talking about to-day, is trying to maintain the upkeep of commissioned officers, because when Great Britain proposes through the ministry to cut down the number of enlisted men, she also proposes in proportion to raise the number of commissioned personnel, because they are her only trained and permanent army.

Outside of this garrison or this police purpose, we have wisely depended on raising a citizen army for purposes of war, and that is a sound policy. It is consistent with our national character. The minute we begin to have a permanent fighting force in peace time, the minute we begin to pay bands of mercenaries to fight for us, then we no longer have a country worth fighting for. Every man ought to bear his share in some way, somehow, in national defense. But these commissioned officers of the Regular Army are the only men in the United States who make a profession of the science of arms in time of peace. They are the only men who give their whole lifetime up to it, and they are the men upon whom we rely, distributed throughout the country, to impart the art of war to the National Guard, the schools and colleges, the reserves, and all of the other civilian agencies and institutions that are preparing the civilian youth of this land to come to the colors at any time when the country may need defense. They are the men upon whom we rely to preserve from generation to generation an active and growing knowledge of the art of war while the rest of their fellow countrymen are following the paths of peace. They are the men upon whom we must rely in time of emergency to prepare and put our war armies into the field to save the country.

If any one can say precisely how many officers we need for that purpose, then he can do better than the War Department can do, or than any committee of this Congress can do. It must admittedly be at best a compromise. No one can put his finger with exactitude on the number. That is obvious.

The American policy of training a civilian population to national defense is a growing thing, but it already is a fact that the tactical organizations of the Army to-day do not have their sufficient complement of officers, and are not getting the proper training in consequence, and the reason for it is that even with what officers we have now the demand is very great for their distribution to these various civilian agencies about which I have been talking, because the public is calling for them day after day, and they are called for in greater numbers than the War Department is able to furnish them.

It is now proposed to reduce the number even by 2,000 from what we have to-day. I say to you, and I say it with all earnestness—and you can cry "militarist" or whatever you may—it is a pity that we can not seem ever to learn any lesson following any war. Nobody is worrying about a foreign war, nobody is frantic about the possibility of our getting into clinches with any foreign Government at this time. The world is tired out and does not want to fight. But we are making a most stupid, a most egregious blunder, a folly of follies, if we permit through our sense of false security the art of war to languish throughout our country, and bring up a generation of young men whose idea is that they have nothing to do but to go their full threescore years and ten, skipping through a fool's paradise, and that in time of war we can call immediately into being a great, forceful, and efficient Army that will spring like Minerva, armed cap-a-pie, from the brain of Jove himself. It is all humbug. [Applause.]

We have been through the results of this same folly war after war, and we have needlessly lost hundreds of thousands of brave young boys because of it. We have sacrificed thousands of men in every war because of untrained officer leadership.

Nobody pretends that we can be absolutely prepared to the last nail, right down to the possibility of never losing anything. We know that it is difficult for Republics to go to war in any event, because they go clumsily into war. They are never so well prepared as are nations under different forms of Government. But at least Republics, if they are more sensible than the other nations about their Government, ought to be equally sensible in remembering some of the lessons those wars teach. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has again expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] and I am against the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN]. I am for the bill. I believe the time has come when we ought to understand what the situation is. The gentleman from California wants 13,000 officers, the gentleman from Mississippi wants 9,000, the Chief of Staff of the Army wants 12,000, and the Committee on Appropriations recommends 11,000.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Not just now.

Mr. KEARNS. I understand he wants 13,000.

Mr. MADDEN. He wants 12,000, with the understanding that he will put back a thousand a year from now. I do not believe the gentleman from California speaks for the sentiment of his country exactly. At any rate, if the following telegram has any significance, I would judge that he does not:

OAKLAND, CALIF., March 19.

CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS:

Sentiment here strongly opposed to retaining top-heavy, swollen commissioned personnel in the Army. Taxpayers and producers on reduced pay see no justice in their continuing to support an inflated pay this absurdly large body of consumers.

ROTARIAN CONVENTION.

That is not from an individual; that telegram is from men from every walk of life. [Applause.] The gentleman from California, when we reach another stage of this bill, will offer an amendment to increase the Army to 150,000 men.

The gentleman from Mississippi will offer an amendment to reduce the Army to 100,000 men. I am opposed to both of those amendments when they come before the House. The Committee on Appropriations come to you with the recommendation of 115,000 men and 7,000 Philippine Scouts, making an Army of 122,000 men, and we propose to reduce the cost of the Army as proposed by the Army from \$350,000,000 a year to \$224,000,000 a year. [Applause.] We are trying to speak for the men and women of the Nation who pay the taxes. We have no fear that any harm is going to befall any interest in America because we have not a very large Army. We believe the Army we propose will meet every emergency that may arise. I congratulate the Secretary of War for the order he has issued under the direction of the President to bring back the Army from the Rhine. [Applause.] The Committee on Appropriations recommended that. I do not say that action was taken on our recommendation, but I do say that we did that without any thought of what was in the mind of the President or the Secretary of War.

We believed the time had come to bring back the Army [applause] on American soil and confine the Army to the conduct of American activities. [Applause.] We propose to reduce the cost of the Army by \$67,000,000 a year. Do you want that reduction, or do you want the taxpayers to be overloaded with these excessive burdens? There is no taxpayer in the Union to-day who is not pleading for relief. Are you willing to grant that relief, or are you insistent upon having a large Army to please the military men of the United States? Who says there is danger to America; who claims with any degree of certainty we are in trouble or likely to be? There is no opportunity to-day, as there has been in the past, to lead that we are liable to be at war with Japan. That bugaboo has been dissipated. The Conference on the Limitation of Armaments set that aside. Now, what is the trouble? What is it that impels these people to demand untold expenditures for the maintenance of the Military Establishment? Have the people of the Nation no rights that even the Military Establishment is bound to respect? Are we to be forever confronted with the argument that we are unprepared. What is there to-day to be prepared for? If there is anything, is it not peace? Peace is the thing that is uppermost in the mind of every man, every woman, and every child in America. War is to be abhorred. We can only reflect the thought of the people of the Nation by translating this bill into a reduction of the cost of Government. [Applause.] Your Committee on Appropriations proposes that, and we come to you in all sincerity hoping you will agree that we have been reasonable in our reductions. Let me make a comparison. The strength of the Army in 1915 was 101,195. It had 4,798 officers. The expenditures for the Military Establishment then amounted to \$115,600,000. We are to-day proposing \$224,000,000, and yet the Army says that is not enough. The strength of the Army to-day is 139,000. The number of officers is 13,000. We propose to reduce the strength of the Army to 122,000 and the number of officers to 11,000. The appropriation for the maintenance of the Military Establishment we propose to reduce to \$224,000,000. The National Guard in 1915 had 129,000 men. The appropriations for the National Guard in 1915 were \$7,500,000. The National Guard enlisted strength at the present time is 142,000 men, and we propose by this bill to appropriate for them \$21,000,000, and still the Army says we are unprepared and not giving them proper consideration. The student officers' reserve training corps last year were 97,000. That corps did not exist in 1915, so in addition to the Army we have a student officers' training corps to-day of 97,000. The civilian training camps last year were 11,000. We train them at the cost of the Treasury and the estimates for the training camps for the coming year under this bill will be 30,000 men. The commissioned Officers' Reserve Corps to-day are 65,000 men. In 1915 there was not a man. Who says we are not prepared; who says

we are not doing justice to the Army? We are making appropriations for all these activities. The strength of the Army, persons in civil life, in 1915, were provided training outside of the Regular Army, and the National Guard and Spanish-American War veterans practically none.

At the present time there are over 2,000,000 men with training received during the recent war and nearly 200,000 officers who saw service and received training during the war. The number of military posts in 1915 throughout the country and ordnance establishments was 230. Now there are 290, and the Army, because we, forsooth, have 60 more military posts and ordnance establishments, want more men to man the posts. Why, we had better burn up the posts if we have to employ a larger number of men to maintain them when they are not needed. [Applause.] The time has come when we must make the Army to meet the situation and not to man posts simply because the posts are there. We had no Air Service in 1915, and now we have 19 flying fields, which include 4 fields which are parts of other military posts and 15 separate flying fields, and we are providing for them, and the value of flying equipment to-day is \$361,000,000, and there was not a dollar of this in 1915; and yet they say we are not prepared, and that this bill proposes to disintegrate that Army. This bill proposes to make an Army that can function for the American people and at the same time it recognizes the right of the American people to some relief from the burdens of taxation for the Military Establishment. Now, we had no Chemical Warfare Service in 1915. The present Chemical Warfare Service has one splendidly equipped plant at the Edgewood Arsenal. The ordnance plants in 1915 numbered 13, and the land value was \$28,000,000.

The present ordnance plants number 37, with a cost value of \$411,000,000, and they have ordnance stores to-day of \$1,355,313,000, as against \$60,000,000 in 1915. Who says this bill is not in the interest of preparedness? Who says that we are destroying the Army? Who says that we are not giving proper consideration to the defense of the land? Who says there is going to be a war? Where is it to be? What are we to do? Are we to keep millions of men in uniform in anticipation of a war never likely to occur, at any rate, during our day? The time has come when the American Congress must declare to the American people for a system of peace, and that is what this bill does. This bill declares for a system of peace, and at the same time declares for a system of security. [Applause.]

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

Mr. WURZBACH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to put myself on record as opposed to the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] and as being generally opposed to the proposition of cutting down the size of our present Army. I realize that it would take more time than is available to me under the five-minute rule to discuss this proposition. We all know that the Army appropriation bill that is before this committee for consideration involves one great, outstanding issue, and that is the question of the reduction of our Army. I regret very much that under the rules and under the practice that prevails in this House it is possible for the gentlemen having control of the time for debate to be lavish in the granting of time to gentlemen who discuss matters extraneous to the bill and limit and practically prevent debate on the real issue involved. Nine hours of general debate was agreed to on this bill—four and one-half hours under control of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] and four and one-half hours under control of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson], both of whom are strongly in favor of the reduction of the Army. Of the 9 hours, only 36 minutes were allowed to those opposed to the reduction, 30 minutes to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, and 6 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE]. Other Members requested time, without success. Gentlemen were given liberal time to discuss matters not connected in any way with the proposed legislation, and others were recognized to discuss parts of the bill about which there was no controversy and no issue. I have the highest respect and regard for the committee in charge of this bill, but I submit that the important part of this bill was not permitted to be presented as fully and fairly as it ought to have been.

I am not militaristic. I am in favor of having a strong defensive but not an offensive Army. I can not understand why such great deference should be paid the judgment of a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and so little respect paid to the judgment of the Committee on Military Affairs, the legislative committee, and especially why so little respect is paid to the experts who are qualified to pass upon this question—I mean the trained and experienced officers of our Army—

and I include herein the President of the United States, who is the Commander in Chief of our armies.

I have noticed since I have been a Member of this House that some Members delight to reflect upon the good faith and sincerity of the officers of the Regular Army of the United States. I hope that that sentiment does not prevail generally among the Members. I hope that this issue of whether or not we will cut the Army or whether we will keep it at its present size will be decided by the real facts, and not by prejudice. Why should a Member of this House, why should any American citizen whose memory goes back the short space of three or four years, look down with disdain and disrespect upon the officers of the Army of the United States? We know that the Regular Army was the foundation upon which the entire fighting force of America was built. I am willing to ascribe to those men equal sincerity, equal honesty, equal patriotism, to that of any Member of this House. They were tried, and not found wanting, in the grim test of fire and blood in the greatest war of all times. We trusted them then, why not now?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WURZBACH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending motion be limited to a reasonable time.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I suggest that debate on the pending motions be closed in 45 minutes. Will that be agreeable? I also request that the debate be limited to five minutes for each Member. The committee would like to have 15 minutes on this side of the House.

Mr. SISSON. For myself and members of the committee on this side I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think that would be fair. Forty-five minutes on the debate on the pending amendments, 15 minutes to go to the Committee on Appropriations, and half an hour to go to the other gentlemen.

Mr. TEMPLE. Reserving the right to object, does not that include the request also that no person speaking shall have more than five minutes?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that all debate on the amendments now pending be limited to 45 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, I would like to know if the five minutes granted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WURZBACH] is included in that?

Mr. HULL. Reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that he asked for objections, but heard no objection.

Mr. WURZBACH. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, if we were willing a few years ago to entrust the well-being, the health, and the lives of 4,000,000 American boys to the officers of the Army of the United States that we ought to be willing, at least, to pay some attention, some heed to their advice in this matter, to which they have given a lifetime's study. This does not in any sense imply a surrender of congressional authority or an evasion of congressional responsibility.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WURZBACH. I will.

Mr. McSWAIN. What is the advice of the officers as to how many officers should be in the Army? I have not heard the advice. Has the gentleman heard it?

Mr. WURZBACH. I have only a short time to discuss this question, but I want to say to the gentleman that the President of the United States—that may not mean much to your side of the House, but I want to call it to the attention of the Members on this side of the House—that the President of the United States; the Commander in Chief of the American Armies; the Secretary of War; General Pershing—and I would rather refer to him as the leader of the American forces across the sea than as Chief of Staff—and, in fact, every military expert that has expressed himself upon this question, is opposed to the reduction of the Army as suggested by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, made up of five men who have had very little experience, if any, in matters of this kind, men selected, I suppose, by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who has had no military experience at all. I commend the Appropriations Committee in its purpose to reduce the expenses of Government, but I believe the American people are more

interested in the way public money is spent than in the amount that is spent.

If we concede then, as we must, equal sincerity of purpose, equal devotion to the Nation's service, and if we further recognize—as we surely must—that a life's study of a problem makes one better qualified on any subject than does the casual consideration given by the average Congressman, it follows as a natural and logical conclusion that the burden of proof rests upon the committee and upon the Congress to show that the recommendations of the officers of the Army are unwise, unreasonable, or unwarranted. I submit that the Appropriations Committee has not successfully borne that burden. But, on the contrary, every witness who testified before the committee, according to the printed hearings, takes issue direct with the conclusions of the committee. The judgment of the committee is not only not supported by the testimony, but is in direct conflict therewith. Therefore, having the same confidence in our Army now that I had in 1917 and 1918, and having heard or read no word of testimony controverting the testimony of the officers of the Army, I shall vote to sustain their conclusions.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Which Army does the gentleman refer to—the Army of 150,000 or the existing Army of 120,000?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, in the limited time allotted me it is impossible even to make a clear statement of my own views regarding this bill. I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] and I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN]; and in connection with his proposition to appropriate for 13,000 officers I want to say that this is only asking for an appropriation as recommended in the bill prepared by General Pershing himself. That bill does reduce the number of officers temporarily to 12,000, but it also provides that the number of officers shall be increased from the bottom up from the lower ranks and decreased from the top down, until it shall have reached the 13,000; and that number is what we should appropriate for, and there is no inconsistency between the fact that the bill introduced by the gentleman from California and reported to this House calls for 12,000 officers and the amendment offered by the gentleman from California asking for pay for 13,000 officers, because that is what it will be before the fiscal year ends.

Now, I would like to refer if I had the time to the fact that the officer personnel has cost us the most, and is one of the most precious inheritances we have as a result of the military system built up during the war. And I ask you, gentlemen, as good business men, is it good judgment to destroy an organization of that kind unnecessarily? Would any business man think of doing that with his business organization, or would any educational institution think of doing it with its faculty or its working force? I think you would say no.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. I would rather not be interrupted. I have a personal view that I wish to present. I hope the gentleman will excuse me. I am trying to follow the policy of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Army, and of the Secretary of War, whom many of us know as a level-headed, patriotic American who is not going unnecessarily to burden the taxpayers of this country with an excessive number of Army officers. Will you pardon me when I state in a rather personal way my own view of this question?

I am not disposed to condemn the framers of this bill merely because I differ from them in their ideas as to what constitutes a proper Army and proper national defense. I have served for years with two members of this subcommittee, and know that they honestly desire to do what, in their opinion, is best not only for the Army but for the entire country. I do not doubt but that this is the attitude of all the members of the subcommittee. However, the other day when this bill was under consideration the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson], in what I suppose he intended as a facetious remark, referred to certain persons as "militarists." We have heard the term used often to-day. I do not, of course, know just what he means by this term; but I do know that my interest in doing what little I can to help my country adopt a safe, sane, sensible policy of national defense comes from anything else than a "militarist" spirit on my part.

It comes, I can say to the gentleman, from the fact that I hate war and all the name implies; and yet when I say I hate war I mean I hate it because of what I have actually experienced, and not as a mere theorist who is afraid of it. [Ap-

plause.] In 1898 and 1899 I saw our boys from Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Kansas, Minnesota, Colorado, Iowa, Nebraska, the Dakotas, Washington, California, Nevada, Wyoming, Oregon, Montana, and Utah make the supreme sacrifice under fire between the point where the enemy guns were effective and the point from which our old antiquated guns, with which our troops were armed, could effectively return the enemy fire. I saw these men in hospitals without proper care and attention because our Medical Corps was not properly organized, and because our medical officers—good men as they were—were compelled to use methods, remedies, and surgical instruments bequeathed to these organizations from the days of the Civil War.

When I saw these things I knew there was something wrong, and I was disposed, like many others, to blame the War Department for these conditions. I made up my mind then, if I could do so, I would try to remedy conditions which made it possible to send our young men to certain death because of a lack of proper arms and equipment. Since those days I have given the subject much consideration. I have read our military histories, and was at first disposed to resent the charges that Congress, and not the War Department, was at fault; but my experience in this House and what we have witnessed during the years of the World War, when the War Department was for the first time in our history given unlimited power and thus unhampered achieved such wonderful results, has convinced me that Congress has been largely at fault; and while I now repeat I hate war, I also add that I hate, despise, and pity the false arguments for economy heard on the floor of this House after every war, arguments which have resulted in destroying the national defense which we had builded during the wars, and thus paralyzing the forces which stood between us and war and made necessary so great a sacrifice when war did come. I will gladly and reverently pray with you that war may never come to us again, but in the meantime I want to work with all real Americans to build up such safeguards as will make war impossible or would put us as a Nation, if war did come, in such a situation that we would not be compelled to send our young men forth to needless slaughter, while behind their dead bodies we frantically and feverishly attempted to do that which should have been done during the days of peace. [Applause.]

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

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the form in which these amendments are presented to the House gives a great advantage in favor of the committee. We have the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson], who wants an Army of 100,000; we have the gentleman from California [Mr. Kahn], who wants the Army in about its present form; and we have the committee standing in between. I think it is important for the Members of the House who really believe in having an Army such as is necessary for our security to see to it that this advantage does not give the vote of this House in favor of the proposal of the Committee on Appropriations.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. Madden], who is entitled to credit not only at the hands of the House but at the hands of the country for the work he has done in behalf of economy, says that this House owes a duty to the country to bring about economy. That is true. But this House owes a paramount duty to this country, paramount to every other duty, to see that the security of this country, with her teeming millions of people, is assured. [Applause.]

They say we have had a disarmament conference. We had a conference with reference to the limitation of naval armaments, and, just so far as we can get our competitors to go, I believe is bringing about limitation of armaments.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations asks, with what country is there danger of war? I do not know.

So, gentlemen, you have got the question before you, whether you are to obey the imaginary duty of practicing economy to the point where we shall not be properly defended, or whether you are going to obey the paramount and real duty to see that we are adequately defended, and I ask you to support the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. Kahn] and the other amendment that he is going to offer subsequently, so that we can maintain an Army at the standard that all our military advisers say it ought to be maintained at, and give us an adequate military defense of our country. [Applause.]

REDUCTION OF THE ARMY BELOW 150,000 IS A MENACE TO OUR SECURITY.

The Army of the United States under the existing law is now reduced to 150,000. It is proposed by this Army appropriation bill to reduce the Army to 115,000, and it has been proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] by amendment to further reduce it to 100,000. I do not believe the

Republic will be secure if we reduce the Army below 150,000. The Secretary of War and all military advice is opposed to further reduction. We have a very great duty to our people to pursue the course of economy and not to expend a single dollar not needed. We have a paramount duty above every duty to preserve this Republic with her millions of citizens secure from attack from without and from insurrection from within.

Our greatest security from dangers within is in the conduct of government so that ills and grievances of our people will be cured and redressed by a Government just to all. But we ought to have a force great enough to quell any internal disturbances by those who might not be satisfied with such government.

Our greatest security from dangers without lies in establishing and maintaining such friendly relations with other nations as shall encourage peace. We should accord to them just treatment even to the point of tolerance. But we ought to have a nucleus for an Army great enough to build up a combat Army to defend against any nation which might attack us notwithstanding such just treatment. The former administration urged a peace time Army of over 500,000; that, in my opinion, was too high. The present administration is opposed to a reduction below 150,000. Consideration for our security and safety should warn us not to disregard this recommendation. Disarm! We are already disarmed. It has never been our policy to maintain a combat Army in peace time, and we do not now have a combat Army, but we must maintain an Army large enough to quell internal disturbances and to furnish a skeleton organization upon which to build a combat Army if necessary.

I believe in limitation of armament. I am happy to know that as a result of the arms conference we are to reduce our naval armaments and save the country two or three hundred millions annually.

Just as far as we can get our competitors to disarm, just so far we ought to go. But this is international disarmament to cut our own Army below the safety zone without any international agreement is national disarmament and national folly. [Applause.]

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

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am not a militarist, and I certainly could not be called a pacifist. I do not know much about military matters, but I believe I do know a little something about the history of this war. I have heard considerable comment here about our unprepared condition when we entered the last war. We were unprepared, my friends. I think nobody in the House knows that more thoroughly than I after having groped through the intricacies of these matters for two years. We were unprepared, but we were not unprepared in the way of men to go to the fighting line. We were unprepared in the things that men needed to fight with.

We had nothing to fight with. We had armies in the field, trained men ready to fight, long before we had anything to fight with. Now, there was one other thing in which we were lacking—

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No; I can not yield. I have not the time just now. Perhaps I will yield in a moment. There was one other thing in which we were lacking, and that was trained officers. When we went into the war we found suddenly, after our declaration of war in 1917, that we were thrown into that great conflict without an adequate number of officers to guide us, so that untrained officers had to do the work; and if there is anything that this war has taught us it ought to be this, that never again should we be found without a sufficient corps of adequately trained officers. [Applause.] You can get the men to fight in the ranks. You can take an American boy and in six weeks' time you can make as good a soldier out of him as there is in the world, but it takes years to train an officer. Do you know the one thing that caused most of the losses and the most of the extravagance in the construction of our camps? That work was done by what was called the construction division. How many officers did we have in it? We had four commissioned officers in the construction division when the war broke out. What did we find it necessary to do, therefore? We called in contractors, the men who were in the building business, and turned the job over to them, and they wasted our money by the hundreds of millions of dollars. What did we do in the quartermaster's and ordnance departments? We had a very small corps of trained officers and we called in the contractors, the men who had shoes to sell, the men who had clothing to sell, and all that sort of thing, and we said, "Here, take charge of this, because there is nobody here who can do it." Gentlemen of the House, there was not an

officer in the quartermaster's department of our Army when the war broke out who knew how to buy a yard of cloth or a pair of shoes intelligently. Yet when this war has given us some officers, when we have a corps of trained men who know something about that business, are we going to discharge them now and cut down our force, and throw away what it cost us, \$30,000,000, to learn in this war? My friends, I am going to vote for the Kahn amendment. [Applause.] It is the right thing to do. Let us keep our trained officers. They are mighty hard to get. So far as the men in the ranks are concerned, I shall not go along on that proposition, because I do not think it is necessary to have now a large enlisted personnel, but I do think we ought to keep these officers, every one of them, in the Army, because there may come a time when we will need them as we have in the last few years. I think I have learned these things from this war, and I am saying them now because I think it is my duty to say to you what I believe our experience has taught us as an American people. [Applause.]

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, perhaps the things that I will have occasion to say have been said a number of times in one way or another this afternoon, but I want to impress upon your minds the importance of this amendment. I will say that every expert who appeared before the Appropriations Committee counseled against the limitation of 11,000 officers that this committee have provided for in this bill. The Secretary of War asked for 13,000 officers in the Army. He certainly can not be classed as a militarist. The head of the General Staff, General Pershing—I do not have him in mind so much now as the head of the General Staff as the man who led the American forces successfully in France—told this committee that it would be absolutely impossible for the Army to get along with less than an officer personnel of 13,000. Then, why do gentlemen conclude that the Committee on Appropriations ought to be followed in the face of all this technical evidence of men who have made a study of this matter? They have warned the members of this committee that the Army will suffer if the number is cut down below 13,000. Yet this committee comes into this House and arbitrarily asks for 2,000 less officers, and some men in this House indicate that they are about to follow the committee who have no information upon this subject except information that would teach them to the contrary.

Gentlemen, I want to appeal to each one of you who has in mind the good of the American Army, to listen to these men who know about these matters, and not to follow the advice of those who do not know and have not heeded the warning which they have received. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the committee in recommending the reduction in the number of officers and in the number of enlisted men have in no instance sought to do violence to the existing establishment. In a few words I think I will be able to show to you that so far as the commissioned personnel is concerned the number recommended by the committee is warranted.

When we had an Army of 101,000 men at the close of June, 1915, we had but 4,798 officers. At that time we had no officers in training at the various schools and colleges throughout the country, in the reserve officers' training corps, or any of the other activities that the Army reorganization act provides for. At the present time we have 12,936. Where are they? In the Medical Corps, for instance, there are more than 250 than are authorized under existing law. When we questioned the officer of that corps who came before us as to the justification for that number he could not give any reason for it except that they were in the service. Now, we have taken those 250 into consideration, and many more who are surplus to that provided by law, as in the Dental Corps, the Veterinary Corps, and lopped them off from the present force. At the close of June, 1915, there were but 185 commissioned officers in the Quartermaster Corps, subsistence and finance divisions. To-day there are 993, or over 800 more officers.

Now, take the Coast Artillery Corps. Everybody in this House, even those who have no special information on this subject, knows that there is not to-day need for the same number of officers in our Coast Artillery, because we are curtailing activities in our fortifications. In 1915 we had 728 in that corps. To-day, with not many more fortifications than then, we have 1,099, or 350 more. In the Infantry we had 1,604. To-day we have 4,111, or 2,500 more than we had then. General Pershing came before our committee and said he was in favor of reducing the existing officer personnel to 12,000, getting rid of the deadwood.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I can not yield. I have not the time. We take the conservative position and only put it at 11,000.

We do not seek to reduce the number of cadets at the Military Academy. That goes on and will replenish the Army with its younger officers. We do not seek to cut down the activities of the service connected with the colleges where we are preparing officers in reserve in case of future emergency. We expect that there will be no war in the next 10 years, but if there were war here are thousands upon thousands of officers who served in the World War—65,000 all told in the Officers' Reserve Corps—6,000 of them who have been brought into the service, increasing the number of officers to more than 12,000. Would the 65,000 officers in the Officers' Reserve Corps refuse to do their duty if an emergency arose?

Every one of the subcommittee will challenge the assertion made by the gentleman who preceded me that the committee has not given a thorough consideration to the matter. Eight weeks of continuous service was given to acquiring information from officers of the War Department. The amazing fact is that notwithstanding the Limitation of Arms Conference, not a recommendation from any officer or official of the War Department was made to reduce the estimates prepared many months before that conference met. Great Britain, notwithstanding its many dominion disorders, recognized the call for reduction of military expenses and cut the Army appropriation for next year more than \$100,000,000. True, our committee received no help from the Military Establishment to meet the demand for less military burdens. We did it regardless of whether we came from districts that had forts or fortifications or posts or arsenals; our duty was to do what we believed was right to the taxpayers, what was right to the country in general, and not to create any hayoc or ravage to the officer personnel, but to carry out General Pershing's own recommendations to reduce the officers to 12,000 and then reduce the Medical Corps and other non-combatant services where no harm would be done to the existing personnel. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, nothing could better illustrate the wisdom of the decision arrived at by the committee than the fact that the two motions that have been made representing the extreme views on this subject leave the decision of the committee squarely midway between them. The path of wisdom can generally be found somewhere in the middle ground between the extremes of opinion and sentiment, and while there may be some little ground for difference of opinion as to the size of the commissioned personnel of our Regular Army, the fact that the decision arrived at by the committee is squarely midway between the extreme views of the little-army men and the big-army men is, in my opinion, well-nigh conclusive proof that the committee is right. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, there is little time left, and I do not want to take much. Every man who has studied the last war knows that it is brains and tools that conduct business in war as in peace. Educated brains in a corps of officers are the first requisite, and for that reason the amendment to the national defense act in 1920 established a corps of officers of 17,679. Why? Because they were not merely to take care of the troops but they were to run the various parts of the Army, which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations referred to as Chemical Warfare, Aviation, National Guard, and the Reserves. You can go through it all, and brains are needed; and if you do not have them, we will be, as at the beginning of the war, without any trained officers. Last year, in 1921, we wanted to reduce expenses; but it is worth notice that the bill then prepared and passed by this same committee, while it reduced the Army from 280,000, including Philippine Scouts, to 150,000, besides Philippine Scouts, but did not reduce the officers by one man. That committee then recognized that officers were needed. We appropriated \$46,000,000 for officers' pay, and now it is proposed to cut this sum in half and more, though it is proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] to appropriate three-quarters of that sum for 13,000 officers instead of 17,000. Is not that enough of a cut? It is proposed by this bill to cut the number to 11,000 officers and \$26,000,000, and it is proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi to cut to 9,000 officers and \$21,000,000.

My friends, we have now nearly 13,000 officers, and they propose to rub out 2,000 of them. They propose in the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi to rub out 4,000 of these officers, the men upon whom we rely, men who have all had their war experience or regular training in military affairs. Where shall we get their substitutes in case of need? What will the young men say who thought that they were making the Army their life profession when they find that men who have done their duty, after 20 years of service as is provided for in this bill, are turned out because Congress says we do not want you? [Applause.]

If you want to have an enthusiastic corps of trained men to take care of your Army in time of war, stand by the Kahn amendment and do not turn people out. [Applause.]

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, it sounds very peculiar, indeed, during the discussion of this bill, to hear men spoken of as "big-army men" and "little-army men." The difference between 150,000 and 115,000 men is not enough to make the difference between a little Army and a big Army. Have we forgotten the recommendations that came from the Secretary of War and the President of the United States one year ago, have we forgotten the estimates that came in the annual Budget—we did not call it a Budget then, we spoke of it as the Book of Estimates—one year ago, estimates that we were considering in the House less than a year ago? The President and the Secretary of War had asked for a standing Army of 519,000 men and appropriations necessary to maintain that Army, amounting to somewhat more than \$699,000,000. Compared with these demands there are no big-army men in the House now.

What has changed the minds of so many of the Members? Perhaps the minds of the Members have not changed so much. This appropriation bill does not come from the same committee that the appropriation bill came from last year. This bill comes not from the Committee on Military Affairs, most of whom are familiar, through years of study, with military problems, but it comes from a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, disregarding the advice of the military authorities of the Nation. I believe in the new Budget plan, but I do not believe that the Committee on Appropriations should undertake to perform the functions of the legislative committees of the House. [Applause.] It was my good fortune to be on the committee that prepared the Budget legislation. I know that the House never intended the Committee on Appropriations to exercise legislative functions and fix the policies of the United States. [Applause.]

The policy of the United States concerning military matters ought to be fixed in legislation reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. As a matter of fact, the Congress did two years ago pass a bill which was intended to adopt a permanent policy with regard to national defense. That bill had been under consideration for more than a year; the committee had advised with the most competent students of military matters and the most experienced officers of the Army and administrators in the War Department. The size of the Army was cut far below what many of these advisors asked for, but the War Department, accepting the permanent policy adopted by Congress, has organized the Army in accordance with it. We have now less than 140,000 enlisted men in the Army and somewhat less than 13,000 commissioned officers. This bill proposes to appropriate only money enough to pay 115,000 enlisted men and 11,000 officers and to discharge the others unceremoniously. This can not have any other than a demoralizing effect on the remaining officers, who will not know what further cut in their numbers may be made next year. If we are to have no continuity of policy, we can have no Army. [Applause.]

We were told a few minutes ago that there is never going to be another war. If we were sure of that, if we could only be certain that we have arrived at the time when the nations shall learn war no more, we would not need even 115,000 men. We could beat our swords into plowshares and our spears into pruning hooks.

Even without that assurance it is not the policy of the United States to maintain a big Army which would be the real fighting force of the Nation if war should come. We do need, however, a nucleus, a training force for officers and men, around which we may develop a fighting force in case necessity should require it. We declared war in April, 1917, and then began our preparation for it. It was about 15 months before any considerable number of our troops were in actual contact with the enemy. It took us all this time to get ready. It was possible for us to take this time because the armies and navies of our friends were between us and our enemy. If necessity ever calls us again to fight, it is not at all likely that we shall have a year or more to get ready at our convenience.

In maintaining our present Army, untouched by the cut proposed by the Committee on Appropriations, we are no more than banking the fire that it may be ready promptly in case of need; but we do want red coals enough under the ashes to keep the fire from going out completely. We want the Army to be maintained in such condition and numbers that it would be able, if required, to kindle enthusiasm and communicate knowledge and efficiency to the much larger number which would be the real strength of the Nation. [Applause.]

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2440. An act extending the period for homestead entries on the south half of the Diminished Colville Indian Reservation.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 9859) making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following Senate concurrent resolution:

## Senate Concurrent Resolution 20.

Whereas the United States transport *Cambray* is expected to arrive in New York on or about March 30, bearing the last of the bodies of American soldiers from the battle fields of the World War: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a committee of five Senators, to be designated by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be designated by the Speaker, is authorized to represent the Congress at such services and ceremonies as may be determined upon as proper and appropriate. One-half of the expenses of such committee shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half out of the contingent fund of the House.

## WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE], who just took his seat, that in one sense of the word there are no big-army people left, except two. There are two big-army men in this House, and you can not make it too big for them. One is the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and the other is the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FISHER]. When they speak, the Army and Navy Club and the General Staff speak to you. There is another thing about this debate that has occurred to me. Every time you find a man who has ever worn the uniform of an officer as high as colonel, you find a militarist and a man who imagines that he has a peculiar knowledge of affairs that does not obtain in any other man. Another peculiar thing about the debate is that you will find a few men who will say that the only men who have a right to a belief about this matter are the men who sit a few days on the Military Affairs Committee, and that no one else has any judgment and sense about the matter at all. The Committee on Appropriations, in the consideration of the Army appropriation bill, has had the benefit of men who have been on the Committee on Military Affairs and the benefit of their knowledge. They were on the Committee on Military Affairs during the entire war, and appropriated billions of dollars during that time and changed the policy whenever they deemed it necessary. The chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on the military bill served for years on the Military Affairs Committee, and the ranking Democrats who served for many years on the Military Committee are now on the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. So, make the most of it if you want to. There are two members of the Committee on Military Affairs on this subcommittee that made up this bill. You have the opportunity to carry out in good faith a pledge which you and the Democratic Party made last campaign, and that is to reduce expenses.

You can not reduce expenditures very much except in the Army and the Navy. We have done the best we could in the other provisions of the bill, and there has been but little difference of opinion. I believed in making up the bill, and I believe now, that 9,000 officers are ample and if you adopt that amendment you save in the neighborhood of \$6,000,000. If you adopt the Kahn amendment you add to the amount of money over what you would expend, if my amendment were adopted, between eleven and twelve million dollars.

Men should bear in mind that when they create a great corps of officers they create that many more life tenures in office. If I had time I would like to discuss that most horrible bill ever introduced and passed through this Congress, the last reorganization bill. Under that bill the Army as now constituted does not have a single second lieutenant in it, and they contend that they are organizing their officers under the terms of that bill. Not only that, but under the terms of that law those men have life tenures in office like unto the United States Supreme Court judges, and men are already beginning to look upon it as a sacred thing when you make an Army officer out of a man. When did that come to be a sacred thing? That law is so bad that it actually smells to heaven. It is nothing more or less

than the work of the General Staff of this Army copied from the Prussian military force. Talk to me about the Military Affairs Committee having made up that bill! They did not do it, they simply viscéd it. That bill was prepared by the General Staff of the Army, and for their benefit and not for the benefit of the taxpayer.

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

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, when the committee came to the question of making the appropriation to provide for the proper number of officers for our Army we were faced, first, with a condition that in certain of the noncombatant corps—the Medical Corps, the Veterinary Corps, the Dental Corps, the Chaplain Corps, and others—there was an excess of officers over the number authorized by law and for which to-day there is not the least basic law upon which we can appropriate a dollar to pay them. The committee determined that it would not provide the money to pay their salaries and that it would provide the means to get them out of the Army. Next, we found that the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Pershing, a man in whom the committee has every confidence and in whom you have confidence, stated that there are in the Army to-day 13,000 officers, and that there were 1,000 of the least efficient of these whom he thinks should not be in the service. He has asked Congress for authority to get rid of them. In consequence the committee has provided for 11,000 officers, nearly a thousand of those we propose to get rid of belonging to these corps where there is a surplus above the number Congress says they can have and for which there is no authority of law to pay a dollar of salary, and the others, by which the commissioned strength is reduced, are the officers whom General Pershing says he should be allowed to take out of the service. The charge is made that this will cripple the Military Establishment. I deny that.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Some apprehension exists lest the training of students suffer by reason of the lack of reserve officers. Will the gentleman state whether or not this bill curtails that service?

Mr. ANTHONY. I am glad to say to the gentleman that the 11,000 officers will provide a sufficiently large number, so that the detail of every officer necessary for National Guard training, every officer necessary for schools, colleges, and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps work, every officer necessary for the Staff Corps of the Army, and still leave nearly double the number available to duty for the line of the Army than we had in 1915. In 1915 we had 4,798 officers, all told, in the Army. To-day there are some in excess of 6,000 with the line of the Army, leaving 5,000 under the 11,000 maximum under this bill for all other kinds of service, a reservoir from which we can draw a sufficient number of officers to take care of all training and use for all other really necessary purposes.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield.

Mr. KAHN. Does the gentleman remember that since 1915 we have added a Tank Corps and a Chemical Warfare Service in the Army which require a great many more officers?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is quite true, but we still have 5,000 in excess of the number required for the line.

Mr. STAFFORD. Only 87 for the Chemical Warfare Service.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. General Pershing, it is true, said he wanted to get rid of, I think, 1,000, but he also stated that he wanted to have authority to replace them with other men.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is, within a year or two years, but I am sure Congress will be able to consider at that time whether it is advisable or not to grant General Pershing's request and add 1,000 more officers to the Army.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Do I understand the gentleman to mention the Army of 1915? Does the gentleman claim we had enough officers then?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think for the size of the Army we had we had enough. I will say to the gentleman. Now, in closing I want to say this word, that the United States has to-day as many of the best-trained and most capable officers as any Army in the world, and the committee was thoroughly imbued with the idea of retaining all of the best of those men in the service, and in the provisions of this bill there is not a single one of those of the class I mention who will be compelled to leave the service. We wanted to get rid of those not authorized by law and get rid of the 1,000 of the least efficient whom General Pershing says can be dropped with benefit to the service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. KAHN) there were—ayes 68, yeas 142.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. SISSON) there were—ayes 40, yeas 180.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 4, after the word "staff," strike out "\$26,896,200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$29,330,954." Line 6, after the word "than," strike out "11,000" and insert in lieu thereof "12,000."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am not concerned about the reduction of the enlisted personnel of the Army. A year ago I introduced an amendment by which the Army was reduced to 150,000 men. I am concerned about the arbitrary reduction of the commissioned personnel of the Army. This amendment is not the plan of the General Staff. It is a compromise between the General Staff plan and the committee's plan. It will make the commissioned personnel 12,000 instead of 11,000, and would not permit an increase after it had been reduced. The committee plan will reduce the commissioned personnel of this Army about 2,000. This bill will be made into law something near the 15th or 20th day of June. It will give the General Staff orders, as it is constructed to-day, to reduce the personnel of the commissioned officers practically 2,000 men, and give them less than 15 days to do it in. You can not do that without creating chaos in the Army. You have to-day over 3,000 commissioned officers in the different schools. A large number of those men will have to be discharged. You only have 4,329 officers in your Army to-day. The rest of them are scattered all over this country in separate services. Where are you going to cut the Army 2,000 men in 10 days without creating chaos? You can not do it, and you know you can not do it, and the gentlemen, I think, who drew this bill knew we could not do it. It takes but three things to make an Army—enlisted men, supply system, and commissioned personnel—and of the three the important element is your commissioned personnel, and if you want and desire to economize on your Army, for Heaven's sake cut your enlisted men, but leave your commissioned personnel alone. Gentlemen, I will not take up your time; you understand the situation. I appeal to you to support that amendment. It will save the Army, and to reduce it to 11,000 will destroy the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. HULL) there were—ayes 65, yeas 115.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out on page 16 all after the word "under," in line 23, and all of line 24, and insert the following: "A board of general officers convened by the President, consisting of one retired major general of the line who commanded an army in active operations against the enemy at some time between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918; one retired major general of the line who did not command troops in active operations against the enemy at any time between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, and who has been retired on account of age since November 11, 1918; the Surgeon General of the Army; and two general officers of the line to be designated by the Secretary of War."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I do not care to take up the time of the House, but I want to call your attention to this fact: That if you are going to take out of the commissioned personnel of the Army about 2,000 officers there will have to be some system provided whereby it can be done. Under the bill that is all left to the Secretary of War. In the interest of the officer who will have to come up for trial and who will have his case passed upon and perhaps be discharged from the Army, I feel that it is but fair that he should appear before a board of the most responsible officers, and officers of

the very highest character that we have in our Army. And I have undertaken in this amendment—it is immaterial to me whether you adopt it or not—that this board shall be composed of three major generals, two of whom are retired, who stand in high esteem with all the officers of the Army, and the Surgeon General, who, I think, is looked upon by every officer in the Army as a man who is absolutely fair. That would leave, then, for the Secretary of War to select two other general officers to serve on this board. And in the interest of fairness and justice to the men who are going to be put out of the service, I plead with you to adopt some such an amendment as this in order that they may have a chance for a hearing.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Is your amendment so drawn as to really designate the individuals who shall compose this board?

Mr. MCKENZIE. I have no objection to saying to the gentleman very frankly that I would like to see on that board Major General Liggett and Major General Morrison, two officers, I think, that every officer in the Army will say they are willing to have pass on their cases, and the Surgeon General as the third one, and I am not so particular as to the other two. I do feel that this ought to be done.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman only calls attention to the iniquity of legislation of this character. Here is the Appropriations Committee cutting down the number of the commissioned personnel, but without power under the rules of the House to go to work to take care of the men who must be put out of the service.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKENZIE. I will yield.

Mr. ANTHONY. I want to assure the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON] that his statement is hardly correct, inasmuch as we have provided that these reductions shall be made under regulations approved by the President of the United States, in whom we have great confidence.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. But it takes the matter clearly out of the hands of Congress; and two years ago, when the Army reorganization bill was passed, there was considerable debate over the putting of officers in classes A and B. And it has been brought to my attention that on several occasions it has been attempted to put men out of the service on the worst kind of hearsay evidence, dating back 20 years.

Mr. ANTHONY. Permit me to further add, as one individual, I would have the highest confidence in the officers named by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I understood from what I could hear of the amendment that it is the gentleman's purpose to create a body to pass upon the qualifications of those officers whom it would be desired to retire. I take it that body would necessarily have to pass upon the qualifications of all officers if the retirement of these officers from the Army was to be passed upon efficiently and justly and the most inefficient retired. Inasmuch as this bill can not possibly become a law until along near the end of the fiscal year, it seems to me it is going to be a physical impossibility for this body or any other like body to pass upon the qualifications of all the officers of the Army. The pending bill does not provide the funds to pay the salary of the officers to be retired beyond June 30 of this year, when this question must be settled if this bill becomes a law, and clearly this board can not ascertain the facts upon which to base intelligent action during the time intervening.

Mr. MCKENZIE. That may be true. I am not prepared to say as to that. But I do say this, gentlemen, that if this Congress is to adopt the legislation which we have this afternoon, which would eliminate 2,000 officers from the Army, then, in God's name, let us provide the machinery that will give those men an opportunity to get a square deal. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I still reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is not entirely proper to offer an amendment to the amendment with a point of order reserved.

Mr. MANN. I suggest the Chair can very easily overrule the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. I ask for the regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee make the point of order?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama to the amendment offered by Mr. MCKENZIE.

At the end of the amendment add:

"Provided, That in carrying out the provisions of this act no officer shall be separated from the service until he shall have been furnished with a full copy of the official records upon which the proposed separation is based. Such officer shall be given opportunity to appeal his case to a court of inquiry, which court of inquiry shall hear his case and such officer shall be given opportunity to present testimony and evidence in his own behalf, which evidence shall be considered by such court of inquiry."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment proposed is not in order. I will reserve it, however, if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take up the time of the committee with this unduly, but I do think that before a man, an officer in the Army, is arbitrarily separated from the service by any rules promulgated by people of whom we know not under this bill he should be given the record upon which such separation is proposed. That is only a fair and a square deal to the man whose separation from the service is contemplated. It is absolutely against American principles, as I see it, to propose to separate an officer from the service without his being able to have an official record of the case furnished him and a chance to be heard in his own behalf and to present his own evidence and testimony.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. How long would it take to make this change—months or years?

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. I do not know, sir. I am not able to tell you. But I do know that if I were an officer in the Army to-day I would want a chance to see the record upon which it was contemplated that I was to be separated from the service arbitrarily.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Is not the gentleman's amendment a copy of the present law?

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Yes. It provides a B board, and it says that no officer shall be classified in Class B until he shall have been given an opportunity to appear before a board of inquiry and see a copy of the record on which their action is based and offer testimony in his own behalf.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. As I understand it, after an officer has served at a certain station there is sent on to headquarters a memorandum by his superior as to the character and class of his service, and that record is not available to the officer at the time, but later can be hauled up against him. All that the gentleman seeks to do is to carry out existing law so that before a man can be dropped from the service he can find out the nature of the complaint made against him?

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Yes; to see the record and be able to present testimony in his own behalf.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLE. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has asked how long it will take to do it.

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLE. Is it proper to refuse justice because it takes too long?

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Certainly not. This man should be given an opportunity; otherwise, my friends, you are going to find that officers now in the Army of certain classes are going to be discriminated against.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Is it not manifest on the face of it that to reduce the personnel of the Army by 2,000 will mean that after a comparatively small number have been canceled we are going to take the rest out of the men against whose record there is nothing?

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. You propose to take the least efficient, do you not?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes; that might be based on the present record.

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Yes. You should take out the inefficient men and leave the efficient.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's amendment. The developments show that we are going down into depths where the merits of men will not be considered at all.

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. They prophesy now that after you have reduced the number of officers now, you will then in 12 months' time, or such a matter, have a lot more officers put in to fill up. A number of those men who will be cut off will be retired on three-quarters pay, and you will not cut down your expense, although you may think you will, because more officers will be put in to fill up. The only way to deal fairly with this question is to take this whole list of officers and push it back, and if a man is not satisfied to go down a grade, wherever by the method of pushing the whole list down a man must go to the next lower grade, then let him step out. [Applause.]

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

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Is it not the opinion of the gentleman that unless this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] is adopted, together with the amendment you have proposed, these Pooh-Bah lord high executioners that still control the Army will arbitrarily take out of the service everyone that they do not agree with, and that they will promote their friends?

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Yes. The point is that a man should have an opportunity for a fair hearing on his case before he is arbitrarily kicked out. That is the only fair deal. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I question whether this is not legislation. I make the point of order that the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JEFFERS] is not germane to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] or to any provision in the bill. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Alabama is in no wise necessary to bring about the reduction of the Army, which is the purpose of the paragraph under consideration. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois proposes a board of general officers instead of merely providing regulations that may be promulgated by the President. But here we go further, and we legislate as to the methods by which they may dismiss or discharge officers from the service. It is not directly connected with the reduction of the officer personnel.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama provide certain details as to the procedure which should be followed by this board which is established by the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, and would not the gentleman from Wisconsin, if we established a separate board, think it would be germane to provide certain rules of procedure which should be followed and to set forth certain rights which officers who are to be brought before this board might have under the procedure set forth?

Mr. STAFFORD. I grant that the question is not free from doubt, but it is my opinion that it is legislation, and it is not of a character that is necessary in perfecting the reduction of the personnel of the Army.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Did the gentleman understand that the original amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is germane to the bill and free from the vice that he mentions?

Mr. STAFFORD. It is germane to that last paragraph—"or under such regulations as he shall prescribe."

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois is not subject to the objection of violating the rules, then it seems to me the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] should be answered in the affirmative.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I shall be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I rather think, glancing for a moment at the question, that the Committee on Appropriations rebuking legislation is a good deal like Bluebeard rebuking bigamy or Satan rebuking sin. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has already shown that Bluebeard had eight wives, so far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned. Perhaps the gentleman did not wish to apply that to the Committee on Military Affairs. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois provides for a board and establishes the personnel of that board. The bill itself provides that this reduction shall all be under such regulations as the President shall prescribe. I suppose if a point of order were made on that it might be well contended that that is legislation. But the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JEFFERS] goes to questions of procedure before the board and lays down certain rights which officers to be affected by this reduction shall have.

Now, it would seem to me that if we can establish a board as the amendment proposes, we can go further and provide as to certain details of the procedure before that tribunal and certain requirements that may be followed in dealing with officers who are to be affected by the action of this board; and it seems to me that this is a germane amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE], and that the contention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is not well taken.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard a moment on the point of order. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois was to the clause which provides that certain things shall be done "under such regulations as the President may prescribe." Now, it seems to me that the whole proviso is legislation and ought to have been held to be subject to a point of order; but having been once admitted—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman misunderstands.

Mr. TEMPLE. I think not; and if the gentleman will allow me to finish my statement he will see that I do not misunderstand.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has already made a statement based on a misunderstanding. This proviso is held in order as legislation under the Holman rule.

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes; and I say having been admitted it is improper to hold out of order an amendment to it which is of like character; that is, when we admit legislation is held to be in order under the Holman rule, then an amendment of the same character can not be excluded. The legislation which has been decided to be in order provides that certain things shall be done "under such regulation as the President may prescribe." The amendment now offered proposes that certain of those regulations shall be provided in the bill itself. If legislation is in order which confers this power on the President, then an amendment fixing certain of these regulations is obviously not out of order. If we have the right to authorize the President to do certain things we have the right to do them by our own action.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] makes the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JEFFERS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] that it is not germane to the amendment. The Chair admits that he thinks the question is open to some doubt, but he is inclined to agree with the contention of the gentleman from Massachusetts that it is a mere method of procedure to be followed by the board in carrying out the purposes of the paragraph. Under that theory the Chair will hold the amendment to be in order and therefore overrule the point of order.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not blame the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JEFFERS] for offering this amendment. I do not blame the gentleman from Alabama for not expressing confidence in the President of the United States; but the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army, and I heard a gentleman on that side of the House question the right of Congress to put a provision in the bill recalling the troops from one country where they now are. He questioned the right of Congress to do that. Now, this is nothing more or less than one of the regulations within the Army, and if you gentlemen on that side want to go on record as saying that you have no confidence in the President of the United States, that is absolutely satisfactory to me, because even under this amendment some Army officer has got to do it, as the bill is drawn. The President will simply select such machinery as he sees fit and proper to be just and fair with the Army officers that he gets rid of. I realize fully that after President Roosevelt promoted certain Army officers over two or three thousand other officers the Army officers who had been writing this military legislation for the last few years and preparing these bills for the last few years have made every effort to get away from the power of the President to control the Army and to circumvent his constitutional prerogatives; but if you gentlemen want to circumvent that now as much as possible, I do not care. I do not blame my friend from Alabama for doing it, but I do not see just what attitude gentlemen are going to be in on the Republican side in saying they are not willing that the President of the United States shall make any sort of regulation as to how to get rid of these Army officers.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Does not my friend from Mississippi think it is perfectly proper for the body which decides for the execution of certain officers at least to take steps that it shall be done in the way that they prescribe?

Mr. SISSON. I think that is a very appropriate term that the gentleman has used—"execution"—because I do not know of anything on earth that in the mind of a militarist on the floor of this House is quite as great a crime as to remove an

officer from the Army. Great God! Has it come to the point that because a man is an officer of the Army you commit a crime when in the interest of the taxpayer or in the interest of economy or in the interest of good service you remove him from the service? What divinity doth hedge the Army officer about that he has grown so great of late that he doth bestride this Republic like a mighty colossus and bids all of us walk between his mighty legs like petty men? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. If I understand this amendment presented by my distinguished colleague, it practically directs at least a majority of the board. I have great confidence in my colleague, and probably would agree to his selection; but I wondered whether my friend from Mississippi thinks my colleague would be any more likely to hit the right parties than the President of the United States would after careful consideration.

Mr. SISSON. I do not think so, I will say to my friend from Illinois, nor do I think that when the American people elected Mr. Harding President they intended to substitute either the gentleman from Illinois or the author of this amendment or any other Member of Congress to hold the position which he now occupies. Of course, no one could blame me if I wanted to substitute some one else.

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

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent to change the word "bill" in the amendment to the word "act."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will modify the amendment as indicated. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JEFFERS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. ANTHONY) there were—ayes 84, noes 60.

Mr. ANTHONY. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered.

The Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ANTHONY and Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were 87 ayes and 54 noes.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were 70 ayes and 78 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of the officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, \$250,000: *Provided*, That no portion of this appropriation shall be expended for the pay of a reserve officer on active duty for a longer period than 15 days, except such as may be detailed for duty with the War Department General Staff under section 3a and section 5 (b) of the Army reorganization act approved June 4, 1920, or who may be detailed for courses of instruction at the general or special service schools of the Army, or who may be detailed for duty as instructors at civilian military training camps appropriated for in this act, or who may be detailed for duty with tactical units of the Air Service, as provided in section 37a of the Army reorganization act approved June 4, 1920, or not to exceed three reserve officers in the Judge Advocate General's Department, or except one officer of the Medical Reserve Corps: *Provided further*, That pay and allowances of such additional officers and nurses of the Medical Reserve Corps as are required to supplement the like officers and nurses of the Regular Army in the care of beneficiaries of the United States Veterans' Bureau treated in Army hospitals may be paid from the funds allotted to the War Department by that bureau under existing law.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 3, strike out the figures "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$981,975."

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I will ask that you look at the top of page 17, because the appropriation provided by this bill practically wipes out the summer training of the Reserve Corps of the Army. This House has voted to reduce the officer personnel of the Regular Army, and judging from the expressions of opinion by various Members during the debate, this House will probably vote to reduce the present enlisted strength of the Regular Army. There remains therefore as reserve the National Guard and the Reserve Corps. I ask the committee's very careful attention to the figures I shall give you, because I do not believe that it is the desire of this committee to absolutely cripple and ultimately wipe out the Reserve Corps of the United States Army.

This bill provides an appropriation of \$250,000 for pay for the Officers' Reserve Corps. The amendment which I have offered provides that one-quarter of the amount which the War

Department asks for, \$987,975, will be given by this House instead of the above \$250,000. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAIG] in a moment will offer another substitute amendment which will provide that \$1,963,951, one-half of what the War Department asked for the Reserve Corps, be granted. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] will offer a third amendment as a substitute suggesting to the House that they give to the Officers' Reserve Corps \$3,927,902, the exact amount the War Department asked for. In other words, the War Department recommended that there be appropriated \$3,927,902 for the Reserve Corps' pay. The committee has cut that down to \$250,000. By the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAIG] as a substitute and the substitute of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] the House will have a chance to say whether they will give to the Reserve Corps what the War Department asked, one-half of what the War Department asked, one-quarter of what the War Department asked, or if they want to follow the recommendations of the committee and practically wipe out the training of the Reserve Corps in the coming summer.

I have some figures which I have compiled from the statements before the committee, and I think this matter is so serious to the defense of this Nation that I will ask the committee to listen to these figures.

I wish to make two preliminary remarks. The defect of the American system before the war was the lack of trained emergency officers. Second, a lack of properly organized skeleton units, properly officered units into which you could pour your enlisted men for use in an emergency. I say to the committee that you must remember that not only in times of actual combat but in all times of warfare when your sons and brothers are in the military service their life and health depend on the training of their officers.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. In this past war enlisted men were put into trained divisions and inside of six weeks they were in the front-line trenches, but you can not train officers in the sanitation of camps or in troop leading in that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I am very much interested in what the gentleman says, and I am curious to know if General Sawyer would be in any danger unless this amendment is adopted.

Mr. HILL. In my argument I am standing for national defense and not for any particular officer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I thought the "rider of the white horse" ought to know.

Mr. HILL. That touches a subject very dear to me, but if the gentleman had read the bill he would know that I am talking of national defense and not of a return to national common sense on the question the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I was asking the gentleman to discuss the common sense of it.

Mr. HILL. On this depends the continued organization of the Reserve Corps in the United States.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I regret that I can not yield.

Let me go over some figures about this. There are four items necessary for the maintenance of the organized reserve. This bill provides, first, \$250,000 for the pay of the officers of the reserve corps. It provides a nominal \$100 for the pay of enlisted men of the reserve corps. It provides for nothing for transportation of the officers of the reserve corps, and nothing for transportation, subsistence, and so forth, for the enlisted men in the reserve corps. The total appropriation under this bill for the reserve corps for those items is \$250,100.

At the present time we have 65,000 reserve officers. The War Department planned to train less than one-half of these next summer—that is, 27,722 officers. It is also planned at the same time to train 20,000 enlisted men of the reserve corps, together with some special training. For this the War Department asks \$7,441,858 in other items which I shall show in a moment in addition to the pay, because this item of pay is only one item of expense. The estimated cost per man and officer on this basis for pay, transportation, and so forth, for the 15 days' training is an average of \$151.80. The War Department proposed to train out of the whole reserve corps only 27,722 officers and 20,000 men, or, with 1,300 other officers, a total of 49,022. This bill provides pay which will train 1,556 officers only in the

whole United States. It will train 184 in each of the nine Army corps areas, and it will train only 34 officers on an average from each of the 48 States of the Union. That wipes out your reserve corps, as far as training goes.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. The War Department requested pay for reserve officers for three months at school—400 officers, half of that is 200, and one-quarter of that, which is my amendment, is 100; officers for 45 days as instructors at military training camps, 900. Half of that is 450, and my amendment is 225. Officers for 15 days, field training, 27,722. Half of that is 13,861, and one-quarter of what they ask for is 6,980, which my amendment will pay. Enlisted men for 15 days, field training, 20,000, asked for by the War Department. There is no pay for them, except \$100, provided in this bill. One-half of that is 10,000, one-quarter is 5,000. If my amendment to the officers' pay is adopted, we shall ask for pay for the men in proportion. The total officers proposed to be trained and total men in the nine corps areas is 49,022 under the War Department recommendation. One-half of that is 24,511, and the amendment that I offer furnishes pay for officers based on a total of 12,255. The average for each corps area under the War Department's full recommendation is 5,446. One-half of that is 2,723, and one-quarter of it is 1,361. For each State on that average, War Department recommendation of trained officers and men in the reserve corps this summer, 1,021; one-half of that is 510 and one-quarter 255.

The cost of that is as follows, and I shall read these figures and then conclude:

Under the estimate of the War Department, pay of officers, \$3,927,902. One-half of that is \$1,963,951 and one-quarter \$981,975. For pay of men, War Department recommendation, \$517,648; one-half of that is \$258,824, and one-quarter of it is \$129,412. Total pay, under the War Department recommendation, \$4,445,550. One-half of that is \$2,222,775 and one-quarter is \$1,111,387. In addition to that there is the cost of transportation, which was developed by the questions asked by the subcommittee.

The figures on that transportation are as follows: Transportation, and so forth, of officers, \$1,621,600; one-half of that, \$810,800; one-quarter of that, \$405,400. Transportation, subsistence, and so forth, for men, \$1,374,708; one-half, \$687,354; one-quarter, \$343,677. Total transportation, under War Department recommendations, \$2,996,308. One-half of that is \$1,508,154 and one-quarter is \$749,077. The total cost of pay, transportation, and all these other items would be, under the War Department recommendations, \$7,441,818. One-half of that is \$3,730,929, and one-quarter of it is \$1,860,464.

In the amendment which I have offered I have sought to increase the amount carried in the bill, \$250,000, up to \$981,975 for officers' pay on the basis of one-fourth of what the War Department asks. If that amendment be passed, there will be necessary other increases to make a total appropriation for training of the Reserve Corps amounting to \$1,860,464. The question is whether you want a reserve corps. If you do, then the recommendation in this bill practically wipes it out. If you want a reserve corps, you must decide whether you want what the War Department asks for, whether you want half of that, or whether you want one-quarter of it. The amendment that I have offered provides that you give one-quarter of what the War Department asks for. The amendment which Mr. CRAIG will offer is one-half and the amendment which Mr. ROGERS will offer is for the full amount asked for by the War Department.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. I want to find out what the gentleman's own attitude is. He speaks of a three-decker proposition. We have a quarter, we have a half, and we have a whole. Is the gentleman in favor of what he offered or is he in favor of the whole or of one-half?

Mr. HILL. I am in favor of the amount that the President and the War Department asked for—the whole amount as will be provided by Mr. ROGERS's amendment.

Mr. STEVENSON. Has the gentleman offered an amendment to that effect?

Mr. HILL. That amendment will be offered by Mr. ROGERS and will be before the committee to be voted on. They will all three be offered, in order that the committee may have a chance to take what it wants.

Mr. STEVENSON. Does the gentleman expect to toll the House along to vote for a quarter and then to raise it to a half and then to raise it to the whole amount?

Mr. HILL. No; but I expect to allow the House, if it wishes to do so, to give what the President wants, or a half of what the President wants or a quarter of what the President wants, and not absolutely strangle the reserve corps. I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the transportation alone of these reserve officers to go to military training for 15 days would aggregate the enormous amount of \$1,500,000?

Mr. HILL. I just read into the Record that it would cost, with other expenses, \$1,621,600.

Mr. STAFFORD. That would not even provide for the entire number; but for 30,000 alone at \$50 a man for transportation it would take a million and a half dollars.

Mr. HILL. I invite the gentleman's attention to the table on page 253 of the committee hearings.

Mr. STAFFORD. And I invite the gentleman's attention to the statement of the officer having this matter in charge, at the top of page 25.

Mr. HILL. Well, I am reading from the report the War Department put in in answer to a question by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], where he declares that the total is \$1,621,600.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here is the direct question propounded by the gentleman from Kansas: For transportation of 30,000 men for 10 days' training, \$50 each, \$1,500,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, in addition to the training of the Regular Army there are four other branches of training for which this bill provides: First, the training of the National Guard, and we authorize \$6,500,000 for the summer training of the National Guard. Next is the civilian military training camps. We had \$900,000 for that purpose this year and trained 10,000 men. In this bill we are appropriating \$1,500,000 for the training of 30,000 civilians at this summer's camps. Next, for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, training at schools and colleges, we are appropriating nearly \$3,000,000 for that purpose, and there will be 110,000 under that form of training this year. Next is the reserve officers in the reserve corps of the Army. There are 65,000 of them. Probably all of them are veterans of the late war. Nearly all of them are trained as well as it is possible to train an officer in the military art, and to say that it is necessary to take every one of those 65,000 men out and put them through a course of training this summer is preposterous. They are already trained officers, a finished product. It is true the War Department wanted to take about one-third of these men, who have already had the best military training possible only a few years ago, to train them again, but the committee did not see its way clear to do it. In the first place they asked \$3,900,000 for the purpose of training reserve officers, who are already trained to command, trained in the best school of all, the school of war, and when the committee attempted to analyze the item we found nearly all of the entire amount of \$3,900,000 would be absorbed in the payment of salaries to those men for 15 days. In answer to questions propounded by the committee, we found the War Department had failed in the figure they gave to the Budget to make any estimate at all for transportation and no estimate for the subsistence and cost of maintenance of the men after getting them into the camp, and in answer to queries as to the amount of money requisite they stated that it would require about \$3,000,000 in additional appropriations for these purposes, so if you are going through with the proposition to again train these already trained reserve officers, as advocated by the gentleman from Maryland, you want to be prepared to appropriate at least \$6,000,000 for that purpose.

Now, if the necessity existed for the training of these reserve officers at this time we would be willing to provide for it, but the committee does not believe that the necessity exists. The War Department did do what the committee thought was a practical thing last summer. They did not have sufficient money available under the appropriation of \$250,000, so they tried out an experiment at Camp Meade, and they invited the reserve officers in the States contiguous to that camp to report at a certain time for voluntary training. The result was very satisfactory, and several hundred of the reserve officers answered the call, appeared, and underwent a voluntary period of instruction in a very satisfactory manner.

I believe if the War Department would adopt a similar policy and open such voluntary camps of instruction for reserve officers at different points in the country, asking that they report voluntarily, without provision for pay, that large numbers of them would come, and I would gladly support an appropria-

tion to provide for subsistence and maintenance while they were at such camps, but I do not believe we are warranted in appropriating several million dollars for the salaries of these men under the proposition of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL].

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. What provision was made in the present fiscal year for this particular item?

Mr. ANTHONY. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars was appropriated, and we propose to reappropriate the same amount. And now, for the information of the House, I will say this provides for an average of nine officers of the Reserve Corps on duty with the General Staff. It provides for the pay of 77 who were sent to Army service schools. We provide for 77 this year. It provides for officers to serve as instructors to assist Regular Army officers at civilian training camps, and provision for the payment of 630 reserve officers for the 16 days of training.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. There has been no change in the existing law which would prevent the War Department from carrying on voluntary officers training this summer?

Mr. ANTHONY. Nothing except the lack of appropriations for maintenance.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Where did they get it?

Mr. ANTHONY. They took it from the appropriation for the general maintenance of the Army.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MILLSPAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the same request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The extension of remarks referred to are here printed in full as follows:

Mr. MILLSPAUGH. Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of the country are to be congratulated upon having in the White House a President with vision enough to sense the craving of the entire world for a return to normalcy, a President with such an abiding faith in those who are associated with him in authority, who have been chosen by the people, that he has summoned to his aid and counsel the best minds of both parties and has launched a program of peace and tranquillity for the world that meets with the approbation of all right-thinking people.

War has left its trail of sorrow and suffering, thousands of homes throughout the land have either been saddened by the placing of a gold star in the service flag on the family altar or have seen their loved ones come back to them broken in body and spirit; financial distress has throttled the Nation; the people are groaning under a burden of taxation, and yet there are those who, obsessed with their personal vanity, seek with their puny hands to muddy the waters and to hold back the irresistible tide of peace which is now running with overwhelming force.

In the face of pressure exerted by those interests which seek to wring from the taxpayers of the country enormous sums with which to build ships to rot and decay and to maintain useless armies in times of peace, Congress has used the knife upon the estimates submitted and has figuratively cut to the bone with the further assurance to the taxpayers that as soon as the recently proposed treaties are ratified, further cutting will be done, to the end that this source of wastefulness in Government expenditures may be curbed.

It is extremely gratifying to know that this Congress has hearkened to the oft-repeated desire of the people for a substantial reduction in the hitherto enormous expenditures for the maintenance of the Army and Navy.

The farmers of our country are aroused as never before against the injustice of spending many hundreds of millions of dollars for the support of useless armies and navies, the cost of which must ultimately be borne by those engaged in agriculture and stock raising, and they will voice their hearty approval of the action of this Congress in eliminating this source of wastefulness.

It is to be regretted that there are those interests which seem to think the farmer is asking too much legislation in his behalf, and who, when legislation is being considered for the advancement and relief of agriculture, plant their feet stubbornly and refuse to be moved; but, fortunately, the time has come when the friends of the farmer are in the saddle in this Congress and his desires and needs are being considered as never before.

To those of us who have been associated with the farmer for many years, who have been his confidant and counselor, who know of the hardships and privations which have been his lot, it is inconceivable that anyone should oppose his efforts to throw off his shackles and enjoy at least a modicum of the advantages and financial returns that accrue in other lines of endeavor.

Surely the man who toils ceaselessly in the heat of summer and the cold of winter to produce the food upon which our existence depends, together with his faithful wife, who must deny herself the many social advantages of the town and city, who is forced by circumstances to work in loneliness, and who must be content to see their children receive an education under great disadvantages, are entitled to better returns for their labor than they have been receiving.

The many measures for the benefit and relief of agriculture which have been enacted into law by the present Congress bear evidence of the fact that those Members who have been sent here from the great Middle West to represent the agricultural interests of that great part of the Nation are functioning.

Extravagance has been checked, appropriations and taxes have been reduced by billions, injurious immigration has been stopped, a budget system inaugurated, a farmers' emergency tariff bill passed, the packers' regulation act has been enacted into law, grain gambling has been restricted, loans to farmers through the War Finance Corporation authorized, and ample funds appropriated for the marketing of farm-loan bonds.

While the war finance act has proven itself a vital factor in rehabilitating agriculture, it must be recognized that it is of a temporary nature and must be followed by a permanent measure which will insure a sound and efficient system of rural credits.

When this has been accomplished and a further substantial reduction in railroad rates has been made effective, coupled with the retrenchment in useless Government expenditures which is now being so successfully accomplished, when the present plans to stabilize the credits of the world bear fruition to enable foreign markets to purchase our grain and manufactured products, surely the taxpayer will have cause for gratification.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. CRAGO to the amendment offered by Mr. HILL: Page 17, line 3, strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$1,963,951."

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to burden the House with remarks on the reason for this increase. From the data furnished me I am satisfied this increase, in the main appropriated for the pay of officers, would entail a total expenditure to train this number of officers of something over \$3,000,000. I will say I am not in favor of appropriating a sufficient sum to pay the cost and the salaries and the expenses of training all the officers in the Reserve Corps, but I believe if we would appropriate such sum as would provide for pay, subsistence, transportation, and the extra cost of the camps for, say, 10,000 of these officers, that we would have taken a step in the right direction. It is a mighty easy thing to ask men to interest themselves in this work and take their commissions in the Reserve Corps, but these men are going to get away from their training. Training is constantly changing, and many of these men are not financially able, as some of them did last year, to voluntarily respond at their own expense and take this training. That leads to a discrimination. It is only the fellow who has plenty of money and plenty of time to spend who can take advantage of that, whereas the great body of the officers of the Reserve Corps are men who can not afford to take this training unless they are for this short period paid the regular pay commensurate with their rank.

If we are going to cut down our armed force and cut down our officer personnel, I feel like insisting very strongly on annually providing sufficient funds to let these men who are enthusiastic in this work and who already have some degree of training to continue their training, and thus keep in touch with the new ideas developed in Army training. I know very well—at least, I think I know—that a man will soon lose his training and lose what he has gained before unless he year after year has a chance to go over some course of instruction. And I think it is a very, very valuable asset of our country, and it is one of the cheapest forms of national defense which we can adopt.

I do not know whether the House is disposed to increase this appropriation or not. I do hope, however, that the men who have this legislation in charge, when the time comes, will agree with the minds on the other side of the Capitol and work out some well-developed plan; not one that will take a great amount of money but one which will enable the men who really desire this training during the next year to take it. I believe it will be money well spent, and an expenditure which will be approved by the great body of the citizens of our country. [Applause.]

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. ROGERS. This is in the nature of an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the substitute, offered by Mr. ROGERS: Page 17, line 3, strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$3,927,902."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. ROGERS. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It lacks 15 minutes to 5. It is evident that you can not get through this afternoon.

Mr. ROGERS. I am perfectly willing to withdraw from the floor if there is going to be a discussion of the program.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I will if it will not be taken out of my time. I want only five minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Would it suit the gentleman's purpose if the gentleman from Massachusetts should use his five minutes and then that I should make the motion to rise?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the largest sum that Congress will devote to the training of officer material in the United States. I was in favor of it this noon. I am more in favor of it now, since the House by a fairly decisive vote has just refused to accept the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] increasing the number of officers from 11,000 to 13,000. I still hope that by the time this bill is enacted we shall have the 13,000 officers that the President and the Secretary of War and every other competent authority have testified the country will need.

In the amendment I have offered I propose a moderate sum of money to train men in peace who shall be prepared in the event of war. I do not know of any way of getting men who shall be ready to command troops if war comes except by training them before war comes. That is precisely the purpose of this amendment.

I find great difficulty, frankly, gentlemen, in following the recommendations of the committee in many respects throughout this bill. I have a high regard personally for the Members who have made up the bill, but I served on the Committee on Appropriations and I know how these things are done. There is a subcommittee of five. They sit by themselves, and then they report to the full Committee on Appropriations. There is an hour's hearing or so before the Committee on Appropriations given to the chairman of the subcommittee. Then, as in this particular case, the bill is ordered reported out by the committee of 35 without the change of a word, or an item, or a line. That is what happens, and the result of that kind of legislation is that three men, three Members of this House, have decided every controverted point involving the military policy of the United States.

In what I say I have no criticism of the patriotism or of the high purpose of the gentlemen who constitute that subcommittee on Military Affairs of the Committee on Appropriations. But I do not forget, gentlemen, the days in 1916 and 1917, when war was in prospect, and even after war had come. What was the record of those gentlemen of the subcommittee on the great questions that confronted the Congress in those days? One of the five voted against the war altogether. Three of them, a majority, voted against the Kahn amendment, which made vital the draft law; and four of the five, all but one, voted for the well-known McLemore resolution by voting against tabling it indefinitely; that is, in effect, they voted for it by voting against tabling it.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Since the gentleman is making a rather gratuitous reference to the votes of those gentlemen, will he

tell what he means when he says we were delinquent in certain things? When he said we voted against the Kahn amendment, what does the gentleman imply?

Mr. ROGERS. I mean to suggest this, that during the war time there were things that I regarded as vital. The gentleman took another view of them, but I had no criticism of him for that. But now on questions involving the military policy of this Nation I prefer to take the views of President Harding, Secretary Weeks, General Pershing, and General Harbord rather than the views of the members of the Military Affairs subcommittee.

THE MILITARY POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE PENDING ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL—A STORY OF SCUTTLE.

The Committee on Appropriations proposes to reduce our officers to 11,000 and our enlisted men to 115,000. It proposes that, except in emergency and after June 30 next, our troops in Hawaii and in the Panama Canal Zone shall be limited to 5,000 enlisted men each, our troops in Europe to 500, and that all our forces now in China shall be withdrawn altogether. For reasons which I have already discussed—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Saturday, March 18, 1922, page 4109—I believe these limitations upon our overseas forces are unconstitutional. Whether or not they are constitutional, I am convinced that they are extremely unwise and shortsighted. I am equally convinced that the drastic cut in the size of the Army, while, of course, constitutional, is also extremely unwise and shortsighted.

Leaving out of account some 7,000 Philippine Scouts, the appropriation act for the present fiscal year appropriates for 14,000 officers and 150,000 enlisted men. The estimates of the War Department for 1923, upon which this bill is based, call for an Army of 13,000 officers and approximately 151,000 enlisted men. Our present Army comprises approximately 13,000 officers and 132,000 enlisted men. The pending bill, as I have said, proposes 11,000 officers and 115,000 enlisted men. The bill thus contemplates a reduction in the Army beginning the 1st of July next of approximately 25 per cent, both as compared with the current appropriation act for the present year and with the estimates of the War Department for the ensuing year.

Clearly, such a drastic cut as this is unwarranted unless the recent arms conference has materially changed the situation. But everyone knows that no agreement whatever was reached at that conference leading to the reduction of the land forces of any of the nations. Similarly, probably everyone knows that several of the nations of the world are maintaining land military forces several times as large as our own. We do not expect trouble from any power in the near future. Still less do we want it. But we certainly do not wish to scuttle our Army and reduce it to a point below the effective minimum both for training purposes and in case it were needed for the national defense.

Secretary of War Weeks, General Pershing, General Harbord, and many other responsible military officers solemnly warn the Nation that a reduction below 150,000 men is a reduction below the minimum of safety. We need the extra 35,000 men, over and above the committee recommendation, not probably for actual use but for insurance purposes—to form the first line of defense in case of need and to form a trained nucleus in case expansion should become necessary. There is not a line of testimony in the hearings which shows either a reason or a basis for the committee action. On the contrary, every witness who dealt with the subject solemnly warned against any considerable reduction.

To my mind, still worse than the cut itself is the manner proposed by the committee for making possible the cut. To-day we have in Hawaii some 12,000 officers and men. The committee proposal would require this to be reduced by 60 per cent, to 5,000 men. To-day we have in Panama some 7,000 men. The committee proposes to lop 2,000 from this force.

Hawaii is the key to the Pacific Ocean and the key to the defense of our Pacific coast. In the islands are 115,000 Japanese and 161,000 of all other races. Forty-two per cent of the population of the islands to-day is Japanese. Secretary Weeks told the committee that there were materially fewer troops even to-day in Hawaii than the requirements of the situation demanded. He pointed out that the Hawaiian Islands are the point from which the defense of the Pacific coast should be made; that any expenditure in the protection of the islands saves a vast amount of preparation on the Pacific coast. He stated that every dollar spent there would mean the expenditure of several dollars on the coast if we did not control the islands. He stated frankly to the committee that there is no reason to control the islands unless we have enough men to protect the situation, and that it would be the height of imprudence not to have a material military force there. Yet, in the face of the testimony of the Secretary of War and of the

even stronger testimony, if possible, of General Harbord, the Assistant Chief of Staff, the committee deliberately proposes to reduce the Hawaiian garrison by 60 per cent, from 12,000 to 5,000. I ask every Member of this House to read General Harbord's testimony, on pages 1454 to 1456 of the hearings, and Secretary Weeks's testimony, on pages 1466 and 1467.

This bill might be termed "A bill to withdraw the western frontier of the United States to a point east of the Rocky Mountains." Some one may say—though the committee report does not say—that the four-power treaty recently agreed to is a sufficient reason for cutting down our Pacific forces to a comparatively handful. I have every confidence in the utility of the four-power treaty and earnestly hope that it will be ratified by the Senate. But, to paraphrase General Putnam, "Let us trust in God and in the four-power treaty, but let us also keep our powder dry."

No; I do not feel satisfied to depend wholly upon the good will of other nations. I apprehend no early trouble with any other power. But I know of no more effective insurance against trouble than to keep at least 15,000 American troops at the "crossroads of the Pacific." There they serve as an object lesson to all men. There they are on the spot, to be moved swiftly wherever the danger, wherever the emergency arises. There they are ever present to protect our great naval base, which, under the four-power treaty, is to be our western outpost for the navies of the country.

Suppose by July 1 we cut down our present 12,000 in Hawaii to 5,000 as the bill proposes. Suppose a year or two hence some emergency arises which leads the President and the Secretary of War to conclude that three times the force must be immediately dispatched to the Hawaiian Islands. The instant our troops set forth from the Pacific coast the expedition will be regarded as a grave menace, perhaps almost as an act of war, by the other party concerned in the incident. While, if we retain our present troops, as every military adviser urges, we should have that vastly greater protection in case of need and at the same time avoid the risk of seeming to threaten and of certainly offending another power.

Perhaps it will be said, as it has been said time out of mind on this floor, that no credence is to be placed upon the recommendations of the President, the Secretary of War, of General Pershing, or of the Assistant Chief of Staff, General Harbord. Personally I resent and despise the frequent allegation that an officer of the United States Army—even the Secretary of War—is so prejudiced as to make his recommendations of little value, but, nevertheless, the argument will be urged again, as it has been urged in the past, on this floor.

What is the alternative? To vote with the Subcommittee on Military Affairs.

Let us assume, if you like, that the President, Secretary Weeks, General Pershing, and General Harbord—able men all, to whom the country owes much—are not infallible. What, I repeat, is the alternative? To me the answer is plain. On a matter of military policy I prefer to be recorded with these men rather than with the Subcommittee on Military Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] has just made a statement here, which indicates that he himself does not know what he is talking about. It is a statement that has frequently been made in the years that have elapsed since we voted on what was known as the Kahn amendment. The statement is that Members of this House who voted against that amendment opposed some vital legislation which was necessary for the conduct of the war. I deny that, and I rather resent the action of the gentleman from Massachusetts in intruding it into this debate. The majority of the Committee on Military Affairs under the leadership of the chairman of the committee at that time, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT], reported into this House a bill for raising the military forces of the United States to conduct the war. We provided in that legislation that the President should first call for 500,000 volunteers, giving him the power thereafter to use all the machinery of the draft and to raise all the men that were necessary to conduct that war. The bill so came upon the floor of the House. The gentleman from California merely offered an amendment to strike out the authority to raise 500,000 volunteers.

Mr. MADDEN. But we did raise several hundred thousand volunteers.

Mr. ANTHONY. I am coming to that. The House struck out the authority to raise the increment of volunteers and enacted the exact provisions of the draft act as our committee reported

it, and for which I voted. Now, what did the War Department do? They found that if they acted alone upon the language of the Kahn resolution they would lose six months' valuable time in perfecting the machinery of the draft act, so they resorted exactly to the policy outlined by the Military Committee of the House under the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT], and instead of raising 500,000 volunteers, they raised nearly a million and a half. [Applause.] And I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] that my vote on that measure was absolutely sound at that time from the standpoint of military policy, as was demonstrated by the action of the administration and the War Department in following exactly the policy outlined in the report of the Committee on Military Affairs to the House. [Applause.]

I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the War Department appropriation bill (H. R. 10871) had come to no resolution thereon.

#### POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 9859), disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Post Office appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed as conferees Mr. SLEMP, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. SISSON.

Mr. BOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate concurrent resolution 20 and consider the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate resolution 20, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### Senate concurrent resolution 20.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a committee of five Senators, to be designated by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be designated by the Speaker, is authorized to represent the Congress at such services and ceremonies as may be determined upon as proper and appropriate. One-half of the expenses of such committee shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half out of the contingent fund of the House.*

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Speaker appointed as the committee on the part of the House Mr. CRAIG, Mr. ARENTZ, Mr. FISH, Mr. McSWAIN, and Mr. RANKIN.

Mr. PAIGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the post office appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the post-office appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks referred to are here printed in full as follows:

Mr. PAIGE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present the following in reference to the pneumatic tube mail service in New York City.

Congress has always voted in favor of the use of these tubes, and on June 28, 1918, this House concurred with the Senate in directing the Postmaster General to continue the tubes in use, but this action was prevented by President Wilson's veto of the post office appropriation bill which contained this provision.

Later Congress authorized a joint commission to look into the subject, and Senator CHARLES E. TOWNSEND is chairman of this commission, which was created by section 6 of the post office appropriation act approved April 24, 1920, "To investigate all methods of carrying the mails, etc."

This commission submitted to Congress on July 26, 1921, the recommendation that the Postmaster General enter into negotiations with the company owning the New York system of tubes "looking into an agreement upon the terms under which service, if restored, may be maintained and such agreement be pre-

sented to the commission before final action is taken by the Postmaster General."

This action by the joint commission was based on the unanimous report of its investigating engineers and of a committee of postal experts who were assigned to the commission by the Post Office Department.

A summary of the report of these engineers and experts is as follows:

(a) That these tubes can handle 10,000,000 letters a day if called upon to do so.

(b) That instead of delaying a large number of letters they actually delayed 84,469 in the 12 months ending June 30, 1918, out of 3,158,000,000 carried, or 1 in 37,400, whereas motor vehicles delayed 74,216,000 letters in 3½ months.

(c) That instead of soiling and damaging "many thousand letters" they actually soiled in one year 588 letters, or but 1 in each 5,000,000 transmitted, and damaged 70 letters, or 1 in 45,000,000 transmitted.

(d) That the tube service was remarkably efficient and the criticisms against it unjustifiable and not based on facts.

(e) That the tubes performed in a manner reflecting great credit on the design of the apparatus and on the actual methods of operation.

(f) That 330,858,000 letters were delayed by motor-vehicle service in one year as compared to 84,000 letters by tube, or on the ratio of 3,915 to 1, and that in one severe snowstorm—February 21, 1921—4,963,500 letters were delayed by motor-vehicle service, or fifty times as much mail as the tubes delayed in 365 days.

(g) That when the pneumatic tubes were discontinued it was necessary to increase motor-vehicle service 51 per cent, or by 96 vehicles, thus increasing street congestion and danger of accidents.

(h) That loss and theft of mail is impossible from the pneumatic tubes, and that while in the last six years of tube operation there was but one loss of registered mail, in 1920 there were 113 robberies, with a loss of \$234,000, and in 1921, in one instance, a \$2,000,000 robbery.

(i) That instead of increasing motor-vehicle service but 15 per cent, as estimated by First Assistant Postmaster General Koons, in 1918, when the tubes were discontinued, it was necessary within six months to increase the service 51 per cent, during which period the postal receipts increased only 5.88 per cent.

(j) That this automobile service, and the necessary extra dispatching clerks, cost \$437,844 instead of \$193,019, as estimated by Mr. Koons, as compared with the tube contract cost of \$472,245 which it displaced.

(k) That the number of pouches increased from 7,183 to 20,354, showing that the tubes carried more than 13,000 pouches daily.

(l) That the automobiles were dispatched half hourly, as compared with carriers' dispatch every 10 seconds, or almost continuously, by tube, and at a speed of 7 to 10 miles per hour, as compared to the tube speed of 30 miles per hour, by which system the mail is delivered directly to the working space of the post office.

The nine postal experts assigned to the commission by the Post Office Department were unanimous in their opinion—

that the pneumatic-tube service expedites the transmission of first-class mail because of its constant availability, increased speed in transmission as compared with motor vehicles, and its freedom from interruption to which all street traffic is subject.

They recommended that the former pneumatic tubes be re-established; that certain extensions be made; and set forth in detail the data upon which their recommendations are based.

The conclusions of the officials of the Post Office Department and of the Postmaster General after a thorough investigation were the same as those reached by the joint congressional commission, by the engineers and experts assigned to this commission, namely, the urgent necessity for the immediate reestablishment of this pneumatic-tube service. They pointed out in this connection that some 14,000,000 pieces of mail are handled in New York daily. Of this number 8,000,000 pieces, or 57 per cent, is letter mail, although measured by bulk letter mail is but 12 per cent of the total mail.

The postal receipts in New York are in excess of \$53,000,000 a year, and the receipts from letter mail in excess of \$36,000,000 a year. The letter mail alone pays a profit; all other mail is carried at a loss.

The pneumatic tubes were built to speed the letter mail only, and according to the official records they speeded 72 per cent of the letter mail in New York City, though they connect only

26 of the 46 postal stations under the jurisdiction of the postmaster of New York.

The Postmaster General therefore recommended to the joint congressional commission that an appropriation be made and authority given for the immediate restoration of pneumatic-tube service in New York and Brooklyn.

These tubes connect all but seven postal stations in the Borough of Manhattan, or New York City proper, and cross Brooklyn Bridge to two post offices in Brooklyn. They are 8 inches inside diameter, made of bored cast-iron pipe, through which cartridges, 24 inches long, carry the mail at a speed of 30 miles an hour. These tubes are laid in pairs, like a double-track railway. The capacity of each tube line between each postal station connected is 180,000 letters an hour. These tubes were constructed on the specifications of the Post Office Department and at the request of the Post Office Department.

These tubes will carry 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 letters in New York every day, and at a cost of less than 2 cents per 100 letters carried, or less than 1 per cent of the \$2 paid by the public for forwarding these 100 letters. It is pertinent to note in this connection that the public pays approximately 90 cents a pound for the delivery of letter mail, since there are about 45 letters to the pound, as compared with 1½ cents per pound for forwarding second-class mail.

The reestablishment of the tubes in New York City will benefit not only the people in that city but also all people who write to or receive letters from that city, through the earlier, more regular, and safer delivery of the letter mail. The use of the tubes will help to modify street congestion and prevent accidents; will give equal and uniform postal facilities over the entire city, thus tending to prevent business establishments concentrating at one point; and because of their speed, the tubes, for practical purposes, will put all post offices under one roof.

The reestablishment of the tubes will benefit the Post Office Department in reducing the number of automobile trips, pouching clerks, trucking and platform labor, and auxiliary service required to meet late trains. By permitting decentralization and each post office doing its own work, the tubes will save the labor and rent at concentration and transfer points which are now required; will keep clerks busy during storm and traffic delays; will permit portions of the postal load to be shifted immediately, without additional cost to the Government, from busy to nonbusy postal stations; will reduce the number of registered mail guards; and will give to the public the best possible mail service.

The Joint Congressional Commission at a meeting held on January 9, 1922, approved the making of a contract in New York for the reestablishment of the tubes at an annual rental rate per mile of \$18,500, or \$513,911.50 per year, with the proviso that either the company or the Post Office Department, after the starting of the service, might appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commission for a revision of this rate, which commission, however, shall not find a rate in excess of \$19,500 per mile per annum. No minimum has been set. The commission also advised a provision in the contract permitting the Government to purchase the system if it so desired.

The immediate reestablishment of pneumatic tube service in New York City is recommended by the Joint Congressional Commission on Postal Service; by its engineers and postal experts; by the Postmaster General, the Budget officials, and the postmaster and officials of the New York post office; by an advisory committee of New York citizens appointed by the Postmaster General; by the mayor, the city government, the Merchants Association, and all civic organizations in Greater New York.

The statement of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, which is concurred in and forwarded to the Senate in a communication from the President of the United States transmitting supplemental estimates for appropriation for the Post Office Department, is as follows:

The estimate for pneumatic-tube service was not included in the Budget for 1923 for the reason that the Joint Postal Commission arrived at its conclusion to recommend the resumption of tube service in New York and Brooklyn only last week, at which time the Post Office appropriation bill was already before the House of Representatives.

The advantages to be obtained from the resumption of service by these pneumatic tubes can not be measured in dollars and cents, since they consist of, first, expediting the service; second, increasing the regularity and reliability of the delivery of first-class mail; third, increasing the safety with which mail is distributed; and, fourth, the relief of vehicular congestion in the streets.

If the resumption of this service is authorized and appropriation therefor made, it will be possible to reduce the estimates for clerk hire in first and second class post offices, under the First Assistant Postmaster General, by the amount of \$150,000 from the amount originally

estimated, and the appropriation for vehicle service in cities, under the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, by the amount of \$200,000 from the amount originally estimated. While these reductions do not offset the cost of the operation of the tubes, they serve to reduce the cost of expedited and more reliable service of distribution, and it is anticipated that the saving in vehicular service in cities, under the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, can later be increased after the readjustment is completed.

The bill as amended by the Senate carried an appropriation for the reestablishment of the pneumatic-tube service in New York City, and I feel that the reasons that prompted that action may be of interest to Members of the House. I append herewith a report from the Merchants' Association of New York on the subject:

THE MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK.

("To foster the trade and welfare of New York.")

IN THE MATTER OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO THE POSTAL APPROPRIATION BILL FOR THE RESUMPTION OF PNEUMATIC TUBE POSTAL SERVICE IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

To the Members of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

The Senate has added to the postal appropriation bill as adopted by the House an item to provide for the restoration of the pneumatic tube postal service in the city of New York.

The abandonment in 1918 of the postal tubes seriously impaired the postal service in this city and delayed the movement of important mail throughout the entire country. The direct effects of such abandonment were:

1. GREAT INCREASE IN THE TIME BETWEEN MAILING AND DELIVERY OF LOCAL LETTERS.

Formerly local letters mailed prior to 1 o'clock were regularly delivered the same day by means of the tubes. Since abandonment of the tubes, in a test of local mail movement made by this association, out of 118 letters mailed before noon of a given day 81 were not delivered until the following day. With the tubes in use the time between mailing and delivery averaged 2 to 3 hours. Without the tubes 18 to 20 hours elapsed between mailing and delivery in 69 per cent of the cases.

With the tubes local service in the business section is usually completely performed within the day of mailing; without the tubes it is usually not completed until the following day.

2. DELAY IN SPECIAL-DELIVERY LETTERS.

At the present time from 15,000 to 17,000 "special delivery" letters per day require from three to five or six hours for delivery. When the tubes were in operation delivery was made in from half an hour to two hours.

3. HEAVY ROBBERIES OF REGISTERED MAILS.

Registered mails of great value move through the tubes with absolute safety against robbery. Since abandonment of the tubes robberies of mail autos carrying registered mails have caused immense losses. To afford protection against robbery an armed guard now accompanies each principal dispatch of registered mail. For this sole purpose about 140 postal employees are required besides a number of United States marines. The annual cost of this protection is very considerable. Restoration of the tubes will fully protect registered mail and make the outlay needless.

4. FREQUENT AND OFTEN PROTRACTED DELAY TO THE ENTIRE BODY OF OUTGOING MAILS.

Winter storms prevent prompt and complete movement of mails by auto. Whenever there is heavy snow it is an almost daily occurrence for autos carrying large quantities of mail for a particular train to miss connection. Such mail is delayed many hours, often until the following day.

To minimize this risk the running time allowed for movement of autos is doubled or trebled, and mails are "closed" at the office of dispatch correspondingly earlier. It frequently happens that important mails are thus closed from two to three hours—and sometimes more—in advance of train time, and large quantities of mail are held over for later dispatch on slower trains with poorer connections. Every part of the country is harmfully affected by delays of this class.

The tube service completely avoids delays from this cause. It assures certain delivery to outgoing trains of all letter mail deposited prior to the normal closing time.

5. DELAY TO LATE OUTGOING LETTERS.

When autos are used the dispatch of letters to trains ceases 30 to 45 minutes or more before train time. The dispatch of letters by tube continues until about 10 minutes before train time. The tubes continue to forward letters for a particular train for 20 to 35 minutes or more after their forward movement by auto has ceased. About half a million letters were thus daily expedited when the tubes were in use. With auto service a similar number are delayed each day. That delay frequently makes a difference of 24 hours in delivery.

6. DELAY TO INCOMING MAILS.

The prompt movement of incoming mails was in similar manner impeded by the suspension of the rapid and certain tube service and the substitution of the slower and less reliable auto service. The difference in promptitude of service was especially noticeable in the winter season, when the auto service was impeded by weather conditions which did not affect the tube service. Late delivery of early morning mail was a condition of extreme frequency, and investigation demonstrated that it was mainly due to delays arising from auto service.

The great practical utility of the tube service has been shown beyond reasonable controversy by the searching study, covering two years, of postal methods made by the Joint Commission on Postal Service, of which Senator TOWNSEND is chairman.

In the conclusions of that commission Postmaster General Hays emphatically concurred.

Gen. Charles G. Dawes, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, whose especial business it is to cut out needless or undesirable appropriations, reviewed the recommendation of the commission and indorsed the desired appropriation; and, finally, President Harding approved the estimates and transmitted them to Congress.

We know by actual experience the deterioration of our mail service which followed the withdrawal of the tubes and which still continues.

We formerly had a facility which was continuous, certain, and speedy in operation. We now have as a substitute an inferior facility, of relative slowness and subject to frequent delays which affect mail movement throughout the entire country.

We therefore urge the restoration of the pneumatic tubes as essential to the restoration of our postal service to its former excellence.

THE MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK,  
LEWIS E. PIERSON, Acting President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

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

To Mr. HICKS, on account of illness.

To Mr. CLOUSE, for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. McDUFFIE (at the request of Mr. BANKHEAD), indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. WURZBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Army appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Army appropriation bill now pending.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on rural credits.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I introduced a bill seeking to make rural credits easier and more helpful to the farmers and am preparing for introduction within the next few days a bill seeking to establish a "producer to consumer" marketing system. I invite the attention of Congress and the country to these bills.

The farmers are entitled to a much better rural credit system than they have ever had. I believe I am offering such a system. The farmers are entitled to a much better marketing system than they have ever enjoyed. I believe I am proposing a way to establish such a system. In these efforts I am asking for friendly suggestions and criticisms. Let us do something helpful to the farmers along these lines.

The farmers need loans now. They would not need them if they could only get a fair price for their products. Help the fathers and mothers and boys and girls of the farm to sell all they can produce directly from the producer to the consumer, at a reasonable price, and they will make all the money they need and to spare. Justice is all they ask. Simple justice, if granted, will give them that which is justly theirs and will enable them instead of borrowers to become lenders of money.

Mr. Speaker, I shall discuss these bills more at length at a more convenient season when I can secure more time for a more detailed explanation of them.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 2440. An act extending the period for homestead entries on the south half of the Diminished Colville Indian Reservation; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 18 they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 9597. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918;

H. R. 9235. An act providing for a grant of land to the State of Washington for public park purposes;

H. R. 10663. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution extending the term of the National Screw Thread Commission for a period of five years from March 21, 1922.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object.

Mr. MONDELL. Then, Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will move to-morrow morning to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday it adjourn to meet on Thursday at 11 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object.

Mr. MONDELL. We will provide for it in the rule.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 22, 1922, 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:

570. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Navy to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget concerning the elimination of the estimate of \$100,000 for the naval station at Olon-gapo, P. I., and the addition of the same amount to the estimate for the naval station at Cavite, P. I. (H. Doc. No. 216); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

571. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a paragraph reappropriating for the fiscal year 1923 \$600,000 for water supply, Schofield Barracks (H. Doc. No. 217); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

572. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, for salaries, "Bureau of Aeronautics," \$56,010, as a substitute for the estimate contained in the Budget of \$43,310, and for "Care, custody, and operation of the naval petroleum reserves," \$100,000 (H. Doc. No. 218); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

573. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination and survey of Providence Harbor, R. I.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

574. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a tentative draft of a bill to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer to the city of Springfield, Mass., certain streets within the Springfield Armory Military Reservation, Mass., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SNYDER: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 9951. A bill to amend section 28 of an act approved February 14, 1920, entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes," for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921; with amendments (Rept. No. 815). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 10971) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to institute condemnation proceedings for the widening of Woodley Road, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 10972) to readjust the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; to the Committee on Adjustment of Pay, etc.

By Mr. MILLSAUGH: A bill (H. R. 10973) to amend an act entitled "An act to revive, with amendments, an act to incor-

porate the Medical Society of the District of Columbia," approved July 7, 1838, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10974) authorizing the use of special canceling stamp in the Indianapolis post office; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SCOTT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 10975) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Boyne City, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 10976) authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer to the city of Springfield, Mass., certain streets within the Springfield Armory Military Reservation, Mass., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 291) authorizing the President to appoint a special mission of friendship, good will, and congratulation to represent the Government and people of the United States at the centennial celebration of the independence of Brazil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 292) authorizing the President to appoint a special mission of friendship, good will, and congratulation to represent the Government and the people of the United States at the centennial celebration of the independence of Brazil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) petitioning the President to give consideration to the wisdom of having a proper ceremonial sinking of one of the American battleships; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. IRELAND: Resolution (H. Res. 307) providing for the appointment of a legislative clerk, with compensation at the rate of \$3,600 per annum; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Resolution (H. Res. 308) providing for six months' salary to be paid the widow of J. Kemp Stevens; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress in favor of the passage of Federal law to further regulate the use of narcotic drugs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 10977) for the relief of Edna Shaw Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 10978) for the relief of James O'Brien; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10979) for the relief of Nicholas Paskaly; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10980) for the relief of John F. Banks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 10981) granting an increase of pension to Tillie E. Reeves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 10982) for the relief of John M. Kills; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 10983) granting a pension to Jane Tilly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10984) for the relief of the Houston (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce and the Hermann Hospital estate; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10985) for the relief of the Houston (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce and Bertha E. Roy and Max A. Roy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 10986) for the relief of John F. Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 10987) granting an increase of pension to Susan Maurer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10988) granting a pension to Dudley Harlan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 10989) for the relief of Thomas W. Doherty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 10990) for the relief of Wade H. Plumley; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 10991) granting a pension to Mary Woodward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10992) granting a pension to Fred L. Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10993) granting a pension to Bryan T. Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 10994) for the relief of Stuart Circle Hospital, Richmond, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARKS of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 10995) granting a pension to Julia C. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 10996) to provide for payment of the amount of a war-risk insurance policy to a beneficiary designated by Capt. John W. Loveland, jr., deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 10997) granting an increase of pension to Mahala H. Fisk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSON: A bill (H. R. 10998) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Blanton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10999) granting an increase of pension to Ann R. Kiger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAW: A bill (H. R. 11000) granting a pension to Sarah Icenogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

4721. By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution adopted by Lake View Post, No. 235, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, favoring the passage of the veterans' compensation bills (S. 506 and H. R. 1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4722. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Tulare County Pomona Grange, Calif., protesting against strikes of railroad employees and miners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4723. By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of the Department of Texas, American Legion, indorsing the Bursum bill (S. 1565); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4724. By Mr. CAREW: Resolution adopted at a mass meeting in the Clermont Avenue Rink, Borough of Brooklyn, New York City, relative to the strength of the Navy and naval repair work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4725. Also, petition of J. Leslie Kincaid, adjutant general of New York State, relative to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 10871); to the Committee on Appropriations.

4726. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of O. J. Marble and other residents of Lapeer, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 9753 and similar bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4727. Also, resolutions of the Michigan Crop Improvement Association, favoring a tariff of not less than 3 cents per pound on red clover and alfalfa imported into the United States, and the enactment of a law requiring that all imported clover seed sold in the United States be labeled as to the country of its origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4728. Also, petition of E. H. Howland and other residents of Lapeer, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 9753 and similar bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4729. Also, petition of Henry Thompson and other residents of Birch Run, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 9753 and similar bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4730. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolution adopted by the Kings County Historical Society, urging that Congress provide for the maximum naval armament allowed by the treaties agreed to by the Disarmament Conference and opposing any further reduction in the Army; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4731. Also, resolution adopted at a mass meeting assembled in Clermont Avenue Rink, Borough of Brooklyn, New York City, relative to the strength of the Navy and naval repairs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4732. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of citizens of Forest, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of House bill 9753 and other Sunday bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4733. Also, petition of citizens of Viola, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of House bill 9753 and other Sunday bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4734. By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Resolution from Metropolitan Chapter, Disabled Emergency Officers of the World War, asking prompt consideration of the Bursum bill relative to the retirement of disabled officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4735. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of Sander Pierson and other residents of the State of Washington, urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4736. By Mr. KENNEDY: Petition of 35 citizens of Pawtucket, R. I., opposing passage of House bills 9753 and 4388 and Senate bill 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4737. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the Bird Lovers' Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the passage of House bill 7452; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

4738. Also, petition of John Dunlop's Sons, of New York City, N. Y., against the bonus bill, either in cash or with a deferred payment through use of a certificate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4739. Also, petition of Watervliet Arsenal, of Watervliet, N. Y., urging the continuance of the present force at the arsenal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4740. By Mr. KNIGHT: Petition of Rubber City Stamp Club of Akron, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 9104; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4741. By Mr. LUCE: Petition of the congregation of the Oak Square Methodist Episcopal Church, of Brighton, Mass., urging adoption of Senate joint resolution 160; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4742. By Mr. RADCLIFFE: Resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Trenton, N. J., favoring the passage of House bill 10212; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4743. Also, resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Orange, N. J., favoring the passage of House bill 10212; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4744. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Flower City Council, No. 203, Order of United Commercial Travelers of America, urging passage of the bill providing for interchangeable mileage books for commercial travelers, with an amendment providing for a 25 per cent reduction from present prevailing rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4745. Also, petition of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce, of Rochester, N. Y., favoring the bill providing for interchangeable mileage books for commercial travelers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4746. Also, petition of the Rochester Commercial Travelers' Mutual Benefit Association, of Rochester, N. Y., urging the passage of the bill providing for interchangeable mileage books for commercial travelers with an amendment providing for a 25 per cent reduction from present prevailing rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4747. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of the Commercial Club of Williston, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price on wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4748. By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of members of the Rotary Club of Pocatello, Idaho, urging the enactment of legislation providing for a more rapid development of the waste lands; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

4749. Also, petition of members of the Nampa Chamber of Commerce, of Nampa, Idaho, urging the enactment of legislation providing for a more rapid development of the waste lands; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

4750. Also, petition of residents of Buhl, Idaho, urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4751. Also, petition of residents of Amsterdam, Hollister, and Hazelton, Idaho, urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4752. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Guiding Star Council, No. 29, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of Utica, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the Towner bill for the fostering and maintenance of the free public-school system; to the Committee on Education.

4753. By Mr. WASON: Petition of E. A. Robbins and 10 other residents of Keene, N. H., protesting against the passage of House bill 9753 or any other Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4754. By Mr. WATSON: Resolution indorsed by the Friends Meeting at Hatboro, Pa., concerning the social and economic situation in Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4755. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the Williston Commercial Club urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4756. Also, petition of Grand Forks Trades and Labor Assembly urging the passage of House bill 9691, providing for the creation of Federal local-option districts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4757. Also, resolution of Grand Forks Trades and Labor Assembly with reference to Congress creating an industrial court to aid in the settlement of labor disputes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.