

5056. By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of Mr. C. Tuttle and 10 other citizens of Creston, Iowa, protesting against House bill 9753; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5057. By Mr. ZIEHLMAN: Petition of several citizens of Takoma Park, Md., protesting against the enactment of the proposed compulsory Sunday observance laws for the District of Columbia, namely, House bills 4388 and 9753; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, April 12, 1922.

(Legislative day of Monday, April 10, 1922.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers in the files of the Department of Labor, at Ellis Island, N. Y., not needed in the conduct of business and having no historic value, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. The Vice President appointed Mr. RAWSON and Mr. CARAWAY members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and directed that the Secretary notify the House of Representatives thereof.

PETITIONS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I present petitions of 564 citizens of Stephenville, Boyd, Joshua, Henderson, Hughes Springs, Paradise, Tolar, Santo, Perrin, Weatherford, Garner, Chico, Hood County, Palo Pinto County, and Jack County, all in the State of Texas, praying for inclusion in the tariff bill of certain rates of duty on peanuts, peanut oils, and other vegetable oils. I ask that the petitions may lie on the table, and that the text of one of them, which is brief, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petitions were ordered to lie on the table, and the body of one was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the honorable Members of the United States Congress:

We, the residents of Stephenville, Tex., interested in the maintenance, development, and prosperity of the South, realizing the extent to which our agricultural interests, directly, and our entire community, indirectly, are affected by the practically unrestricted flow of foreign-grown peanuts and other agricultural products, vegetable oils, etc., into our country because of the approximately free trade conditions existing before the emergency tariff bill was enacted, and fully appreciating that the failure to include peanuts at 4 cents per pound and peanut oil at 5 cents per pound, as well as a like rate on other vegetable oils in the permanent tariff bill, which is to supersede the emergency tariff bill, will take from the South its one cash crop that has proven a great blessing as a substitute crop for cotton in boll-weevil infested sections where cotton can not be profitably produced on account of this pest, earnestly request your consideration of this vital matter to the end that you help to secure rates stated above, which are not more than sufficient to cover the difference between the cost of production here and abroad.

Mr. WILLIS presented resolutions adopted by members of Toledo (Ohio) Chapter No. 5, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, and by the First Annual Convention of Disabled American Veterans of the World War held at Detroit, Mich., June 30, 1921, favoring the passage of the soldiers' bonus bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COLT presented a resolution adopted by the New England Southern Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church, at Pawtucket, R. I., favoring the enactment of legislation prohibiting polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the New England Southern Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church, at Pawtucket, R. I., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the New England Southern Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church, at Pawtucket, R. I., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for uniform marriage and divorce laws, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN (S. DOC. NO. 181).

Mr. MOSES, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 274), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the report of Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, submitted in compliance with Senate Resolution 191, be printed as a Senate document.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 3448) to validate an agreement between the Secretary of War, acting on behalf of the United States, and the Washington Gas Light Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

A bill (S. 3449) granting a pension to Charles A. Detrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 3450) granting a pension to Eliza W. Cobb (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3451) granting a pension to Abbie Holbrook (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 3452) for the relief of Hettie Pierce (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3453) granting a pension to Elizabeth Miller (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 3454) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Stott; to the Committee on Pensions.

JEWISH NATIONAL HOME IN PALESTINE.

Mr. LODGE. I introduce a joint resolution which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 191) favoring the establishment in Palestine of the National Home for the Jewish People, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of the National Home for the Jewish People, in accordance with the provisions contained in the declaration of the British Government of November 2, 1917, known as the Balfour declaration, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected.

TARIFF BILL AMENDMENTS.

Mr. SPENCER submitted an amendment and Mr. BROUSSARD submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by them to House bill 7456, the tariff bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CLAIMS OF CERTAIN LIBERTY-LOAN SUBSCRIBERS.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5775) for the relief of Liberty-loan subscribers of the North Penn Bank, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Santa Rosa National Bank, Santa Rosa, Calif.; and Mineral City Bank, Mineral City, Ohio; Robbinsdale State Bank, Robbinsdale, Minn.; and Farmers & Merchants State Bank, Kenmare, N. Dak., which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10730) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I have heard it rumored that because of the tariff bill just having been submitted to the minority members of the Finance Committee and they having only a few days in which to study it and not being able to be here to-day, there was some chance of adjourning to-day at half past 2 o'clock. May I inquire if that is in the minds of the leadership on the other side?

Mr. McNARY. I think there is no chance of that, unless by a vote of the Senate. I know we are all anxious to dispose of the unfinished business, and I certainly would oppose a movement of that kind.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I judge it is the desire of the Senator from Mississippi to attend the opening game of the baseball season this afternoon, and that that is the ground for the rumor to which he refers.

Mr. HARRISON. Several of the Senators who will only have two or three days to study the report of the Finance Committee are anxious to have some time away from the Senate Chamber.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is called for. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. The next item is on page 8, Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McNARY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PAGE. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I wish to report back favorably a resolution coming over from the House. It comes with a favorable report from the Secretary of the Navy and I think there is no objection to it. The House and Senate Naval Committees have examined it very carefully, and I ask unanimous consent to present the report and have it considered at this time.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I shall have to object to that until we get further along with the appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Pomerene
Ball	Gerry	Lodge	Reed
Broussard	Gooding	McCormick	Sheppard
Bursum	Hale	McKinley	Simmons
Capper	Harrell	McNary	Smoot
Caraway	Harris	Moses	Spencer
Colt	Harrison	Nelson	Stanley
Culberson	Heflin	New	Sterling
Cummins	Hitchcock	Newberry	Sutherland
Curtis	Johnson	Nicholson	Townsend
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Norbeck	Walsh, Mont.
Dillingham	Kellogg	Norris	Warren
Edge	Kendrick	Oddie	Watson, Ga.
Ernst	Keyes	Overman	Willis
Fernald	King	Page	
Fletcher	La Follette	Poindexter	

Mr. DIAL. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH] is detained on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading clerk resumed the reading of the bill on page 8, under the heading "Bureau of Animal Industry."

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 12, at the end of line 4, to strike out "\$2,578,800" and insert "\$2,877,600," and at the end of line 6 to strike out "\$1,728,800" and insert "\$2,027,600, of which \$300,000 shall be immediately available," so as to read:

For investigating the disease of tuberculosis of animals, for its control and eradication, for the tuberculin testing of animals, and for researches concerning the cause of the disease, its modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and such other means as may be necessary, either independently or in cooperation with farmers, associations, State, Territory, or county authorities, \$2,877,600, of which \$850,000 shall be set aside for administrative and operating expenses and \$2,027,600, of which \$300,000 shall be immediately available, for the payment of indemnities.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question. I was discussing with the Senator yesterday afternoon the question of taking care of State experimental stations. Did the Senator make up his mind that that is cared for in the bill?

Mr. McNARY. In answer to the Senator from Arkansas, I will say that it is carried under the States Relations Service, on page 55 of the bill. There are a number of them in that service. The one to which the Senator made reference is cared for in that department, and the same amount of money is appropriated this year that was given last year, \$720,000.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is that thought to be enough to take care of it?

Mr. McNARY. It is believed that it will be, in the same manner in which it has been cared for in the past.

Mr. CARAWAY. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, at the end of line 10, to increase the appropriation for all necessary expenses for scientific investigations in diseases of animals, including the maintenance and improvement of the bureau experiment station at Bethesda, Md., and so forth, from "\$112,000" to "\$118,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 14, to increase the total appropriation for general expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, from "\$5,126,446" to "\$5,432,146."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, recurring to page 12, the item agreed to just before I came into the Chamber, for investigating the disease of tuberculosis in animals, and so forth, "\$2,027,600, of which \$200,000 shall be immediately available," may I inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill just exactly what is the

purpose contemplated by the appropriation and what is the reason for the very large amount carried in that item?

Mr. McNARY. I will state to the Senator that the item covers the treatment of tuberculosis in animals. The amount is increased over the amount fixed by the House to equal the estimate of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. It is an increase of the appropriation of last year, but does not increase the estimate of the Budget. It is thought necessary in order to prevent a deficit which might occur if the appropriation were not increased. Last year a deficit of \$600,000 was carried in one of the deficiency appropriation bills. It is thought that this amount will meet all indemnities and all research work done by the department.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator explain briefly whether in his opinion these appropriations have been productive of good, and whether the Federal Government should be called upon to pay for animals which because of their diseased condition are destroyed? Is it properly a charge upon the Federal Government or the State Governments, or should the owners meet the loss? I express no opinion, but seek the views of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. In Utah the Federal Government's share was about \$1 to \$3 for the State. The Government pays an indemnity, the maximum of which is \$50 and the minimum \$25. The balance of the value of the stock condemned is paid by the State. It is thought to be a governmental activity, inasmuch as the disease spreads from State to State without regard to invisible State lines. It is also based upon the theory that the stock moves in interstate commerce from one State to the other. The inspections are often made, not at the point of shipment, but at the point of destination. There the Government inspectors meet the stock after it has passed through several States and if stock is there condemned it prevents the spread of the germs of tuberculosis.

If it were left to the State or to individuals there would be no special effort made, as I understand it, to attempt to control the disease which has destroyed and is now destroying vast quantities of live stock in the country. I think it is purely a governmental activity and that great good is being accomplished.

I can say to the Senator that in a very great many of the States the eradication of the disease and infestation has been markedly reduced during the last three or four years. As the work proceeds it will no doubt come under the control of the States, and perhaps in a few years the States can take over the whole system which they now employ for the control and eradication of tuberculosis, and without the participation of the Federal Government.

Mr. KING. I do not quite agree with the Senator that after a while the Federal Government will relinquish control and the States handle these matters themselves. The Federal officials will never permit that to be done.

When the General Government fastens its grip upon a subject or matter, it will not surrender control. If it is disposed to do so, the bureaucrats and officials and officeholders who benefit by the retention of control by the United States will not permit it to be done. This bill is a confirmation of that general observation. I have read the bill rather hastily, and I find that appropriations are carried for subjects, or rather for objects, for which appropriations have been made for many years. One would have supposed that some of the subjects previously dealt with would have exhausted themselves by this time, but the Federal machinery having been created, positions must be given to those who have been operating the machinery for all the years. Indeed, the machinery is annually increased and the expenses augmented. So, Mr. President, I do not look for the realization of the prophecy which the Senator from Oregon has made, that the States later on will assume control over these matters, and that the Federal Government will be relieved from the burden. We might as well recognize the fact that the General Government is becoming more omnipotent each year; it is constantly invading the States, encroaching upon their powers and functions, and assuming greater control over local and individual matters.

However, I desired the opinion of the Senator as to whether legally or morally the Federal Government or the State governments, or both, should compensate the owners of animals destroyed, because of diseases which unfit them for use and which might soon cause their death.

Mr. McNARY. I will state to the Senator from Utah that I think there is no question about the legality of this transaction. Congress itself has placed its approval upon legislation of this character for many years. There are cases where the States have upheld the rights of the owners, to be paid out of general taxation for the condemnation of property that is calculated to spread disease, whether it is in plant pathology or

in animal pathology. Hundreds of millions of dollars are conserved and preserved by the activities of the States and of the Government along this line; but if an individual has a flock which is infected with a communicable disease, and the Government steps in and destroys or confiscates that property, then some compensation should go to the individual. The Government is the gainer by reason of preventing the spread of an infectious or contagious disease, for in the end its prevention inures to the welfare of the community.

Mr. KING. It would seem that if the State seizes animals which are diseased and destroys them, the entire loss should not fall upon the owners, although if the animals are so badly infected as that they are valueless a different conclusion might be reached. But, does the Senator believe that the Federal Government should assume a part of the burden resulting from the destruction of animals so diseased?

If the live stock were absolutely valueless, if the disease had progressed to such a stage as to render the animals valueless, then the thought occurred to me, Should the States pay for the same, should the Federal Government share in the loss, or should either be called upon to make payment?

Of course, the power of the State in dealing with this subject is plenary. It may, if there is no inhibition in its constitution, enact laws calling for the destruction of diseased animals or improper foodstuffs, and reimburse the owners therefor, wholly or in part. But the power of the General Government is entirely different. It can not do many things that States may do. It can not tax except for purposes that are Federal and national in character, and unless it has the delegated authority so to do.

We fail to keep in view in much of the legislation enacted by Congress the distinction between the powers of States and the delegated and enumerated authority or power possessed by the Federal Government.

Mr. KENDRICK. There seems to be in many cases no opportunity to ascertain as to whether or not the disease is incurable and the live stock, therefore, valueless; and, as I understand, this appropriation is intended to share the loss between the owner of the property which is destroyed and the public or the Government. In certain cases which developed when the foot-and-mouth disease was prevalent actual demonstration proved that the disease could be cured and the live stock actually saved and be restored to a healthy condition; but it was not deemed to be in the interest of the public to take any chances of prolonging the risk by treatment of the disease.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, while I have the floor, if I may have the attention of the acting chairman of the committee for a moment, I desire to say that I observe this bill carries very large appropriations—over \$33,000,000. Will the Senator state how it compares with the appropriations for the years 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917? I will be entirely frank with the Senator. Is it not a fact that this bill carries many more millions of dollars than were appropriated for either of the years to which I have just referred?

Mr. McNARY. I can state to the Senator from Utah, in my own way, that the bill this year contains appropriations approximately \$3,000,000 less than for the fiscal year 1922. It is true there have been increases made necessary by the development of the agricultural resources of the country from year to year. While there has generally been a progress upward, this year there has been a decrease which is quite marked. The decrease this year is due largely to the fact that the bill does not contain an appropriation for a million dollars which was carried last year for the acquirement of lands to protect the watersheds of the navigable streams. The bill also omits an item of \$2,000,000 to buy seed grain for drought-stricken regions.

Mr. KING. I was going to call attention to the fact that the so-called reductions were in those items which ought not to be included in this bill.

Mr. McNARY. If the Senator had permitted me to conclude, I should have stated, as I shall now do, that there are a few other new items carried in the bill which practically offset those which have been omitted from it, namely, \$175,000 goes into the appropriation for the Center Market, which is thrust upon the Department of Agriculture; something like \$600,000 is carried in the bill for the administration of the so-called packer act; nearly \$300,000 are appropriated for the execution of the futures trading act. Those new items practically offset those which were carried in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1922 but which were left out this year.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator knows that during the war, for reasons which were urged and doubtless regarded as sufficient—at least by many Senators—the Agricultural appropriation bill was very greatly increased, the increases involving many millions of dollars; but every assurance was then

given that after the war we would return to the prewar appropriations. It is apparent that we are not keeping these promises, but propose to increase the appropriations from year to year, so that they will soon reach or exceed the highest war levels. This bill shows no economy, no retrenchment, no reforms. It is a bill filled with extravagant demands, and seems to have been projected by the bureau chiefs and officials whose powers are to be increased. I will ask the Senator why reductions were not made in many of the items in this bill? It seems to me that \$35,000,000 is entirely too much to appropriate for the current year for the Department of Agriculture.

May I ask the Senator whether it is not a fact that most of the increases are caused by a larger number of officials and are designed to meet the compensation of those officials?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am very happy to inform the Senator from Utah that I think but little, if any, increases have been made on that account. I am also pleased to inform the Senator from Utah that the department will have at least 1,000 less employees in 1923 than it carries on the roll for the year 1922. There has been a decrease in the number of employees.

Mr. KING. Of course, the Senator knows that during the war we increased the appropriations upon the theory that a crisis was upon the country and it was necessary to increase the food supply. Thousands of employees were added to the rolls, but with the understanding they would be separated from the service after the emergency had passed.

Mr. McNARY. The largest increase in the bill comes about by reason of that excellent work known as research work, involving the discovery of the causes of plant and animal diseases; the extension work, which carries that knowledge out to the farmers and producers of the country; the laboratory work; the States Relation Service work in connection with the agricultural schools of the country. Increases have been made along that constructive line, rather than to provide for the payment of salaries of clerks and officials.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator—because I see so many of these are lump-sum appropriations—whether there is anything to limit the compensation to be received by employees who are to be paid from such lump sums?

Mr. McNARY. There is a limitation of \$5,000 per annum in the bill, a provision of that kind having been carried since 1912, at which time the limitation was \$4,500. Employees are carried under lump-sum appropriations until the next succeeding year, when they go to the statutory roll. None of the bureau chiefs are paid higher than \$5,000.

Mr. KING. What I mean is this: In these appropriations the Senator will find large sums, many hundreds of thousands of dollars, but there is nothing to indicate the character of the employees who will be paid or the amount which will be paid to each. Is it understood by the committee just how those large sums will be distributed; how much will be paid for salaries; and if so, the amount to be paid to each employee; or is it left entirely to some bureau chief or to the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of such funds as he may see fit, paying a large number of employees small salaries or a few employees large salaries?

Mr. McNARY. As I have tried to make plain to the Senator, the positions under the different bureaus are statutory, and, of course, it requires an act of Congress to increase or decrease those statutory salaries. In the case of a lump-sum appropriation a wide discretion rests with the chief of the bureau. That is naturally and necessarily so; but none of the experts or scientists are paid a sum in excess of \$5,000 per annum; they are on the statutory roll. However, as I have said, a wide discretion properly is left with the bureaus in connection with the distribution of lump-sum appropriations. The committee has never found any abuse of such appropriations and authority, but the department and the chiefs of bureaus, having in mind the proper execution of the law and its administration, have never misused any funds given to them or violated any trust reposed in them in connection with the lump-sum appropriations made by Congress.

Mr. KING. Let me give an illustration: Supposing \$100,000 or \$200,000 are appropriated for investigations in respect to wheat rust or for the investigation of any other particular disease, is there any limitation in the bill with respect to the number of persons who may receive the appropriation?

Mr. McNARY. Oh, no; that could not be done. We must trust to the judgment, the stability, and the honesty of the officials who administer the law. Using the illustration of the wheat rust referred to by the Senator, or the barberry bush, the scientists are employed in research work to ascertain how the fungi are carried, during what period of the year, and what damage they do to the wheat, many of those scientists being located in Washington. There are also many inspectors, who

are out in the field locating the shrub and explaining to the farmers upon whose property the shrub is located the necessity of its eradication in order to diminish the damage done by the fungi. It must properly be left to the bureau to determine the number of inspectors necessary to carry on the field work, the tasks which they shall perform, the amount of research work to be carried on in the laboratories, and the extension work that must be conducted. There is a limitation upon the salaries and upon the amount of money that may be expended, but we could not by statute provide that they must have so many inspectors in the field, so many workers in the laboratory, and that so many pamphlets shall go out to instruct the farmers concerning the infestation and how to correct it.

Mr. KING. What I meant was whether there was any limitation upon the salaries paid to the various employees who would be called upon to perform work under a particular appropriation.

Mr. McNARY. I tried to make myself clear to the Senator from Utah, but I will repeat that there is a limitation of \$5,000 upon the salaries which may be paid to scientists and all those who perform any character of work for the department. Outside of that, the distribution of the fund is in the judgment and discretion of the chief of the bureau as to the amount of money he shall pay to inspectors and locators, to stenographers and others, who come under his employ in order to carry on the work.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am compelled to leave the Senate Chamber in a few moments to visit one of the departments, and probably the item which I am about to inquire about will not be reached while I am in the Chamber. Will the Senator explain the item of \$427,830 for publications? Does that embrace all the publications of the department, the various circulars and publications coming from the Agricultural Department?

Mr. McNARY. I will ask the Senator what page he is referring to?

Mr. KING. Pages 53 and 54. The item is on page 54—"Total, Division of Publications, \$427,830."

Mr. McNARY. That covers the issuance of the crop bulletins, market bulletins, crop estimates, and all those pamphlets carrying information to the farmers which are the result of research work. That is called extension work. It is carrying the information out to those who need the information which has been discovered by the research work of the scientists in the department.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if some of the publications sent out are similar to some I have received, they are not of much value, and I know that farmers have complained of the lack of value of many of these publications. There is no restriction, then, except in the total amount, as to the bulletins which shall be published—the number, and so on?

Mr. McNARY. No. In the employ of the department there are over 2,000 scientists working daily throughout the year on all those problems that inure to the welfare of the horticultural and agricultural interests of the country. When they ascertain a fact by long research in their laboratories or by investigations in the field, this information is sent out to the farmers of the country, and they, taking advantage of it, have done very much to improve agricultural conditions throughout the country. I believe it is one of the best investments the department is making, one of the best activities in which the Government is interested to-day—the welfare of the farmer—and this work under these publications is doing very much good.

Mr. KING. Some of the publications are valuable. Many of them, I think the Senator will admit, especially if he will communicate with the farmers, are of no consequence.

DISMISSAL FROM CLASSIFIED SERVICE.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I regret very much to interrupt the consideration of the pending bill. I shall take but a few minutes.

In this morning's Post there appears a statement by a local attorney to which I wish to refer. The heading of the article is:

CITES BUREAU CHARGE.

"Forty affidavits filed against Wilmeth order," attorney says. Accused of favoritism. Dismissal of 600 employees basis of demand for reforms.

The statement is, by inference at least, that the recent dismissal by the President of the employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing was the result of those affidavits filed by the attorney for Mr. Hill, who succeeded Mr. Wilmeth as the Chief of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. The attorney who gives out this statement is a Mr. Davis. By the way, the same Mr. Davis, is also the attorney for Mr. Hill in

the suit brought by his, Mr. Hill's, wife against him for divorce. I mention that merely to identify the man Davis who now comes to the rescue of the administration by giving the alleged reasons why these men and women of the bureau were dismissed and disgraced. He alleges the reduction in the force that occurred last July was the basis of the charges against Wilmeth, and furnished a justification for the President's removal of these faithful employees. In my hand I hold a report that bears a superscription of Washington, D. C., September 7, 1921, and is addressed to the honorable, the Secretary of the Treasury. I want to read it, because it tells what Mr. Wilmeth did six months ago, and shows that his action was approved by the present Secretary of the Treasury, and inferentially by the President himself; and now these paid apologists for the President, in their desperation, to find some reason to justify the President's action, this paid attorney comes forward with a misleading statement against these employees. This report deals with the same question.

Incidentally I might say that the subject of Mr. Davis's article in the Post this morning, which the Post plays up on its front page as a justification for the action of the President, deals with the action of Mr. Wilmeth who as director acted only, as I am informed, after he had discussed with Mr. Wadsworth, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, the method he was to follow in reducing the force at the bureau, and that this plan met the approval of Mr. Wadsworth. After it had been approved and put into effect those who were let go filed complaints against Mr. Wilmeth. The Secretary of the Treasury then appointed a committee to investigate the whole matter, and this is their report. It reads:

SIR: The undersigned, constituting the committee named by you on July 20, 1921, "for the purpose of considering the protests of certain employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing against their release from employment in that bureau," respectfully report as follows: The committee has carefully investigated these protests to the fullest extent it deemed necessary or requisite to carry out your instructions, and finds as follows:

1. That there was not only a legitimate reason but an urgent necessity for a reduction in the force of this bureau to the extent to which it was actually reduced.

2. That before any employees were discharged, the director of the bureau put into effect the following rules to be observed in determining what employees should be dismissed:

(1) Drop employees, regardless of term of service, whose records are poor, involving inefficiency, inattention to duty, tardiness, excessive loss of time, agitators, and trouble makers.

(2) Drop, without prejudice, married women whose husbands are employed in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing or in other branches of the Government service at a good salary.

(3) Drop, without prejudice, those employees most recently appointed.

(4) Furlough indefinitely, but subject to recall to duty within the period of a year, employees whose services are not now needed, but whose efficiency and attention to duty have been such as to make their services desirable. This will enable the bureau to draw recruits from a trained and experienced force.

3. That, making reasonable allowance for the human element in the relations between the employees and their next immediate superiors, these rules were apparently so observed as to produce as little individual injustice as could be expected in dealing with so many cases.

4. That the reduction was a real one and not a pretended one for the purpose of putting other more favored employees in the places of those released.

The committee therefore recommends that said protests, and all of them, be disallowed, and that the applications of the protestants, or any of them, for immediate reinstatement should not receive favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted.

D. R. CRISSINGER, *Chairman*.
WILLIAM T. ABBOTT.
W. G. PLATT.
S. R. JACOBS.
CHAS. STEVENSON.
J. E. HARPER, *Secretary*.

Approved:

A. W. MELLON, *Secretary*.

Now, notice who signed the report:

The first is D. R. Crissinger, Comptroller of the Currency; William T. Abbott, W. G. Platt, S. R. Jacobs, Charles Stevenson, J. E. Harper.

Approved: A. W. Mellon, *Secretary*.

The plan was submitted when the order was given to reduce the force. It was approved before it was put into effect. After it was put into effect, and certain employees complained, the Secretary of the Treasury appointed a committee headed by the comptroller, Mr. Crissinger, and this committee investigated the whole matter again and approved everything that had been done. That report was submitted to Mr. Mellon and Mr. Mellon approved it. Now this attorney, in order to besmirch the reputation of Mr. Wilmeth and justify the promotion of his client, revamps these charges, and the Post publishes them on the first page as a justification of the President's action. All these facts were known to Davis before he gave out his misleading statement. Therefore I think Mr. Davis was exceedingly unhappy in the manner of his defense.

Mr. President, I realize—it has been whispered here on the floor of the Senate; everybody knows it—that if these charges of the wrongful dismissal of these employees be pressed some kind of a finding is to be made against these dismissed men and women. They know that. They know that what they have done is now being combed by Secret Service agents, not only to find what actually was done but, if necessary, to find something that was not done in order to justify the heartless removal of these people. They are not going to be surprised at anything that may happen. They and all others realize that something is going to be found which will be claimed justifies this action of the President, and everybody is going to know that when this "finding" is announced that it is not true.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STANLEY. I have heard such rumors, but I have not credited them; I have been loath to believe them. Does the Senator mean that in a Christian Government, headed by gentlemen who pretend to some sense of duty and of honor and of decency, faithful servants of this Government would first be slaughtered upon the altar of political expediency, turned out at the ipse dixit of a spoilsman, and then covertly advised that if they complained at this wrong done them, in violation of the letter if not the spirit of the law, they would lose in character as well as in fortune?

I respect a spoilsman who is bold and open about it. I am not inclined to fall out with the honest Republican or Democrat who believes that the fellows who make the fight should share in the plunder. That man may be mistaken, but he is respectable; but a Government official who would go to some poor man or woman and say, "If you make any noise about this, there will be something found out that will hurt you worse than the loss of a job," is not a spoilsman, he is a blackmailer, and I can not believe that this or any other administration would resort to political blackmail, although I have heard that rumor.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator from Kentucky undoubtedly saw the statements in the papers and he has heard the rumors, and he must know that if justice is all that was sought the investigation would have been had prior to the dismissal and disgrace of the men and women and not afterwards. Under any theory of justice and right men are entitled to be faced by their accusers and to know in advance of their conviction what the charge is, but here the charge was made in secret, the finding was made in secret, and the men are openly and publicly disgraced. Then detectives are set to work to find out some reason that in the mind of the people would justify this cruel action of the President.

As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WATSON] suggests, ordinarily in decent procedure a man is entitled to a list of the witnesses who shall appear against him. In this particular case, there being no witnesses, of course there could be no list furnished.

There is a reason back of all this. On the 21st day of December, 1921, Mr. FORDNEY, a Member of Congress from Michigan—and I think I do him no injustice when I say that he thinks that "to the victor belong the spoils," and there are many honest men who entertain that view—made a speech in the House of Representatives, and the question of replacing Democrats with Republicans in the departments here was discussed. Mr. FORDNEY said there was to be a new broom in the Treasury soon, and then they would get places. After that had been passed for a little while, Mr. CHALMERS asked this question:

The gentleman is very wise, and I understand very close to the administration. How soon, in the gentleman's opinion, may we expect a new broom in the Treasury Department?

Mr. FORDNEY. I understand that the Senate is quite likely to confirm to-day the appointment of Mr. Dover, of Takoma, Wash., a former resident of Ohio, as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who will have charge of the customs. That is a step in the right direction and at the right time. [Loud applause.]

This Mr. Dover was secretary of the Republican Committee in the good old days of Mark Hanna and the "Blocks of Five." He got into the Treasury, and the removals commenced. They are going on now, though not quite so spectacular as those I have just been discussing. I shall not take time to read the newspaper clippings, but merely the headlines, and without objection I shall include them. In the Daily News recently appeared this:

To "Hardingize Government in interest of efficiency."—The language is that of one of Harding's closest advisers—Men scheduled to go have important jobs, but, it is alleged, Democratic leanings.

I ask leave to insert that article in the RECORD.

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

TO "HARDINGIZE GOVERNMENT IN INTEREST OF EFFICIENCY"—THE LANGUAGE IS THAT OF ONE OF HARDING'S CLOSEST ADVISERS—MEN SCHEDULED TO GO HAVE IMPORTANT JOBS, BUT, IT IS ALLEGED, DEMOCRATIC LEANINGS.

[By Lawrence Martin.]

The Government departments are to be "Hardingized in the interests of efficiency" one of President Harding's closest advisers said to-day.

A general "housecleaning" that will remove at least 2,000 prominent Government employees here with Democratic leanings or views, alleged to be hostile to those of the administration, has been decided upon as a sequel to the summary dismissal by the President of 28 Bureau of Engraving chiefs.

President Harding, it is represented, having determined to attain the highest efficiency of governmental administration, the more important positions in the administration must not be held by Democrats or others not friendly to his policies. He has decided to carry out this policy, regardless of any criticism at the start, believing it will be approved in the long run.

ONE IN TEN ARE TO GO.

Elmer Dover, recently appointed Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, will soon extend the housecleaning policy throughout the Internal Revenue Bureau, where the nucleus of a Democratic machine—relics of the McAdoo-Roper days—is alleged to exist.

In addition to the bureau chiefs dismissed from the Bureau of Engraving, it is known that 445 of 5,000 employees of the Customs Service have been removed recently.

This ratio of 1 to 10 will hold in other departments, it is said.

CAUSES FRICTION WITH BLAIR.

Dover is now directing his attention to cleaning out the Internal Revenue Bureau. His moves already have caused some friction with David H. Blair, director of the bureau. The President is said to take the position that this bureau, particularly the income-tax division unit, is far behind in its work, and that a lack of sympathy on the part of some bureau chiefs with his policies is partly responsible.

About 300 changes already have been ordered among the 7,000 employees of the Revenue Bureau, and the number will be increased.

DRY AGENTS BEING SHAKEN UP.

The next department to come under the knife will be the Prohibition Bureau. Present indications are that 300 or 400 of the dry agents have been removed.

Administration spokesmen claim the President's policy already is having a beneficial effect—that hundreds of employees who have been lax in their work are "pepping up," because of the fear of losing their jobs.

Mr. CARAWAY. I wish to call attention to "Hardingizing." That is the expression, to "Hardingize" the departments. I think this administration will be credited with the coining of two words—"Newberryizing" and "Hardingizing." "Newberryizing" means to buy a seat in the Senate, and then for the administration to whip in line Members of the Senate to sustain him and keep him there.

Mr. REED. Is not the Senator for once a little inaccurate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I thought the Senator was going to say that "Newberryizing" consisted in buying a seat in the Senate, and "Hardingizing" consisted in compelling the Republicans to vote to retain him in his seat.

Mr. CARAWAY. I think that is correct. "Newberryizing" means to buy a seat, and "Hardingizing" the Senate means to compel the Senate to keep him in it.

"Hardingizing" means something else. It means to drive men and women out of employment, destroy their reputations, blast their prospects for future honorable employment, and deny to them even the right of being told why it was done. That is "Hardingizing."

"Hardingizing" means more than that. When these wronged men and women go to see the President, as humble supplicants, and ask that he tell them what the charges were which warranted him in summarily driving them out of public employment and destroying their reputations, "Hardingizing" means to go to the golf links and leave your secretary to tell them that the President is sorry if it hurts, but he has no other explanation to make.

When that old lady went to the White House, that lady whose hair is as white as snow, who had gone into the Government service when a girl and worked her way up until she was the chief of a bureau, who had been summarily dismissed, disgraced, and driven out of public work—when she went there and asked if she may be told why it was she was dismissed, and why she was disgraced, and why her opportunity to earn an honest living had been taken from her, "Hardingizing" means to have the President say, in effect, by refusing to see her, though I do not, of course, say that he used these words: "This old woman, whose reputation I have destroyed, and whose right to make an honest living I have taken from her—send her away. I can not have the wine of my joy embittered by her tears. Whatever my reason was for disgracing her, I keep it to myself."

Mr. President, I am reminded of the minister of Louis XVI just before the French Revolution. Thousands of starving men, women, and children assembled in front of his hotel to petition him for something to eat. They wanted to tell him of their

conditions. The Government had seized everything they had, and they were actually starving in the streets. This minister sent word out that he would not see them. They besought him to know, then, what they should eat, and he inhumanly said, "Let them eat grass." Three months later, Mr. President, the same motley mob marched down the streets of Paris with the head of that minister on a pole and a bunch of grass sticking in his mouth. The minister was reduced to that humble state as well as the citizen who begged for bread.

"Hardingizing" goes further than that. The President has a new launch, which cost \$45,000, the finest in which anyone ever rode. I am not complaining, because a local paper said—and it knows—that the President could not land properly and keep his dignity with one that cost less money. He got it; \$45,000 is a trifling, insignificant sum, of course. If it were not for the striking contrast, to which I am about to call attention, I would not even mention it. Here is a letter, written by Mrs. James H. Brooks, whose husband is a minister of the gospel in a little city of six or seven thousand people down in my State. She herself is the head of the Federation of Women's Clubs of that State and an active worker in all matters of reform and all movements of educational advancement. She wrote me this letter:

BLYTHEVILLE, April 3, 1922.

DEAR MR. CARAWAY: I am just back from a meeting of the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Arkansas, and as I was honored with the presidency of this young child—"the baby sister," Mrs. Hobart calls it—I want to know some things.

We went out to Fort Root. Found things beautifully clean, and the woman in charge all that heart could wish in the attitude toward and care of our poor mentally sick boys.

That is a hospital for service men.

But to my horror and shame I found them—the superintendent and nurses and legionaries—begging us for second-hand clothing to clothe these dear boys—as physically perfect and beautiful as my boys or yours, and even that they must sell the baskets they make to get money for smokes. Isn't that a crying shame to this Government of ours? Is this so all over the country, and is there any way in which Congress can be made to see these things? These boys ought to be on the pay roll of the United States, receiving enough money to have the things they want. I am almost sure, thinking over the men as I saw them, that they were all average, and many more than average, in intelligence before they went into that "hell" into which they were sent.

I know you have worked for the boys; but please work as you never worked before.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JAMES H. BROOKS.

Mr. President, that is "Hardingizing." Buy your yacht and make the crowned heads of Europe ashamed when they come in comparison with you in the show places of the world, but let the boys who were sent across the sea to preserve the liberty of the world beg for second-hand clothes to wear and cigarettes to smoke. That is "Hardingizing."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Senator referred to that launch. It cost \$45,000?

Mr. CARAWAY. That is my understanding, and it was cheap at that, they tell us.

Mr. HARRISON. What is the use of that launch?

Mr. CARAWAY. Can it be possible that the Senator from Mississippi does not realize that when you are "Hardingizing" a nation you must "Hardingize" the President himself and make him outglitter in splendor any other ruler in the world?

Mr. HARRISON. I had seen in the papers a few days ago that because of the general depression in England the King of England had dispensed with his launch or his yacht.

Mr. CARAWAY. The King of England wore patched shoes also, but he is not "Hardingizing" a great nation. But I am also reminded by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Watson] that the President of the French Republic does not maintain a private yacht.

Mr. HARRISON. It may be, if the Senator will permit, that it is just such actions as that, with 6,000,000 men out of employment and wages being reduced, which resulted, in the election yesterday in one of the districts in New York which has always gone Republican, in the last election by 30,000 majority, in the Republican being elected by only 2,500 or 3,000 majority, the plurality or majority being cut 27,000 votes, I believe, from the Republican majority in the last election.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course, and they will not be able to find a 2,500 majority in November.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. REED. Some mention was made of economy in some of the European courts. I noticed an article in one of the papers a day or two ago to the effect that the Queen of the British Empire had reduced her bill for dresses to \$1,500 per year, and she was forced to spend most of that for court dresses, which, under the custom, she was compelled to have; that she had even

resorted to having her dresses made over and some of them dyed; and that this was being done not only as a matter of practical economy but in order to set an example to be followed by other people who ordinarily expended vast sums. So the women over there seem to be in the crusade of economy as well as the men.

Mr. CARAWAY. I hope that George Harvey does not hear that, for he will cut the society of the Queen if he knows it. When George gets on his knee breeches he would not associate with a lady who had on a secondhand dress, I know.

Mr. President, here is another fine example of "Hardingizing." I am in receipt of a letter this morning from a former service man. What little this may say about me I hope the Senate will pardon my reading, because I want to read the entire letter. It is dated April 10, 1922, is addressed to me, and is as follows:

I was so pleased when I read the article in the Star this evening in regards to the resolution introduced I just had to drop you a line to let you know I am only one ex-service man who appreciates the work you are doing for our interests. It is an awful hard thing when a man spends his early manhood in the Army and Navy, and then 16 or 17 years in the employ of Uncle Sam, with excellent records, only to be laid off, without any redress whatever.

As I said before, I am only one, but I was in the navy yard as a helper when, on February 9, I was told, after working until 11 o'clock, that I was furloughed. The consequence is that I am now without work. I have served on foreign soil three different times for this country—Cuba, 1898; Philippines, 1900; China, 1901—and from my viewpoint it looks very hard that I, a married man with a family, trying to buy my own home, am furloughed while the very man that was kept to do the work I was doing came in the yard during the war when it meant either war or work. My rating was 97.2.

May you be successful, Senator, in all you undertake, and believe me you have my hearty praise for your faithful work.

He signs it without any injunction of secrecy, but I do not care to publish his name. If anyone wants to see it, I will show it to him. That is Hardingizing the Government employees.

We have a law against doing that very thing. I hold it here in my hand. There even is an order bearing date June 20, 1921, calling attention to that law. It reads:

Provided, That in the event of reduction being made in force in any of the executive departments, no honorably discharged soldier, sailor—

And so on.

I have another letter from an ex-service man dated the 11th, yesterday, telling the same story. I have here another letter, dated the 11th, from an ex-service man who lives in the southeast part of the city who had a place in the Government but was discharged, although his rating was good. He was laid off that somebody else might get his place.

That is Hardingizing the Government; but it seems to go beyond that. Hardingizing seems to be going even to the extent of compelling the President's own minister, the pastor of his own church, when designated to deliver the invocation at the meeting of a great world conference, to eliminate the name of Jesus Christ from his prayer. That is Hardingizing the church.

Now, my good friend the Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, who seems to have been the only man who saved anything from the wreck of that conference—he saved his whiskers and nothing else—gets mad whenever anything is said about it. He wrote a letter saying that he hoped the people would quit criticizing the delegates of that convention. He recently gave out an interview, which was headed:

Christ not censored from parley prayer, Mr. Hughes declares.

Doctor FESS—Congressman FESS, from Ohio—who is chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee, had written to Mr. Hughes to know about this, because Christian people everywhere did not understand why it was necessary to censor the prayer of a Christian minister, a Baptist preacher, in order not to offend the reigning monarch of Japan. Therefore, he wrote to Mr. Hughes for a denial, and got a typical Hughes denial, which always means to imply that any statement that does not agree with Mr. Hughes is not only inaccurate but contemptible. Mr. Secretary Hughes acquired that habit when he was a judge, you know. He could then make people accept his statements, right or wrong, and probably wrong. He gave this out for publication, in the concluding part of which he said:

The narrowness and bigotry exhibited in the criticism to which your correspondence refers are, in my judgment, so utterly despicable that I do not intend to notice the matter in any way.

God bless your soul, and they are just common, ordinary Christian people commenting on the matter. But Mr. Hughes thinks that he does not need to take notice of them. He then continues with a statement, which I think he will regret some day:

I shall not say anything in reply to the statements that are made. The best thing is to ignore the matter altogether. Doctor Abernethy's prayer was admirable in every respect.

That ought to do Doctor Abernethy a lot of good to have Hughes approve his prayer. The newspaper item then continues:

Mr. Hughes then added for Mr. Fess's information—

And I suppose for no one else's—
that no censorship was exercised.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, without desiring to interrupt the Senator, I have seen what purports to be a copy of the correspondence which discloses absolutely that the prayer was censored.

Mr. CARAWAY. I have it here, and if it had not been published already, in deference to the minister's wishes not to have it published, I would not read it now. It has been published, and I therefore want to lay it alongside of Mr. Hughes's letter in order that these narrow-minded bigots who ask that the name of Jesus Christ be used in prayer, these narrow-minded people who think Jesus Christ ought to be prayed to and ought to be named in our prayers, the contemptible people that Hughes referred to, may know just exactly what the minister said about it. I am going to read his letter.

Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C.

That is the church the President "honors" by worshipping in it, you know. It is written to the editor of the Manufacturers' Record, and, as I said, unless it had been published I would not have read it. It has been in my possession for a long time, but inasmuch as Doctor Abernethy did not want it given publicity, I would not have published it, but some one else has done so, and therefore it has had publicity, and so I read it.

May I first say just this much in explanation: This letter was in answer to a letter written by the editor of the Manufacturers' Record, who is a personal friend of Doctor Abernethy, who asked him to tell him what truth, if any, there was in the statement that he had been compelled to strike the name of Jesus Christ from his prayer, and this is his answer:

I am in receipt of your very cordial letter of January 6. If I could have the opportunity of talking with you on this matter face to face, I am sure I could convince you I did not have it in my heart at all to dishonor my Lord Jesus Christ in the offering of that prayer at the conference. I have been very severely criticized for it by people from all parts of the country, but they did not know the background of the situation.

I trust you will regard what I say to you in the strictest confidence—that is, it is not for publication.

And, as I said, unless it had been published, I would not have published it.

Had I been left to my own initiative, I am very sure that I would have offered the prayer that I did in the name of Christ—at least that is the way I always do end my prayers. I was reminded, however, that the conference was not a Christian body—

And, by the way, the whole American people found that out when the four-power pact came out, because it was a surrender to paganism, an alliance with a pagan nation against a Christian nation, and, therefore, Doctor Abernethy correctly said:

I was reminded, however, that the conference was not a Christian body—

And he then continues—

that there would be Buddhists and Confucianists present, and was told that it was the feeling that a simple recognition of the Deity would fill the requirements. I remembered that the prayer that Jesus taught and which we repeat from Sunday to Sunday did not contain his name, and yet it had the spirit of Christ in it, as we will all agree.

I felt—

Now, mark you this, Mr. President—

I felt that it would be better to offer a prayer of recognition of God Almighty and a petition for guidance than to have no prayer at all.

But Doctor Abernethy was told he could not pray in the name of Jesus Christ. I will not censure him. He was told, if his letter tells the truth, that he could offer this prayer without the name of Jesus Christ, or no prayer would be offered at all.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CARAWAY. With pleasure.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I remind the Senator from Arkansas that it was Christ Himself who offered the Lord's prayer, and He could not invoke Himself, because He had not then been crucified.

Mr. CARAWAY. I thank the Senator. Now, continuing with Doctor Abernethy's letter:

I therefore offered the petition as it was published in the papers. I do not believe I crucified my Lord as I have been accused of doing.

I am sorry that my brother ministers, including Doctor Dixon, have spoken as they have. I feel very sure that if they had known everything they would not have judged me as harshly as they have.

I trust this will, in a measure at least, explain the situation to you.

Thanking you again for your cordial sympathy, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

W. S. ABERNETHY.

Now, Mr. President, lay that letter alongside of Mr. Hughes's statement, who says these contemptible people who say that Doctor Abernethy's prayer was censored, these people who complained because Jesus Christ was not mentioned in a Christian country—lay it alongside of Mr. Hughes's statement and then you can believe either one of the two. You can not believe both of them. I personally believe Doctor Abernethy, though I never saw him.

Well, Mr. President, that is another case of Hardingizing the church, Hardingizing the faith of the Christian American people, by striking the name of Jesus Christ out of our prayer.

Mr. President, I want to call attention to an article that appears in the Post—I seem to have lost the date of it, but I believe it was last Wednesday—which was headed as follows:

Officials deny shake-up plan for Treasury. Reorganization work goes on over head of Secretary. Changes already total nearly 400. President's friend works scheme independent of Mr. Mellon.

The article says in part:

Dover has been working directly with President Harding and has been quite frank in his discussion of the forthcoming changes.

Now, Secretary of the Treasury Mellon, who is at the head of the whole business, but who thus far has kept his hands and his voice out of the hubbub, has spoken.

Discussing Mr. Dover's reorganization plans, without mentioning any names, of course, Secretary Mellon in an official statement said:

"These reports do not emanate from any official source."

The article says that they are going to work their reorganization over the head of Mr. Mellon. I think it is to Mr. Mellon's everlasting credit that he refused to become a party to the scheme.

Another headline in the Washington Post reads as follows:

Firm in bureau shift. Harding to disclose no charges; believes reasons ample.

Both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have found it necessary to issue warnings to the officers and enlisted men of the Army and the Navy against turning Bolshevik. Mr. Denby came out with a strong letter warning the men in the service, both officers and enlisted men, against joining the Reds. Mr. Weeks thought so well of Denby's statement that he adopted the same phraseology, and the headlines in the paper read as follows:

Weeks joins "Red" warning by Denby. Cautions Army that communists stress efforts to breed disloyalty among men. Amplifies his Navy order.

There is a reason, Mr. President, why the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War should issue these orders. When you Hardingize the Army and the Navy and the governmental departments, as they are doing, you breed disloyalty. Denby knew it. He knew it when he discharged the soldiers and sailors, in violation of the law, who were supposed to be protected by statute. He knew he was violating the law. He was assuming to be above the law, and he feared that men in lesser station might follow his example and disregard the law, and therefore he warns all who are below him that, "While I do not regard the law and deny a man's right to appeal to me, I am supreme; but you must not turn 'Red,' as I have, and disregard the law. You must be obedient to the law." And Mr. Weeks adopted the same language.

Our genial friend, the Vice President, of whom I am exceedingly fond, as the spokesman for the administration went to Michigan, as I have been told—I have no knowledge of the correctness of the statement—to help secure the renomination of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I do not know whether that is true or not, and I do not care; but the Vice President, who is accredited with being the shrewdest man associated with the administration, went to Michigan and made a speech. I do not think I am voicing any secret when I say that I have often heard it said that the mistake the Republican Party made was in not giving the first place to the man who is second. He took two hours and a half to talk about this administration, and if he, with his shrewd Yankee brains, could not think of anything good to be said for it, it could not be found; that is all. After he had wandered all around the earth he came back and said, "Well, boys, the President opened the doors of the White House." That was the best thing that the Vice President could find to say for this administration—that it had "opened the doors of the White House." Incidentally, he could have said that it had opened the doors of every workshop and factory in this country and had turned out the men, until millions of them are walking the streets and begging for bread. He could have said, if he had been candid about it, that the administration had not only opened the doors of the White House but had opened the doors of the mines, so that every man who goes below the surface of the earth and earns his living with shovel and pick is now on an enforced vacation.

He could have said, if he had wanted to, that Hardingizing the administration had opened the doors of practically every factory in New England, so that thousands and thousands of men and women and children are begging for places to work, and some of them who were strikers were shot down in the good old State of Rhode Island the other day. The President opened these doors as well as the doors of the White House.

However, it is a commentary, Mr. President, that when the brains of this administration—and I think the Vice President is the brains of the administration—went to Michigan, after weeks and weeks of study, with all of his Yankee ingenuity—and I do love his peculiar New England drawl; it carries to me conviction, of one kind or another—after thinking of all the things that this administration had done that he could afford to talk about, he said, "Why, bless your heart, boys, the President opened the doors of the White House." He has, and he has hung on it a sign "To let," and a new tenant will take it at the end of his present lease.

However, Mr. President, let me say in conclusion—and it will possibly be the last I shall say about this question at all—that I know we are not going to get any investigation. I know it for this reason: I know that this question can not be mentioned but that a half dozen Senators on the other side of the Chamber rise in anger. Why, the other day, when I tried to get consideration of this resolution, there were four or five Senators on the floor at once protesting. One of them whose name, I think, never before appeared in the Record—I do not presume anybody knew he was a Member of the Senate except the cashier who pays the salaries—was loudly shouting for "regular order," so that no word might be said for a dismissed soldier or sailor who had been deprived of his rights. The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] was particularly loud in his protests. And the author of the beautiful resolution seating Mr. NEWBERRY, which said, "God bless your heart, you bought your seat, but since you belong to our tribe and we needed you one time and may need you again, you are as good as the rest of us; walk in and take the seat," also objected. They all objected, and they shut off consideration. The Post exultantly said the next morning that I tried a new flank movement on the administration to find out why they had done these men wrong, and it was promptly headed off by the Republicans. Of course they headed it off. I know I am not going to get any investigation. I told Mr. Wilmeth this morning that he would get no investigation; that he would get no vindication; that he would be "framed up" if it became necessary. He knows it. I know it.

But, after all, Mr. President, I am not concerned with the political aspects of this question. I have had some sympathy with those who do not agree with the merit system. Sometimes I have thought that it did not always produce good results. I have, though, no kind of patience with hypocrisy and sham; I have no patience with Hardingizing an administration and a department, because that means to do an injustice and ignore the other man's rights; it means to ignore the law; it means to blast the reputation of honest men and women. I have no patience with Hardingizing an administration. If you are compelled to reward what few people now remain faithful to this administration by giving them places, why, let the President do what he threatened to do the other day. He said, "If you make me mad I am going to take all of these places out of the civil service." Let him do it. Then, at least, he could look every man in the face and say, "I did so because I believe that the friends of the present administration ought to have the places. God knows there are few enough of them left, and I want to reward my faithful partisans." Then the Republican majority could at least go to the country and say, "This is our policy; we have adopted it; we are frank about it; we are not practicing any hypocrisy or sham." However, they will not do it; they are going ahead Hardingizing the departments, and the President has Hardingized the Senate and makes the Senators on the other side of the Chamber deny to those who have been wronged any kind of redress or any kind of investigation which will disclose the lack of justification for the action of the administration. But, after all, Senators, this is but the beginning, not the end.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10730) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 16, at the end of line 24, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Animal Industry from "\$6,669,276" to "\$6,974,976."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, before the amendment just stated is disposed of I desire to express the gratification I feel that the customary provision in regard to the utilization of the appropriation for the eradication of tuberculosis has been preserved in the bill before us. In the deficiency bill which was passed in the month of January a provision was inserted for what is known as area eradication. It became the subject of a letter addressed to me by Doctor Butler, State veterinarian of Montana, some correspondence in relation to which subject I should like at this place to have inserted in the Record, if there is no objection. For the purpose of showing the efficacy of the cooperative efforts on the part of the State and the Federal Government, I desire to read a paragraph from the letter:

The stockmen of the West have cooperated with the Bureau of Animal Industry in an earnest effort to eradicate tuberculosis, and I may state for your information that, according to the United States Bureau of Animal Industry's official figures, Montana has done more work in the eradication of bovine tuberculosis than any other State in the United States, and, according to our official figures, we have reduced bovine tuberculosis from 10.63 per cent in 1911 to 0.94 of 1 per cent in 1921. Our figures for 1921 are very substantial, in that for that year we tested 72,932 cattle, and, as I have said, found only 0.94 of 1 per cent tuberculosis. This record, so far as I have been able to ascertain, has not been duplicated by any State or country in the world, with the exception of the District of Columbia.

I ask that the correspondence to which I have referred may be inserted in the Record.

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

The correspondence referred to is as follows:

STATE OF MONTANA,
LIVE STOCK SANITARY BOARD,
Helena, January 30, 1922.

Hon. T. J. WALSH,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the Federal indemnity deficiency appropriation for the balance of the present fiscal year, which was recently passed, we find the following provision:

"For the payment of indemnities on account of cattle slaughtered in connection with the eradication of tuberculosis from animals, \$600,000: *Provided*, That this sum shall be expended only in payment to owners whose cattle have been in their possession for a period of at least six months prior to slaughter.

"*Provided further*, That no part of said sum shall be expended for the payment of indemnities to owners of herds hereafter placed under Federal and State supervision unless such herds are located in circumscribed areas designated and agreed upon by the States and Federal Government in which to conduct cooperative tuberculosis eradication work."

We see by this provision that the Federal Department of Agriculture, without previous notice to this department, has changed its policy relative to payment of indemnity in the cooperative tuberculosis eradication work with Montana. This change in policy is contrary to the provisions of its cooperative agreement with the State of Montana, which was entered into and agreed upon in 1917.

We can, and have in the past, practiced area tuberculosis eradication in small isolated dairy districts where such area work was practical and within our financial possibilities. Our objection to the bureau's stand is that unless an owner of cattle lives within these small circumscribed areas, he will not be entitled to indemnity. These areas are to be decided upon by the bureau and State officials.

Anyone conversant with the West will immediately realize that it is impossible to place an entire State under such area work. Under these conditions to arbitrarily deprive a stock owner of indemnity simply because he did not live within an area designated by the Federal and State officials is discriminating and is absolutely unjust.

We write you this letter with the earnest request that you endeavor to have the appropriation bill for the coming fiscal year contain the same provisions as the last previous annual appropriation bill, and not the provision of the deficiency appropriation, which I have quoted.

This deficiency appropriation is unfair and unjust to the Western States. I may state I have had letters from Minnesota and North Dakota on this proposition, and our ideas in this matter are practically identical.

The stockmen of the West have cooperated with the Bureau of Animal Industry in an earnest effort to eradicate tuberculosis, and I may state for your information that, according to the United States Bureau of Animal Industry's official figures, Montana has done more work in eradicating bovine tuberculosis than any other State in the United States, and, according to our official figures, we have reduced bovine tuberculosis from 10.63 per cent in 1911 to 0.94 of 1 per cent in 1921. Our figures for 1921 are very substantial, in that for that year we tested 72,932 cattle, and as I have said, found only 0.94 of 1 per cent tuberculosis. This record, so far as I have been able to ascertain, has not been duplicated by any State or country in the world, with the exception of the District of Columbia.

Considering that Montana has worked so diligently in this national program of bovine tuberculosis eradication, we can not but feel the decided and distinct injustice to western stockmen by the provisions contained in the deficiency appropriation bill. These provisions are applicable to small, intensely populated areas, but are inapplicable to Western States with large counties and sparsely settled areas.

Yours very truly,

W. J. BUTLER,
State Veterinary Surgeon.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1922.

Hon. T. J. WALSH,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: I have your letter of February 14, inclosing copy of communication you received from Dr. W. J. Butler, executive officer, State live-stock sanitary board, Helena, Mont., protesting against the provisions of the item in the deficiency appropriation for the eradication of tuberculosis of live stock in cooperation with the various States.

The provision to which Doctor Butler takes exception permits the payment of indemnities to owners of herds placed under Federal and State supervision prior to December 15, 1921, therefore it in no way interferes with the work in that State as far as paying for tuberculous cattle that were in herds then under supervision is concerned.

Up to January 31, 1922, only 44 per cent of the regular Federal allotment to Montana for the payment of indemnity was used, so there remains to be expended, if necessary, 56 per cent during the remaining five months of the fiscal year. This fund is not required to be spent in circumscribed areas doing tuberculosis work, so that the work in Montana can proceed in the usual manner for the balance of the year.

The department records indicate that area tuberculosis work is being conducted in Gallatin, Richland, and Ravalli Counties, Mont., therefore should it be necessary to pay indemnity for tuberculous animals in those countries it may be paid out of the deficiency appropriation.

The plan of eradicating tuberculosis of live stock from all the herds within an area agreed upon is not a new project. It was one of the three projects decided upon by the department when the tuberculosis eradication work was inaugurated in cooperation with the live-stock owners and State live-stock sanitary officials in 1917. The other projects are:

1. The eradication of tuberculosis from pure-bred herds of cattle, otherwise known as the accredited herd plan.
2. The eradication of tuberculosis from swine.

The accredited herd plan contemplates the tuberculin testing of herds of cattle whose owners sign joint agreements with the State and Federal departments. This work requires the detaching of State or Federal inspectors to make tests promiscuously around the State and entails a considerable amount of travel and added expense which can be materially reduced when employees are detailed to test all of the herds within an area agreed upon.

The area plan must ultimately be the basis for the suppression of tuberculosis among live stock in the United States. Obviously but a small part of the program could be accomplished by testing herds here and there, leaving large groups of herds untested, thus jeopardizing the health of those herds which have been cleaned up at a great expense to the State and Federal Governments. That the area plan is applicable to western conditions as well as territory more densely populated is borne out by the progress being made in the States of Oregon and Washington. In each of those States quite a number of counties are actively engaged in the suppression of the disease among all the herds in the county.

Very truly yours,

HENRY C. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

MONTANA LIVE STOCK SANITARY BOARD,
Helena, March 13, 1922.

Hon. T. J. WALSH,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: I thank you very much for your letter of March 4, with a copy of the honorable Secretary of Agriculture's letter with reference to tuberculosis eradication work.

The statements in my letter of January 30 addressed to you are correct. The honorable Secretary of Agriculture's answer does not take into consideration the essential objections we record against the United States Bureau of Animal Industry's attitude on indemnity for tuberculous cattle and cooperative work on bovine tuberculosis eradication.

Our objection is that they enter into an agreement with the different States and then change their methods without consulting with the various States with whom they have agreed to cooperate. We also are correct in our statement that area work, as area work is now defined, is not practical nor financially feasible in large range districts. Area work is not new. We have carried on area work in Montana for a good many years, only that area work has been limited to certain restricted districts which are thickly populated and wherein the dairy industry was the principal industry of that section.

The honorable Secretary's reference to the work being carried on in Washington and Oregon is not apropos. Area testing in these States is carried on in their thickly settled dairy sections in the vicinity of Portland and Seattle. So far as we have been able to ascertain, they have not undertaken area testing in any of their range or beef sections.

Area testing in Montana is being carried on in Gallatin and Ravalli Counties but not in Richland County. Climatic and geographic conditions make it impossible to carry on area work during the winter months in Richland County. In summer months cattle are out on the range, and with the present world financial conditions it is not practical to round up and gather all cattle in a county and subject them to a tuberculin test.

It is true we have not as yet been affected by the deficiency appropriation provisions, but should these same provisions become part of the regular appropriation, then Montana and other Western States will be discriminated against in a very unfair and unjust manner.

I again desire to express to you my very sincere appreciation of your earnest efforts in behalf of the live-stock industry of Montana and the Western States.

Yours very truly,

W. J. BUTLER,
State Veterinary Surgeon.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, at the end of line 21, to increase the appropriation for the investigation, testing, and improvement of plants yielding drugs, spices, poisons, oils, and related products and by-products, and for general physiological and fermentation investigations from "\$39,820" to "\$45,820."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, at the end of line 17, to strike out "\$379,705" and to insert "\$432,505"; and in line 18, after the word "That," to strike out "\$147,200" and to insert "\$200,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For the investigation and improvement of cereals, including corn, and methods of cereal production, and for the study and control of cereal diseases, including barberry eradication, and for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases, and for the investigation and improvement of broom corn and methods of broom-corn production, \$432,505: Pro-

vided, That \$200,000 shall be set aside for the location of and destruction of the barberry bushes and other vegetation from which rust spores originate.

MR. NORRIS. Mr. President, since the amendment just stated is a committee amendment, if we want to make any change in the amount recommended to be appropriated by the committee, it will have to be done now. So I wish to move an amendment to the committee amendment.

MR. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I inquire to which amendment the Senator is referring.

MR. NORRIS. I am speaking of the amendment at the end of line 17, which I am going to couple with an amendment in line 18.

MR. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

MR. NORRIS. Yes.

MR. McNARY. To what page is the Senator referring?

MR. NORRIS. Page 22.

MR. McNARY. In reference to appropriation for the eradication of the barberry and the investigation of cereal diseases?

MR. NORRIS. Yes. I move, Mr. President, to amend the amendment of the committee in line 18, page 22, by striking out "\$432,505" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$532,505," and also in the committee amendment, on the same line, by striking out "\$200,000" and inserting "\$300,000."

MR. KELLOGG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

MR. NORRIS. Yes; I yield for a question.

MR. KELLOGG. I have offered an amendment, which I supposed was pending, to increase the amount to \$732,000.

MR. NORRIS. There is no such amendment pending now, of course. I presume the Senator submitted an amendment and had it printed.

MR. KELLOGG. I thought I had offered it.

MR. NORRIS. But, of course, it is not pending.

MR. KELLOGG. Perhaps not.

MR. NORRIS. It will have to be formally offered.

MR. KELLOGG. Very well.

MR. NORRIS. The fact of the amendment being printed does not make it pending, of course.

MR. KELLOGG. I could not offer it until the item was reached.

MR. NORRIS. No; the Senator could not offer it before this particular item came up, and it has not heretofore been reached.

MR. KELLOGG. I wish the Senator would increase the amount suggested by his amendment.

MR. NORRIS. Perhaps after we have discussed the item I may increase the amount. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that I am not myself so much impressed with the amount that I have proposed as an amendment. I believe this work ought to be done rapidly, and that it will be economy to do it rapidly. I have moved to increase the amount that may be utilized from \$200,000 to \$300,000, based on the testimony of Doctor Ball, assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, who says that they could utilize that much; that they have the men and machinery already, so that they can use \$300,000 instead of \$200,000. He says further in his testimony they could use \$500,000; but he is not sure that it could be done economically. Personally I think if we have the machinery and the organization to eradicate the barberry bush, it will be economy to do it all at once, because that much more wheat and oats, but principally wheat, will be saved. I think Senators all understand that the rust in wheat, especially in the northern part of the country, running from the Canadian line clear down to Oklahoma, is caused by the spores which are blown by the wind and which originate in the barberry bush.

The barberry bush is a flowering plant, planted because it is a flowering plant, a shrub, grown in cities, on lawns, and it grows wild throughout the country. The idea is to eliminate the barberry bush, and thus eliminate black rust in wheat. My understanding is, as a scientific proposition, that with the exception of some rust which is not so damaging, and which takes place in the Southern States, there will be no rust in wheat if the barberry bush is entirely eliminated. Commencing along in the spring of the year, these spores germinate on the barberry bush if the weather is suitable; hot, moist weather being especially favorable.

The spores are carried by the wind and get into the wheat, germinate there, and rust is the result. If another spell of moist, hot weather should take place, the spores would be blown again, would germinate on the wheat itself, and millions, trillions of these spores mature in a short space of time, in a few days. If the weather is suitable and the wind is right, it

covers miles and miles of territory, of course; and when rust gets into the wheat it means the destruction of the wheat crop.

This is ordinarily considered an item for the benefit of the man who produces wheat, and of course he is primarily benefited; but in the end and in a broader scope, in a broad, fair, economical consideration of it, it is a benefit in which the consumer is just as much interested as the producer.

The method of elimination—we carried an appropriation for this purpose before on the agricultural bill, commencing during the war—is for the department to send its representatives out into the country and to a great extent educate the people. No man will produce this bush on his premises if he knows what a harmful thing it is liable to be; that it is liable to make a shortage in the principal food crop of the people. The man who has it on his lawn will be willing to exterminate it himself. The farmer who has it on his farm will be willing to exterminate it. A great many of the people do not understand that from this barberry bush such an immense national damage may be the result; so it is somewhat a matter of education.

In some places these bushes have grown wild on the hillsides, so that there are acres and acres of them on unused land that nobody cares anything about and it is necessary for some public official to destroy them. Some States have passed laws in regard to the matter. The State of Minnesota, I understand, has expended a great deal of money in the eradication of the bush, because wheat is one of the great crops of the State. North Dakota is another great wheat State that has spent some money for this purpose. There will be no difficulty in having the cooperation of all honest-minded citizens as well as officials in attempts that are made to eradicate the barberry bush.

As I said before, if the barberry bush were eradicated this year, completely annihilated, there would be no rust next year or this year, either one. It would be all over. Therefore it is economy to go as fast and as rapidly as we can without the use of unnecessary assistance and without employing men simply to idle away their time, or something of that kind. The department, as I understand, are equipped to utilize for this purpose \$300,000 during the coming fiscal year. As I understand the testimony, they are not equipped to go beyond that. If they are, for one I am willing to accede to the request of the Senator and increase the amount named in the amendment.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon whether I am right. I have glanced over the testimony briefly. It was Doctor Ball, I think, who testified that in his judgment \$300,000 could be used, and I rather derived the impression from reading his testimony that if more money than that were appropriated they did not have the machinery and organization to use it properly.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I will state to the Senator from Nebraska that a number of people living in the infested district wanted the amount increased to \$500,000. The question of the extent of the appropriation was submitted to Doctor Ball, the assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, and he said that \$300,000 could be efficiently used, and he left the impression with the committee, I think, that that, perhaps, was the maximum amount that could be used this year.

Mr. NORRIS. That was the impression I got. I got it regretfully, too, because personally I would rather have a larger sum appropriated.

Mr. McNARY. I do not recall that he did oppose the larger appropriation.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; he did not. He said they could use \$500,000, if I remember his testimony. I was trying to find it. I was glancing through the hearings again this morning. Yes; here is Doctor Ball's testimony.

Mr. KELLOGG. What page is it on?

Mr. NORRIS. Page 111 of the hearings. He says:

We would not change that amount of \$147,200 at all.

That is the amount carried in the original bill before the committee. In other words, he was not asking for an increased appropriation. I confess that I hardly understand that myself. I am not saying that the officials of the department have asked for this increased appropriation, because he says distinctly that they have not asked for it; but in looking over the situation, taking the understanding that I have of the black rust, which is such a damaging thing in all wheat communities, and destroys a crop of wheat in a few days' time if the weather is just right, it seemed to me that the Agricultural Department ought to have taken more of an interest in trying to eradicate this pest, to meet this proposition, when it seems to me it can be so easily done.

I will read this testimony further:

Doctor BALL. We would not change that amount of \$147,200 at all. That work has already been planned with the States for the next year. The plans are all laid; the men are all provided for.

Then he was asked a question by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] with regard to the Budget, as follows:

In your estimate, your budget—meaning the department's budget to the Director of the Budget—did you include this proviso?

Doctor BALL. No; I think not. We just left it out, but we outlined to them that there would be \$147,200 expended. You see, gentlemen, here is what we furnished: I have here an outline showing every single project that we carry on, how much was spent last year, and how much we estimate to spend this year, which is in the hands of the committee and of the Budget.

Then the Senator from Oregon asked him another question:

Doctor, let me ask you this direct question, because we had a number of witnesses here from the district where this infestation occurs, and they want \$500,000 in the 13 States, which would be practically \$38,000 per State; and they urged—you perhaps heard their testimony—that the increased appropriation was necessary to control this rust by the eradication of the barberry.

Doctor BALL. It is just a question of the speed with which you do it. If we could spend all that money in one year, we are equipped so that we could probably eradicate the barberries. We could probably use \$500,000. I am sure we could use \$300,000 and use it efficiently and economically. I am not quite sure that we could use \$500,000 so economically, because it would require the building up of an organization very rapidly; but we could use \$300,000 efficiently and economically this year; and if we did that it would cut in half the time that would be required to get the barberry out.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] asked:

How do you get the estimate of \$300,000? Is that guesswork?

Doctor BALL. That is just doubling our present work.

Senator OVERMAN. And you think by doubling the appropriation you can eradicate the barberry in how long a time?

Doctor BALL. The estimate they make is about three or four years. We are working now, you understand, in the most dangerous localities. Each year that we work we are completing large areas in those dangerous localities and giving more and more protection. I think in three years the protection to the wheat crop will be very complete. If a little rust outbreak came then, we would know that there was a barberry to be hunted up somewhere in that region, and we would go back and hunt for it. It will take a number of years before this will all be done.

I have no doubt but that it will take a number of years to accomplish this work, Mr. President, because it will be impossible in going over it once to get every bush, and it is not so easy to exterminate, either. It is necessary to dig it up. They have not yet found any way to get rid of the barberry bush except to dig it up. It is not difficult to dig. It is a very easy matter. It is just a little bush, but you have to find all of them. If you leave the roots in the ground and they sprout up you may get half a dozen bushes instead of one, or, if you do not find one, it will spread next year, so that, of course, it will be several years before it can be completely eradicated; but the great damage that comes is the destruction of the wheat crop, and to a great extent oats also. If the great bulk of the barberry bushes were destroyed, it would only be a question of hunting up the stray bushes that escaped destruction the first year, which could be easily done, because wherever an outbreak of rust occurred in any community it would be known that somewhere in that vicinity was a barberry bush, or more than one—several, perhaps—and they would hunt for them and get them out.

Another thing, Mr. President, and one of the things that I think has to be taken into consideration in the time in which we do this, is that a great many people do not understand, do not know, that rust comes as it does. A great many other people do not know that they are growing as shrubs in their own yards, on their own lawns, these pests that mean so much harm to the production of the principal food crop of the world. When they do understand it, when they do know it, the officials will have the assistance of everybody, of every honest citizen who is interested in the eradication of the barberry bush; and therefore, Mr. President, it is economy to appropriate just as much money as can be economically used.

I have put this amount at \$300,000 on the strength of the testimony I have read. I would a great deal rather double it, myself, if I thought the money could be used economically.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator has just touched upon a branch of the subject which interests me very much. As I understand his statement—and that is the information that I have gleaned from a reading of the RECORD—the department already have an organization which is apparently complete and apparently efficient. They suggest that they can use up to \$500,000 for this purpose. Having the organization complete, knowing what the disease is, and knowing what the remedy is, why not be a little more indulgent, in view of the importance of this subject not only to the farming community but to the entire country?

I have here a statement which seems to have been compiled by the Agricultural Department, to the effect that since 1916 there have been destroyed by this black-stem rust over 323,-

000,000 bushels. That is what they estimate. If there were uncertainty about the remedy, or uncertainty as to the cause, then I would share the Senator's view that we should not increase this above the \$300,000, but the disease is known, and the remedy is known. It requires a little more of an organization.

Mr. NORRIS. I read a statement somewhere as to the value of oats which had been destroyed. Has the Senator that data in the same statement?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; I think I have.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator not give that?

Mr. POMERENE. Let me give the figures for the year 1916. The loss in wheat was estimated as follows:

	Bushels.
1916	180,000,000
1917	16,203,000
1918	804,000
1919	71,417,000
1920	55,012,000
Total	323,446,000

During this period the total production of wheat in the United States was 3,932,361,000 bushels. The average annual loss during this period was 64,686,000 bushels of wheat. The estimate of the loss in other cereals from black-stem rust of the same kind in 1919 only was 4,369,000 bushels of barley, 15,027,000 bushels of oats, and 31,000 bushels of rye.

Mr. NORRIS. Thirty-one thousand bushels?

Mr. POMERENE. Thirty-one thousand bushels of rye, according to this table. On yesterday, knowing that this item would come up, I wired to our director of agriculture for some information, and in reply to that wire he sent me this telegram, which I have received within the hour:

Barberry fungus prevails in Ohio in many sections. Damage to wheat 1 to 15 per cent, owing to locality. Ohio has appropriation of about \$25,000 to control various plant diseases. Federal appropriation should be four or five hundred thousand.

L. J. TABER,
Director of Agriculture.

Mr. Taber is well known.

Mr. NORRIS. He is the State agricultural director?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; he is at the head of the State agricultural department.

Mr. NORRIS. In Ohio?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; in Ohio. For that reason I was going to suggest to the Senator that he increase the amount provided by his amendment to the amendment. I do not see how there can be any objection to it. If by making an increased effort now we can shorten the time we are to suffer from this disease, I think it will be economy to do it.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I think we all agree, whether we look at it from the standpoint of the Federal Government, or of the States, or of the communities, that first you must eradicate the barberry bush in order to prevent the rust on the wheat. About that there is no question or room for argument. But I want to ask the Senator this question: Does he not think that the States should cooperate with the Government at least on a 50-50 basis in a matter of this kind?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; and no. I should like to have them do that, but you can not control a matter of this kind by State lines. That is the difficulty. It may do the farmers of Ohio good if you have an appropriation so that they can work up to the Indiana State line; but suppose Indiana is not doing anything. For that reason, it seems to me, the Federal Government has the right to take hold of this thing, and take hold of it vigorously.

Mr. McNARY. I am not arguing that the Government should not. Indeed, the Government has manifested its desire to do so, by making the appropriation. But I want to propound another question, first making a statement. The infestation is in only 13 Northwestern States, and the Senator may be surprised to know that only one State that I recall, namely, Minnesota, is expending any money to assist the Government in this enterprise.

Mr. NORRIS. I think North Dakota is, and I judge, from the statement of the Senator from Ohio, that at least this year Ohio will be aiding.

Mr. POMERENE. It has \$25,000 appropriated for work on plant diseases, and I take it from this telegram that that appropriation can be distributed as the director of agriculture may see fit.

Mr. McNARY. I am very happy to know they have been so generous; but there has been no testimony before the House committee or the Senate committee that Ohio has contributed

in any way, and I think when the Senator looks into it he will find that none of the appropriation, which the Senator says is \$25,000, goes to wheat rust.

Mr. POMERENE. It is an appropriation to be expended by the agricultural department of the State of Ohio, and in view of the expression which is used in this telegram, "\$25,000 to control various plant diseases," I take it that it can be used for this purpose.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the junior Senator from Ohio?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Confirmatory of what my colleague has just stated, I want to say that I am certain it will be found that the statement of the Senator from Oregon is a mistake, so far as Ohio is concerned, because I know that the appropriation includes moneys which are to be expended for this particular purpose.

Mr. POMERENE. That is the construction I placed upon the telegram.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to say to the Senator from Ohio that I am very much impressed with what he has said. I did not know, before he interrupted me, that the State of Ohio had taken the steps which evidently it has taken in this matter.

Mr. LADD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. LADD. I want to say just a word in this connection. I have received this week a telegram from the president of the Great Northern Railroad urging that an appropriation of \$500,000 be made to assist in eradicating the barberry bush. North Dakota has been working for a number of years in the effort to eradicate the barberry, and yet the surrounding States are not all working in that direction.

In 1916, on the 4th day of July, and up to that date, it looked as though North Dakota would have a crop of 125,000,000 to 150,000,000 bushels of wheat, but on the 4th of July and the preceding days the rust came in from the barberry bushes in the country there and the actual crop was 39,000,000 bushels of damaged wheat instead of 125,000,000 to 150,000,000. In other words, the State of North Dakota lost 100,000,000 bushels of wheat in one year as the result of rust from the barberry bushes, and therefore the State is deeply interested. I feel that it is not a State problem, although the State of North Dakota has been appropriating money annually for this purpose. It is a national problem.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator know whether Canada has done anything along this line?

Mr. LADD. I think they have done some work, and I think there has been a meeting of a committee of Canadian people in that locality this year.

Mr. NORRIS. Have the Canadian Provinces, or the Dominion as a whole, appropriated any money?

Mr. LADD. I can not say whether they have appropriated any money or not.

Mr. NORRIS. That is something which ought to be taken up with the Canadian officials, I think, especially for the benefit of States like North Dakota.

Mr. KELLOGG. In the State of Minnesota the legislature made an appropriation of \$25,000 this year, and money has also been raised by private subscription; so that whatever the Federal Government does more money will be spent locally than the Federal Government will spend in that State. When the Senator from Nebraska is through with his statement I will enlarge a little upon that point.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have been greatly impressed with one argument made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], which, I confess, never occurred to me before. It is that in the case of most of the investigations for which we provide there is something unknown, there is some uncertainty; we do not know how to do this or how to do that. I may cite the case of the boll weevil. Perhaps we have not found any method of eradication of the particular pest. Therefore the chances are that we will know in advance that the expenditure of money will be useless, and yet we can not afford to let it go by without doing the best we can. Therefore, if we do not know what the remedy is to reach the evil, we can not tell exactly how much money we ought to have.

But, as the Senator from Ohio said, and I want to emphasize it, there is no secret about this proposition. There is nothing unknown about it. Our scientific men, as far as I am able to see, have laid the thing bare before us. There is only one source of black rust in wheat in the Northern States, and that

is the barberry bush. There is no other means by which it can be communicated. The destruction of the barberry bush means the end of the black rust.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD], who is now presiding, a few moments ago gave an illustration of what is likely to happen in any wheat community in the United States, with the finest prospects in the world. Hot, moist weather comes on, there is some wind, and the entire country is covered within a few days. You have a crop which is almost ready to harvest, all the work having been completed, when the use of the land for a year will be gone, and all the labor and all the seed will be lost. The crop will be almost ripe when you see it commence to wither and go down from black rust, and sometimes so much of it will be destroyed that it hardly pays to harvest what is left. It is gone. There is no remedy. There is no way to save it.

We know just exactly what the cause is. We know just exactly how to eradicate it. I have been impressed with what other Senators have said, and I think I will modify my amendment before I sit down. Instead of inserting "\$332,505" in line 18, page 22, I will just increase it by "\$300,000," making the committee amendment "\$732,505," and in the place of "\$200,000" insert "\$500,000." I express the hope that in going beyond what the evidence discloses can be used economically it will not be required of the department that all the money shall be expended. I think it all ought to be expended if it can be done economically. At least it will give them a free hand to go to the very limit if they are able to get the organization at work. I hope they will be able to get it together and will use the whole amount which will be necessary to exterminate the barberry bush.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Nebraska has modified his amendment so as to add \$500,000 instead of \$300,000. It is true that Doctor Ball testified that he was sure they could use \$300,000, and he said, "We could probably use \$500,000."

There is some other testimony in this record on that question. The ravages of black rust, as stated by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], have been so great within the last few years that the States have become aroused, and while appropriations have not been made in every State, several States have made appropriations and are now getting organizations to exterminate the barberry bush.

An organization of 10 States has been effected in the Northwest, of which Governor Preus, of Minnesota, is the president, and Mr. Harrison Fuller is the secretary. It includes a large number of men throughout the Northwest vitally interested in the production of wheat, including the farm organizations, railroads, millers, consumers, and others.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if I may suggest it to the Senator, the statement which has been made by the Agricultural Department is even stronger than what he stated a moment ago.

Mr. KELLOGG. I was just about to read it. On page 7 of the Record will be found a statement where Mr. Fuller said:

My only point was this: I will not bore you with the statement that we have from the Department of Agriculture; but we have consulted the Department of Agriculture, and we have their assurance in writing that the sum of \$500,000 could be expended efficiently and economically and with great profit to the barberry eradication movement. I have a statement here which I might put in the record.

I will not stop to read the whole statement, but I beg leave of the Senate to read some paragraphs from it. It is found on pages 8 and 9 of the printed hearings, and I am assured the statement was made by Mr. Ball. I am not sure whether it is Dr. Ball or his brother, but I believe he is in this work in the Department of Agriculture. He said:

The present appropriation is \$147,200 per annum, divided among the 13 States, according to the difficulty of the problem.

According to the statements of the experts in the record, men who have studied it, it will take 12 to 15 years to eradicate barberry in these States at that rate. Again, he said, reading further from page 8 of the printed hearings:

This sum is the minimum which can be used effectively and keep the work going on a sufficient scale as to show results each year in 13 different States. It provides for a steady progress, but so slow as to make it certain that the campaign must last for at least 10 years longer. Funds in any amount, up to a total of \$500,000 per annum, including the \$147,200 now appropriated, could be used effectively for the following reasons:

1. Appropriations up to one-half million dollars would not require any particular increase in overhead expenses in Washington, but practically all the additional money would go to the 13 States for use in the field.

2. Comparatively little additional administrative or overhead expense would be required in each of the 13 States, as a State leader and clerk in each State is necessary under the present arrangement, and they could handle a much larger volume of work at a minimum of additional expense.

3. A sufficient number of well-equipped young men can be obtained through the cooperating State agencies in each State to use effectively additional funds up to the limit named. These would be young men raised in the State, familiar with its geography, its people, and its farming problems, and able to work harmoniously with the people of the State in getting this big job done.

4. Any increase in the annual appropriation would enable the work to go forward more rapidly. This would effect a financial saving in three ways. First, it would shorten the duration of the campaign and, therefore, the period of years during which the administrative organization must be maintained. Secondly, it would shorten the period of years during which fruiting bushes will continue to bear their fruit to be scattered over surrounding woodlands by birds and start new infestations. Thirdly, it will reduce the period of years in which the remaining bushes can start rust on wheat crops in the early spring.

In this entire area bushes have been eradicated almost completely from cities and villages. In the solid black portions the farm-to-farm survey for bushes has been completed and practically all of the bushes removed. In the dotted portion—

He is speaking about a map now, but I will not read the balance of that, because the map is not in the Senate and I can not refer to it. That is the last statement made by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] said, in the face of the appalling losses and the threatened destruction of the wheat industry, we should not hesitate to appropriate all the money the Department of Agriculture could use.

I would like very briefly to suggest to the Senate the extent of the growth of the barberry bush and what is necessary to eradicate it. The barberry bush was discussed by Doctor Stakman, who is an expert at the University of Minnesota, formerly, I believe, in the employ of the Department of Agriculture, who has for years made a study of this subject. The extent of it is stated by him, as follows:

It is particularly in the New England States and in the Middle Atlantic States, down as far as middle Virginia, including parts of West Virginia, the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado that the barberry problem is the most acute.

But it does extend beyond and is now developing in Idaho and Montana, and there is no reason why it will not sweep over the entire country to the Pacific coast.

Referring to the testimony of Doctor Stakman, who had maps before the committee, I quote:

A single bush produces a tremendous number of berries, and those berries produce seedlings. This will give you some idea of it. [Producing picture.] This is in Wisconsin, in Dane County. There are thousands of barberry seedlings on a rocky ledge like that, and those barberries will grow up into large bushes. Pretty soon they will simply cover those hillsides, and then it will almost be impossible to eradicate them, because they will be in rocky places where it would be practically impossible to eradicate them without the use of dynamite, or without the use of some chemical which would kill them.

Then he proceeded to discuss it further and said:

I want to impress upon you particularly, if I may, the fact that all through this region here, through the principal wheat-producing region and through the principal small-grain-producing region, including wheat, oats, barley, and rye, the barberry bush is escaping from cultivation. It has escaped from cultivation in the past, and it is my honest conviction that if the barberry increases its escape from cultivation at the same rate in the future that it has in the past—and as a matter of fact it will increase more rapidly in the future than it has in the past—I am absolutely convinced that unless by some piece of good fortune we get desirable resistant varieties of all of these grains it will be impossible to grow wheat and possibly small grains successfully in this region in which those grains are now being grown, for the simple reason that wild barberry bushes are scattered through all those States now. In Iowa, for instance, there are 7,700 properties on which the common barberry bush was found. There were about three-quarters of a million common barberry bushes which were located up to this last fall. In Wisconsin there were over 3,000,000 common barberry bushes, a great many of them escaped, covering hillsides, and unless they are eradicated now it will be quite impossible to eradicate them in the future. If it becomes impossible to eradicate them in the future, it seems to me that it is going to be practically impossible to grow grain successfully in that region.

There are additional advantages. It seems to me that it is true economy to increase this appropriation at the present time, although, of course, that is a matter for the judgment of you gentlemen; but to me it seems as though it is real economy, for this reason: If we go ahead with the present appropriation of \$147,000 a year, which is spread over the 13 States, it means that this campaign will have to go on for 12 or 15 years, probably, at least, and there is a certain overhead which must be maintained. If the increased appropriation is made, it will mean that not a single cent or practically not a single cent of the increased appropriation will need to go into overhead. The overhead can be maintained as it is now, so that the increased amount of money which becomes available can go right into the work of locating these bushes and assisting in their eradication.

Doctor Ball testified that in Wisconsin 3,000,000 barberry plants were taken out in one space of about 5 square miles. I shall not take the time of the Senate further on the question. The Senator from Ohio did not begin to state the total ravages and losses to the wheat crop by the black rust. In 1916 alone we lost 200,000,000 bushels in this country, and the decrease of the crop from 1,000,000,000 bushels down to 639,000,000 bushels was largely due to barberry.

I shall not now take the further time of the Senate, as I hope we may reach a vote very promptly.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I wish to say just a few words with reference to the pending amendment. I am in hearty sympathy with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to the committee amendment increasing the amount of the appropriation for this purpose to \$500,000. I may say that I submitted an amendment intended to be proposed increasing the appropriation to \$350,000, but that was under a misapprehension as to the position taken by the Department of Agriculture in regard to the amount that might be judiciously used for the purpose. I understand now that I was misinformed in regard to that, and that the department thinks the \$500,000 can be judiciously used.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LADD in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. STERLING. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the Senator state that the department thinks that amount could be used?

Mr. STERLING. That is the statement made now, as I understand it.

Mr. LENROOT. Doctor Ball testified that he thought \$300,000 the amount.

Mr. KELLOGG. I read the last statement which was put in before the committee, very carefully prepared by the Department of Agriculture, and they state that they can use \$500,000.

Mr. LENROOT. Was that after Doctor Ball testified?

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator will look on pages 8 and 9 of the printed hearings, he will find the statement there.

Mr. KELLOGG. It appears at page 8 of the testimony. It was the last statement put in by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

Mr. STERLING. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. This statement was given in response to a request from a society that was attempting to prevent the spread of rust. Doctor Ball's testimony before the committee was the last statement made, and I think in response to questions from the committee it was clearly indicated, and made almost certain if we consider his testimony to be at all of value, that \$300,000 is all that could be economically used.

Mr. STERLING. I wish to say a word now with reference to another matter. It may have been gone into by some other Senator, though I do not know, because I came in while the discussion was going on. I wish to call attention to a statement in Department Circular 108, United States Department of Agriculture, to the effect that during the five years, beginning with 1916 and ending with 1920, there was a loss of wheat alone from black rust in the United States of 323,436,000 bushels. I find on my desk a statement submitted by Mr. Harrison Fuller, to whom the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] referred, showing the total loss of wheat in my own State of South Dakota during these same five years was 35,113,165 bushels. The loss in oats is given for two years at 11,571,000 bushels, and in barley 5,355,000 bushels.

Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD perhaps the same telegram received by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD], who is now occupying the chair, from Mr. Ralph Budd, president of the Great Northern Railway Co., and also a letter from Mr. Gray Silver, the Washington representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the papers presented by the Senator from South Dakota will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears none.

The telegram and letter are as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., April 6, 1922.

Senator THOMAS STERLING,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I understand consideration is being given to an appropriation for eradicating the barberry bush for prevention of rust on grain. I think it hard to overestimate importance of taking every possible step for prevention of rust in grain fields, and scientific research, as well as results obtained where the eradication of barberry bush has taken place, seems to indicate conclusively that eradication of common barberry bush will prevent a very large part of losses from rust. The earlier extensive work is undertaken the cheaper it will be to eradicate the barberry, as it is spreading quite rapidly, and I earnestly ask your support for an appropriation of \$500,000, to be included in the general Agricultural appropriation bill, for the eradication of the common barberry bush.

RALPH BUDD,
President Great Northern Railway Co.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1922.

Hon. THOMAS STERLING,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR STERLING: The wheat-producing States of the Middle West are very much alarmed regarding the spread of black-stem rust, which is caused by spores which winter over on barberry bushes. The

scientists have determined the only method of controlling this rust is by digging up and destroying the barberry bushes.

This work was taken up as a war measure first and some progress has been made. However, we feel that it is inadequate to meet the situation, and so stated before the Senate Appropriations Committee recently when it was considering the agricultural appropriation bill. The committee increased the appropriation \$52,800, making a total appropriation of \$200,000. We believe and have the assurance of the Department of Agriculture that in the 13 States where it is a serious factor \$500,000 can be used judiciously this year in the location and eradication of the barberry bushes.

That the matter is of serious import is shown by the fact that a rust-prevention association was formed in St. Paul, Minn., March 11, upon the conclusion of a conference called by Gov. J. A. C. Preus. At that time the millers and others contributed a large sum to carry on the campaign, but it is entirely inadequate and, of course, the expense should not be borne in any major degree by them.

I think you will be interested in the recent dispatch from Minnesota, which I am inclosing herewith.

Appreciating your interest in this matter, and hoping you will lend your influence and vote for a larger appropriation, I am,

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION.
GRAY SILVER,
Washington Representative.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I hope very much that the amendment tendered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] will prevail. The great destruction already wrought by this pest, and the imminent peril of its being increased from year to year, certainly ought to move us to every effort to eradicate it. It must be apparent, of course, to all that if an insufficient appropriation is made, the extent of the labor for the purpose of eradicating the bushes which act as carriers will be increased, because they will continue multiplying until they are eventually all destroyed.

As indicative of the loss which has been suffered in my State from this source, I have here a memorandum which discloses that the disease was particularly prevalent in the year 1917, and then was not particularly destructive in the two succeeding years of 1918 and 1919, perhaps because those were periods of extreme drought, and for some reason or other it seemed to affect barley only to any appreciable extent in the year 1919. In the year 1917 it was figured that the loss on wheat amounted to 2,525,000 bushels, on oats to 3,400,000 bushels, and on barley to 270,000 bushels. In 1920 the barley loss in my State amounted to 1,397,000 bushels. So the total loss within two years in my State runs up to \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000, and the aggregate is something enormous.

Neither are we dependent for such information as we have concerning the part played by the barberry bush upon the information given to us by scientists in recent times. I observe that it was recognized in France way back in the seventeenth century that the barberry bush was instrumental in the propagation of black rust, and laws were passed in France as far away as that time for the eradication of the barberry bush. It has been recognized in New England for a good many years that it was likewise responsible for this particular pest, and laws were passed in the New England States for its eradication. I observe that acts have been passed in various States where the work has been carried on, involving the invasion of the premises of private owners for the destruction of the barberry bush.

Mr. McNARY. If the Senator will yield at that particular point, I desire to say that I think he must accept it as a true statement that the laws inhibit the barberry bush in all the States where the infestation occurs.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Does not the Senator think the most complete remedy would be the enforcement by the States of the laws which make it unlawful for one to have a barberry bush growing on his premises?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. And does not the Senator think if those laws were enforced and a few were prosecuted and convicted for their violation that that would do more to eradicate the barberry bush by local effort than could be done by the appropriation of Federal money?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not know that it would do any more; but the Senator must bear in mind, of course, that these bushes are very likely to grow along fences and roads and upon unoccupied premises. In my State it appears that they propagate to a very considerable extent upon the public lands, at least in the vicinity where cultivation to any appreciable extent exists.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator yield at that point for another question or statement?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I think the Senator's classification is very good; but does not the Senator think it would be equitable if these three factors were engaged in the attempt to eradicate the barberry bush—the individual on privately owned land, the State upon the public highways and other public property owned

by the State, and the Federal Government upon the public domain which is owned by the Federal Government?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I would not like to restrict the work of eradication in that way. The spores are so easily transferred from one region to another that there must of necessity be cooperation; but I do not think by any means that the activities of the Federal Government ought to be restricted to work upon the public lands. The situation is exactly the same as with respect to fire prevention in national forests. If the work for the prevention of fires or for the extinction of fires were confined only to the national forests we would not be able to preserve the national forests. There must be cooperative work in connection with all of these transactions.

Mr. McNARY. Then the Senator, I understand, believes in generous cooperative work?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. In connection with the protection of national forests the owners of private forests are contributing at the rate of 8 to 1 by the Government. In the appropriation we are now considering the private individual is scarcely contributing anything, and the Federal Government is doing it all. That is the complaint which I make.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But the conditions are not by any means identical, not to say not analogous.

Mr. McNARY. I thought the Senator used the word "analogy" as indicating a similarity between the preservation of forests and the destruction of the barberry bush.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It is easy to distinguish a very wide difference, because in one case you have the actual property which is being destroyed, but when a barberry bush grows upon one man's farm the owner of the farm may not suffer any more than one whose farm is immediately adjacent. So the situation, as it seems to me, is very materially different.

I want to say that I do not believe that anybody need have any apprehension that the States themselves will not join very cordially with the Federal Government in this very necessary work, because they all appreciate the peril in which they stand, as evidenced by the legislation which exists in all of the States in which work is being done for the purpose of aiding in the eradication of the offensive bush.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator permit me to amplify the statement regarding State cooperation?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I take this statement from Mr. Fuller, who is high in authority in this matter, because he is the secretary of the organization which has to do with the prevention of grain rust. A question was propounded to him by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], and he replied:

The States, with the exception of Minnesota, have made no substantial appropriation.

As the Senator from Montana knows, the damage wrought by the barberry bush has been known for generations in other countries and for many years in this country, as it was brought here by the earliest settlers in New England, and its destructive power, as the home of the fungi that destroy wheat, has been known for years.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That does not argue anything so far as I am concerned.

Mr. McNARY. But it argues tremendously with me.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. We have exactly the same situation with reference to the eradication of tuberculosis in cattle. In that case we have undertaken to pay dollar for dollar for carrying on the work in a cooperative manner. We do the same thing in reference to the eradication of the cattle tick. The Federal Government has been making very liberal appropriations for the extermination of splenic fever during all these years. It is appropriately the work of the Agricultural Department to provide against these diseases which spread over great areas, to the destruction either of plants or animals.

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

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not the Senator think that a State which is affected should at least match dollar for dollar the appropriation of the Federal Government in a matter of this kind?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not think so. I do not think that has been the policy pursued in respect to any of these matters.

Mr. LENROOT. With regard to the effort to eradicate tuberculosis, the States and individuals contribute; the Federal Government pays only about one-third or less than one-third of the indemnities.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is only with reference to the indemnities.

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But for the work of extermination we have made constant appropriations, as has been done for the extermination of dourine, glanders, and so forth.

Mr. MYERS obtained the floor.

COOPERATIVE ORGANIZATIONS.

Mr. CALDER. Will the Senator from Montana yield to me in order that I may submit a report from a committee?

Mr. MYERS. With pleasure.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, some days ago the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] introduced the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 188) creating a committee to investigate existing conditions of industry and commerce in the United States for the purpose of recommending to Congress legislation defining the rights and limitations of cooperative organizations as distinguished from illicit combinations in restraint of trade. That joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, from which committee it was reported unanimously. It was then referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. As chairman of that committee, I now report back favorably the joint resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be given immediate consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will let us vote upon the motion which is now pending.

Mr. CALDER. I will say to the Senator that if the consideration of the joint resolution takes any time, I will withdraw the request.

Mr. NORRIS. The pending motion will not take more than a minute, I think, and after it is disposed of, then there will be no objection to the Senator's request.

Mr. CALDER. I am compelled to go to a committee meeting.

Mr. NORRIS. I think debate has about ended on the pending amendment, and we are ready to vote. I should dislike to see the pending amendment laid aside now.

Mr. MYERS. I will say that I desire to speak for about five minutes on the pending amendment.

Mr. CALDER. I will say to the Senator that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] is compelled to leave the Chamber in a few moments, and I am obliged to attend a committee meeting. I thought that perhaps the Senator would permit action to be taken on the joint resolution. If it takes any time, as I have said, I will withdraw it.

Mr. MYERS. I am willing to yield to the Senator, but others have a right to object, of course.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I trust the Senator from Nebraska, if there is no opposition, will permit the joint resolution to be considered.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think there is any opposition to the motion to amend the committee amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; there is.

Mr. EDGE. The amendment to the pending bill has been debated for two hours; some of us have been waiting here hoping that that debate would cease, and that the joint resolution might be considered.

Mr. NORRIS. I will not object, Mr. President.

Mr. CALDER. The joint resolution, I will say, comes from the committee with a unanimous report.

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to know something about the joint resolution, and what it provides.

Mr. EDGE. If I may be permitted to occupy the floor for a moment, I will say that the joint resolution simply provides for an inquiry. It establishes no policy, but provides for the appointment of a joint committee to ascertain the present situation in which the trade associations of the country find themselves, in view of the decision in the hardwood lumber case, which has put these associations in a position where they may be held to be violating the law. The proposed special joint committee will investigate the entire subject.

Mr. OVERMAN. The joint resolution simply provides for an investigation?

Mr. EDGE. That is all.

Mr. CALDER. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be considered now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I do not quite understand what the joint resolution proposes. I wish the Senator would explain it more clearly.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator from New Jersey can explain it better than I can.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Let us have the resolution read before we consent to its consideration.

Mr. EDGE. Perhaps I can explain it to the satisfaction of the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution for the information of the Senate.

The reading clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 188) creating a committee to investigate existing conditions of industry and commerce in the United States for the purpose of recommending to Congress legislation defining the rights and limitations of cooperative organizations as distinguished from illicit combinations in restraint of trade.

Whereas the revival of the industrial activities of the United States is essential to the welfare of the individual as well as the Nation; and Whereas business has been suffering severe depression from which its reconstruction should be stimulated by every legitimate means; and

Whereas business procedure that will, without protecting monopolies, eliminate waste in production or distribution, lower costs, simplify and standardize methods, increase efficiency and the morale of business is a beneficial factor in economic progress; and

Whereas congressional action has already been taken to assist in agricultural cooperative marketing and distribution; and

Whereas the industrial tendency is toward the substitution of research and scientific business methods for previous uncertainty and ignorance; and

Whereas business is hesitating because unable to secure guidance, legal or governmental, which will clearly indicate the proper lines of conduct in business association; and

Whereas business is entitled to know in definite terms what it legally can and can not do: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That a joint committee of Congress is hereby created, to be composed of six members, three of whom shall be appointed by the President of the Senate and three by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the committee to investigate existing conditions of industry and commerce in the United States and the markets of foreign countries, in so far as the same directly affects industry and commerce of the United States, including questions as to production, distribution, labor, and business methods, and to report to Congress and to suggest such legislation, if any, as it may deem best upon these subjects, with a special reference to the most effective ways and means to revive industry and to stimulate foreign and domestic trade, to stabilize business conditions as to the future, to minimize the danger and distress of recurring periods of business depression, with their resultant cycles of general unemployment, and to define the rights and limitations of cooperative organizations as distinguished from illicit combinations in restraint of trade.

SEC. 3. That such committee is hereby authorized during the Sixty-seventh Congress to sit during the sessions or recesses of the Congress, at Washington or at any other place in the United States, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ experts deemed necessary by such committee, a clerk, and a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before such committee, such stenographer's service to be rendered at a cost not exceeding \$1.25 per printed page, the expenses involved in carrying out the provisions of this resolution to be paid one-half out of the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 4. That the committee may from time to time report to Congress, and shall submit a final report on or before December 4, 1922.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I will object to the present consideration of the joint resolution. It relates to a subject worth discussing.

Mr. EDGE. If the Senator will withdraw the objection for just a moment, I desire to say that I think he will admit that this Congress owes to industry some effort at least in the way of trying to solve the present unsettled business conditions. The joint resolution does not propose to establish any policy of any kind whatever, but simply makes it possible for a joint committee of Senators and Representatives to study the subject and investigate. The Commission on Agricultural Inquiry conducted a similar investigation and recommended certain legislation, some of which has already been enacted. It would seem that the joint committee proposed by the joint resolution, working with a definite object in view, could be of some service in solving the great problem which confronts us at this time.

The joint resolution proposes to establish no policy. I have already introduced a bill which covers this subject to some extent. I am purposely not pressing the bill, because I think more information should be secured. This committee provides an opportunity to do that very thing. Why delay an inquiry?

Mr. OVERMAN. With the idea of securing the repeal of the Sherman Act? Is that right?

Mr. EDGE. It has nothing to do with the repeal of the Sherman Act. Let me point out that this Congress has already practically unanimously adopted legislation which provides for cooperative marketing associations. They are outside of the Sherman Act. I voted for that bill with pleasure, and I think practically all of the Senators did. As I remember, the vote upon it was unanimous. The trade associations are asking nothing of that kind. They are not asking to be outside of the jurisdiction of the Sherman Act, but they are asking, and I think properly so, to have a clear definition as to what they can and can not do under existing laws and statutes; that is all. We certainly owe them some effort along that line when we realize that throughout this country industry is practically paralyzed to-day. These trade associations are not functioning. They are afraid to move after recent decisions of the Supreme Court. With the millions of men depending upon industry, the least we can do is to try to find some solution of the problem. Any delay in the passage of this joint resolution is simply a

delay upon the part of the Congress itself in trying to find that solution. We are passing no legislation.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator says it is in aid of the bill that he has introduced.

Mr. EDGE. This joint resolution does not refer to the bill. The bill is simply presented as one of those measures that can be given consideration by such a committee. The bill itself was prepared by the Federal Trade Commission in Washington, and I presented it merely to have it before the country.

Mr. OVERMAN. Did the Federal Trade Commission indorse it?

Mr. EDGE. The Federal Trade Commission practically indorsed it, or individual members of the commission did.

Mr. OVERMAN. Oh, yes; individual members.

Mr. EDGE. I do not know that the commission as such indorsed it, though the bill was prepared by the commission.

Mr. OVERMAN. Perhaps the chairman did, but not the commission.

Mr. EDGE. There is no reference to this bill in this joint resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator had said that it was presented in the interest of his bill, as I understood him.

Mr. EDGE. Oh, not at all. I simply said that I had introduced a bill on the subject which I had no intention of pressing.

Mr. OVERMAN. I hope the Senator never will press it.

Mr. EDGE. Perhaps I shall not. Personally, I am not at all sure that it is the proper solution of the problem. That is the very reason why I want to see a committee investigate it. If I felt that this bill answered the problem I would press it. The mere fact that it is such a big problem, such an important problem, and that in my judgment this Congress has so much responsibility to do something in this connection, is the very reason and the sole reason why I am not pressing the bill. I want to see a strong committee appointed to inquire into and investigate as to proper relief in this regard, just as we have done in the case of other activities of the country; and I can not see what harm the passage of this joint resolution would do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I can see no parallel at all between the situation regarding the industries of the country and the legislation that we passed allowing agricultural concerns and interests to form cooperative associations. The agriculturists could not if they would violate the Sherman antitrust law, in my opinion; but this joint resolution proposes to enter upon the very doubtful and dubious ground as to how far industrial concerns can go without actually violating the Sherman antitrust law.

Mr. EDGE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I object to this measure on two grounds: First, because it ought not to be put through without discussion and light; and, in the second place, I think I shall object to it all the time, because both the House and the Senate have committees to which this matter can properly be referred, and it seems to me that this is an effort to take it away from the jurisdiction of existing committees and form some special committee for the purpose of bringing in a special report in the interest of enabling these concerns to go as far as possible toward the violation of the Sherman antitrust law.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, of course I can not prevail on the Senator if he insists on objecting; but I do want a moment to answer the suggestion that the Senator has made.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire to be courteous to the Senator; but if objection is to be made, and it is fixed in the mind of the Senator from Nebraska, I hope he will make the objection without going into a general discussion of the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is useless to discuss the matter. We ought to have it debated, at least; so I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. EDGE. I recognize the fact that the Senator is objecting; but if I may just, in two minutes, answer the suggestion the Senator has made I shall appreciate the courtesy.

The Senator inferred that this meant the appointment of a special committee, notwithstanding the fact that both Houses to-day have regular committees that could handle such subjects. There is not any question in the world as to that; but the Senator must know—and of course he does know—that when we have had very important intricate subjects of this kind it has been the universal policy of Congress to appoint special committees to devote their direct attention to them. Perhaps the Committee on Interstate Commerce would properly handle this matter in the usual course, or the Judiciary Committee or the Commerce Committee, I am not sure which; but we know perfectly well from experience that our overloaded committees can not spend the necessary time on all of these matters and give them the attention which in my judgment the

country properly demands. A special committee with that special responsibility, just like the Joint Agricultural Committee, calling witnesses on all sides of this important question, and bringing to the Senate of the United States and to Congress a direct report, with possible remedies, would help in the solution of a great big problem. I think the criticism entirely unjustified that there is any desire to have a special committee that would not give the matter the same careful, broad consideration that its members would give as members of a larger committee that perhaps has many other subjects to consider; so that I do not think that objection of the Senator is very well taken.

I sincerely hope, if the Senator will not withdraw his objection now, that he will at least give the matter consideration from the broad viewpoint that he does on matters of important legislation, and recognize that we do owe industry some solution of these problems.

If he has a better method to suggest in order to bring about a solution, I shall be glad to have it; but the fact can not be denied that there are over 3,000 of these trade associations, organized at the request of the Government during the war for the purpose of stabilizing production, that are now practically inactive because of the decision of the Supreme Court in the *Hardwood* and other cases, all of which decisions were by a divided court, as I recall, and that they do want, and I think properly so, to have some definition whereby they can at least proceed in the great work in which they were engaged and should be engaged in helping to stabilize production and development.

I take issue with the Senator somewhat. These trade associations are entirely parallel to the cooperative marketing associations of which the Senator spoke, saying that they are not parallel. The cooperative marketing associations, as I understand them and as they are understood in agricultural circles, are for the purpose of developing better market conditions and cutting down the expenses of marketing—a very laudable purpose—and I was glad to support the bill. These trade associations are for exactly the same purpose—to have uniform ideas and developments spread among their members, so that they can reduce overhead expenses and reduce the cost of operation.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. EDGE. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. I understood that the Senator in charge of the bill waived objection to the consideration of the joint resolution if it would not lead to debate. I hope the debate will not go on all the afternoon.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I have entirely finished; but this is a subject in which I am so much interested that I sincerely trust the Senator from Nebraska will look at it, as I say, from the broad viewpoint from which I know he usually looks at all big public questions, and try to help in the solution of this great problem. If this is not the proper way, I should like to get his idea about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to receiving the report? The Chair hears none, and it will be placed on the calendar.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10730) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I am very heartily in favor of the pending amendment. I have received from Montana so many communications about it, calling to my attention the urgent necessity for an adequate appropriation for this object and the necessity for it, from a number of authentic sources, has been so forcibly impressed upon me that I feel it my duty to say a few words on the subject as expressive of the sentiments of the agricultural interests of Montana.

The farmers of the Northwest are in a desperate and most deplorable condition. I think they are sunken lower in the depths of despair than has ever been known before. Many of them in Montana are despairing of being able to stay on their farms, and yet they know not what else to do. In Montana the farmers for a number of years past have had to contend with repeated and appalling droughts, grasshoppers, high railroad rates, high cost of production, high prices for everything they have to buy, and for the last couple of years poor markets and low prices for all they produce, and these conditions have brought them to the verge of despair. The agricultural interests all over the country share more or less in that condition. I think it one of the most serious problems that confront the

people of this country to-day, and I think the Federal Government ought to do everything legitimate and within the bounds of reason to assist in overcoming that most deplorable condition of affairs.

Many of the farmers of Montana have become so desperate that they are demanding very unusual and drastic legislation. Many of them are demanding the revival of the Government Grain Corporation and the fixing of a minimum price for grain, the Government to buy at the fixed minimum price all the grain which does not bring that price in the market and store it in Government-owned warehouses. Now, when there is an opportunity within a reasonable, natural sphere to assist in overcoming the very deplorable condition of affairs which exists among the agricultural interests of the Northwest in particular and the whole country in general, I think Congress should not hesitate to do it, as it may relieve the necessity of enacting later more drastic legislation.

Montana has become a great wheat-growing State. For quite a number of years it has been climbing up steadily in the scale of States that are large producers of wheat. Wheat has become, I think, the main agricultural product of the State, but for a number of years the wheat growers have had this terrible pest of black rust, created, scattered, and disseminated by the barberry bush, with which to contend. It has done immense damage to wheat growing in Montana.

With all of the obstacles with which the wheat growers of Montana have to contend, including those of high railroad rates, remoteness from market, high prices for everything they have to buy, and low prices for their products, I think it would be very burdensome if they should have to continue to contend with this pest, which is working havoc with their wheat-growing industry; and unless some adequate remedy is provided, unless an adequate appropriation be made for the extermination of this pest, it will continue to grow worse and worse and will do incalculable damage.

I think it would be very unfortunate to make for this purpose an inadequate appropriation, one not sufficient to eradicate the pest. That would only temporarily check the pest, partially smother it, decrease it for the time being, but it would not eradicate it. The seeds of it, the roots of it, would still be there, and the pest would spring up with renewed vigor and spread another year with increasing damage to the wheat-growing interests of the country. If the Federal Government is going to handle this matter at all, I think it will be economy and wisdom to appropriate a sufficient amount of money practically to stamp out the pest once and for all, or bring it under complete subjection, so that hereafter a very small annual appropriation would suffice.

Something has been said on the floor about the duty of people doing for themselves the things they can do and not depending on the Federal Government for everything. That may be sound doctrine, but I think it would be a very poor policy to begin to apply it right now upon the farmers of the country, who are already struggling under more back-breaking burdens than any other class of our people, and at a time when their business is at the lowest extremity to which it has been reduced in many years. The people of this country have been educated to look to the Federal Government for aid in everything; the Federal Government has encouraged them in it; Congress has encouraged them in it by yielding to their demands and making all sorts of appropriations for things which the States or the people might provide for themselves; but this I consider a distinctly legitimate function of the Federal Government. For many years it has been the policy of the Federal Government to encourage the development of agricultural interests, and the country never was in more need of it than it is right now. Now is the time for the Federal Government to exercise its power in that direction more beneficially and legitimately, I think, than ever before. I know the urgent need of an adequate appropriation for this purpose. I hope the amendment providing for an increased appropriation may be adopted without opposition and that it may be retained in the bill when it comes out of conference.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think it entirely fitting that I should briefly outline the state of mind of the committee on this item.

The committee thought it was very generous, and I think it was. The department did not estimate any particular sum of money for this work for the year 1923. The Bureau of the Budget did not make an estimate for this work, but \$147,200 was given by the House for the eradication of the barberry bush.

A number of witnesses appeared before the Senate committee, and the committee, after due deliberation, added \$52,800 to the amount appropriated by the House, which sum, added to

the total for the eradication, which is under the head of "Investigation and improvement of cereals and the study of diseases, investigation of the destruction of the barberry," made the amounts total \$393,705, or the full amount estimated by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The committee is in entire sympathy with the efforts of the people living in these 13 infested States to eradicate the barberry bush. If it were a matter of research or further investigation or extension work, I think the committee would have been influenced to have increased the appropriation, but it is not a matter of research; it is a matter of eradication by manual effort.

Everyone knows what causes wheat rust. Everyone knows, or should know, that the barberry bush is the host plant which must exist in order that the fungus may reproduce itself. The bush is not a small, insignificant shrub. It stands from 10 to 15 feet high. From its physical appearance it is known, or should be known, by everyone living in the infested country. It is simply a question of the removal of the bushes.

I said that everyone knows it. Perhaps I should say that information in regard to it should be further disseminated among those who do not know, but the great majority of the people living in the infested country know the character of the barberry and the result in the way of a loss in the wheat crop by reason of its nonremoval.

Therefore the committee thought that the Congress was generous in giving over \$200,000 to aid these States. The committee further thought these States did not appreciate the assistance of the Federal Government or they would appropriate more money. The hearings held by the Senate committee and the House committee show, as I recall, that outside of the State of Minnesota no other State contributed one dollar in cooperation with the Federal Government. It was thought by the committee, or a majority of the committee at least, that if that attitude were made known to the various States appropriations would be made in cooperation with the Government, so that in a few years the barberry could be eradicated.

I think it is the duty of any citizen who has barberry bushes on his place to go out and remove them. I believe if the laws which are on the statute books in these various States were enforced and a few derelict owners of private property were prosecuted, it would do more to bring about the eradication of the barberry bush than the expenditure of millions of dollars appropriated by the Federal Government.

This is not a new problem. I might say that in the far West we have the Canadian thistle. Anyone who allows it to grow upon his place, after due notice, subjects himself to a fine and, further than that, the supervisor can go and remove the enemy and take a lien upon the individual's property; with the result that neither the Federal Government nor the States have been called upon to appropriate one cent, but by the enforcement of these laws the bush has been almost exterminated.

Mr. President, the argument is made, one which I think affects the participation of the Government in this undertaking, namely, that the spores of the fungi blow a great distance. I am sure the testimony shows that the spores were found as high as 8,000 feet in the air. That shows that by the force of the wind it can be carried from State to State. It is not controlled by the invisible State lines, and that is the particular excuse given for the cooperation of the Federal Government with the States. But the Federal Government should not be compelled to appropriate all this money, and I believe, and the committee believe, that in adding \$52,800 to the House appropriation we show a disposition on the part of the Government to assist these States and communities in destroying a plant which is the host of the fungus which brings destruction to the wheat crop, and if the States would more generously appropriate another year, when the money is available, if the committee now in charge of the bill has the honor to handle this matter, I feel certain it would add very greatly to the amount of money which is carried in this bill.

For those reasons, Mr. President, the committee thought it was acting very generously to these States.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Suppose the amendment to the amendment is carried, and this larger amount is appropriated, something like \$600,000.

Mr. McNARY. The amendment offered increases it from \$147,000 to \$500,000.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator think \$500,000 can be expended in the work of the eradication of this pest during the next year?

Mr. McNARY. The Senator to whom the remark is addressed is not familiar with the conditions, other than as they appear upon the record. There may be a little conflict with regard to the attitude of the department, but I think Doctor Ball was very conservative when he said, and it was first reported and called to our attention by the Senator from Nebraska, that \$300,000 could be economically and efficiently expended.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As I understand it, no extra overhead expense would be involved in expending this additional amount of money. Every dollar provided by the additional sum would be expended in the actual work of eradication. If the Senator admits that this money can be expended in the work of eradication, of what possible use is it to limit the appropriation to \$100,000? We might as well expend nothing at all as to expend a mere fraction of what is necessary to eradicate. It is not mere reduction of the barberry bush we want to achieve; it is the eradication of it.

Mr. McNARY. Let me tell the Senator from Nebraska that the Government is not engaged in the manual eradication of the barberry bush. It does not send men out drawing salaries from the Federal Treasury to take a pick and shovel and remove these bushes from the ground. It has to point them out, and educate the farmer upon whose ground the bushes are found that that is the host plant of the fungi which destroy his crop.

Occasionally, when the investigators find a few bushes, rather than go and notify the owner of the property, they remove them; but does the Senator think that the Government is hiring men with shovels, at from three and a half to seven dollars a day, to go out and remove barberry bushes from privately owned property?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to find out what the practice is. It seems to me that, according to what the Senator says, there would be no eradication; there would be a mere paltering, a mere trifling with a great evil. If the evil is as great as it is said to be, involving each year millions of bushels of wheat, which are not only necessary as far as the farmers are concerned but which are also necessary for the prosperity of the country, the National Government should take hold of the matter in a determined, aggressive, and thorough manner, and not by a mere trifling expenditure.

Mr. McNARY. That is not the proper term to apply to the very generous efforts on the part of the Government and its expenditure of money in this matter. The Government can not do any more than educate the people as to the injury which would result to their crops from permitting the barberry bush to grow on private property. The Senator from Nebraska suggests that the Government employ a vast army of laborers to go out and attend to the manual removing of the bushes, an undertaking in which I think the Government should not engage.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Is the Senator quoting me?

Mr. McNARY. I am drawing a logical inference from what the Senator said.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not making any suggestion as to how it should be done. I have no knowledge of how it is done.

Mr. McNARY. I am aware of that fact, and I am trying to tell the Senator.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I say that the appropriation of a trifling sum of money is a waste of money, and if eradication is desired we ought to appropriate enough money to eradicate it now; and if it is desirable, as the Senator himself intimates, to bring about cooperation between the National Government and the State governments, then that ought to be provided in this bill. We should not simply content ourselves with a nominal appropriation where a great appropriation is needed. I have listened to the debate and learned that this affects some 13 States of the Union, and that there are actually hundreds of thousands of individual cases where the barberry bushes are growing upon farms and on the highways and in various places where wheat is exposed. Does not the Senator think that if the evil is so great there ought to be an appropriation commensurate with it?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think the appropriation is commensurate with the activities which ought to be undertaken by the Federal Government, but if there is any difference between the opinion of the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator having the bill in charge, it is as to the amount of work which should be done by the States. I think the States are not doing their share. I ask the Senator this question, If he is the owner of a farm in Nebraska—perhaps he owns several—and he knows that there are barberry bushes on his farm, and he knows the havoc and destruction wrought by permitting those bushes to grow on his farm, does he think the Federal Government should make an appropriation to hire men to go upon his farm and remove those barberry bushes?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not a member of the committee. I have not heard the testimony.

Mr. McNARY. It is not a question of whether the Senator is a member of the committee or not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But I judge from what the Senator has said that he thinks there should be some form of cooperation between the National Government and the State governments, and I ask him why he does not provide for it in the bill?

Mr. McNARY. I do not think it is necessary. I think the States, knowing that the Government is putting up this money, should meet the Government in a more liberal way than they do now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Would it not be easy to provide conditions in this bill of which the States could take advantage in their different legislative sessions, and avail themselves of the Government appropriation?

Mr. McNARY. Of course, that could be provided.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Would not that be the practical way of reaching the evil?

Mr. McNARY. That was discussed by the committee. There was no particular objection, and the thought was that perhaps in some other year that could be suggested. If that is true, the States then would have to appropriate \$200,000, whereas Minnesota is only appropriating \$20,000, and no other State is contributing at all.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It seems to me, if the committee takes the position that no great national appropriation should be made until the States enter upon a form of cooperation, that opportunity should be given them in the bill in addition to any direct appropriation made.

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

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. It was stated before the committee that the Secretary of Agriculture would recommend a 50-50 plan next year. As one member of the committee I was not willing that it should go in this year, because none of the legislatures are in session at this time, and therefore none of the appropriations would be available during the coming summer, if we inaugurated it at present. Next year the legislatures will all be in session.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But the bill is appropriating for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, more than a year from now.

Mr. LENROOT. But that fiscal year begins the 1st of next July.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If it is to be left open to the legislatures that meet next year, the provision ought to be inserted in the pending bill.

Mr. LENROOT. If it is inserted in this bill, none of the money would be available during the next summer; the work that is now going on would have to stop; but at this time next year it can be done and cooperation compelled as a condition of the expenditure.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I realize that that is true, as far as the use of the money for the present year's work is concerned, but why could not the bill contain a provision that the legislatures could avail themselves of when they meet next year?

Mr. LENROOT. Our committee could not have reported such a provision, because it would have been obnoxious to the new rule, and the whole bill would have had to go back to the committee.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, in view of the position taken by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] with reference to this very important item in the bill, I wish to call attention to the fact that the principle to which he appeals has not found very general recognition in this bill. At page 13 of the bill I find an appropriation—

For all necessary expenses for the eradication of southern cattle ticks, \$660,000.

That is a very proper appropriation. It is one which has been carried in the Agricultural appropriation bills for many years, but there is no provision that it shall not be expended except the States cooperate in the expenditure, and it is not utilized alone for the purpose of devising new means for ridding the cattle of this pest. The means of combating the disease are perfectly well known. Let me read further from the provision:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the purchase of animals or in the purchase of materials—

And so forth.

It will be observed that it is not for the purpose of experimenting nor for the purpose of discovering new remedies, but for the purpose of eradicating the disease.

Now, let me turn to page 15 of the bill, where we find this item:

For investigating the disease of hog cholera, and for its control or eradication by such means as may be necessary, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and other methods, either independently or in cooperation with farmers' associations, State or county authorities, \$510,000.

Turning over to the next page, we find this item:

For all necessary expenses for the investigation, treatment, and eradication of dourine, \$45,000.

There is no cooperative feature in any of these items. So we go into the Bureau of Plant Industry and find an item that is of very great interest to the people of the State of Oregon as well as my State. On page 19 we find an item for the eradication of white pine blister. I read:

For the investigation of diseases of forests and ornamental trees and shrubs, including a study of the nature and habits of the parasitic fungi causing the chestnut-tree bark disease, the white-pine blister rust, and other epidemic tree diseases, for the purpose of discovering new methods of control and applying methods of eradication or control already discovered, \$81,115.

Of course, with respect to all these matters, if we could inspire the States to contribute with great liberality, it would undoubtedly be very desirable, but with respect to these diseases which can not be confined within localities and are not restricted by State bounds, and which spread from one State to another, and particularly a disease like this, that is carried miles and hundreds of miles through the atmosphere, it would seem as though it was rather the field of national work than of State work, although, of course, State cooperation is necessary, because the authorities of the Federal Government would probably not be entitled to invade the premises of private owners within any State except they had the State legislation. But, so far as the appropriation is concerned, it is not, as it seems to me, in accord with the general policy that has been pursued for years, as evidenced by those items of the bill to which I have invited attention.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Jones of Washington in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I am very glad the Senator from Montana has called attention to these items; but I observe this distinction: The white-pine blister item contains an element of research. There is no element or factor of research in the barberry-bush item. It is purely one of eradication. That is the first distinction.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have invited attention to that peculiar feature. I have invited attention to the fact that they have not yet exhausted the field of research with reference to the white-pine blister, but we do not confine our appropriation to that. A portion of the appropriation for the white-pine blister we are going to use for the application of known methods of combating it.

Mr. McNARY. So is the Government doing that under the present appropriation. As to the other matters, the diseases affecting hogs and cattle, those animals move in interstate commerce and they require inspection. Many times the remedies result in the development of a reaction to a certain treatment. They are not visible to the eye. No one can tell when the inspectors pass through the car whether an animal is suffering from tuberculosis or whether there are parasites on hogs or ticks on cattle or scabies on sheep. It requires an investigation of each particular animal to see if it reacts to the test. Consequently it requires that work of inspection. But in the barberry work, when its host is a wild shrub and the remedy is eradication, there is nothing left to-day but private initiative plus the aid of the Federal Government and the State governments. The Federal Government has done its share beyond any doubt.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I expect the pending amendment to the amendment of the committee will be adopted; but being a member of the committee, I can not let it be adopted without placing on the record my protest against the increase without any provision for cooperation upon the part of the States.

The amendment, I think, is subject to a point of order; I am very clear that it is, but I am not going to make it. If the Senate desires to adopt the amendment to the amendment on the merits, I am perfectly willing that it should do so.

But, Mr. President, more and more the tendency is for the State to look to and expect the Federal Government to do these things, not in the way of assistance and cooperation, but to do exclusively things that the States ought to do at least a part of themselves. In this particular instance, if the Federal Government is going to undertake the eradication of the barberry by appropriations, where the Federal Government is going to

hire men to go upon the farms and lands of the country and dig them out, the barberry bush will not be eradicated for many, many years to come.

There is one way in which the barberry bush can be eradicated, and that is through an educational campaign conducted by both the Federal Government and the States, so that every farmer may know at once what a barberry bush is and every farmer may know the menace of the barberry bush. Beyond that, if the State legislatures would enact laws providing that when a barberry bush is pointed out to the owner of the land, if he does not remove it at his own expense it is to be deemed a misdemeanor, subject to fine or imprisonment, when that time comes the States will take care of the barberry problem. But under present conditions there is no penalty upon the part of any farmer for not removing the barberry bush.

What is being done under the appropriation to-day? A Federal agent goes through a State, finds the barberry bush, locates it, notifies the farmer that he has a barberry bush at such and such place on his land, and orders him to remove it. Then within 10 days the Federal agent makes another visit and finds out whether it has been removed, and if it has not been removed, the Federal agent, with his hired men, removes it. What is the penalty upon the farmer? The penalty upon the farmer is the actual cost of removal. That is assessed as a tax against him. Is there any penalty about that? Will that kind of a law bring about the eradication of the barberry bush in this country?

I appreciate my own State's interest in this matter. Wisconsin was either the first or the second State to realize and appreciate the danger and the menace of the barberry bush. But I think my own State ought not to ask the Federal Government to furnish all the money to do this work. I think my own State ought at least to put up dollar for dollar with the Federal Government. Wisconsin has done something. Minnesota appropriates \$20,000 a year for that purpose. Minnesota to-day, under the \$147,000 appropriation, is getting \$14,000 a year from the Federal Government.

Under the increase granted by the committee Minnesota will get from the Federal Government every dollar that she raises herself. It would seem, would it not, that a great wheat-raising State like Minnesota, with the black-rust such a menace to it, that the State Legislature of Minnesota ought to be the first to take the necessary measures for the removal of the barberry bush instead of coming to the Congress of the United States and asking the Congress of the United States, as they are doing by the amendment, to put up \$4 for every dollar that is put up by the State.

Where is this movement going to stop if the Federal Government is going to be asked constantly to increase appropriations to do these things in which there ought to be cooperation between the States and the Federal Government? The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] a moment ago referred to some items in the bill in which he understood there was no State cooperation. Among others, he referred to the white-pine blister. The white-pine blister is being dealt with to-day, and for every dollar that the Government appropriates for the eradication of the white-pine blister the States are appropriating three. With reference to tuberculosis in animals, for every dollar the Federal Government is appropriating the States are appropriating three. In the matter of the eradication of predatory animals, for every dollar the Federal Government appropriates the States are appropriating two. And that is the way the work should be done.

But, Mr. President, is it fair in the great State of Montana, whose prosperity is so bound up in wheat, that the people of the State take so little interest in their own prosperity that they are refusing to appropriate any money for the removal of the barberry bush and yet are asking the Federal Government to appropriate all that is being expended in that State? What is true of Montana is true of other States. I think North Dakota has done something. I do not remember how much has been appropriated by the State of North Dakota, but the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD] is present. Can the Senator from North Dakota inform us?

Mr. LADD. I can not at this moment inform the Senator from Wisconsin as to the amount of money which North Dakota has appropriated, but during the last four or five years considerable sums have been expended for carrying on the campaign for the eradication of this pest. The State has made appropriations and the commissioner of agriculture has sent out a force to engage in the work of the eradication of the barberry bush. What good, however, has that work accomplished when in all the States surrounding North Dakota the barberry bush grows and the barberry spores come over into our State and destroy

our crops? The destruction of the barberry bush is not a State question alone, it seems to me, but is a national question.

In order to protect ourselves and to insure the production of a necessary food supply North Dakota has gone further than merely to endeavor to eradicate the bush. Not being able to cope with the barberry bush in the State, we have appropriated money to develop a wheat which is rust resistant, but the rust-resistant wheat does not happen to be a good milling wheat; it does not produce good flour for bread. So the experiments have been continued, and this year they are putting out a variety which they believe will withstand the rust to a considerable extent and which will also be a flour-producing wheat. So that research and experimental work as well as efforts for the eradication of the barberry bush have been going on in North Dakota for five or six years.

Mr. LENROOT. I know that North Dakota and perhaps Wisconsin were the two first States which really dealt with this problem in an effectual way.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. In view of the imputation by the Senator from Wisconsin against the State which I have the honor in part to represent on this floor, I desire to submit that this disease comes upon us from communities farther east. The testimony before the Agricultural Committee discloses that the people of the State of Wisconsin have allowed this destructive bush to grow without very much restriction; in fact, photographic copies of fields in that State were used for the purpose of illustration before the Committee on Agriculture when considering this measure. It comes with rather poor grace, it seems to me, from the Senator from Wisconsin to asperse the people of the State of Montana for inactivity in this matter, particularly in view of the fact that agriculture in my State has suffered some unusual trials in the last three or four years.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if we are going to proceed upon the theory that it is useless to spend money in wheat-growing States to attempt to eradicate the barberry bush unless we go back to the Atlantic coast and eradicate the barberry bushes all over the United States, then there is no use of making any appropriation at all. If the theory of the Senator from Montana be correct, that because the barberry grows in Wisconsin, Montana is not responsible, and that if the barberry bushes in Montana should be removed this year they would return next year, then we have got to go to Massachusetts and other New England States and remove every barberry bush in the United States or else we had better stop making appropriations. I do not consider that a sound argument. Although the spores move in the air, the movement is a very slow one. I do not for a moment insist that the Federal Government ought not to participate and participate fairly. I do not say it is solely a State question. I am willing to appropriate dollar for dollar from the Federal Treasury for every dollar that is appropriated by the State; but when Montana is so vitally interested I think it is not unreasonable to ask that the people of that State themselves shall expend some money to save themselves from destruction instead of asking the Federal Government to do it all. That is the only point that I make.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It would not do much good unless the people of Wisconsin would do it, and they have not yet evinced any very great desire to do it.

Mr. LENROOT. The people of the State of Wisconsin were the first and those of North Dakota were the next to begin the eradication of the barberry bush. I am frank to say that if it were not for the feeling that the Federal Government could be relied upon to do all these things Wisconsin might be doing more for the eradication of the barberry bush.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LENROOT. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator a question in connection with the statement that Wisconsin and North Dakota have been engaged in the eradication of the barberry bush for many years, and were the first to go into the effort. Have those two States received any benefit from what they have done? Has it not been true that, as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD] has stated, their labors have been to a great extent nullified by the fact that the spores are blown into that State from States where no attempt has been made to eradicate the barberry bush?

Mr. LENROOT. Doctor Ball in his testimony was asked that very question, and he said it was very difficult to determine

the matter, because whether or not black rust prevails does not depend alone upon the existence of the barberry bush but upon climatic conditions existing at a particular time; so the two things must coincide; but Doctor Ball did testify that there was a year in Wisconsin when he thought it was very apparent that benefit had been derived from what had been done.

Mr. NORRIS. In order that the Senator's statement may not be misunderstood—I am afraid it may be subject to misunderstanding as he made it—I desire to say that the rust can not exist in the Northwestern States without the barberry bush; but it does not follow that where the barberry bush is found rust will prevail, because, in addition to the presence of the barberry, there must be a certain kind of weather in order to spread the disease.

Mr. LENROOT. There is no question about that; we might have no rust in a given year; but if there were no barberry bushes we would never have any black rust in the Northwestern States.

Mr. NORRIS. That is true.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, Mr. President, just a word with reference to the amount of money which may economically be used for this purpose. We had Doctor Ball, of the Department of Agriculture, before us, and this is what he said:

We could probably use \$500,000. I am sure we could use \$300,000, and use it efficiently and economically. I am not quite sure that we could use \$500,000 so economically, because it would require the building up of an organization very rapidly; but we could use \$300,000 efficiently and economically this year; and if we did that, it would cut in half the time that would be required to get the barberry out.

I wish to say at this point, in further reply to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], that the Department of Agriculture, while they agree that these spores are carried through the air, do not agree with him that it is useless to eradicate the barberry bush from a single State on the theory that it will be immediately filled up with barberry bushes from other States, because the present plans contemplate that in 13 States only the barberry bush will be practically eradicated in four or five years, while if the theory of the Senator from Montana is correct, unless we go to New England and eradicate all the barberry bushes in New England and everywhere else, there will be no use in spending the money at all. With that I do not agree. While the spores will still come through the air to some extent, if we can eradicate the bushes which are now in existence in every State where wheat is grown, we shall have the barberry bush problem under control. The only point that I make is that the States which are so vitally interested in the eradication of the barberry bush ought to help themselves and not expect the Federal Government to do it all.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee and the Senator from Wisconsin, I desire to say a few words. I do not deny that the States ought to appropriate money to cooperate in the work, but this is not a matter which has been known and appreciated for 25 or 30 years. The investigation of the relation of the barberry bush to the black rust in the West commenced about six years ago, I think, in the University of North Dakota, and it was only about three years ago that the States began to realize the necessity of the eradication of the barberry. I do not think that the people generally appreciate it now. I do not believe there are a half dozen Senators on the floor of the Senate who would know a barberry bush if they saw one, and I am sure Senators have the average intelligence of the farming community of the country.

Mr. President, it is true that the relation between the black rust in wheat and the barberry bush was known in Denmark before it was known here, and the bush was eradicated there; but it is not true that that relation has been known here for many years. Now the people are waking up to the danger. It takes some time to conduct such a campaign of education. Within the last year there was organized—the Governor of Minnesota being the president of it—an organization of 10 States, comprising the principal wheat-raising States, where the ravages of the black rust are the worst. They are awake to the subject. The legislatures of those States are not now in session and will not be in session until the winter of 1923. In my State they made an appropriation a year ago of \$20,000 per annum; but, finding that insufficient, the people there have raised money by private subscription, and I guarantee that whatever money the Federal Government may devote to this purpose will be more than matched in Minnesota, and I believe it will be matched in every State, because the organization to which I have referred is now awake to the subject.

But, Mr. President, because the States have not done all they could, although now awake to the conditions, are we to sit back and say we will do nothing except appropriate \$200,000 to de-

stroy the ravages of a disease which threatens the greatest single farming industry in the country? I am told by men who are not alarmists that wheat raising will cease in those States in a few years if the barberry is not eradicated. The barberry is growing on every piece of wild ground where the seedlings drop, and it is spreading with great rapidity.

Mr. President, if it were not for the fact that the Federal Government has had an experienced department studying plant diseases and animal diseases, where would the agriculture of this country be? It is useless for me to stop to enumerate the activities of the Department of Agriculture along this line; they are known to Senators, but we might just as well say in such cases that it is the duty of the State to protect their local industries. Furthermore, it is not expected that the Federal Government is going to send out men at from \$3 to \$7 a day to dig up the barberry plants. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that the Government's money is to be used in a campaign of education and farm survey in connection with the States and in aiding the States in teaching the farmers what they must do, and in that way bring about the eradication of the barberry bush.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this is not purely a State question. It is true, as the Senator from Wisconsin says, that it is not entirely useless to eradicate the barberry bushes in one State if they are growing in another, because the spread of the rust, of course, would not be so great from one State to another; but it is true that the barberry can not be eradicated in the great territory reaching from Pennsylvania on the East to the Rocky Mountains on the West and from north of the Ohio River and Kansas and Oklahoma unless there is Federal co-operation, because the seeds are taken by birds and scattered from State to State, and the spores or rust germs or whatever you call them are blown, according to the testimony, 50, 75, or 100 miles; and when attached to grasses and wheat, if the weather conditions are proper, they multiply with astonishing rapidity and are again distributed, and we have known fields of wheat in less than a week to be absolutely ruined.

I think the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota and North Dakota took hold of this subject as early and as energetically as any of the States. I do not think the appalling calamity that confronted the wheat-raising communities was really appreciated among the people generally until within the last two or three years. I do not think it was fully appreciated, although in 1916 this country did lose approximately 200,000,000 bushels of wheat by the black rust, because the weather conditions were favorable for the spread of the rust; and the statistics show that from that day to this the losses have been from fifty to seventy-five million bushels of wheat per annum, and I am saying nothing about the losses in other grains.

I realize perfectly the soundness of the argument of the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Wisconsin that in many of these things the States should do more; but I do believe that the States are now awakening and the people are awakening to the threatened danger to this great industry, and that if this appropriation is made, with the organization which now exists, we will find the States at the very next legislature cooperating to the fullest extent in the eradication of the barberry bush.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield; certainly.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator stated a moment ago that this was a newly discovered or at least a newly acknowledged cereal disease.

Mr. KELLOGG. Oh, no; I did not mean that.

Mr. McNARY. That is, so far as these States are concerned.

Mr. KELLOGG. I think the agitation or investigation of the subject commenced about six years ago. It is true that in 1883 or 1884 or 1885 a report on the subject was made in Denmark, I think; but it was not generally published or understood in this country.

Mr. NORRIS. It was not published in the English language, as I recall.

Mr. KELLOGG. No; I do not think it was published in the English language.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator permit me again to refer to the record before the Senate committee?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I refer to the testimony of Doctor Stakman, plant pathologist at the University of Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station. The doctor said:

I have been preaching barberry eradication since about 1912—

I count that as 10 years ago—and Doctor Humphrey, of the Department of Agriculture, also has. Professor Bailey, of North Dakota, has been preaching it for a longer time than that, and various other plant-disease specialists have been insisting on it for a number of years.

Mr. LADD. Mr. President—

Mr. McNARY. If I might add a word, that would indicate that there was a wide knowledge of the disease among scientists through these infected States 10 years ago.

Mr. LADD. Mr. President, it is true that some of the scientists knew where the trouble lay, but the investigations had not been made to any great extent. If we go back to Denmark, early in the eighties they published a very comprehensive study of the entire subject and caused the eradication of the barberry bush from that country so as to preserve the wheat crop of the country, and that was done in Holland also to a considerable extent; but we did not have the information in this country. I might say, in that respect, that I have been advocating the eradication of the barberry bush since in the eighties, when as a student I took it up in the University of Maine, and I knew the condition; but the study had not been made by the authorities who gave the information.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from North Dakota is a noted scientist, and we all regard his ability highly. May I ask his attention to the fact, as a matter of history, that Doctor Stakman said, testifying on page 12 of the hearings before the Senate committee, that—

The first barberry eradication law which was passed on account of the fact that the barberry was known to damage grains was passed in 1660 in Rouen, France.

I should assume that if it was known nearly three hundred years ago in France that the barberry was the host wherein this fungus lived—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that that was not known in France at that time. The only thing they knew about it was that when they had the barberry bush they had black rust. They did not know the means by which it was communicated.

Mr. McNARY. They associated the two together.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. And from that came the thought, which subsequently developed, that the rust was found in the barberry.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. KELLOGG. But it is only within a very few years that it has been appreciated by the people, the State authorities, the legislatures, that the eradication of the barberry bush is necessary if we are going to raise wheat. There are no legislatures that meet until 1923, I believe, at least in any of the Western States where the barberry is found; and I do not believe that we, facing this calamity, should hesitate for a moment to give all the aid possible in the campaign to eradicate the barberry bush, which this testimony shows can be done in a very short time if the appropriation is sufficient, but it will last from 10 to 15 years if we appropriate merely at the rate of \$150,000 or \$200,000 a year.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the amount of money, computed in cold cash, that would be saved by a sufficient appropriation to eradicate the barberry bush in one year would be many times more than the appropriation, just in the value of wheat that it would save, providing it was an ordinary year, when the weather conditions were such as to give this disease the opportunity to develop.

I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that, at least in my judgment, this is not a local proposition. It is not a proposition confined to the 13 States that are referred to so often. It is a national problem, Mr. President, and in my judgment, the State of Delaware is just as much interested in it as the State of Minnesota, because in all the States the people eat bread. In all the States the people use wheat. The people of the States that do not produce a bushel of it use as much of it per capita as those that produce the actual grain, and perhaps more, because they are usually, like those of Delaware, doing a whole lot of things that are more profitable, and they have more money to spend for bread than the poor farmer who has to bend his back to raise the wheat. Therefore, Mr. President, all of the country is interested in the production of wheat. The less wheat we produce the more we will pay for bread, assuming that no artificial instrumentalities come in the way of the law of supply and demand.

I think, therefore, that we ought to consider the question in a very broad sense, in a national sense; and what are we going to do, Mr. President, if some State does not eradicate this pest? Admit, as I do, at least for the sake of the argument—and I should be willing to have every State cooperate—that the States

ought to cooperate, that they ought to furnish half of the money, or three-fourths of the money. We have no way to compel them to do it. Suppose a State does not do it, and it becomes the pest-hole of the United States for the development of this disease; what are we going to do about it?

Mr. President, as I said before, I have no doubt but that every State to the extent of its ability will cooperate. If there were to be meetings of the legislatures prior to the going into effect of this appropriation bill, I should have no objection to limiting it so that the States would be required to cooperate; but that could not be done now without great damage, without a liability, at least, of great loss to the wheat crop on account of rust. If we can use the money to eradicate this disease in one year, it is economy to do it—not only economy, but it is economy that runs into the millions and hundreds of millions—because every year the loss from black rust in the wheat in America is something tremendous.

Mr. President, it is no answer to say that perhaps we may have to go to Maine, and eradicate the pest there, and all the way across the continent. If it is necessary to save the wheat to make the bread for our people to eat, we will do that. We are not limited by the Constitution now as to the extent to which we may legislate in a case of this kind; but we would amend the Constitution if necessary to save the life of the people. The barberry bush is a pest that comes in direct contact with the food that the people have to have to live, that destroys it after the expense and the labor have been employed to make the completed grain; and the people will not stop at any means that may be necessary to eradicate that pest.

It has been known since 1660 in France, as has been shown here, that the barberry bush had something to do with black rust, but they did not know then just how it came about. I think that has been comparatively a modern discovery, as to just how it came about. Be that as it may, Mr. President, it is a fact that the people of the United States, as a rule, do not understand it to-day; and, as was well said, how many Senators here would know a barberry bush if they should meet it in the street this afternoon? How many people in your States know that the barberry bush is the host by means of which the pest lives that destroys the wheat and brings on the black rust? They all know about the black rust; they know what a ravage it is; they know what kind of weather is required to develop it; but not one person in a thousand knows just the scientific way in which it comes about, or that it comes from the barberry bush.

On the subject of another pest, I remember just last year reading a scientific article in some magazine about the destruction of the white pine, and I learned—it may be a confession of ignorance of which no other Senator is guilty, but it is true, nevertheless—I learned that if you raised a gooseberry bush or a currant bush in the vicinity of a white-pine tree, you killed the white-pine tree; that allowing a currant bush to grow within three or four hundred feet of a white-pine tree meant the death of the white-pine tree. I commenced to investigate further, and delved into it until I learned something about it. I suppose that has been known by scientific men like the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD] for the last hundred years, but I did not know it. [Laughter.] If the Senator from North Dakota feels at all offended at that remark, I will take off a few years.

Mr. President, that only illustrates that while we know the damage wrought by some of these things, we do not realize the scientific reasons which bring them about. People can see the white-pine trees shrivel up and die, and wonder what is the matter, and they may be raising gooseberries or currant bushes right in the shade of the very trees themselves. There is a pest now which has gone all over this country which is eliminating the chestnut tree. As far as I know, nobody has yet discovered any way to stop it. It means the destruction of chestnut trees. Unless we get rid of the barberry bush it means that we can not and will not raise wheat in this country, and it is only a question with me as to how much money these people can use. I do not like the testimony of Doctor Ball. It has been read two or three times, and I read some of it which has not been read by the Senator from Oregon, in which Doctor Ball said they asked for no increase. They made no estimate whatever in regard to the barberry bush. I think they are derelict in the department when they are not thinking of doing something about a pest of that kind. It is striking at the very foundation of the American people's principal food product.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. KING. This is not quite pertinent to the particular barberry bush which the Senator is discussing, but may I not inquire of the Senator whether, with all the appropriations which we have been making from year to year for many years for the Department of Agriculture for the extirpation of other pests, have they not multiplied rather than decreased, and as we increase the number of employees and augment the appropriations, have not the number of pests multiplied?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not suppose the Senator will claim that if we increase the appropriation, for instance, in this case, it will necessarily increase the number of barberry bushes in the United States?

Mr. KING. I am not so sure about it.

Mr. NORRIS. On the other hand, will the Senator claim that if we make no appropriation whatever, the barberry bushes will all die?

Mr. KING. Many of us, when we were younger, worked on farms, and if many of these new-fangled diseases of which we hear nowadays existed then, we dealt with them. Crops were produced, the yield in many instances being larger per acre than now, and we did not get millions of dollars of appropriations out of the Treasury every year to help the agriculturist. The farmers did their own work. They did not depend upon the Government for everything. But a different plan is now being urged. The Federal Government is expected to do what private enterprise should do. I am not referring to agriculture particularly, but to the general tendency to secure Federal aid in matters of a purely local or individual character. This tends to produce anemic people, people who will come for help when they should carry their own problems. The Federal Treasury is to become a vast cornucopia that will pour forth a golden flood to help thousands of employees who should be engaged in private employment, and to aid individuals in the enterprises to which they are directing their attention.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there may be a great deal in what the Senator has said—that we got through with those things when we did not know anything about scientific reasons and had no scientific men. We got along, though lots of people died who otherwise would have lived. There was hookworm for years and years and centuries and people did not know it, and many died. There was appendicitis, and people died. They got along without doctors. But is that any reason why when a man gets appendicitis now he should not get a surgeon and have the appendix cut out? If hookworm gets into the community, is there any reason why we should not eradicate it? There was typhoid fever more in the early days than there is now. Smallpox then was more deadly than it is now. But is there any reason why we should not resort to modern methods of avoiding those diseases now? The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] suggests to me that there was yellow fever. Is there any reason why we should go back to the old days, before the street car, before the electric light, before the lamp even, before we had bathrooms, and live as we did then, or as our forefathers did?

One thing it seems to me we ought to try to do and that is to fix things so that our children, those who follow us, will have more of the comforts of life than we had, will know how to meet these diseases which confront us better than we have been able to meet them. We are not worthy of being called noble sons of noble sires unless we improve on our forefathers. The swallow which built its nest among the rafters of Noah's ark built just as good a nest as the swallow that is building one now under the eaves of the United States Capitol Building. That is the difference between man and the lower animals. Man improves and the lower animals do not. They are just the same now as they were when Adam was here. We think we are a little better; I believe we are. Sometimes it is expensive and costs lots of money, but we must have these things, even if they do come high. It is no argument now to say that because our forefathers did not know anything about the cause of black rust and just suffered their damages without being able to help themselves we should sit idly by now and see the wheat fields crumble and decay just before they are ready to harvest, when we know what the matter is and know how to apply the remedy, and do not do it simply because it is going to cost some money to do it.

I know that lots of money is spent foolishly. I wish I could stop it, but I can not. Because I can not stop it, I am not in favor of stopping all advance and progress and doing the best we can even though we do squander a lot of money in doing it.

It would be economy, as I said in the beginning, to eradicate this thing now and to do it quickly. We will save dollars by doing it, and it is only a question as to whether the department is able to use this amount of money. It seems to me they can not, and if they can not use it all, at least we will give them

all they can use up to the limit of this amendment, \$500,000, so that they will not be handicapped. Every time they do anything to eradicate the barberry bush they do just that much more to save the wheat crop and that much more to save the food which the American people eat.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire to have inserted in the *RECORD* the law of the State of Montana providing for the eradication of the barberry bush. It is brief, and will serve as a model for statutes of that character. Briefly, it provides that any landowner on whose land is growing a barberry bush is required to dig it up and destroy it. If he does not do so, the horticultural inspector comes along and, having given him notice, which he has not observed, the inspector himself digs up and destroys the bush, and the expense of doing so becomes a charge upon the land upon which the bush is growing, and becomes a part of the taxes imposed upon the owner of the land.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator asks that it be printed in the *RECORD*?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

[Laws of Montana, sixteenth legislative assembly, 1919.]

CHAPTER 40.

An act providing for the eradication of harmful barberry and extending the provisions of the act to mahonia in case of necessity, and defining the powers and duties of the State board of horticulture.

Be it enacted by the legislative assembly of the State of Montana: SECTION 1. That it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to sell, offer for sale, barter, give away, exchange, deliver, ship, transport, receive, or accept for shipment or transportation, plant, or permit to exist on his or its premises in the State of Montana any plant of the harmful barberry.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the State board of horticulture or its duly authorized inspectors to enforce the provisions of this act, and they are hereby empowered to cause to be eradicated any such harmful barberry plants found growing anywhere in the State. If the owner of the land on which such harmful plants are found growing shall fail or refuse to eradicate such plants within 10 days after receiving a written notice to that effect from a horticultural inspector, said inspector shall proceed to have such harmful barberry plants eradicated and destroyed wherever they may be found growing. As soon as the horticultural inspector has had such harmful barberry plants eradicated and destroyed he shall make out a statement in duplicate of the actual cost and expense incurred by him in eradicating or destroying such harmful barberry plants. One of such statements shall be transmitted to the landowner affected by the work and the other shall be filed in the office of the treasurer of the county wherein such land is situated. The treasurer shall place such amount so indicated in such statement on the tax duplicate against the land of the landowner affected by such work, and such amount so entered shall be collected in the same manner and at the same time as taxes are collected, and when so collected shall be paid by the treasurer to the State board of horticulture, which shall remit to State treasurer to be added to the appropriation for the use of the State board of horticulture.

SEC. 3. The term "harmful barberry" as used in this act shall be construed to apply to any species of *Berberis* and as hereinafter provided for, to mahonia, which are susceptible to infection by *Puccinia graminis*, commonly called black stem rust of grain (but not including Japanese barberry, *B. thunbergii*, which does not propagate the rust).

SEC. 4. The State board of horticulture is hereby empowered to apply the provisions of this act to species of mahonia whenever in its judgment the necessity arises.

SEC. 5. Any person, firm, or corporation which shall violate any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined any sum not less than \$10 and not more than \$25 for each offense.

SEC. 6. All acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

SEC. 7. This act shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and approval.

Approved February 21, 1919.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I think the Senate as a whole is convinced of the fact that the barberry bush ought to be exterminated. The question arises in my mind, suggested by the Senator from Nebraska, as to how much money Congress ought to authorize this year for that purpose.

As I understand it, the gentleman who has charge of the expenditure of this money has stated that while they could spend \$500,000 he was in doubt as to whether they could expend it entirely profitably or economically, but was satisfied that they could expend \$300,000. I am wondering why the amendment goes to the \$500,000, a doubling of the amount of the appropriation in the House, and is not confined to the \$300,000. The authorities who expend the money say they can expend that much economically. They have some doubt about the other amount.

If it were clear to my mind that the \$500,000 could be used profitably and economically for this purpose, I should not hesitate to vote for it, because I would say it was money well expended, but having doubt about it, not having heard any reason as to why \$500,000 should be appropriated instead of the amount suggested by Doctor Ball, it occurs to me that this amendment should be made to read "\$300,000" instead of "\$500,000."

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, Mr. Fuller, the secretary of the organization in 10 States for the eradication of the barberry bush, supplied to the Department of Agriculture and placed in the hearings, at page 8, if the Senator will read it, a statement to the effect that the department can use \$500,000, and use it economically. That is in the record, at page 8.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Is not Doctor Ball the man who has charge of this work?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not know whether he is or not.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think so, although I am not positive about it. I judge Doctor Ball does not have charge of it. Perhaps the Senator from Oregon can tell us. I do not think he has charge of it, because he stated in the beginning of his testimony that they did not ask anything for this item. He did not seem to know anything about it.

Mr. McNARY. Doctor Ball has made several visitations to that country out there, but I am not sure as to the individual who actually represents the department in this work of organizing. The appropriation is used in the different agricultural colleges in the States. I think it is under the department here, but the various individuals having in charge this work have their offices in State agricultural colleges and operate from there in cooperation with the State officials.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I received a letter from the State agricultural college at Lansing stating that the man in charge thought \$200,000 too small a sum for this purpose, but he did not state how much ought to be appropriated, and what I am interested in knowing now is why \$500,000 is asked, instead of \$300,000. If there is better authority than Doctor Ball, I would be glad to hear from him.

Mr. KELLOGG. I have talked with Mr. Fuller—

Mr. TOWNSEND. Who is Mr. Fuller?

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. Fuller is the secretary of an association, including representatives from 10 States, Western States mostly, interested in the eradication of the barberry bush.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does he have anything to do with the expenditure of the money?

Mr. KELLOGG. No; he is a private citizen and belongs to this association. Governor Preus, of Minnesota, is the president of it, and I think the governors of the various States are members of it. He made a statement before the committee, which appears on page 7 of the hearings, to this effect:

Mr. FULLER. My only point was this: I will not bore you with the statement that we have from the Department of Agriculture; but we have consulted the Department of Agriculture, and we have their assurance in writing that the sum of \$500,000 could be expended efficiently and economically and with great profit to the barberry eradication movement. I have a statement here which I might put in the record.

The statement is on page 8, and was prepared, as he told me, by Mr. Ball, a brother of Doctor Ball, who is in the Department of Agriculture and knows all about this subject. That statement says that the campaign carried on with the appropriation of \$147,200 would take at least 10 years.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What does the Department of Agriculture here in Washington say about it?

Mr. KELLOGG. This is what the Department of Agriculture here in Washington says.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; Mr. Fuller says that a brother of a man in the department says he can use it.

Mr. KELLOGG. There are men in the Department of Agriculture who have charge of this work, and this comes from the man who has charge of it, as I understand it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wonder why they did not call that man before the committee?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not know. I was not on the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. The Doctor Ball who testified is the director of scientific work of the entire department. He is the head of it all. He is a pioneer in the work of barberry-bush eradication. He was the State entomologist of Wisconsin for three years, and that was under his personal direction.

Mr. McNARY. Doctor Ball is not the author of the statement now being referred to.

Mr. LENROOT. I understand that.

Mr. TOWNSEND. As I understand it, that was furnished by a brother of Doctor Ball.

Mr. President, as I said, I am perfectly willing to vote every dollar that the department says it can use efficiently and economically in the process of exterminating the barberry bush; but for us to vote against the advice evidently of the man who has charge of the work and say that we will give him \$500,000 when he says he can use \$300,000, giving him twice as much as he is getting now, it looks to me as though we are voting without information, without that information which is necessary in order for us to fix properly the amount of appropriations. That is the only question that is in my mind. It is not a ques-

tion of the extermination of this pest, or the appropriation of sufficient money to do it, but it is a question of voting blindly an amount which seems to be without foundation of reason why it should be \$500,000. Therefore it seems to me that the part of wisdom is to stop with the sum which is practically double the amount which we appropriated last year and give the department the amount that is asked for by its officials.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, we have heard to-day a great deal about barberry bushes. From many sources the damage wrought by this menace has come to us. With a sincerity unquestioned and an eloquence unequalled these interested Senators have described this unwholesome, injurious, and infectious thing. The bill carries large appropriations designed to prevent many diseases and eradicate numerous pests, pests of all kinds and insects of every description. For instance, scabies in sheep are sought to be eliminated. Tuberculosis in animals, cattle ticks, hog cholera, the foot-and-mouth disease are all provided for.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that there is nothing in the bill about Democrats?

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, no; but to-day the Senator heard enough about Democrats. There was an election yesterday, and the Senator's suggestion brings it to my mind. It was up in one of the northern districts of New York. The attention of the Senate has already been called to it, and that is why Senators on the other side of the aisle are looking so woe-begone, so crestfallen, so "down in the mouth," if you please, at this time. It was an election that told a story—a story that presages what is to follow. It did not bring "glad tidings of good news" to the Senator from Wisconsin or his colleagues or the administration. Naturally you were surprised.

In 1920 in this New York district the vote was 51,512 for the Republican candidate, and for the Democratic candidate it was 21,000, a majority of 30,000 for the Republican candidate in that election. If I read correctly from this morning's issue of the official organ of the Republican Party, the Washington Post, the figures of yesterday's vote, Mr. Irvine, the Democratic candidate, received 17,712, and Mr. Henry, the Republican candidate, received 20,799, a majority of 3,000 for the Republican candidate on yesterday in this hidebound Republican district of New York where only two years ago the Republican majority was 30,000.

Primaries in Illinois were held yesterday. There was one very distinguished Republican leader, a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, indorsed by the administration in all the papers of his district, of which he owned three. I refer to Mr. IRA C. COPLEY. Practically all of the papers in the district, as I understand, carried the indorsement of Mr. JOSEPH W. FORDNEY, the author of the tariff bill which has recently passed the Republican House and which, after being remade by the Finance Committee of the Senate, was reported yesterday in secret, in executive session, to the Senate. Mr. FORDNEY, as well as the administration, indorsed Mr. COPLEY. I understand there was a Republican running in that primary against Mr. COPLEY, who criticized some of the administration's present policies, and was unsparing in his strictures on the votes cast by Mr. COPLEY. The result was that Mr. COPLEY was defeated by 4,000 majority. One of the other Republicans who was up for renomination and who had a contest was Mr. IRELAND. He was, of course, defending his record in that contest as a friend of the present administration. He also went down to defeat yesterday. So if the Republicans can get any consolation out of the returns of yesterday they are easily satisfied.

Now, Mr. President, if I have answered the question of the Senator from Wisconsin, I will proceed to talk about the bill.

The bill not only touches scabies, and cattle ticks, and hog cholera, and the foot-and-mouth disease, and tuberculosis, but it also deals with moths, both gypsy and brown-tailed, white-pine blisters, boll weevils, pink boll worms, bean beetles, citrus canker, Hessian flies, chinch bugs, grasshoppers, and last but not least, the rust spores from the barberry bush.

It is perfectly natural that whenever we strike the question of the barberry bush it should elicit a great deal of discussion in the Senate. It is quite a coincidence that the barberry bush has been discovered and it seems to thrive most and prevail in certain localities. The localities apparently affected more than others are those represented by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], and in the State of Michigan, represented in part by Mr. TOWNSEND, and in Wisconsin, represented in part by Mr. LENROOT, and in that section of the country.

I heard the testimony before the committee and I have no doubt that the barberry spores that emanate from it are most

destructive, that the injury wrought therefrom is quite large, and that they are a dreaded menace.

It is natural that the wheat growers of the Middle West should be alarmed over the advent of this pest and are desirous of eradicating before a wider spread is made and greater damage wrought.

I am always sympathetic with any people who are cursed with dreaded disease or locality that is visited by dreaded pests. It is that same sympathetic feeling that has moved the Congress to make these annual appropriations so that disease to animal life might be eliminated—that insects destructive to plant or vegetable life might be destroyed and pests menacing horticulture might be eradicated.

The best methods and the surest means to do these things have commanded the attention of scientists the world over, and received of Congress most liberal treatment. Of all these pests enumerated in this bill, I will concede that few, if any, are more injurious than the barberry bush.

However, the barberry bush is not the only berry that I know of that is a pest or threatens to menace the country. Great as is the injury that may be wrought by the barberry, it is not to be compared with some other pests or, may I say, diseases by the name of "berry." You know what I mean. I can see the smiles on your countenances when I mention "berry" pests or menaces to-day. Sirs, when we talk about the danger of a "berry" pest, the people will not think of barberry bushes; they will think of Newberry bushes, a term taken from "Newberryism," meaning the plundering of the people by the purchase of power. I care not how Senators may inveigh against this barberry pest or any other pest, insect, or disease, none are as menacing to our peace and happiness, as destructive of the perpetuity of our institutions, and the very stability of our Government as the most dreaded of all pests—Newberryism.

I am going to vote for the increased appropriation that is provided in the bill by the committee, so that every effort will be made to eradicate the barberry bush. I am not going as far as some would have us to go, however.

I am not now referring to the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], but I am referring to some others who have spoken in behalf of an increased appropriation to eradicate the barberry bush in what I am about to say. If they had shown the same zeal in trying to eradicate the other kind of pest, the kind that is more deadly than the barberry, that is not applicable alone to one State or two States but to many States—the kind that reaches from Maine to Washington, that not only blights and destroys the wheat but affects the ambition of the young boy, destroys the high ideals of a people, and removes the last vestige of justice and equal opportunity. I say, if they had shown the same zeal and opposition to the advent and triumph of Newberryism that they have to eradicate barberryism, they would have rendered a greater service to more people and a larger section of the country.

It is said that these rust spores from barberry bushes are carried upon the wings of the wind and light upon the wheat and other plant life. Newberryism distributes spores, but they are not called rust spores. In New York the spores that emanate from it might be termed "Calder" spores, or those from Newberryism in Massachusetts might be called "Lodge" spores, or those in Michigan might be called "Townsend" spores, or in Minnesota might be called "Kellogg" spores.

There are other States that I might enumerate where these spores might light, not rust spores but spores that change their names when they get into the various States. I see my friend from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] coming in. I failed to specifically mention Ohio, where certain spores from Newberryism would not be termed rust spores, but they change the name to "Willis" spores there.

So while I am going to vote for this reasonable appropriation in the nature of an increase to try to prevent and eradicate the barberry bush, I shall not go to the extent that some desire to go.

I hope that Senators will, when such a dreaded menace offers its head in this body in the future, a menace that affects not one State but the whole country, that they will exhibit the same zeal in preventing the menace to which I have referred, namely, Newberryism, that is now apparently shown in an effort to eliminate the barberryism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, let the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 22, line 18, in lieu of the amount "\$432,505," proposed by the committee, insert "\$732,-

505," and in the same line, in the proviso, in lieu of "\$200,000" insert "\$500,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For the investigation and improvement of cereals, including corn, and methods of cereal production, and for the study and control of cereal diseases, including barberry eradication, and for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases, and for the investigation and improvement of broom corn and methods of broom-corn production, \$732,505: *Provided*, That \$500,000 shall be set aside for the location of and destruction of the barberry bushes and other vegetation from which rust spores originate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hale	McKinley	Rawson
Ball	Harris	McNary	Reed
Borah	Harrison	Moses	Sheppard
Broussard	Heflin	Myers	Sterling
Bursum	Hitchcock	Nelson	Sutherland
Calder	Johnson	New	Swanson
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Townsend
Colt	Kellogg	Norbeck	Trammell
Cummins	Kendrick	Norris	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Keyes	Oddie	Warren
Dial	King	Overman	Watson, Ind.
Dillingham	Ladd	Page	Willis
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Phipps	
Gerry	Lenroot	Poinexter	
Gooding	Lodge	Pomerene	

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] are necessarily absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. McNARY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KELLOGG (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. NEW (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). A few days ago I made a pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], which was to continue so long as one of us was out of town. I understand he is present. I therefore feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD] and vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and vote "nay."

Mr. McKINLEY (after having voted in the negative). I have a permanent pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY]. As he is not present, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BALL (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. KENDRICK (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. KENDRICK. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. KING. I inquire if the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. KING. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], who, it appears, has not voted. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and will allow my vote to stand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair, after having voted in the negative). The present occupant of the chair desires to state that the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent. The Chair undertook to take care of that Senator for to-day, but he finds he can transfer his pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER], which he does, and will allow his vote to stand.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] are absent on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WATSON];

The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST] with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]; and

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES].

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—37.

Ashurst	Hale	Myers	Reed
Broussard	Heflin	Nelson	Sheppard
Bursum	Hitchcock	New	Sterling
Capper	Johnson	Newberry	Sutherland
Colt	Kellogg	Norbeck	Trammell
Cummins	Kendrick	Norris	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Keyes	Oddie	Willis
Frelinghuysen	Ladd	Polindexter	
Gerry	La Follette	Pomerene	
Gooding	Moses	Rawson	

NAYS—16.

Ball	Harris	Lenroot	Phipps
Calder	Harrison	McNary	Smoot
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Townsend
Dillingham	King	Page	Warren

NOT VOTING—43.

Borah	Fletcher	Nicholson	Stanfield
Brandegge	France	Owen	Stanley
Cameron	Glass	Pepper	Swanson
Caraway	Harrell	Pittman	Underwood
Crow	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Culberson	Lodge	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
du Pont	McCormick	Shields	Watson, Ga.
Edge	McCumber	Shortridge	Watson, Ind.
Elkins	McKellar	Simmons	Weller
Ernst	McKinley	Smith	Williams
Fernald	McLean	Spencer	

So the amendment of Mr. NORRIS to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether individual amendments are in order now under the procedure that has been adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that a unanimous-consent agreement was entered into whereby the bill was to be read for action on the committee amendments.

Mr. KING. I desire at the appropriate time to offer an amendment appropriating several million dollars to exterminate weeds from the farms of the country. If the Government is becoming so paternalistic, I think it ought to take care of all the weeds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment will be in order when the committee amendments are disposed of.

Mr. NORRIS. That will be in order when the weeds commence to grow. They have not started yet.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I generally agree with my friend the Senator from Utah; but his irony, I think, is hardly warranted.

Mr. KING. That was a joke, not irony.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator meant it for irony. I am not criticizing him. He had a right to indulge in it; but I rather embrace it as an opportunity merely to express my opinion about appropriations for farm work, farm development, and improvement in agriculture.

Mr. President, the making of appropriations which have the effect of improving the character of the grains of the country or the stock of the country by the dissemination of proper knowledge is not any more paternalistic than teaching the alphabet to children at the public expense is paternalistic. It is educational, and there is no reason why the education of the people

should stop at the primary department of the public school or at the graduating line of the public school. If we could disseminate the last word in scientific knowledge regarding farming, it would pay back not only a thousandfold but probably ten thousandfold the expense.

The particular amendment we have just voted on is of a little different character. It proposes to stop a disease, or something which is in the nature of a disease—a pest. There never has been any question about the right and the propriety of the Government stopping the spread of contagion from one State to another among animals or among human beings. This is merely a proposition to stop the spread of disease among plants, the particular plants especially concerned in this instance being wheat and oats. That is not paternalistic. It is protective. It is not any more paternalistic to stop the spread of a contagion within the borders of the country than it is to put down an armed rebellion within the country or to protect the country against the invasion of an enemy. This class of legislation does not come within the term "paternalism" at all. It is a proper public duty, and it has been exercised for scores of years, and with the highest benefit.

Mr. President, I have not the slightest doubt that of all the moneys that have ever been expended by the Federal Government the money which has brought the finest return, the greatest reward, has been the money expended through the Agricultural Department. I do not claim that that department, in the process of experimentation and development, has not made mistakes, or that it may not make many mistakes in the future. I do not claim that every dollar brings a return; but I do make the broad claim that if you take the Agricultural appropriations in the aggregate, year by year, they have produced more of actual wealth in this country, a thousand to one more, than the money that has been expended.

No one can estimate the far-reaching effects of an improvement in agriculture. The old illustrative statement that he is a public benefactor who makes two blades of grass grow where one grew before can be applied here and multiplied by the immense farm population and then by the immense city population. This country probably would starve for meat and butter and milk if we had the kind of cattle that were universally found in this country when I was a boy. I have not the slightest doubt but that if you should compare the cattle of 50 years ago with the improved breeds of to-day it would be found that meat and butter and milk are produced at half the expense and waste of the inferior grades with which our fathers were obliged to put up. I remember the old razor-back hog that took about two years to mature and that could run so fast that you could not catch him when he had grown up. If we were forced to raise that sort of animal upon our farms to-day, and nothing else, it is my opinion that pork would cost twice as much as it does to-day. Wheat and corn and every variety of cereal have been improved to the same extent. The money expended by the Agricultural Department has been largely responsible for these vast strides forward; and we are only in the infancy of the development of our agriculture.

It is a matter of regret that some European countries have advanced so much more rapidly than we have in the application of scientific principles to the development of the farm that they are able to produce crops far beyond those which we produce at the present time. If we were to appropriate \$10 for the development of agriculture where we appropriate \$1 at the present time, assuming that the Agricultural Department would be correspondingly expanded, it is my opinion that it would be the finest investment that this country ever has made in its history.

I am in favor of economy in the administration of the affairs of this Government. If I had my way, I would abolish about nine-tenths of the boards and bureaus and departments; but there is one department that I would enlarge and bring to it the highest scientific skill of the world, at whatsoever cost, and that is the Agricultural Department. I think this bill and all of its provisions ought to be considered in that light.

I do not say this now for the mere purpose of replying to what my friend from Utah meant as a bit of satirical witticism. I wanted to say it anyway. Agriculture must be taken care of in this country. Fifty-two per cent of our population now live in cities, and there is no class of men who have felt the terrible strain which has fallen upon the country since the war as the farmers have. It must be remembered that the farmers are the only class of our people who were not permitted to sell at war prices during the war. It must be remembered that from the very first of the war to its end the Government fixed a price upon substantially everything the farmer produced. They did not permit him to sell in the open market of the world at the war prices, but they compelled him to buy in a market that was not controlled, and consequently he was obliged to pay war

prices for everything he purchased. Against that I protested on this floor for weeks, and in order to prevent it resorted to every legislative device at my command. I said then that the farmers of this country were as patriotic as any other class of men; that if it were necessary in order to win the war that the farmer should sell his wheat for a dollar a bushel, or give it to the Government, if, indeed, such a thing were possible and yet maintain production, the farmers of the country would be willing to do it, provided everybody else in the country were brought under the same rule, an equitable rule of common regulation.

But if the prices at which the farmer had to sell were kept down artificially by the Government and the price at which he had to buy were not thus regulated, the farmer would be despoiled and would be singled out of all the people of the country to ultimately be the sufferer through the war, while other classes of people might be the profiteers by the war. My protest not only went unheeded, but throughout this country the protest and the protestant were alike denounced. It was almost claimed in some instances that my attitude was one of disloyalty.

What has been demonstrated in the last few months? The farmer who found that his price was prevented from going up when prices were mounting, after the war was over found there was no one to keep his price from going down. Accordingly he has found himself confronted with this sort of a situation—not having been allowed to realize the high prices during the war, and during the war having been compelled to pay high prices for everything he consumed, unrestricted war prices. Since the war is over he has found that the bottom dropped out of his market, and he has been compelled to sell at ruinous prices the grains which he produced by high labor, with high-priced machinery, and at the expenses which are always incident to production when all values are high.

If the farmer had been permitted to reap the high prices of war times, he might have had money in the bank when the slump came instead of having a note in the bank, and he could have recouped himself during these times of depression out of the profits made during the time of inflation, as business houses generally did and as they are still doing. But the country then had been taught to believe, by an extensive propaganda, paid for out of the money of the people and expended through press bureaus skillfully organized, that Mr. Hoover was a magician, a magician sent almost from on high to shower the benefits of his celestial wisdom upon this earth, and that it was a kind of sacrilege to say that anything Mr. Hoover proposed to do would not bring infinite blessing to the people.

What did Mr. Hoover do? He regulated the price of everything the farmer produced, and he did it without any authority of law whatsoever. He did it by acts as arbitrary as have ever disgraced any Government—Democratic, Republican, monarchical, or Bolshevik—in the history of the world. No grant of power was given to him to regulate the price of anything, but he was given the power to license business institutions. And as he construed the power of license, it was not the power of regulation for the purpose of preventing illegal practices; it was a power of life and death over a business institution which he could exercise, and therefore, having the power of life and death, he could command an institution to pay whatever prices he saw fit to dictate.

Accordingly, he said to the grain dealers of the country and to the millers, "If you pay more than a certain price for wheat, I will take away your license to do business." He then organized the Export Grain Corporation, the only corporation allowed to ship grains abroad during the war, and through that corporation fixed the price of export grain. Accordingly, there was no place in the world for the farmer to sell his wheat where the price was not regulated by Mr. Hoover's arbitrary decree, issued not as of right, but because he had the power to deny business institutions the privilege to exist if they paid the farmer more than Mr. Hoover saw fit to dictate. Thus the price was fixed illegally by the violent and illegal abuse of a power of license.

How did he treat the great business institutions? They were permitted in most instances, where their profits were fixed at all, to vastly increase their profits, and, speaking in a broad sense, their markets were thus stabilized and their profits guaranteed. So that, for the most part, where they were regulated at all, they were enabled to pile up huge profits, vast surpluses, out of which they could draw their expenses in the days of adversity which everyone anticipated would come after the war was over. Outside of the domain of Mr. Hoover there was no regulation whatever.

I happened to be in a position a few days ago to know of an institution that had accumulated during the war period a sur-

plus of over \$12,000,000, and when orders ceased after the war, they had that money, accumulated during the war, so that they were able, if they desired, to continue to pay their regular dividends, even though business was slack and no profits were being made, paying them, and paying them properly, out of a surplus accumulated for the very purpose of meeting the days of depression and stress.

Those institutions for the most part—and I am not speaking of this particular one—had great war contracts, and made immense profits. Many of them worked on the cost-plus basis, and had no opportunity to lose. They were piling up this money against the evil day.

How differently the farmer was situated. He was denied a market. He was denied war prices. Hence, he did not have the surplus which he might have had if the hands of the Government had not rested upon his neck during the war. That, Mr. President, is just what the Federal Government did to the farmer during the war. The price of wheat was depreciated substantially \$1 a bushel within a few days' time. It remained at a fixed price during the war, when the world was clamoring for bread, and when after the war was over the Government released its grip the price of wheat mounted within a very few days, if I recollect, some 60 or 70 cents a bushel, so that the price both before the war and after the war when unregulated was from 70 cents to \$1.20 higher than it was during the period of regulation, a complete demonstration that the regulation throughout the war had kept down the price of wheat substantially or nearly a dollar per bushel. Multiply that by the number of bushels of wheat produced in the United States during practically the two-year period of regulation, over 1,500,000,000 bushels, and we have a rough approximation of the stupendous amount taken from the farmers on wheat alone.

But the price of wheat is reflected in the price of corn and the price of corn is reflected in the price of cattle and the price of hogs. In addition to that the prices of cattle and hogs were arbitrarily fixed through regulation of the packing houses imposed upon the packing houses by the same arbitrary methods, namely, the threat to take away their licenses unless they conformed to the arbitrary will of Mr. Hoover.

It is impossible with any accuracy to estimate the amount of money taken from the farmers by virtue of these price regulations. But I believe the farmers were deprived of between five and six billions of dollars during the two-year period of regulation.

The trouble with agriculture to-day is that agriculture was not permitted during the war to reap its just profits, but was compelled to sell in a restricted market and to buy in an unrestricted war-wild market. But to-day, with the war over, there is no one here to prevent the price of agricultural products going down to the very bottom. They kept them from going up, but they do not keep them from going down.

There is another phase of the matter that must not be overlooked. The price of the farm products was fixed not alone to benefit the American consumer, if that, indeed, was ever the object, but the farm products were sold to European countries at these regulated prices, reduced prices, so that Great Britain, France, Belgium, and all the world, seeking to buy American farm products, obtained them at the restricted prices. On the other hand, England, France, Italy, Belgium, and all the world sold to us at the full war values. The singular thing is that during that very period of the war Great Britain—I have not examined the figures for other countries—sold more in dollars than she did during any corresponding period of her history.

The result, therefore, was that the American farmer was bled white, not for the benefit of the American consumer alone but for the benefit of our allies in the war and of all Europe. Now, when Europe finds her markets disrupted and values gone, the farmer, who has to sell his surplus, is compelled to sell that surplus upon a bankrupt market at the bankrupt prices prevailing in the world. And there are none so wise they can prescribe a remedy.

These are the conditions confronting the farmer, and they confront the cattlemaster, the sheepman, the hog man in just the same way. The percentage of men engaged in the cattle-raising business who have become bankrupt is simply astounding, appalling. Companies and individuals supposed to be possessed of very great wealth, but in fact not possessed of it, are to-day prostrate, and their paper, lodged in the banks of the great Central West, is to a large extent worthless. At a time like this and under these circumstances, when the developments of the present are exactly what on this floor I said they would be and, as the Record will show, I predicted not once but scores of times, if we can aid agriculture or stock breeding and stock raising by liberal appropriations it is our duty to do it. Let there be no cheeseparing on this bill and no sneers about paternalism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The Assistant Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at page 24, line 5.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 24, at the end of line 10, to strike out "\$20,000" and to insert "\$25,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For the investigation, improvement, encouragement, and determination of the adaptability to different soils and climatic conditions of pecans, almonds, Persian walnuts, black walnuts, hickory nuts, butternuts, chestnuts, filberts, and other nuts, and for methods of growing, harvesting, packing, shipping, storing, and utilizing the same, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent to return to page 19. My reason for making the request at this time is the fact that I shall not be able to be in the Chamber—

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator please withhold his request until the Bureau of Plant Industry items have been concluded? There are only one or two more amendments under this heading.

Mr. WILLIS. Very well.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 13, after the word "fruits," to insert "and vegetables," and at the end of line 15 to strike out "\$114,200" and to insert "\$121,700," so as to make the paragraph read:

For the investigation and improvement of fruits, and the methods of fruit growing, harvesting, handling, and studies of the physiological and related changes of fruits and vegetables during the processes of marketing and while in commercial storage, \$121,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 7, to strike out:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For purchase, propagation, testing, and congressional distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; all necessary office fixtures and supplies, fuel, transportation, paper, twine, gum, postal cards, gas, electric current, rent outside of the District of Columbia, official traveling expenses, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same; for repairs and the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$360,000. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated; and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes and the packing, assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States. An equal proportion of five-sixths of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall, upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the department upon the receipt of their addressed franks, in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General may jointly determine: *Provided, however*, That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each Member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery not later than the 10th day of January: *Provided also*, That any portion of the allotments to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress remaining uncalled for on the 1st day of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the department: *And provided also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, mulberry and other rare and valuable trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. I understand this is a proposition to strike out the appropriation for the distribution of free seeds?

Mr. McNARY. It is. It proposes to strike out the appropriation of \$360,000 for the distribution of seeds.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have no desire to take the time of the Senate further so late in the day. The Senate seems to be generally in accord with this amendment, but I think it is a mistake to strike out the item.

I simply want to say what I have said before on the floor of the Senate, that there is no way by which the wealth of the

country can better be increased than by the dissemination of good seeds throughout the country. It has become one of the fads to talk about the seeds being sent out by Congressmen for political purposes. We can start almost anything of that kind and carry it on for two or three years and it will become popular on the floor of the Senate.

But, Mr. President, I assume, to begin with, that the Department of Agriculture buys these seeds for what they are worth in the market, and that they buy them with prudence and that they are selected wisely. Now, what becomes of them? They are sent out almost exclusively into the farming communities, into the small villages, and they are nearly always distributed to people who want to plant them. It costs but a trifle, if there is an improved variety of vegetable, to scatter the seed in that way instead of scattering it through some seed house. When the cultivation of it once begins in a community it spreads. If Mrs. Smith finds that Mrs. Jones has a better variety of tomatoes in her garden than she has, she gets some of that seed the next year, and so the benefits grow. It has been one of the means of distributing a better variety of seeds over the United States.

Now, who is opposed to it? I unhesitatingly say that the propaganda against it begins with the big seed houses, who do not want the Government in competition with them, and who will put about six peas in a little envelope, with a beautiful picture on the outside, and charge 25 cents per package, and who want to continue that particular kind of despoliation and petty larceny.

I have heard the question debated, and I have not seen anyone rise on the floor yet and show that there has not been a good result from the distribution of these seeds, and no one will ever be able to do it. You may say this is a question that is not susceptible of demonstration.

This is susceptible of demonstration. We have in all the gardens of the United States a very much finer class of vegetables than we had a few years back. Some of the seeds may be distributed through the seed houses, but, assuming that the Agricultural Department is using common sense and reasonable care in the selection of seeds and that Members of Congress are using a little sense in distributing them, then the benefits coming from the distribution in this country of the high-class seeds thus selected bring back a full reward and a complete return to the people at large.

Let us see now whether the seeds are properly distributed. I do not claim that some of them may not get into the hands of people who do not use them, but what reason is there for a Congressman to send seed to somebody who does not want to plant them? He makes himself ridiculous when he does it. So the seeds are sent out to people who do want them. If it is desired that the distribution of seed shall not be made through Members of Congress, I shall not object. If it is thought that there is some better method of distribution than through Members of the two Houses of Congress, I shall not object to that method being adopted. However, to cut out the appropriation for this purpose is to cut out the means of the distribution of improved varieties of seeds in the United States, and to do it for the benefit of some thieving, robbing seed houses. That is a pretty harsh expression, but if Senators do not think they are thieving and robbing let them undertake to plant a garden and go down and buy their seeds from a seed dealer. They are the people back of this fight; nobody else is back of it except some individual who has been misled.

I protest against eliminating the item. If the committee thinks that the seed could be better distributed through the Agricultural Department, well and good. That department now has a large organization. I do not myself want to distribute these seeds. It is a burden and it is no political benefit to any man to have them to distribute, for there are always ten people who want them where one person can be supplied; but it is a piece of stupidity to stop this custom which has so long existed and which must inevitably bring great benefit.

Who starts the proposition to discontinue the distribution of seed? It is always some one who wants to establish a reputation as an economist. That is his motive. But back of the agitation is the seed house.

I hope this amendment will be defeated. If it is desired to have a vote on it, I am going to call for a quorum. If it is not desired to have a vote on it—

Mr. McNARY. May I suggest to the Senator from Missouri that we might pass over this item until to-morrow?

Mr. REED. I am quite willing to do that, but I do not want it to come up in my absence. I hope the Senator will notify me if I am not here, though I shall try to be here all day to-morrow.

Mr. McNARY. I will suggest to the Senator from Missouri that at the proper time I intend to ask that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment was agreed to will be considered as reconsidered and the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. WILLIS. I ask unanimous consent to return to page 19 of the bill and to offer an amendment, which I ask the Secretary to state.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent to return to page 19 of the bill, in order that he may offer an amendment to the text of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. I should like to have the Secretary state the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of course, the amendment can not be offered now except by unanimous consent.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to the Senator's request, as I understand he desires to leave the city.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In the first paragraph, on page 19, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "\$87,935," and in lieu thereof to insert "\$92,935," so as to make the paragraph read:

For the investigation of diseases of orchard and other fruits, including the diseases of the pecan, \$92,935.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, if the matter which I am about to bring to the notice of the Senate had been brought to my attention soon enough, I think without doubt the item in the bill would already be as I am proposing that it shall be if the amendment which I offer is adopted. It was not, however, brought to my attention until after the estimates were submitted, and therefore it was too late to incorporate the proper provision in the bill.

It developed upon careful inquiry, as I shall show in a moment by a letter from the Department of Agriculture, that the industry of growing black raspberries in northeastern Ohio and a number of other States, particularly in New York and Michigan, has been practically destroyed by the effects of the peculiar disease which is known as "blue stem."

The Department of Agriculture has been doing some very satisfactory work to eradicate that disease within the past year, and, as the Secretary of Agriculture states in a letter from which I shall read, will be very glad to continue that work. I shall read merely one paragraph from the letter, which was sent not to me but to Representative BURTON, who was formerly a most distinguished Member of this body. In that letter the Secretary of Agriculture states:

This question is of such importance to the future of the black raspberry industry of the Lake region, which is now greatly reduced in acreage and production by these diseases, that it is a matter of importance that this phase of the work be thoroughly tested as promptly and effectively as possible. The department will consider making provision for it in connection with the estimates for the fiscal year 1924, but unfortunately this would not permit the undertaking of active work in the fields until another year has elapsed, which the raspberry growers of your region strongly desire to be undertaken at once, and which would be highly desirable to undertake if our funds permitted.

The situation, Mr. President, is simply this: Because of the effects of this disease not only is the price of this fruit going clear out of sight, making it practically impossible for the ordinary householder to buy it in that section, but I learn from reports which were made to the canners' association that in that whole section of the country there are only two firms who are canning black raspberries. I believe the subject is of sufficient importance to warrant the continuation of the work. The Government has had a man in that field, and it is believed that with another year's work the situation will be pretty well in hand. I hope, therefore, the amendment may be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIS. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter to Representative BURTON in explanation of the amendment.

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

The letter referred to is as follows:

FEBRUARY 25, 1922.

HON. THEODORE E. BURTON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BURTON: I have your letter of this date in which you refer to the damage that is being done to raspberry plantations in your district and the efforts made to ascertain the cause of the diseases and to develop practical methods for controlling them.

In reply I would say that destructive diseases of the raspberry have in recent years caused very serious reduction of the acreage devoted to this fruit in such States as New York, Ohio, and Michigan. While

the exact cause of certain of the most destructive of these diseases has not yet been determined, investigations that have been prosecuted in the Bureau of Plant Industry during the past two years afford strong reason for hope that the blue stem, the most destructive of these diseases in the Great Lakes region, may be brought under control. While the work has not yet been under way long enough to permit an unqualified statement that effective and practicable methods for controlling the disease are in sight, the experiments in northern Ohio are very promising and the results of the work done by our specialists there are the basis for this expectation. The work thus far conducted is, however, on much too small a scale and during too short a time for a prompt determination of the practicability of controlling the diseases under ordinary field conditions.

Our specialists who are making this investigation are strongly of the opinion that the most important step necessary in retarding the spread of the disease and rendering possible the resumption of profitable black-raspberry growing where the disease is troublesome will be accomplished through the prompt and thorough eradication of all diseased plants from the fields and areas where the young plants for new acreage are grown. Unlike most fruit trees and vines, these young plants are not grown in nurseries but are obtained in the form of rooted tips from the fields planted for fruit production. What appears to be necessary at this stage to promptly determine the practicability of this method is to thoroughly eradicate the disease from one or two typical raspberry-growing localities comprising areas of a few square miles each in order to provide a sufficient supply of disease-free plants to permit the development of new plantations with disease-free stock. Such work will, of course, need to be very carefully and thoroughly supervised by a specialist familiar with the obscure early symptoms of the disease, under whose direction the fruit growers can themselves eradicate the diseased plants.

This question is of such importance to the future of the black-raspberry industry of the Lake region, which is now greatly reduced in acreage and production by these diseases, that it is a matter of importance that this phase of the work be thoroughly tested as promptly and effectively as possible. The department will consider making provision for it in connection with the estimates for the fiscal year 1924, but, unfortunately, this would not permit the undertaking of active work in the fields until another year has elapsed, which the raspberry growers of your region strongly desire to be undertaken at once, and which would be highly desirable to undertake if our funds permitted.

The appropriation of \$5,000 for this purpose, which you suggest, would be sufficient for the effective handling of this work under the authority in the appropriation for fruit investigations under general expenses in the Bureau of Plant Industry.

Very truly yours,

HENRY C. WALLACE, Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest that the total on page 29 of the bill be passed over, because the amount will depend upon the amendment which has already been passed over.

Mr. McNARY. I think that by unanimous consent the Secretary has already been authorized to correct totals to correspond with amendments which may be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest that the total be passed over until the Senate acts upon the amendment which has been passed over and the amount shall have been determined.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. With permission of the Senator in charge of the bill, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

PUBLICATION OF ESTIMATES OF UNGINNED COTTON.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 2579, to provide for the publication of estimates of unginced cotton.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Agriculture to collect and publish, in the same manner, for the same period, and upon the same dates as the Director of the Census publishes statistics concerning the amount of cotton ginned, an estimate of the cotton remaining unginced.

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

ADDITIONAL COTTON STATISTICS.

Mr. HARRIS. I also ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 187, authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish additional cotton statistics.

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

Resolved, etc., That the Director of the Census be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to collect in connection with the reports of cotton ginned to November 1, November 14, December 1, December 13, January 1, January 16, and March 1, provided for in the act of Congress, approved July 22, 1912, an estimate of the number of bales of cotton that will be ginned at each establishment from the current crop after the date to which the respective reports relate; that it shall be the duty of every owner, president, treasurer, secretary, director,

or other officer or agent of every cotton ginnery to furnish an estimate of the quantity of cotton remaining to be ginned when requested by the Director of the Census; that the provisions of the act approved July 22, 1912, in regard to furnishing information concerning the quantity of cotton ginned and the confidential character of the information thus furnished shall apply equally to the statistics concerning the estimate of the quantity of cotton remaining to be ginned required by this resolution. Statistics of the total quantity of cotton remaining to be ginned in each State, as estimated by the ginner, shall be published by the Director of the Census in connection with each of the seven ginning reports specified above.

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

RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, April 13, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 12 (legislative day of April 10), 1922.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

D. Arthur Lines, of New Orleans, La., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana, to fill an existing vacancy.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICERS.

Col. William Henry Hay, Cavalry, to be brigadier general from April 11, 1922, vice Brig. Gen. Henry Jervey, retired from active service April 10, 1922.

Col. Edmund Wittenmyer, Infantry, to be brigadier general, vice Brig. Gen. Edward Fenton McGlachlin, jr., to be appointed major general.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Capt. Ira Adam Crump, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from December 29, 1919.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

James D. Segars to be postmaster at Carbon Hill, Ala., in place of L. C. Kelley, deceased.

ALASKA.

Theodore Diederick to be postmaster at Tanana, Alaska. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

COLORADO.

Roy H. Horner to be postmaster at Wiley, Colo., in place of M. M. Minehouse. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

CONNECTICUT.

Edwin H. Powell to be postmaster at Burnside, Conn., in place of P. C. Cavanaugh. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

FLORIDA.

Mary C. Thornton to be postmaster at Ormond Beach, Fla., in place of Macon Thornton, resigned.

GEORGIA.

Jacob S. Eberhardt to be postmaster at Carlton, Ga. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Robert T. Broome to be postmaster at Danielsville, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

Marcus G. Keown to be postmaster at Mount Berry, Ga. Office became presidential October 1, 1920.

Mattie M. Pope to be postmaster at Omaha, Ga. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

William V. Cobb to be postmaster at Smyrna, Ga. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Annie P. Harper to be postmaster at Stillmore, Ga., in place of A. P. Harper. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1922.

ILLINOIS.

Clara A. Hollow to be postmaster at Trenton, Ill., in place of Daniel DuRussell. Incumbent's commission expired August 17, 1921.

James E. Jontry to be postmaster at Chenoa, Ill., in place of J. E. Jontry. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

Frances Baker to be postmaster at Golconda, Ill., in place of J. M. Rumsey. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

Arthur L. Patterson to be postmaster at Grayville, Ill., in place of C. L. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

Rola Eubanks to be postmaster at Omaha, Ill., in place of Omaha Coulter, resigned.

Russell P. Garrison to be postmaster at Wayne City, Ill., in place of G. H. Sherman. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1921.

KANSAS.

Charles Friskel to be postmaster at Frontenac, Kans., in place of Hugh O'Hara. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

KENTUCKY.

Robert R. Burnam, jr., to be postmaster at Richmond, Ky., in place of R. C. Stockton. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

Joseph H. Fortney to be postmaster at East Bernstadt, Ky. Office became presidential October 1, 1920.

MAINE.

George H. Rounds to be postmaster at Naples, Me. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Ralph R. Mathews to be postmaster at Berwick, Me., in place of C. M. Guptill. Incumbent's commission expired July 10, 1920.

Everard J. Gove to be postmaster at Biddeford, Me., in place of E. J. Cove, to correct name.

Will C. Heldreth to be postmaster at York Beach, Me., in place of W. N. Gough. Incumbent's commission expired July 23, 1921.

MARYLAND.

Robert H. Lancaster to be postmaster at Frostburg, Md., in place of P. T. McGann, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS.

James R. Tetler to be postmaster at Lawrence, Mass., in place of M. F. Cronin. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

MICHIGAN.

Henry M. Cosier to be postmaster at Bear Lake, Mich., in place of O. K. Ray Maker. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Benjamin F. Scamehorn to be postmaster at Bloomingdale, Mich., in place of Paul Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Jesse M. Green to be postmaster at Roscommon, Mich., in place of M. W. Gibbons. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

John M. Klipp to be postmaster at Watervliet, Mich., in place of A. A. Howard, resigned.

MINNESOTA.

John L. Beck to be postmaster at Mountain Iron, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

E. Jay Merry to be postmaster at Fairmont, Minn., in place of F. W. Betz. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1921.

Anton E. Rishof to be postmaster at Gary, Minn., in place of Halvor Lee. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1921.

MISSISSIPPI.

John W. Crane to be postmaster at Blue Springs, Miss. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

MISSOURI.

Florence Gilkeson to be postmaster at Garden City, Mo., in place of G. B. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1920.

C. P. Dorsey to be postmaster at Cameron, Mo., in place of J. C. Downing. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

NEBRASKA.

John T. Bierbower to be postmaster at Giltner, Nebr., in place of Edwin Cutts. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

Allen A. Strong to be postmaster at Gordon, Nebr., in place of C. M. Rebbeck, resigned.

Harold Hjelmfelt to be postmaster at Holdrege, Nebr., in place of Harold Hjelmfelt. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1922.

NEW MEXICO.

Roy H. Smith to be postmaster at Tucumcari, N. Mex., in place of R. A. Dodson, removed.

NEW YORK.

John W. Bow to be postmaster at Romulus, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Warren G. Hasbrouck to be postmaster at Highland, N. Y., in place of G. S. La Moree. Incumbent's commission expired July 3, 1920.

James McLusky to be postmaster at Syracuse, N. Y., in place of J. J. Kesel. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Hobart R. James to be postmaster at Cherry Creek, N. Y., in place of H. E. Safford. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Gabriel A. Connor to be postmaster at Bellhaven, N. C., in place of D. L. Windley. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

James L. Sheek to be postmaster at Mocksville, N. C., in place of E. E. Hunt, sr. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

OHIO.

John H. Siegle to be postmaster at Urbana, Ohio, in place of W. A. Lowry. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1922.

William F. Hains to be postmaster at Wilmington, Ohio, in place of K. B. Hummel. Incumbent's commission expired July 10, 1920.

OKLAHOMA.

Robert C. Mayfield to be postmaster at Glencoe, Okla., in place of W. T. Kniseley, removed.

James S. Biggs to be postmaster at Stuart, Okla., in place of J. B. Boyett. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

OREGON.

Benjamin F. Turner to be postmaster at Maupin, Oreg. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Ed D. House to be postmaster at Pleasantville, Pa., in place of Thomas McGuire. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

Robert S. Bowman to be postmaster at Berwick, Pa., in place of O. E. Letteer, resigned.

Ralph W. Marshall to be postmaster at Polk, Pa., in place of E. J. Hutchinson. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

Herman Raithel to be postmaster at Smithton, Pa., in place of S. H. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

James A. Stickel to be postmaster at Vandergrift, Pa., in place of John Adams, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Peter J. Kleinjan to be postmaster at Gregory, S. Dak., in place of E. K. Biehn, deceased.

Benjamin W. Ryan to be postmaster at Kimball, S. Dak., in place of W. J. Quirk. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1922.

TENNESSEE.

Florence R. Ballard to be postmaster at Bemis, Tenn. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

Columbus L. Parrish to be postmaster at Henderson, Tenn., in place of O. L. McCallum. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1922.

TEXAS.

James D. Heaton to be postmaster at Barry, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Maude P. Williams to be postmaster at Brookeland, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Raymond C. Ditmore to be postmaster at Waskom, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Scott F. Benson to be postmaster at Alvin, Tex., in place of R. H. King. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

Maye B. Fitzgerald to be postmaster at Marfa, Tex., in place of Robert Greenwood. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Benjamin F. Huntsman to be postmaster at Winters, Tex., in place of W. F. Flynt. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Mamie Milam to be postmaster at Prairie View, Tex., in place of Mamie Milam. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Thomas F. Lindley to be postmaster at Seminole, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

UTAH.

John A. Israelsen to be postmaster at Hyrum, Utah, in place of A. A. Savage. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

VIRGINIA.

William C. Crews to be postmaster at Madison Heights, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

Paul E. Haden to be postmaster at Palmyra, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

WASHINGTON.

John L. Harris to be postmaster at Kelso, Wash., in place of J. P. Buford. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

William R. Wells to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Wash., in place of J. G. Boughter, removed.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Wendell Evans to be postmaster at Winona, W. Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Sewell J. Champe to be postmaster at Montgomery, W. Va., in place of C. T. Dyer, resigned.

Justus E. McCaskey to be postmaster at Paden City, W. Va., in place of G. B. Henthorn. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

WISCONSIN.

Frank E. Shults to be postmaster at Baraboo, Wis., in place of A. C. Pearson, deceased.

John E. Wehrman to be postmaster at Prescott, Wis., in place of T. J. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Wilbur S. Wurm to be postmaster at Shullsburg, Wis., in place of George Paquette. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

William R. Homermiller to be postmaster at Tomah, Wis., in place of M. T. Syverson, removed.

WYOMING.

Charles A. Ackenhausen to be postmaster at Worland, Wyo., in place of J. T. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 12 (legislative day of April 10), 1922.

POSTMASTERS.

OKLAHOMA.

Gavin D. Duncan, Boswell.
Albert E. Hawkins, Canute.
Orlo H. Wills, Delaware.
Ida White, Konawa.
Grace M. Johnson, Mulhall.
Ethel Senft, Quay.
Merrill M. Barbee, Spiro.
Eve A. Loyd, Stigler.
Albert Ross, Thomas.
Harvey G. Brandenburg, Yale.

OREGON.

William S. Bowers, Baker.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Otto W. Muchow, Hartford.
Gertrude Snell, Tulare.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate April 12 (legislative day of April 10), 1922.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICER.

Col. William Henry Hay, Cavalry, to be brigadier general, vice Brig. Gen. Edward Fenton McGlachlin, jr., to be appointed major general.

POSTMASTER.

Anna L. Kettleson to be postmaster at Zimmerman, in the State of Minnesota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, April 12, 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:

Eternal Spirit, the blessings of the daydawn and of the nightfall never fail us. We are grateful for this divinely ordered progress of the world and may our vision of it never be clouded. Always may we feel the stress of effort in the exercise of our sacred trusts. When it is difficult to do right and easy to do wrong, do Thou be with us. Enable us to be magnanimous, generous, and just toward friend and foe. Give encouragement to the cultivation of those finer emotions that make for the joys and the comforts of life. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

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

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of further considering the bill H. R. 11228, the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York suggests that there is no quorum present.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, has the Chair declared no quorum?

The SPEAKER. Not yet. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11228, the naval appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 96, noes 7.

Mr. COCKRAN. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. As many as favor the motion of the gentleman from Michigan will answer "yea" when their names are called; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 299, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 130, as follows:

YEAS—299.

Ackerman	Cannon	Fenn	Jeffers, Ala.
Almon	Carew	Fess	Johnson, Ky.
Anderson	Chalmers	Fisher	Johnson, S. Dak.
Andrew, Mass.	Chandler, N. Y.	Fitzgerald	Jones, Pa.
Andrews, Nebr.	Christopherson	Fordney	Jones, Tex.
Appleby	Clague	Poster	Kearns
Arentz	Clarke, N. Y.	Free	Keller
Aswell	Classon	Freeman	Kelley, Mich.
Atkeson	Clouse	French	Kendall
Bankhead	Cockran	Frithingham	Ketcham
Barbour	Codd	Fulmer	Kiess
Beedy	Cole, Iowa	Gallivan	King
Begg	Collier	Garner	Kinkaid
Bell	Collins	Garrett, Tenn.	Kissel
Benham	Colton	Garrett, Tex.	Kline, N. Y.
Bixler	Connally, Tex.	Gensman	Kline, Pa.
Black	Connell	Gerner	Knutson
Blakeney	Connolly, Pa.	Glynn	Kopp
Bland, Ind.	Cooper, Ohio	Goodykoontz	Kraus
Bland, Va.	Cooper, Wis.	Graham, Ill.	Lanham
Blanton	Coughlin	Greene, Vt.	Lankford
Boies	Crago	Griest	Larsen, Ga.
Bowers	Cramton	Hadley	Larson, Minn.
Bowling	Crisp	Hammer	Lawrence
Box	Cullen	Hardy, Colo.	Layton
Brand	Dallinger	Harrison	Lazaro
Brennan	Deal	Haugen	Lea, Calif.
Briggs	Denison	Hawley	Leatherwood
Britten	Dickinson	Hayden	Lee, Ga.
Brooks, Ill.	Dominick	Herrick	Lee, N. Y.
Brown, Tenn.	Doughton	Hickey	Lehlbach
Bulwinkle	Dowell	Hill	Lineberger
Burdick	Driver	Himes	Linthicum
Burke	Dunbar	Hoch	Little
Burroughs	Dunn	Hogan	Logan
Burton	Dyer	Huddleston	London
Butler	Echols	Hudspeth	Longworth
Byrnes, S. C.	Elliott	Hukriede	Lowrey
Byrns, Tenn.	Ellis	Hull	Luce
Cable	Fairfield	Humphreys	Luhning
Campbell, Kans.	Faust	Hutchinson	Lyon
Campbell, Pa.	Favrot	Jacoway	McArthur

McClintic	Norton	Robison	Thomas
McCormick	Ogden	Rogers	Thompson
McDuffie	Oldfield	Rosenbloom	Tillman
McKenzie	Oliver	Rucker	Tilson
McLaughlin, Mich.	Olpp	Sanders, N. Y.	Timberlake
McPherson	Osborne	Sanders, Tex.	Tincher
McSwain	Overstreet	Sandlin	Tinkham
MacGregor	Paige	Scott, Mich.	Towner
Madden	Park, Ga.	Scott, Tenn.	Treadway
Magee	Parker, N. J.	Sears	Tucker
Maloney	Parks, Ark.	Shreve	Tyson
Mann	Patterson, Mo.	Sinclair	Underhill
Mapes	Perkins	Sisson	Upshaw
Mead	Petersen	Slemp	Valle
Merritt	Porter	Smith, Idaho	Vinson
Michener	Pou	Smith, Mich.	Voigt
Miller	Pringley	Smithwick	Volstead
Mills	Purnell	Snell	Walters
Millsbaugh	Quin	Stafford	Ward, N. C.
Mondell	Radcliffe	Steagall	Wason
Montague	Raker	Stedman	Weaver
Montoya	Ramseyer	Steenerson	Wheeler
Moore, Ohio	Rankin	Stephens	White, Kans.
Moore, Va.	Ransley	Stoll	Williamson
Moore, Ind.	Reece	Strong, Kans.	Wingo
Morgan	Reed, N. Y.	Strong, Pa.	Wise
Mudd	Reed, W. Va.	Summers, Wash.	Woodruff
Murphy	Rhodes	Swank	Woodyard
Nelson, A. P.	Ricketts	Sweet	Wright
Nelson, J. M.	Riddick	Swing	Wurzbach
Newton, Minn.	Riordan	Tague	Yates
Newton, Mo.	Roach	Taylor, N. J.	Young
Nolan	Robertson	Temple	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Rodenberg

NOT VOTING—130.

Ansorge	Fish	Klecza	Schall
Anthony	Focht	Knight	Shaw
Bacharach	Frear	Kreider	Shelton
Barkley	Fuller	Kunz	Siegel
Beck	Funk	Lampert	Sinnott
Bird	Gahn	Langley	Snyder
Bond	Gilbert	McFadden	Speaks
Brinson	Goldsborough	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sproul
Brooks, Pa.	Gorman	McLaughlin, Pa.	Stevenson
Browne, Wis.	Gould	Mansfield	Stiness
Buchanan	Graham, Pa.	Martin	Sullivan
Burtness	Green, Iowa	Michaelson	Summers, Tex.
Cantrill	Greene, Mass.	Moore, Ill.	Taylor, Ark.
Carter	Griffin	Morin	Taylor, Colo.
Chandler, Okla.	Hardy, Tex.	Mott	Taylor, Tenn.
Chindblom	Hawes	Nelson, Me.	Ten Eyck
Clark, Fla.	Hays	O'Brien	Vare
Cole, Ohio	Hersey	O'Connor	Vestal
Copley	Hicks	Padgett	Volk
Crowther	Hooker	Parker, N. Y.	Walsh
Curry	Husted	Patterson, N. J.	Ward, N. Y.
Dale	Ireland	Periman	Watson
Darrow	James	Rainey, Ala.	Webster
Davis, Minn.	Jefferis, Nebr.	Rainey, Ill.	White, Me.
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Miss.	Rayburn	Williams
Dempsey	Johnson, Wash.	Reavis	Wilson
Drane	Kahn	Reber	Winslow
Drewry	Kelly, Pa.	Rose	Wood, Ind.
Dupré	Kennedy	Rossdale	Woods, Va.
Edmonds	Kincheloe	Rouse	Wyant
Evans	Kindred	Ryan	Zihlman
Fairchild	Kirkpatrick	Sabath	
Fields	Kitchin	Sanders, Ind.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.

Mr. Frear with Mr. Padgett.

Mr. Snyder with Mr. Barkley.

Mr. Kahn with Mr. Dupré.

Mr. Ireland with Mr. Ten Eyck.

Mr. Patterson of New Jersey with Mr. Johnson of Mississippi.

Mr. Walsh with Mr. Kitchin.

Mr. Sanders of Indiana with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Gorman with Mr. Summers of Texas.

Mr. Winslow with Mr. Drane.

Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Wood of Indiana with Mr. Drewry.

Mr. Chandler of Oklahoma with Mr. Hawes.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Kindred.

Mr. Speaks with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Williams with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Woods of Virginia.

Mr. Greene of Massachusetts with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.

Mr. Chindblom with Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Lampert with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Funk with Mr. Cantrill.

Mr. Shaw with Mr. Hardy of Texas.

Mr. Vare with Mr. Mansfield.

Mr. Hicks with Mr. Hooker.

Mr. Knight with Mr. Kunz.

Mr. Kirkpatrick with Mr. O'Connor.

Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Rainey of Illinois.

Mr. Kreider with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Rayburn.
 Mr. Reber with Mr. Goldsborough.
 Mr. Perlman with Mr. Kincheloe.
 Mr. Hersey with Mr. Fields.
 Mr. Gahn with Mr. Gilbert.
 Mr. Ansorge with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Brinson.
 Mr. Siegel with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.
 Mr. Volk with Mr. Sabath.
 Mr. Morin with Mr. Rainey of Alabama.
 Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Griffin.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11228) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS].

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly manifest to every Member who has heard or read the remarks of the Resident Commissioner of Porto Rico, Judge DAVILA, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. STRONG] that a very unhappy situation exists to-day in Porto Rico.

This I know is a matter of regret to all of us, because I am quite sure that every official here from the President down, charged in any way with responsibility for the good government of Porto Rico, is most anxious to do that and that only which will bring happiness and prosperity to the people of that island.

If mistakes have been made anywhere along the line, the facts should be known so that those mistakes can be expeditiously and, if possible, permanently corrected.

The people of Porto Rico came to us not of their own accord, not upon their initiative; they came as part of the spoils of war, without in any way being consulted about the matter and without their consent asked.

That they came willingly, as they did; that they welcomed our invading army joyously, as they did, only shows the unhappy situation in which they had lived and walked and had their daily being as a part of the Empire of Spain.

When they welcomed our soldiers they did so because they had always looked to this good country as the champion of liberty in the world, and they rejoiced at the prospect of coming under that flag which they confidently believed was the harbinger and guarantor of "government of the people, for the people, and by the people."

The task of governing overseas dependencies is one of the most difficult that statesmen anywhere have ever been confronted with. Froude, the English historian, says that all history has demonstrated that self-governing democracies are incapable of properly administering the government of colonial possessions. Whether this be true or not I am not well enough informed to affirm or deny, but I believe that I can truthfully say that no statesmen charged with this high responsibility in all the history of the world were ever more sincerely and earnestly desirous of providing the best possible government for its dependencies than have been the statesmen of the United States since we embarked upon our colonial policy in 1898.

The people of Porto Rico have only such government and such rights under their government as Congress, under the Constitution, has seen fit to grant them. They exercise that measure of self-government which we have by congressional action delegated to them, and if there is an unhappy situation in the island to-day, and certainly there must be, we can not escape responsibility for it, and we will not have discharged our full duty unless we make most diligent effort to ascertain the cause or causes for this condition, and then with the facts before us set ourselves most diligently to the task of correcting whatever can be corrected by Congress. [Applause.]

Under the Jones Act, passed a few years ago, we very greatly enlarged their measure of self-government. We gave them a bill of rights, which followed closely those guaranties of liberty which are contained in our own Constitution.

We gave them the right to elect the members of their legislature and senate, and while we still retain in the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the United States Senate, the power to appoint the Governor of Porto Rico and two of his cabinet ministers, we gave to the Senate of Porto

Rico the right to participate with the governor in the selection of four members of his cabinet, who were to be the heads of the other executive departments.

In addition to this we gave them citizenship, thus guaranteeing to them those rights which our fathers held to be necessary for the happiness of any governed people.

For several years after this act everything ran smoothly there and we had every assurance that the people were happy and contented, but something has occurred to mar this situation, and, charged as we are with so much responsibility in the matter, we ought to know, if the facts be ascertainable, what the causes of this present state of unrest and dissatisfaction are.

The Senate of Porto Rico in the most formal way possible has, by a resolution adopted by an overwhelming majority of its members, presented most grievous charges of misbehavior against the Governor of Porto Rico. They charge that "he lacks the most elementary qualifications of integrity, tact, impartiality, and mental training required by the office he holds"; that "he has violated the organic act" which is his charter of rights; that "he has appointed incompetent persons to public office"; that "he has attempted to corrupt the judiciary, removing judges and threatening to remove others without cause, and attempting to coerce the members of the courts of justice."

These same charges have been made upon the floor of this House, but in greater detail and more illuminating circumstance, by the Resident Commissioner, Judge DAVILA, upon his responsibility as their Representative here, and they have asked that these charges be investigated by Congress, to the end that they may have thus an opportunity to establish the truthfulness of their allegations most solemnly and formally made.

If what they say is true, and the Porto Rican Legislature had the power which is lodged in the legislature of every State of the Union, unquestionably the governor would be brought to the bar of the Senate to answer articles of impeachment; but they have no such power. Congress has not thought it wise to delegate this power to the Legislature of Porto Rico. We have never delegated it to any territorial legislature.

When the charges are made, however, in the form in which they have been presented to us, it becomes our duty to give them most serious and thoughtful consideration, and I do not believe we can justify ourselves if we fail to take cognizance of them.

What the procedure should be, of course, is for the House to determine, but certainly these charges should be given earnest consideration.

Our own experience has taught us on numerous occasions—and no one can speak on this subject more feelingly than I can—that governors here in the States have sometimes misbehaved themselves in such a manner as to warrant their removal from office, and we can not assume that the President can not make the same mistake which the people themselves sometimes make in selecting their own governors.

Nobody doubts that President Harding more than any other man in the United States would regret such an error; nobody doubts that he has the very best interests of Porto Rico at heart; nobody, no matter how bitter a partisan he may be, will believe that the President lacks in any degree that wholehearted, sympathetic solicitude for the happiness and prosperity of these dependent people which they have a right to expect. But even so, nobody, not even the President himself, thinks that he is infallible in such matters. No other President from Washington down has been able to fill the multitude of important offices under him without occasionally selecting a man who for one reason or another was not suited for the position to which he was assigned.

The friends of Governor Reily, both in Porto Rico and in the States, have bitterly denied the charges of misbehavior which have been brought against him.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota. Mr. KNUTSON. How does the action of the Governor of Porto Rico compare with the action of Mr. Sullivan, who was sent down to Santo Domingo by the former administration?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Sullivan was recalled, and I would like to see that same parallel followed, if there be a parallel between the two. [Applause.] Let me repeat: The friends of Governor Reily, both in Porto Rico and in the States, have bitterly denied the charges of misbehavior which have been brought against him; but the very meaningful fact remains that the charges have been officially preferred and that those who have preferred them, and they only, have asked that some tribunal or committee be set up before which they could submit the facts. If the governor is not guilty, surely there is no reason to suspect that such an investigation could be to his preju-

dice. If he is guilty, this House and the country ought to know it.

Governor Reilly is a Republican; he was appointed by a Republican President, and the Senate of Porto Rico and the Representative from Porto Rico have asked that a Republican House of Representatives investigate their charges and give them an opportunity to establish them by proof.

Can the governor, or his friends, or his party associates here afford to refuse this opportunity?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am in very hearty sympathy with the statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi with reference to the predicament into which matters have fallen in the island of Porto Rico; but I want to ask the gentleman, if an investigation were ordered by the House of Representatives and it were found that all the charges made in the Senate of Porto Rico against the governor were true, then where would we be? Just where we are now, would we not?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I think not.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Are we not dealing with a matter that belongs wholly to the Executive?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I think not.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I would be glad to hear from the gentleman what remedy he would suggest in the premises that should follow in case it should be found that the charges were true?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. One of two results might follow unquestionably if the governor was shown to be guilty of the charges which have been most formally presented against him by the Porto Ricans. Either the President would recall him or this House should impeach him. That is my opinion. We have investigated public officials in times gone by, however, where Congress had no power to impeach. I believe that few men ever appointed to office or who have held office in this country have heretofore sat silently by when charges of so serious a nature were preferred against them on this floor without requesting an investigation.

If charges of a serious nature were brought in this House against the gentleman from Kansas, I know that he would immediately demand an investigation to the end that the facts might be known. The House of Representatives has gone very far in the exercise of its power of investigation, has investigated the question as to whether or not the Senate of the United States was corruptly influenced in a vote that it cast, has investigated Cabinet officers, has investigated the Vice President of the United States, upon their request.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; upon their request. If the Governor of Porto Rico should request an investigation of charges made against him on the floor of this House by the Resident Commissioner he would be entirely within his rights, and would be asking the House of Representatives to investigate a matter over which they had jurisdiction.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The gentleman from Kansas proceeds on the theory that the power of the House to proceed in this matter depends on the Governor of Porto Rico; that if he makes a request it gives us the power to investigate; but if he is charged and sits silently by without making a request Congress can do nothing. I do not agree to that.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the difference is this: We would have recourse to a remedy if the charges were wrongfully made against the governor by the commissioner, but the House, on the other hand, if a committee should find and Congress should adopt the report of the committee that the governor was guilty of everything charged by the Senate of Porto Rico, we would be just where we were when we began.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It is unthinkable, Mr. Chairman, that the President could appoint a Governor of Porto Rico who could go down there and run amuck, disregarding and setting at naught the act of Congress which is their charter of rights, defy the law and all decency, and still Congress be powerless to impeach him. I do not subscribe to any such monstrous doctrine. I do not know whether the charges are true or not.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I did not say that Congress was powerless to impeach him; I say it would be wholly impracticable to do so. It would take too long.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Impracticable from what standpoint? Here are these helpless people, with no rights except what we give them. They have no vote, they can not elect anybody to this Congress. In the exercise of the powers we have given them they have chosen a senate, they have elected a Representative on this floor, and that Representative and that senate in a formal way charged that the governor has attempted to debauch the judiciary of that island; that he has attempted

and has executed his threat to discharge judges without authority of law, in one instance because the judge refused to give him the reasons upon which he predicated a decision. They have made a number of most serious, damning charges against the governor, and because the governor does not request that a committee be appointed to investigate those charges we are to sit idly by and fail utterly in our duty to these helpless people. I do not believe that represents the sentiment of the people of this country. [Applause.]

One of the charges against the governor is that he attempted to intimidate senators of Porto Rico and force them to confirm his nominations, and declared that he would have the Government at Washington annul the organic act, which provides that judges shall be appointed with the advice and consent of the senate, unless his nominations were confirmed, and now we are advised that when the senate refused to confirm his nominations and adjourned that he himself, without waiting to have the Government at Washington annul the organic act, has done that very thing himself and reappointed the same men to the very offices to which the senate refused to give its consent to their appointment.

These are serious charges and can not be brushed away.

The power to appoint men to office is a kingly power. This provision, "by advice and consent of the Senate," which is in our Constitution, is something new under the sun. It never appeared before our fathers put it in the Constitution.

When Congress was deliberating on the Jones bill it was proposed that certain offices of high responsibility should be filled by the governor "with the advice and consent of the senate."

This was not idly done, it was deliberately done. The question was discussed as to whether the right of the Porto Rican senate to veto nominations by the governor should be included with the other rights which were contained in the so-called Jones Act, and it was decided deliberately that that right should be included.

It is interesting to consider this question somewhat from a historical viewpoint, this "with the advice and consent of the senate."

Until it was so provided in the formative period of our own Government this procedure was practically unknown in any of the governments of the world. Our fathers, when they met in the Constitutional Convention, had serious misgivings touching the appointive power. They had observed in the history of the monarchical governments of Europe how the king had maintained his autocratic power by distributing offices among his favorites. They recalled how this absolute power had been abused by the English King and how helpless they had been when they objected to the reappointment of some colonial governors who had so cruelly and arrogantly nullified their charters and disregarded the rights these charters were devised to secure.

They were afraid to trust the President of the United States, for fear of the evils which might flow from the abuse of this absolute power. Few questions were discussed as long in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia. Many radically differing theories were entertained and urged. Some wanted to place the appointive power with Congress, but as Congress would frequently be in recess, others urged that that power be lodged with the Executive.

All agreed that it was neither a legislative, a judicial, nor an Executive function, and therefore inhered in neither branch of the Government.

The power to appoint officers rests, therefore, solely where the law expressly places it, and the President has no power except what the Constitution and the law of the land give him.

Like many other provisions in the Constitution, the provision relating to appointments was a compromise; was one of the many "checks and balances"; and so it was finally agreed to as set forth in section 2 of Article II:

He shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers, consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for and which shall be established by law, but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

Still this did not meet all the possible exigencies, because the Senate would not always be in session, and so another paragraph was added, as follows:

The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.

This is the source of the President's power, and it is the sum total of it.

The President may make recess appointments; that is, where the vacancy happens in a recess of the Senate.

The language of the Constitution is, "That he may fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate." Not vacancies that may exist, but vacancies that may "happen." Such commissions must expire by their terms "when the next session of the Senate ends," unless in the meantime another appointment has been made "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Fearing that the President might not keep strictly within the letter of this limitation, and that it might be construed that where the President and Senate could not get together on an officer to fill the office, and the Senate should adjourn, that the President would then make another temporary or recess appointment, section 1769 of the Revised Statutes was written into the law as the interpretation of Congress of the appointive power above referred to:

SEC. 1769. The President is authorized to fill all vacancies which may happen during the recess of the Senate by reason of death or resignation or expiration of term of office by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session thereafter. And if no appointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is made to an office so vacant or temporarily filled during such next session of the Senate, the office shall remain in abeyance, without any salary, fees, or emoluments attached thereto, until it is filled by appointment thereto, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and during such time all the powers and duties belonging to such office shall be exercised by such other officer as may by law exercise such powers and duties in case of a vacancy in such office.

They went further, and in section 1771 provided that:

SEC. 1771. Every person who, contrary to the four preceding sections, accepts any appointment to or employment in any office, or holds or exercises, or attempts to hold or exercise, any such office or employment, shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and shall be imprisoned not more than five years, or fined not more than \$10,000, or both.

This was to make sure that nobody would accept appointment to an office where there had been a session of the Senate after the vacancy happened. But Congress did not stop there.

In section 1772 a severe penalty was provided for anyone who would undertake to issue a commission in such cases.

That section reads as follows:

SEC. 1772. Every removal, appointment, or employment made, had, or exercised, contrary to sections 1767 to 1770, inclusive, and the making, signing, sealing, countersigning, or issuing of any commission or letter of authority for or in respect to any such appointment or employment, shall be deemed a high misdemeanor, and every person guilty thereof shall be imprisoned not more than five years, or fined not more than \$10,000, or both.

These provisions are no longer carried in the law, but they serve as most illuminating evidences of the construction which those who preceded us here placed upon the limitations by which the Constitution hedges about this kingly power.

Section 13 of the organic act provides:

That the heads of departments, appointed by the governor, shall hold office for the term of four years, and until their successors are appointed and qualified, unless sooner removed by the governor.

And it might be argued, if this were all of the law, that, having been appointed in a recess and the Senate having failed or refused to confirm the appointments, that these same officers would nevertheless hold over until their successors were appointed and qualified, but this is not the only provision in the organic act.

Section 26, among other things, provides:

That appointments made while the Senate is not in session shall be effective either until disapproved or until the next adjournment of the Senate for the session.

The recent session of the senate in Porto Rico was convened for 10 days for the sole purpose of considering nominations submitted to them by the governor, and during that session the governor's nominations to cabinet positions were rejected. By the very terms of the organic act, therefore, their original appointments terminated while the senate was in session, and we now have the unfortunate situation in the island of the department of finance, the department of interior, the department of agriculture and labor, and the department of health being administered by persons who have no lawful authority whatever to exercise the functions of those offices.

Have we no duty to perform in such an emergency?

Are we to sit here idly and manifest no concern whatever in the government of Porto Rico when, if these allegations be true, the governor appointed to administer the affairs of that island is deliberately denying to the people of Porto Rico the character of government which we deliberately gave them? When the governor, without any authority of law, sets aside the plain and well-considered provisions of the organic act and proceeds to rule the island in accordance with his own will? Is it our will or our wish to have the government of Porto Rico converted into a satrapy?

We are told that the opposition to the governor's appointments is inspired by no better purpose than the desire of the majority party to possess all the patronage of the island. With all due respect to those who thus insist, I say it is nobody's

business why the Senate of Porto Rico withholds its consent. We said to them in their organic act that they could participate with the governor in the appointment of certain officers, the governor to nominate, the senate to confirm. The governor has no more right to question the senate than the senate has to question the governor.

Andrew Jackson was criticized more harshly than any other President for what was called the abuse of the appointing power.

It was Mr. Marcy, a member of his Cabinet, who said, "To the victor belong the spoils." The Senate rejected the nominations of two directors of the United States Bank whom they had confirmed a year before. Jackson returned their names, explaining that he did so in order to discuss with them the objections which had been made and to explain that the things which these directors had done and which had given rise to the criticism of their conduct of the bank had been done upon his orders and that the blame, if any was due, should be put upon him. In his message returning these names he said:

I disclaim all pretention of right on the part of the President officially to inquire into or call in question the reasons of the Senate for rejecting any nomination whatever. As the President is not responsible to them for the reasons which induce him to make a nomination, so they are not responsible to him for the reasons which induce them to reject it. In these respects each is independent of the other and both responsible to their respective constituents.

After giving the reasons for their nomination as above explained, he concluded thus:

I repeat that I do not claim a right to inquire into or officially to censure the acts of the Senate.

If Andrew Jackson could not question the Senate or censure their acts, it hardly becomes E. Mont. Reilly, the Governor of Porto Rico, to do so.

We may neglect the affairs of our own people because they can and will hold us to a strict accountability of our stewardship at the next election, but the people of Porto Rico are helpless. They have no voice in our elections. They are dependent absolutely upon the good faith of the constituted authorities of this Government to see to it that their liberties and their rights are not ruthlessly taken from them.

A man may handle his own estate in as careless and reckless a fashion as he chooses, but he can not in law or good conscience be careless with the estate of his ward, and this is exactly the relationship which we bear to the people of Porto Rico.

I noticed in the paper to-day that the Internal Revenue Collector had returned a check to a taxpayer in Honolulu who had given a check on a bank there because it was drawn on a foreign country. He explained his error by saying that for the moment he had forgotten that Hawaii was a part of the United States.

If we fail to take any notice of the resolution of the Porto Rican Senate the people of that island will be justified in concluding that this Congress has forgotten that Porto Rico is a part of the United States.

These charges, which reflect most seriously upon the Governor of Porto Rico, not mere charges of neglect of duty, of sins of omission, but charges of serious, positive, and damning malefactions, have been formally preferred by the Senate of Porto Rico as well as by the Resident Commissioner, and now that the gentleman from Kansas, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, has promised an investigation if the governor requests it, Governor Reilly must either make that request or rest under the suspicion of guilt. He must make his choice.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It is no answer to these charges to bring countercharges against the Resident Commissioner. We can not absolve ourselves from the responsibility which is ours by questioning the legality of an act of the Porto Rican Legislature, which undertook to provide \$5,000 a year for the expenses of the Resident Commissioner in Washington.

Whether this was proper, or wise, or lawful on the part of the legislature, or whether the auditor of Porto Rico was within his rights when he refused to pass the appropriation some three or four years ago, and whether Governor Reilly, upon his arrival in Porto Rico, indorsed and approved the action of the auditor are matters entirely beside the question.

The Senate of Porto Rico charges the governor with numerous and serious acts of misbehavior, and it is no sort of answer to these charges to say that the Resident Commissioner wanted this extra appropriation paid to him.

With all due respect to everybody, this is merely a smoke screen, and, while it may becloud the issue, it does not meet it,

Has Governor Rely attempted to coerce or to corrupt or to unlawfully influence the courts of justice in the island? Has he violated the organic act in the manner set forth by the Senate of Porto Rico and by the Resident Commissioner?

These are the charges which have been made officially to this House.

Again, we are told that the people of Porto Rico are disloyal and that they are enraged at Governor Rely because he has set up a standard of 100 per cent Americanism in the island. I have received letters to that effect from Americans on the island, stating that they are disloyal. The charge has been made here that they set up the flag of Porto Rico. Mr. Chairman, when the Governor of Massachusetts went over there last year to unveil the monument which Massachusetts had erected to her soldiers who gave their lives in Porto Rico in 1898 the only flag which he carried on his automobile was the flag of Massachusetts. Nobody thought there was anything wrong about that. We do not take our State flags here very seriously, but I dare say if the governor from one of the other States should go about our State denouncing the State flag as "a dirty rag," we would take that seriously. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, we make mistakes, and God knows we make enough of them, not only in selecting governors of our States but in the selection of other officers, but when one of our governors misbehaves himself, as some of them do, the people of the State have the consolation or the humiliation, according to the angle from which they view it, of knowing that he is their baby, that they elected him, and they have the machinery under the constitution and the law to get rid of him if they so desire. The people of Porto Rico did not select their governor. They have not the power to get rid of him, although the grand jury over there seems to be making some progress along that line, according to newspaper reports. [Laughter.] I noticed in the New York Times the other day that the grand jury in Porto Rico had made its presentment to the district attorney, with the request that he proceed against the governor for the misuse of public funds; and I see in the same paper this morning that the governor has removed the district attorney.

But as to the loyalty of Porto Rico. We have it on very good authority that it is a difficult matter to frame an indictment against a whole people, although some gentlemen seem to have recently overcome that difficulty, so far as Porto Rico is concerned. When we engaged in the war with Germany the following telegram was received by President Wilson from Antonio R. Barceló, the President of the Porto Rican Senate:

SAN JUAN, P. R., May 9, 1917.

Hon. WOODROW WILSON,
Washington, D. C.

The Unionist party of Porto Rico, gathered in an assembly at San Juan, pledges its unconditional support to the American Nation and to its illustrious President in the present conflict, and expects that Porto Rico be assigned its share of sufferings and sacrifices until victory is obtained.

ANTONIO R. BARCELÓ,
President of the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, the bleaching bones of the boys of Porto Rico who gave their lives on the battle fields of France in the war for world liberty testify to the sincerity of that offer. [Applause.] Disloyal men do not rush to the colors when the tocsin of war is sounded, when they are to be put to the test of fire. Oh, I have seen a lot of professional patriots wrap the flag about them on all occasions and preach about Old Glory, who never heard a bugle note that was not sounded on the dinner horn, who never heard their country's voice unless it called them into a fat office. [Laughter and applause.] These Porto Ricans answered the call, and when the first draft was made Porto Rico furnished by volunteers more than her quota. When the next draft was made she furnished again more than her quota. They did not have to be drafted. [Applause.] Upon every drive for Liberty bonds Porto Rico went over the top. Upon every drive for the Red Cross, for the Y. M. C. A., for all of the other war services Porto Rico went over the top, and yet because she asks the privilege of having a judiciary uncorrupted and untrammelled by executive interference, because she asks that the senate be respected in the rights which we gave them, to advise and consent to the governor's appointments, this smoke screen is set up, and we are told that they are disloyal. I do not believe that their conduct in the late years justifies the statement. I believe they are loyal, and that fact is not altered though it be also true that when they volunteered and when they went upon the battle field and when they died they had in their hearts the hope that maybe some day, somehow, in the fullness of God's providence, independence might come to their island. [Applause.] I say we ought to investigate these charges and ascertain what the facts are, and if the governor is not guilty say to him, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant," but if he is guilty, then let him take the consequences. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN].

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, until last night the main issue raised by the pending appropriation bill was one affecting the size of our Naval Establishment. Yesterday, however, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] contributed to our proceedings a communication from the Secretary of State, which he had incorporated in the Record and which presents, to my mind, a question far exceeding in importance the size of the Navy we are to maintain under the limitations of the recent treaty. That question is the right and duty of Congress to discharge—unhindered by pressure or influence from any quarter—the powers conferred on it by the Constitution.

I have had occasion repeatedly, as gentlemen will remember, to deplore, in the course of debate, the decay of what might be called the congressional spirit; that spirit of self-respect and regard for their powers and duties among our Members on which the dignity and the efficiency of this House must always depend. But by nothing in our former proceedings was I prepared for this last experience, where we have spread before us here as a reason that should determine our action with respect to a matter peculiarly, completely, and exclusively within our own jurisdiction—the ratiocinations of an officer who is not created by the Constitution, or even mentioned in it. I do not know by what authority Mr. Hughes usurps the function of this House or by what authority we could transfer it to him. I do not suppose anyone will doubt that the power and the duty to fix the size of our Naval Establishment belongs to Congress. I do not know by what authority in the Constitution or by what theory of intelligent procedure this House can be asked to surrender the powers conferred upon it by the Constitution to any officer of this Government, no matter who he may be, whether the head of the State Department or the head of the Navy Department or the head of any other department. [Applause.]

If we had here a different system of government the military authorities would have but to declare their requirements and, whatever might be the machinery by which public funds were raised, it would at once be set in motion to comply with their demands. But we have a democratic representative Government. This body is a feature of it created especially for the purpose of determining the size of our Military Establishment and providing means for its support. And this duty we must discharge if our constitutional system is to continue in operation. It is, indeed, conceivable that some other officers or bodies might be found which could exercise these powers more effectively or discharge them more wisely, but the Constitution intrusts them to us, and to us alone. Yet for some reason I never could understand we are invited—nay, vehemently urged—to throw upon others these duties which the Constitution imposes upon ourselves. And it is very likely, I fear, that we will once more by our own vote declare ourselves incompetent to discharge the function for which we are created—at least less competent than other persons to whom it has never been intrusted. Is it any wonder that the House, which is so distrustful of itself, has become an object of distrust to the people and of contemptuous disregard to other branches of the Government?

As a striking illustration of the condition to which the legislative department has been reduced, I would call attention at this point to the extraordinary contempt of Congress which was manifested in the proceedings and embodied in the conclusions of the recent conference.

A year ago, with full concurrence of the Navy Department—the authority of which so many gentlemen now seem to think we should accept on this question as absolutely conclusive—Congress decided—and the decision was embodied in a law—on establishing a Navy which was to be the strongest on all the seas. If that law had been loyally enforced, this country would now be approaching first place among the naval powers of the world.

It provided for capital ships—swift battle cruisers—which had they been completed would be the finest and fullest development of naval architecture in all history. That they would constitute a fleet which must have outstripped all competitors for supremacy at sea was universally conceded. After hundreds of millions of dollars had been spent upon constructing these ships, ordered by Congress in the discharge of its constitutional duty, a gentleman whose office is not even created by the Constitution appeared before representatives of foreign governments, and without a word of authority from us, in flagrant contempt of our powers, forgetting apparently our very existence, agreed—not tentatively, subject to the approval of Congress—but absolutely—to reverse the policy of naval construction established by law. And he actually did it. The law

commanded the completion of these battle cruisers. The Secretary of State and two or three other gentlemen representing foreign nations agreed they should not be completed. And they were not. Nay, more, this self-constituted authority agreed to destroy them, and to-day they are either in process of destruction or they are assigned to destruction.

Now, Mr. Chairman, without stopping to consider the merits of that policy, I think it is well for the House to realize the exact place which in the light of these events it occupies to-day in our constitutional system. When an officer—I do not care even though he be the President—when any officer outside of Congress can undertake—not in a discussion amongst different departments of our own Government, but in negotiation with the representatives of foreign governments—to reverse the action taken solemnly by the lawmaking power and actually does set aside a statute without resistance or censure or even a word of protest by this body, then the Congress has ceased to be an essential, an important, or even a respectable feature of our political system. The Senate, through its power to ratify or reject a treaty, still retains a large measure of authority. But this House is no longer a body that receives or deserves serious consideration. And this condition is without hope, because it is brought on the House by its own conduct.

I myself—a recent arrival here—after vainly trying to induce other gentlemen of longer service and greater weight to do it—offered a resolution asserting, while the conference was still in session, that the size of our Military Establishment by land and sea is matter for Congress alone to determine and not to be affected by agreement through the treaty-making power with any foreign governments, but the Speaker held that the question it raised was not privileged.

The House submitted to that ruling, and the resolution has gone to the Committee on the Judiciary to sleep the sleep that knows no waking. Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. COCKRAN. With great pleasure.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman understand that there is anyone here questioning the authority of the House in the matter of having a voice in determining the size of our Naval Establishment?

Mr. COCKRAN. The gentleman, very much to his regret, is compelled to confess that not only does somebody question the authority of the House in this respect, but everybody seems to question it. If the right of the House to have a voice in fixing the size of our Navy is unquestioned (as seems to be assumed and indeed asserted in the gentleman's question), then an officer who not merely agreed with foreign governments to stop construction of vessels ordered by Congress to be built, but actually put an end to it without a word of authority from us, has committed an offense against the Constitution which ought to be more than a subject for remonstrance and condemnation here. It should be made the subject of an impeachment to be tried before the body at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. MONDELL. I was not referring to the communication of the Secretary of State. I referred rather to the gentleman's suggestion that there might be some one here who doubted the authority or duty of the House to have a voice in determining the size of our defense establishments. I think there can be no one here who questions that.

Mr. COCKRAN. I am very sorry indeed that when the proposal of the Secretary of State to destroy ships authorized and directed by Congress to be built was pending before the conference and when the attention of the whole world was fastened on it the gentleman from Wyoming did not find a voice as leader of this House to make that assertion then, but left it to be made in a resolution which has been smothered in the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MONDELL. It is not the province of Congress, or the House, at least, to question the procedure of the treaty-making power in making treaties. It is the duty of the House when the time comes for it to act to assert its view and judgment and opinion. And there is now a bill reported from a committee of this House, to be considered immediately following this appropriation bill in the House, in which the House will express its approval of the treaty and what is proposed under it.

Mr. COCKRAN. The tardy action of the House, which the gentleman promises, is some compensation for its neglect of an obvious and pressing duty when the treaty was imminent. And at this I rejoice. But the gentleman's statement raises very clearly a question which, it seems to me, should be met and decided at once. He says that Congress has no right to question the procedure of the treaty-making power, and I agree with him so far as matters within the scope of treaties are concerned. But the treaty-making power has nothing whatever to do with the extent of our defenses. The rights and privileges

of Congress are invaded when the treaty-making power undertakes by agreement with other nations to determine how large or how small our Navy is to be. After the Military Establishment has been fixed, then the treaty-making power may, within certain limits, enter into agreements with foreign nations concerning the use or disposition of our armed forces. As, for instance, a treaty with Canada—or rather a treaty with Great Britain—may provide that no army shall be kept on our northern frontier or that no ships of war shall be kept in certain waters. All that is within the domain of treaties. It touches and concerns our relations with other countries. But our armament itself—its extent and character—is purely matter of domestic concern. No power on earth but the American Nation represented here in Congress has any right to interfere with it or affect it in any way. When, therefore, an officer of this Government undertook to deal with foreign powers as though he had a right to fix the size of our armament on land or sea, I regret deeply that somebody occupying a position of authority in this House did not rise and assert the constitutional truth that no treaty could affect the right of Congress to determine the extent of our defensive establishment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question or two. As I understand the constitutional provision applicable to the question raised by the gentleman from New York, it is in substance that the Constitution and all laws enacted and treaties made in accordance with the Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land. Now, the law which the gentleman from New York has mentioned as having been enacted two or three years ago and fixing the size of our Navy was a statute. A subsequent treaty duly made would have just as much authority as that statute and would repeal it pro tanto.

Mr. COCKRAN. That I deny absolutely.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit me to say that the Supreme Court of the United States has more than once expressly held that a law and a treaty are on a parity, and that the one which is last ratified or enacted is the supreme law of the land? That is the law unquestionably, as repeatedly held by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not differ from the gentleman as to what the Supreme Court has held more than once with respect to the effect of a treaty. But those decisions all had reference to matters clearly inside the treaty-making power; that is to say, the power which fixes our relations with foreign countries. The treaty-making power, I repeat, does not extend to matters that are of purely domestic concern. It certainly does not extend to duties and powers which have been conferred upon us, and upon us alone, by the Constitution. When the treaty-making power interferes with the right of Congress to fix absolutely every detail of our defensive armament the dignity of this House is affronted and the Constitution is trodden under foot.

Mr. Chairman, I had little hope on rising that anything I might say would awaken the House to realization of the depths to which it has fallen or rouse it to an effort at recovering its lost importance. But none the less I deemed it a duty to point out how completely—in this matter of supreme moment to the country and the world, involving nullification of a law solemnly enacted by our authority—we have been thrust from any part in the direction of public affairs.

And yet my action in bringing before this body the situation into which we have been thrown—not so much by other branches of the Government as by our own submission to oft-repeated invasions of our authority—has not been wholly without result. Already it has evoked from the gentleman from Wyoming—who, I hope, will allow me to call him my friend—the assurance that soon a measure will be introduced to assert the right of the House to a voice in determining the size of the Military Establishment of the Government.

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

Mr. COCKRAN. With pleasure.

Mr. MONDELL. The fact that Congress last year directed the President to call a conference with a view to limiting the expenses of naval appropriations, subject to the approval—

Mr. COCKRAN. I was just coming to that. I understand the point the gentleman would make.

The only excuse or justification which we can find anywhere for the action of this conference with respect to our Naval Establishment is the request or suggestion addressed by Congress to the President last year that he invite certain nations to confer on the possibility of bringing about a reduction of naval armaments. The way in which that suggestion was conveyed illustrates strikingly the degree to which our rules are responsible for the condition into which the House has fallen.

The object of the House, the object of the country, the passionate desire of the whole world was for disarmament; not for dissolution or reduction of naval establishments alone, but for complete disarmament by land and sea.

This House was asked to give formal expression to that world-wide desire in an amendment which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] offered to the naval bill of last session. Never since the dawn of civilization had occasion so favorable arisen for removing—aye, forcing—weapons of war from the hands of men everywhere. And that must have resulted in putting into their hands implements of industry. The providence of God had so ordered events that one nation had the power to establish peace throughout the world on foundations that could never be disturbed, and that nation was the United States of America.

For the first time in the history of the world the nation that could concededly establish the strongest military forces on land and sea did not desire a great armament but abhorred all armaments. The power which it admittedly possessed to establish the greatest armament it might have used to drive armaments from the face of the earth. And that decisive triumph of civilization could have been achieved by direct communication between the people of this country and the peoples of all other countries in the world without conferences, negotiations, agreements, or treaties conducted by diplomats whose function it has always been to deceive the public mind and pervert the public conscience—substituting for their malign activities plain declarations of purposes and desires by the representative body of each country.

With this in mind, I suggested that there be embodied in the bill which we passed last year establishing the largest navy in the world the substance of a joint resolution previously introduced by me in the House directing the President of the United States to disband all our military forces by land and sea as other nations disbanded theirs—not as politicians of different countries by various formulas and phrases calculated to deceive honest minds seemed to promise disarmament—but as all military forces were actually disbanded. By establishing the greatest military forces on land and sea, while at the same time proclaiming our readiness to disband them when all other nations had disarmed, we would be in effect declaring that we were determined to be first in armament if they made us and first in disarmament if they would let us. And to that proclamation there could have been but one answer. Disarmament, universal and complete, would have been the immediate result.

No matter how reluctant to disband all military forces politicians and statesmen might have been, the imperious demand of every people for relief from the burdens of taxation which is crushing the very life of industry, would have constrained them to accept our proposal. But the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] was declared out of order. Under the rules of this House it was held impossible to prescribe conditions under which the military force we were by that very act establishing should be disbanded. I did not offer any amendment to the naval bill myself, but suggested in a speech the importance of expressing the eager desire for disarmament which animated our entire membership, and our belief that it could be effected by declaring our intention, if other nations maintained great armaments, to outarm the strongest of them, but if all other nations disarmed to disarm with them. That suggestion was completely ignored. I am glad now that by refraining from any attempt to amend the measure, I have saved my innocence from familiarity or contact with that quagmire of the intellect, the rules of the House. [Laughter.]

The bill passed without any provision favoring disarmament—every proposal in that direction having been ruled out of order. At the other end of the Capitol the Senator from Idaho, Mr. BORAH, offered an amendment—the Senate always having jealously reserved to itself the right to put conditions on appropriations of money, which is the very essence of legislative power—requesting the President to call a conference of the powers maintaining large navies. It was adopted, and that amendment came back to this House. It was the only proposal looking to reduction of armaments on which, under our preposterous rules, we had any opportunity to vote.

I stated then that I did not approve of restricting the movement for disarmament to abolition or reduction of navies. The very largest reduction of naval forces would effect a saving of money so slight as to be almost negligible. The reduction of public expenditures by which the world can be saved from industrial collapse must be effected by lessening the billions wasted in maintaining enormous land forces. But that view could not be expressed in any resolution or action originating in this body under the rules. And so the Borah amendment—a totally inadequate provision—was adopted by a gagged and helpless House. I voted for it, as did many others, because a vote

against it would have been a vote against any attempt whatever to mitigate the burden—the crushing burden of warlike preparations.

The President of the United States under that request by Congress and in the exercise of his own inherent powers was justified in asking these different nations to confer on what they would consent to do in the direction of reducing armaments. About this there can be no doubt. But I deny that he had the power to enter into a formal treaty for the destruction of vessels built in obedience to a law of the United States until authority to destroy them had been given him by Congress, or to take any action whatever in concert with foreign governments that would affect in any degree the size or efficiency of our Military Establishment on land or sea.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believe that everything political should be judged by its fruits, whether it be an administrative policy or an institution of government or the action of an individual officer. If this interference by the Secretary of State and other persons outside the House with the discharge of its functions should result in better laws, better administration, a better Army or a better Navy, I would say, "Let the innovation continue and become a recognized feature of our political system."

Men are not made for constitutions. Constitutions are made for men. If a constitution be found to embarrass justice or defeat it, to retard progress rather than facilitate it, then that constitutional system should be amended or abolished. The system of government that will afford everybody subject to its authority the most complete assurance of security in the enjoyment of what he produces by his toil is the system which deserves to survive and which will survive.

Applying this test to the new method of allowing our action here to be governed and directed by persons outside our membership—which so many gentlemen seem to favor—how has it worked? How will it affect disposition of the pending question? To answer this we must first realize just what is the issue actually before us; and to realize this we must recall the conditions under which it arose.

The Secretary of State entered the recent conference with an air of extraordinary mystery and proposed that we destroy the very best features of our national defense—reduce our Naval Establishment from the greatest to the second in the world. And this proposal was made to nations that are the only powers which could possibly be our enemies in naval warfare. Think of it!

The one country that has always hitherto ruled the waves, which has insisted that control of the sea is absolutely essential to its very existence, but which can no longer maintain that supremacy against this Nation, was confirmed in the first position; that is to say, she was placed above us as a naval power by our own representatives. The spokesman for England, Lord Lee of Fareham, voicing the utmost demand that she felt it reasonable or safe to advance before the conference assembled, asked that she be put on equal terms with us. But Mr. Hughes has put her ahead of us; with a promise, it is true, that at the end of 10 years we will be equal to her in naval strength. She actually has superiority—we have a promise of equality—after a while.

And to bring about this result our representatives in the conference agreed to destroy the ships now almost completed that would have given us the greatest Navy in the world. Now, why should we decline to maintain the greatest Navy if we are to have any Navy at all?

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this world will never be at peace until complete disarmament is effected. I am the last man in all the world who would favor maintaining a great armament by land or sea for any purpose except one, and that is to force abolition of all armaments. This world will never, in my judgment, regain its capacity to support in anything approaching comfort the great populations that sprang into existence during a century of peace until all human energies and resources are enlisted in the great task of producing commodities which afford subsistence to human beings—none diverted to war or preparations for war. Not till everyone is actively at work—the armed forces of the world confined to those necessary for police purposes—will it be possible to stop the march of starvation which, after having already ravaged Russia and other countries of the East, is heading westward steadily and ominously, threatening to engulf the whole world in disaster that can not be measured.

Now, what has this conference contributed to the delivery of mankind from the curse of militaristic preparations? What have we gained by it that would justify destruction of the finest ships of war ever designed by human genius? Has disarmament been accomplished? On the contrary, armaments

have been made permanent. We ourselves must remain armed, even though our people desire to disarm. According to this letter of the Secretary of State, we have not only agreed to refrain from taking first place among the armed nations but we must maintain all the forces consistent with our remaining permanently in second place. For he insists that the basis of this treaty is that each nation subscribing to it will maintain the existing strength of its naval establishment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New York 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I hardly think any gentleman here will deny that under this agreement we can not have the strongest fleet. That melancholy fact has been established beyond all question and beyond all necessity for further argument by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] in the admirable speech which described with singular lucidity the relative tonnage that can be maintained by this country and England under the naval pact. Now, I have said before and I say again that while men—sensible men—may differ about the advisability of maintaining a Navy stronger than any other, I do not think there can be any difference among rational beings as to the folly of burdening a country with the cost of establishing a Navy that is inferior to any other.

As I have more than once pointed out, the second strongest navy is very much like the second best hand at poker, about the very worst thing anyone could have. If you can not get the best hand at poker, you had better keep out of the game. With the second best you can not win anything, but you are very likely to lose everything. Deliberately to enter the game with the certainty that the very highest hand you can get is the second best would show you better fitted for admission to a lunatic asylum than for successful participation in serious affairs. This is equally true of armaments. Deliberately to establish a Navy that could not possibly be victorious in battle over the only enemy it is ever likely to face would be an act of folly unparalleled in human annals. And yet that is precisely what this country has agreed to do. It has entered into a compact binding us to maintain a fleet that by no possibility could be equal to that of the country we must fight, if ever we are to fight at all.

But, Mr. Chairman, the treaty has been ratified. It is now a fact. We can not escape it or change it. And, therefore, nothing remains for us to do but to deal frankly and fairly with the situation it has created.

Since this treaty is in existence, my own judgment would be in favor of refusing to maintain any Navy. If we can not have the strongest, I would have none. Every ship I would send to the scrap heap, keeping just the necessary force for police purposes. If we were without any organized forces whatever at sea piracy might revive and this would be a calamity, to prevent which we are bound to take every precaution. Moreover, total abolition is impracticable, because there are a number of gentlemen over here who would maintain a Navy anyhow for the sake of pursuing those violators of the Volstead law that they think are undermining the Constitution. [Laughter.]

What then, Mr. Chairman, remains for us to decide? Nothing but the provision we should make for the second-class navy, which is the best that we can now establish. And just here is where an issue of much gravity arises.

The Committee on Appropriations reports that after careful scrutiny it finds a personnel of 67,000 men will suffice to equip all the ships that this treaty allows us to have, and it provides for them. A minority of the committee insists that 67,000 men will not be enough to man these vessels properly. Somebody or other said that 96,000 were necessary for that purpose. Somebody else said 75,000, and still others said 85,000 would be required. If we try to identify the somebody who has made any of these claims, he becomes elusive. To whom under these circumstances should we look for light, on a matter obscured by contradictory statements? To the agencies established by the House itself for the very purpose of obtaining the information necessary to sound conclusions or to persons outside our membership whose statements are vague when not mutually contradictory and who can have access to no sources of enlightenment that are not open to us and to our committees?

What is the argument for disregarding the report of the committee—this committee appointed by us that represents us; that is, in fact, ourselves? Simply that this measure does not provide for placing on each vessel its full fighting strength. That is to say, it does not provide that these vessels shall be maintained permanently on a war footing. Now, I want to ask gentlemen on both sides of the House when, in the whole

history of the world, has any navy ever been maintained on a war footing in peace time? There never has been a war in all the experience of mankind which immediately after its conclusion was not followed by a great reduction in naval forces. I have not the time now to give you the figures—

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCKRAN. In a moment. Just let me finish this, and then I will yield. I have not the time to give the exact figures of all the reductions which followed different wars, but I will mention what is perhaps the most striking instance in history. In 1812, several years after the Battle of Trafalgar had been fought, but while England was still at war, she had 115,000 sailors and 31,000 marines actually under arms. In 1816, one year after the conclusion of peace, she had 24,000 sailors and 9,000 marines on her ships. Study the history of every war and you will find at its termination a reduction of 35, 40, 50, or 75 per cent in the number of men serving in the belligerent navies. Our own Civil War was no exception to this rule. But here we have what? Here we have this precious treaty which we were asked to accept with joy and approval because of the great reduction in taxation which it was to bring about; and if these additional men are voted, the expenses of the Navy, according to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]—the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations—will be higher four years after the conclusion of the war than they were last year, three years after its conclusion. A treaty that was to have reduced taxation largely will have increased it enormously.

The utmost reduction of military expenditures that can be effected by the treaty, even under the appropriation now proposed, is, after all, but \$100,000,000. If gentlemen who oppose the report of the committee have their way, there will be no reduction at all. There will be an increase. The question before this body is, then, in the last analysis: Will you, after having sacrificed our supremacy at sea in order to obtain some alleviation from the crushing burden of armaments, throw away the slight reduction in military expenditures your own committee recommends; and this on vague statements proceeding from doubtful sources, unsupported by any respectable authority? Are we to act once more as if we held anybody outside the House more competent to perform its own functions than everybody inside the House?

That is the question before this body, and the only question worth considering at this time.

There is no possibility—greatly to my regret—that this Congress will vote either to establish the greatest Navy in the world or else to abolish all naval armament. And that being so, whether the personnel of this second-class Navy is fixed at 67,000 or at 85,000 is of itself matter of little moment. But on the issue of following our own committee or accepting the direction of persons outside the House I do hope the vote will be decisive in favor of vindicating the dignity and capacity of this body to discharge its duties by the agencies it has itself established.

I have said, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat it, that if all the navies of the world were entirely disbanded, the economic result would be almost negligible. The total number of men released to industry would be only a few hundred thousand. It is on land that the great forces are maintained which threaten the peace of the world and retard its recovery from the ravages of war. There is little danger, in my opinion, that war on a world-wide theater can recur for a generation in view of the exhaustion caused by the conflict just closed. But preparations for war are continued on a scale greater than ever. Five million men are kept under arms. Their support must be drawn from the labor of others. It is the withdrawal of these enormous numbers of men in the very flower of their productive capacity from the field of industry that constitutes the great burden under which civilization is staggering and in grave danger of total collapse. Until that burden is removed entirely or at least lightened sensibly there can be no recovery for industry, no restoration of prosperity, no prospect of averting perils to the whole social fabric which threaten universal chaos. And this treaty for which we have sacrificed so much, instead of leading to disarmament, is an obstacle—I fear an insurmountable obstacle—to disarmament. From the hour when M. Briand said that the land forces of France would not be reduced, any treaty to which he was a party became inevitably an obstacle to disarmament. But if the conference has resulted in lengthening rather than in shortening the distance that divides us from disarmament, for heaven's sake let us guard the independence of our own legislative department in dealing with matters that remain the scope of its authority.

It is absolutely essential to the preservation of our republican government that Congress should retain full control of our expenditures for military purposes. This, indeed, is the very

crux of democracy and of the civilization from which democracy springs—on which democracy must always rest. There are in the last analysis but two forms of civilization. One I have often defined as civilization of the camp, the other civilization of the workshop. There can not, of course, be a civilization exclusively of the camp nor a civilization exclusively of the workshop. The camp can be formidable only where the workshop supplies it with the means of prosecuting effectively enterprises of war, while the workshop can reach its fullest productive capacity only in peace. And—up to the present at least—no means have been discovered by which peace can be preserved except by organizing armed forces to maintain it. But the difference between the two systems is none the less striking and conspicuous. Civilization of the camp protects and encourages the workshop only that military forces may be made more formidable. Civilization of the workshop seeks always to reduce the size of armaments to the very lowest point consistent with safety. Under civilization of the camp industry may grow, but armies always grow still more extensively. Under civilization of the workshop commerce expands continuously, while war is regarded as the most dreadful of calamities. And under that spirit the forces that make for conflict are always discouraged and steadily shrinking.

The war just ended was a conflict to the death between these two systems. It was my earnest hope that the victory of our arms would result in making civilization of the workshop supreme and universal. That hope has not yet been fulfilled. Indeed, we are farther from it than ever, judged by superficial indications. Instead of a world freed from militaristic preparations and delivered from the dark shadow of future wars which huge armaments project over the horizon of humanity, we have a world where military forces are multiplying and preparations for war are prosecuted more feverishly than ever before and on a constantly expanding scale. But I do not despair. Disarmament is the goal which all men and women of every race and every clime are striving to attain. And to that splendid goal I believe this country will lead the human race, notwithstanding the attempt by this treaty to make naval armaments permanent.

The great things America has done—and they are the greatest in all history—so great that not a human being in all the world would reverse or remove a single one of them if he had the power—the great things America has done have been accomplished not through her politicians but in spite of them. The settlement of our Civil War on conditions so just, and therefore so wise, that a few years after its conclusion victors and vanquished alike were rejoicing at its result—the most successful composition of internecine conflict in all human experience—was not effected by any political leader or any political party. It was forced on parties and politicians by a public opinion sufficiently enlightened to ascertain what justice required and sufficiently virtuous to impose what justice demanded.

And so in this cataclysm I feel confident the conscience of the American people will ultimately succeed in enthroning justice over all this earth. Somehow or other—in ways and by methods we can not now foresee—a declaration for disarmament—complete disarmament—will ultimately be enforced by the American people on the American Congress and enacted into law. It will be the word of God embodied in a statute proclaiming and securing freedom, progress, and prosperity to the whole world. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore].

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted me I propose to discuss a matter that has received considerable attention throughout the country—the recent wholesale removal of 30 of the officials of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, filling the most important positions in that establishment.

At the outset I wish to say that even though the method of removal is of the most doubtful legality, I should remain silent if the officials had been removed because of misconduct, but, apparently, no charge of misconduct was brought against any of them. That prior to their removal nothing was called to the attention of the President as the basis for such a charge is clear from a letter written from the White House since the removal became effective. In addition, there has been given out a letter from the President to the representatives of all the Federal employees which reiterates that the character of none of the persons dismissed has been impugned. The President desires it understood that his letter is written not as an apology but as an explanation. But the difficulty is it does not explain. May I respectfully say it makes one think of the remark of Talleyrand to the effect that the art of language is to conceal thought? The letter does state that the action was taken after "extended deliberation"—not investigation but deliberation.

We well know that the President himself is too busy with a multitude of matters to give any of them very extended deliberation. We must only conjecture who did the deliberating in this instance. Perhaps they were the two officials, one of the Department of Justice and the other in the Treasury Department, but not at the head of that department, who seems to be the patronage pilots on the administration ship, and whom the President had best drop from the vessel if he would keep it from going on the rocks. I am not at all surprised that the representatives of the Federal employees find the President's letter unsatisfactory.

The work of the bureau, which includes the printing and engraving of Government bonds and the notes that are a part of our circulating medium and the issue of all postage stamps, is very important and requires the service of persons possessing great technical knowledge and skill. It is not denied that such qualities, matured by experience, were possessed by the 26 men, among whom were 5 war veterans and the 4 women who have been displaced. All of them had rendered valuable service to the Government; several of them by inventions and improved processes for which, of course, they were paid nothing, had saved the Government large sums of money, and some of them had declined private employment at larger salaries than the Government was paying because of their devotion to the work in which they were engaged. They hail from the District of Columbia and 11 States. They were all in the classified civil service and appointed thereto not by the President but by his subordinates to whom the power of appointment had been intrusted under the Constitution and the law. They were appointed without regard to party affiliations, and most of them were appointed before the advent of the Wilson administration. Here was a group of high-class employees, each one having a record of fidelity and efficiency, who, prior to March 31, were without any intimation that their work was unacceptable or that it was in contemplation to dismiss or otherwise punish them. And yet, without warning, that evening they were summarily dismissed by the President's order of that date. I hope that some one who has the time will compile and present to the public the facts showing how unusually valuable to the Government was the service rendered by each of the dismissed officials. I am not able to do that now, but by way of illustration I may mention that I have heard one of them spoken of as the master engraver of this country, the finished beauty of whose work is approached by only one other, who is a New York engraver.

As further illustrative, and to indicate the suddenness of what was done and the shock it occasioned, I may mention one case of which I know, the case of an accomplished scientist, a man of middle age, residing here in Washington with his little family, by whose service the Government had profited to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and who during the war had refused lucrative private employment. He left his office late in the afternoon of March 31, and in the night was visited by a messenger who delivered him a copy of the order, along with a communication of less than four lines from the Secretary to the President, which said: "You will note the abolishment of your position and be governed accordingly." Going to the bureau the next morning he was not permitted to enter his office except in company with a watchman and a Department of Justice agent, and not enabled until later in the day to withdraw his books and other belongings. He, like most of his fellow sufferers, is a man of small means, and is now turned adrift in a time of widespread unemployment, when places are difficult to find. His case is typical of the situation which the order has brought about, and which, so far as I know, is without precedent in our history. He and the others have been abruptly ousted from the positions they filled. Those of them who were moving on toward the retirement age can now have no hope of coming within the scope of the retirement law. Furthermore, as I understand, dismissal means ineligibility for reappointment to civil-service positions.

On the Monday following the black Friday transaction of March 31 the officials visited the White House in a body, to inquire why they had been dismissed. They were in the shadow of what was to them a tragedy. The President, they were told, was in the sunshine of the golf links. They left at the White House a communication addressed to the President. At that moment the country was assuming that the removal must have been prompted by the discovery of irregularities for which the officials were responsible. All sorts of statements and rumors to this effect were appearing in some of the newspapers, which even still persist.

The men and women who had been dismissed not only felt a deep sense of injustice but the gross humiliation of being depicted as probable malefactors. That they are not malefactors we are now authoritatively assured. We also seem to be ad-

vised that preceding their removal there was no investigation, but only deliberation. It seems to be clear that the President, in determining conditions in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, did not investigate through the Bureau of Efficiency, which is the agency that he could have used for that purpose. In this connection it may be emphasized that even though it may have been found, as from what we now know it was not found, that some one individual or two or three individuals had been guilty of misconduct, nevertheless, in fairness and equity, that fact would not have afforded ground for the wholesale removal of a large number of officials working to a great extent independently of each other. [Applause.]

On the 3d of April I offered a resolution, a copy of which will be attached to my remarks, which sets forth the law governing the removal of persons from the classified civil service. It also recites the fact that, when the order was issued, it was approved by the Attorney General, Mr. Daugherty, who was then in conference with the President. It also calls attention, I believe, to the fact that, after the sentence had been pronounced and the execution had taken place, an investigation was started by the Attorney General, presumably to search for evidence to justify what had been done. The resolution proposes the appointment by the Speaker of a committee of five to make a different sort of investigation—a thorough and impartial investigation—and report its conclusions to the House. What I desire are the actual facts. I was aware when I offered the resolution that the Committee on Rules, to which it was referred, would probably observe its habit of not considering any resolution introduced by members of the minority of the House. That very autocratic committee has proved true to form. The chairman of the committee has not deigned to acknowledge the receipt of my letter to him of the 4th of April, urging that the resolution be promptly considered. He has failed to give the subject so much as the cold respect of a passing glance, and so does not assist in getting at the actual facts.

Yesterday the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], a Member for whom I have great respect, a man who possesses in high degree one of the qualities now most needed by men in public life—the quality of courage—predicted on the floor of the House that when the facts are known there will be no one to defend the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. I do not lightly regard the gentleman's statement, but I know something about that bureau, and I oppose to his prediction my own prediction, that if we ever secure a full and impartial investigation, such as is contemplated by my resolution, it will be found that no agency of this Government has been better managed or conducted than the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. [Applause.] And why should we not have such an investigation?

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to discuss this matter in a partisan manner. I am a party man, but, recognizing the seriousness of the conditions that now prevail, I have been anxious, I have been eager, for the success of the administration. No one would have been happier than I had it refrained from any course that merits adverse criticism. But this ominous incident, while it immediately affects only 30 American citizens, who, in certain quarters, are being ridiculed and derided because of their just complaint, adds to the confusion and uncertainty of the times in which we live by threatening to place the business of the Government where it once was—in the hands of reckless and unscrupulous spoilsmen.

All who study sufficiently to take a long view remember how the spoils system corrupted the Government of England during the eighteenth century. The use of money and patronage to control elections was the influence that wrought untold injury to England. The oppression and alienation of the Colonies was in no small measure due to the fact that the Government at home becoming corrupt, as a consequence wealthy and incompetent men, protected by the party in power for party maintenance, were foisted upon the Colonies as officials. Only after the Revolution, as a result of a struggle that had been initiated by such friends of America as Burke, Pitt, and Rockingham, was there a marked advance toward stabilizing the civil service and giving paramount consideration to the interests of the public in the conduct of the business of the Government, rather than the interests of party and the interests of powerful individuals.

The student may read the whole story in Dorman B. Eaton's book on Civil Service in Great Britain, which is the product of a survey of conditions in England made by Mr. Eaton at the request of President Hayes.

Nearly half a century ago a similar struggle to overthrow the spoils system in this country, which had become flagrantly offensive, was begun during the administration of President Hayes. It enlisted the support of many of the most eminent citizens and public men, including Senator Pendleton, of Ohio,

a Democrat, and Representative Garfield, of Ohio, a Republican, and, being carried on with strong and steady determination, led to the enactment of the law of 1883, which has since been variously amended. Whatever the imperfections of the new system—and nothing in government is ideal—I believe it is regarded by the overwhelming sentiment of the country as far preferable to the spoils system, and I do not believe that the people of the United States will quietly acquiesce in its obliteration. I have no sympathy with anyone, Democrat or Republican, who favors even an approximate return to the old basis. On the contrary, I for one would be glad to see appointment to office and removal from office, offices of every character except those great offices whose occupants are looked to by the President to put into effect his general policies, I should like to see them all filled according to merit, which would involve the elimination of partisan influence, whether exerted by the President or by his subordinates or by Senators and Representatives. And in saying this I have in mind not only offices like those in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, which had been assumed to be fairly beyond the touch of the spoilsman, but also the post offices which are to-day in greater degree than in recent years more completely the prey of the spoilsman. The enormous majority of the people of this country, the millions who go their quiet way on the farms and in the fields, the millions who labor in the factories and mines, the millions who are toiling in numberless other occupations are mainly concerned that the civil-service offices shall be properly filled, and are not much concerned as to whether they are filled by members of this party or that.

They take note of the wide difference between Government enterprise and their well-managed business enterprises. And they perfectly appreciate, whatever may be alleged to the contrary, that the difference will not be narrowed and Government rendered more satisfactory by making party affiliations and activities the standard of appointment. On this issue, which includes, but does not put to the front the Pecksniffian hypocrisy of pretending to make merit the standard, while really making party fealty the standard, but puts to the front a more fundamental and vital question, the integrity of our civil-service system, I have no misgivings as to what would be the result of an appeal to the country.

It is a circumstance of marked significance in the estimation of those who dread a return to the spoils system that only a few days before the President's order was issued his Attorney General proclaimed himself hostile to the present system. His utterance was not rebuked by the President, but, nevertheless, I am reluctant to believe that he spoke with the President's authority and approval. There have been Presidents who would not only have rebuked him but dismissed him for the good of the service. Mr. Roosevelt, who would now, had he lived, almost certainly be in the Presidency, who abhorred the spoils system and was among the staunchest and most resolute defenders of the merit system, would surely not have countenanced the doctrine which the Attorney General has proclaimed, nor, in my opinion, is it conceivable that he would have signed the order which the Attorney General doubtless prepared.

While the main issue raised by the action of the President is the issue as to whether spoils politicians are to have their way and work their will at the expense of the people of the country who desire the best Government that can be provided—while every other question is subordinate to that—I wish to express my sympathy for the individuals who have been wronged. Even if there were no law applicable to the matter, who can deny that a wrong has been done them by the treatment which they have received? The Attorney General was at the elbow of the President, we are told, when the order was issued. It is to be deplored that the President took the advice of the Attorney General. The President had much better have acted in the spirit of Edmund Burke when he said: "It is not what a lawyer tells me that I may do, but it is what my conscience tells me I must do and not do." [Applause.]

The men and women, for whose removal I have not the slightest doubt the Attorney General and politicians who share his view are responsible, are not people of wealth or power, and for that reason they were the very people who were entitled to the careful and earnest consideration of the Chief Executive. It has not been left to those of our race or of our religion to discover the duty resting upon rulers to primarily take into account the helplessness of those who have been least favored by circumstances of birth, fortune, and position. It was the Caliph Omar who said, when he came to his throne, "He that is weakest among you shall be in my sight the strongest until I have vindicated for him his rights, and he that is strongest will I treat as the weakest until he complies with the law." I predict that in the time to come the President will think regretfully of

the cruel fate to which a number of helpless citizens who had served the Government well in days of peace and in days of war were doomed by the stroke of his pen.

The essential injustice of the transaction is so clear that I hardly care to essay the task of trying to determine the rights of these people by a discussion of the law, which they supposed was made for their protection. But relative to that aspect of the matter I shall quote the statutory provision of 1912, with some little comment. The statute provides as follows:

That no person in the classified civil service of the United States shall be removed therefrom except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of said service and for reasons given in writing, and the person whose removal is sought shall have notice of the same and of any charges preferred against him, and be furnished with a copy thereof, and also be allowed a reasonable time for personally answering the same in writing and affidavits in support thereof.

It seems that Congress was practically unanimous in enacting this provision. The provision was, of course, intended to have a meaning. The Supreme Court in a decision in the case of *United States v. Wickersham* (201 U. S. 390) construing the regulation of 1897, to which I shall refer in a moment, and which is similar to the statute, held that an employee in the classified civil service appointed by the head of a department can not be removed by the appointing authority without notice and hearing, and if so removed he can sue for the subsequent accruals of salary. It is true that the court reserved the question as to whether the President is bound by such a regulation or statute.

I suppose that is a constitutional question. But whether strictly bound or not, he ought to consider himself bound, in the interest of the country and in the interest of fairness to individual officials and employees. If the law binds him, his action is illegal. If, on the other hand, the law does not bind him, it would be impossible to enact any law that would bind him, and he can go as far as Mr. Daugherty and the others desire him to go in completely breaking down the civil-service system. He can insist upon the exclusive right to make all appointments, except where the power of appointment is delegated by Congress to certain agencies named in the Constitution. And, however appointments are made, whether by him or by those agencies, he can dismiss all executive officials and employees at any moment and as frequently as he may think fit. He can level to the dust the system which has been so laboriously built up.

But listen. The statute I have quoted was enacted in 1912, but long before 1912 the Presidents of the United States had put in effect regulations not very dissimilar to the statute, thus electing to bind themselves to the observance of the principle now expressed in the statute. The first rule with reference to the matter was promulgated by President McKinley in 1897, and it reads as follows:

No removal shall be made from any position subject to competitive examination, except for just cause, and upon written charges filed with the head of the department, or other appointing officer, and of which the accused shall have full notice and an opportunity to make defense.

In 1899 President McKinley modified the rule, making it closer to what is the language of the present statute. In 1902 President Roosevelt promulgated the rule in the following language:

No removal shall be made from the competitive classified service, except for just cause and for reasons given in writing; and the person sought to be removed shall have notice and be furnished a copy of such reasons, and be allowed a reasonable time for personally answering the same in writing. Copy of such reasons, notice, and answer, and of the order of removal shall be made a part of the records of the proper department or office; and the reasons for any change in rank or compensation within the competitive classified service shall also be made a part of the records of the proper department or office.

The substantial policy of McKinley and Roosevelt became the policy of Taft and Wilson. That policy, now given the sanction of a statute, is the policy that President Harding apparently rejected when he issued his order of March 31. He will, I think, find it desirable to explain to the country much more fully than he has attempted to do his reasons for rejecting a definite policy of enormous importance, which had the approval of four Presidents, two of whom were from his own State, and which is crystallized into law.

I turn again for a moment to the individual officials who are directly involved. It is a platitude to say that the best asset is good character. These were men and women of character, as is manifest from their record and the esteem in which others hold them. Notwithstanding, they have been treated as if they were without the sort of character which alone can invite and assure confidence. I give one other illustration. Mr. Ashworth for a quarter of a century or more had been custodian of dies, rolls, and plates. According to custom, and perhaps under authority of law, on the 6th of January last the Secretary of the Treasury appointed a committee to examine Ashworth's office. The committee, after weeks given to the performance of its

duties, made a report to the Secretary of the Treasury, in substance stating that it found everything to be as it should be in that office. That report was made to the Secretary at 4.30 o'clock on March 31. Nevertheless at 6.45 o'clock the same day the President signed the order dismissing Ashworth "for the good of the service." Thereupon a Mr. McCauley was appointed to succeed Mr. Ashworth, just as a Mr. Hill was appointed to succeed Director Wilmeth. None of these people, so far as I am aware, are constituents of mine, but I have known Wilmeth for years and I have confidence in the purity of his character. I also know about the high character of Mr. Ashworth. I know very little about Messrs. McCauley and Hill, but I submit that before they should have been appointed to responsible positions, which ought to be filled only by men of undoubted character, there should have been some deliberation, if not investigation.

The records of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, which is in such close relation to the Department of Justice, should not have been overlooked as a source of information. If the charges made in litigation pending in that court against Hill and McCauley are well founded, they will receive the condemnation of the court, as they should receive the condemnation of all decent citizens. [Applause.]

I entertain no doubt that those by whom the President was advised—and, as I think, very much misled—were actuated by an intention, which is not confined to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, to remove officials who are not active in either party and appoint in their places those who can be relied upon to respond to party dictation and render active party service. Look at the transaction in its nakedness. The call of party distress was being heard from many States. The exigency was great. Something must be done that would have a tonic effect upon party workers everywhere. The call was heeded by the spoilsmen in Washington. There was no time to give notice or to allow a hearing. There was no time for inquiry into the antecedents of the new appointees. There was no time for anything but a quick step upon the path of reaction, toward the condition of demoralized service, general inefficiency, and political corruption which was the condition formerly existing here.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I should like to know more about the proceedings in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I have not the time to go into that. Nor have I the time to do more than merely refer to a statement headlined in the newspapers this morning to the effect that the President's order is explained and accounted for by a transaction which took place in the bureau in July. That transaction involved the dropping from the roll of six or seven hundred employees, in line with carrying out the policy of economy which is so constantly and urgently insisted on. I should not forget to say that among those dropped from the roll was Mr. Perry, who has, by being appointed assistant director, become a beneficiary of the order of March 31. Hill director and Perry assistant director!

It is stated in substance that the July occurrence was of such nature as to fully warrant the President in issuing the order of March 31. But the simple facts are that the action of the Director of the Bureau in July was not only within the law but was sanctioned in advance by the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; and that when protests were made the Secretary of the Treasury appointed a committee, with the Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. Crissinger, as its chairman, to look into the matter and make a report, which last September made a report which I shall attach to my remarks, giving the action of Director Wilmeth sweeping approval.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman is incorporating that in his remarks will he not incorporate sufficient of the proceedings in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in the Record to give us more information?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. If I did so, I might be charged, as another Member on a former occasion was charged, with putting in the Record something it should not contain. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, since the President's order was issued some fool friend of his, from whom he should pray to be delivered, predicting that similar action would be taken in many other directions, said that the purpose is to "Hardingize" the executive departments of the Government, just as some one else has said that there is a purpose to "Newberryize" the legislative department of the Government. If such a program should ever be fully consummated, this will cease to be a government of law and will become a government of men, of the most unworthy men, guided wholly by their selfish and predatory instincts. There will be a weakening of the foundation on which rests

liberty regulated by law. The golden age of the Republic will have passed and the golden opportunity of the agitator, the communist, and the Bolshevik will have come. [Applause.]

The resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 319.

Whereas, pursuant to an order of the President, issued the afternoon of March 31, and immediately effective, there was a wholesale removal of responsible officials of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the appointment of other officials in their stead; and

Whereas the order was made notwithstanding the law which provides "that no person in the classified civil service of the United States shall be removed therefrom except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of said service and for reasons given in writing, and the person whose removal is sought shall have notice of the same and of any charges preferred against him, and be furnished with a copy thereof, and also be allowed a reasonable time for personally answering the same in writing, and affidavits in support thereof"; and

Whereas previous to being notified of their sudden dismissal by a letter from the Secretary to the President, accompanied by a copy of the President's order, none of the said persons, so far as they were aware, had been complained of to the Secretary of the Treasury, to whose department the Bureau of Engraving and Printing belongs, or complained of by him, or otherwise made the subject of complaint; and

Whereas the order recites that the action of the President dismissing the said persons was taken "for the good of the service," which carries the implication that the officials removed had been guilty of misconduct, which is a grave injustice to them if, as is alleged to be the fact, they are persons of capacity, character, and experience who have discharged their duties faithfully and efficiently, some of them being officials whose inventions and improvements have been freely used by the Government to its great advantage, some of them having heretofore declined attractive offers of private employment because of their devotion to the interests of the Government, and some of them being war veterans; and

Whereas it was stated by the press at the time the order was issued that it was approved by the Attorney General, who was then in conference with the President, and it is now similarly stated that the Attorney General will cause an *ex parte* investigation of conditions in the bureau for the purpose, apparently, of determining whether the order, already executed, was justified by the facts; and

Whereas in view of his recent utterances, which show that he is hostile to the general policy embodied in the civil service law, such an investigation made and any decision promulgated by the Attorney General would hardly inspire public confidence; and

Whereas it is in every sense proper and desirable that there should be a thorough and impartial inquiry into every feature of the transaction in question: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker appoint a committee of five members who shall ascertain and report:

The specific facts and reasons upon which the order is based, and by what, if any, real investigation it was preceded; whether the persons removed, or any of them, have failed in the performance of their duties; whether there is ground for believing that the good of the service is likely to be promoted by their removal or by the new appointments; and whether or not the facts indicate that the order may be regarded as a step in the direction of a return to the discredited spoils system by disregarding the spirit and, as is also claimed, the letter of the civil service law.

The report of the Crissinger committee is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 7, 1921.

To the honorable the SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

SIR: The undersigned, constituting the committee named by you on July 20, 1921, "for the purpose of considering the protests of certain employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing against their release from employment in that bureau," respectfully report as follows:

The committee has carefully investigated these protests to the fullest extent it deemed necessary or requisite to carry out your instructions, and finds as follows:

1. That there was not only a legitimate reason but an urgent necessity for a reduction in the force of this bureau to the extent to which it was actually reduced.
2. That before any employees were discharged the director of the bureau put into effect the following rules to be observed in determining what employees should be dismissed:
 - (1) Drop employees regardless of term of service whose records are poor, involving inefficiency, inattention to duty, tardiness, excessive loss of time, agitators, and trouble makers.
 - (2) Drop, without prejudice, married women whose husbands are employed in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing or in other branches of the Government service at a good salary.
 - (3) Drop, without prejudice, those employees most recently appointed.
 - (4) Furlough indefinitely, but subject to recall to duty within the period of a year, employees whose services are not now needed but whose efficiency and attention to duty have been such as to make their services desirable. This will enable the bureau to draw recruits from a trained and experienced force.
3. That making reasonable allowance for the human element in the relations between the employees and their next immediate superiors, these rules were apparently so observed as to produce as little individual injustice as could be expected in dealing with so many cases.
4. That the reduction was a real one and not a pretended one for the purpose of putting other more favored employees in the places of those released.
5. The committee therefore recommends that said protests, and all of them, be disallowed, and that the applications of the protestants, or any of them, for immediate reinstatement should not receive favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted.

D. R. CRISSINGER, *Chairman*.
WILLIAM P. ABBOTT.
W. G. PLATT.
S. R. JACOBS.
CHAS. STEVENSON.
J. E. HARPER, *Secretary*.

Approved:
A. W. MELLON, *Secretary*.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, there is at least one comforting thing about the present debate upon the Navy bill, and that is that the issue presented by the measure is entirely clear and narrow. It is this: Is it possible with 67,000 enlisted men to maintain, during the ensuing fiscal year, a well-balanced treaty Navy, with all of the auxiliaries that are appropriate to the treaty Navy? That issue is answered squarely in the affirmative by the majority of the Committee on Appropriations, and it is answered squarely in the negative by the minority of the Committee on Appropriations.

Most of us in the House, myself more than many, perhaps more than most, are not experts on great questions of naval policy; we are not able of our own knowledge to answer these questions. It is a question of fact that is now before us, but it is an extremely complicated question of fact. What are we to do? I assume that like myself there are many men in this body anxious to do the right thing, who have looked about to see where they could get the most reliable and authentic information which would enable them to make up their minds. When I am seeking light on any legislative question my first inclination is to turn to the men in this House who know most about the subject under discussion. Without wishing to belittle the information of other Members of this House, I should place in the first rank on naval questions the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] and the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT]. Mr. KELLEY has devoted himself diligently and effectively to a study of the Navy during the entire time I have been a Member of the House, and nobody disputes his ability or his power in presenting his case.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan tells us flatly, vigorously, and emphatically that there is no doubt that the bill now before us is sufficient to support the treaty Navy. On the other hand, we turn to Mr. PADGETT, absolutely, absolutely trustworthy in every respect, beloved by the membership of this House, and a man who has served on the Committee on Naval Affairs for 18 years and who has presided over the Committee on Naval Affairs as chairman for 8 years. What does he tell us? I ask you to turn, those of you who did not hear his speech day before yesterday, to page 5247 of the RECORD of this morning. He says:

I want to say to you that in my honest judgment the bill as reported not only fails to maintain that standard—

The treaty standard—

but will bring the Navy of the United States from a position of five to a position of not exceeding three.

That is Mr. PADGETT's judgment, after nearly a score of years of familiarity with naval questions.

So we have Dr. KELLEY of Michigan on one side, Dr. PADGETT on the other side, admirable men both, taking diametrically opposite positions upon this matter that is of such very great importance to the entire country, a matter as to which every Member of this House, I know, wants to cast the right and proper vote for the national welfare. What are we to do when doctors disagree? We want to get certain and accurate information, and we are confronted with an impasse between the two gentlemen whom I have quoted. What did the Secretary of State do? And, by the way, if any criticism attaches to anyone for the Hughes letter which was read from the Clerk's desk yesterday, I suspect it should attach to me. I asked the Secretary of State a civil question, because of the fact that he had been chairman of the Conference on Limitation of Armament, and like a civil gentleman he answered, stating his opinion. What does the Secretary of State say upon this question? He says:

I have questioned the naval experts with whom the American delegates consulted during the recent conference, and whom we found both accurate and in sympathy with the principle of limitation by agreement, and I am advised that the proposed number of enlisted men is far below the number required to maintain our Navy upon the basis contemplated by the treaty.

The Secretary of State says frankly that he can not of his own knowledge say whether 67,000 or 86,000 or 96,000 is the proper number to maintain the treaty ratio. But he does what he did all through the arms conference—he goes to the men that he considers the best men in the Navy Department, men whom he has found reliable and accurate in the past, men whom he has found not overfond of a swollen Navy, and he takes their judgment as to what is necessary to maintain the treaty Navy. They tell him that the proposal of the bill is wholly insufficient. He accepts their judgment.

Is there anything else, gentlemen of the committee, that we can do? Must we not go to those who have made their life work trying to learn about the Navy and about what can be done with the Navy Department and with the men and the matériel that the Congress of the United States gives them to work with as best they can?

I do not need on this floor to repeat what has been said over and over again as to what will happen if the Navy is to comprise 67,000 men. It will be seriously curtailed and crippled. There is one point I want to make that I think has not been stressed; perhaps it has not even been mentioned at all during the discussion.

Remember, if you please, gentlemen, this very important fact, that the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. We can say how large a Navy he may have, but he alone—and in naval matters the Secretary of the Navy, of course, acts under him—he alone can say what use shall be made of the Navy which the Congress of the United States gives him.

We saw in connection with the Army debate an attempt to limit the use that the President and the Secretary of War could make of the forces for which the Congress was to appropriate. The House of Representatives, by unanimous vote, settled, and, I hope, settled permanently, that this Congress is not going to run the details of the Army. [Applause.] Absolutely the same thing applies here. We can say how many men the Navy shall enlist, how many men shall be granted to the Navy for the ensuing fiscal year; but, gentlemen, we can not say what the use shall be that the Secretary of the Navy deems most fitting.

I assume, perhaps, that there is no real controversy about the proposition I have advanced. I am glad to notice that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], recognizes this fundamental fact very definitely in the course of the hearings. On pages 385 and 386 of the hearings the discussion was proceeding between Secretary Denby and Mr. KELLEY as to the proper allocation of a Navy of 50,000 men for sea duty. Mr. Denby explained what the viewpoint of the Navy would be as to the detailed use of whatever Navy Congress should give. Mr. KELLEY said, "That is a matter for you entirely." And I see him nod his head in affirmation that that was his intent and that he stands upon that position to-day.

Thus, we have this situation: That the Secretary of the Navy has announced that with 67,000 men he will not be able to keep in commission more than 13 capital ships. He has announced that that will be his program, that that will be his viewpoint, and that that will be the most efficient use from the standpoint of national defense which can be made of the 67,000 men proposed in this bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What does the gentleman say to the proposition that with only 50,000 men he is now keeping what he regards as an 18-battleship fleet in commission?

Mr. ROGERS. I shall not deal with the past. I want the best possible navy in the future. The Secretary of the Navy, if we give him only 67,000 men, will keep in commission only 13 capital ships instead of the 18 provided in the naval treaty.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, it does not make any difference whether you, if you were Secretary of the Navy, or I, if I were Secretary of the Navy, would undertake to maintain 18 capital ships with 67,000 men. The fact is, as we are told in the hearings over and over again, that the Secretary of the Navy, who is now on the job, will not deem it for the national well-being to maintain more than 13 capital ships with a force of 67,000 men.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. We determine the question of policy?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. May I ask the gentleman, is there anything now existing in the world that indicates that we shall need more than 13?

Mr. ROGERS. That is a very fundamental question which I have not time to answer in the remainder of my 20 minutes. I agree with what I understood to be the viewpoint of the gentleman yesterday, that the treaty does not obligate us to keep our naval strength up to the maximum provided therein. I think it would be a most calamitous day for this country, however, when the Congress of the United States voted to go below the treaty ratio. [Applause.]

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

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Assuming that the gentleman from Tennessee is right—and I think he is, that we are bound under the treaty, morally bound, not to exceed the 5-5-3 ratio—does not the gentleman think that at the time that treaty obligation was entered into we were morally bound to the American people to see that that obligation is met? [Applause.] And

what would the gentleman think, if a statement had been made at that time that France and England and Italy and Japan were joining together to prevent our getting a Navy of at least 5-5-3 ratio, would have been the reaction of this country?

Mr. ROGERS. If our delegates had agreed to a Navy the one-hundredth of 1 per cent less than that of any other power in the world they would have been swept out of existence by a storm of public disapproval. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, I wish I could deal a little further with the ratio matter along the line I have already discussed it; but I must pass to another aspect of the question. In order to know what our ratio should be for the ensuing year it is manifestly necessary for us to know what the program of the other powers is for the same fiscal year. How otherwise can we know what "5-5-3" really means? In other words, the agreement made two months ago is not in all respects an absolute agreement; it is an agreement involving the element of relativity. Hence it becomes instantly important for us to ascertain what the plans of Great Britain and Japan are for the ensuing fiscal year.

I confess, gentlemen, that I have been amazed as I looked through this volume of hearings, containing over 1,000 pages, going into the greatest detail on every conceivable subject which deal directly or indirectly with the Navy. I can not find a single line that shows what the personnel of the British and Japanese Navy is to-day or what it is likely to be in the next fiscal year. I hope that admission was inadvertent. I hope it was not intentional. But whether it was intentional or unintentional, it is a very serious defect that the evidence is lacking which ought to be officially before us to enable us to make up our minds. [Applause.]

I realize, I say, the importance of knowing what the British and Japanese strength will be, because otherwise we can not know what the first 5 is, what the second 5 is, and what the 3 is. We must know those facts. I have put in a good deal of my time in the last few weeks trying to get the facts. I had no ax to grind; I did not seek to establish one figure in preference to another figure. I simply desired to get correct information. I have talked with the Navy Department. I admit that I have talked with the Navy Department. It seemed to me that the best place to get information concerning the navies of the world is our Navy Department. As to Great Britain, the Navy Department has told me that the lowest figure which honestly and fairly compares with the 67,000 in this bill is 104,000 and some odd hundreds. That eliminates from the British figures the activities that ought to be eliminated in order to check up with our own figures. I shall print in the RECORD, if I can get permission, the details showing just how that figure is arrived at.

Gentlemen, 104,000 for the British Navy is a conservative figure. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], whom we all trust, has said (p. 5250) that the corresponding figure was at least 117,000. But I have stripped from the British figures everything that could present any possible question or doubt. I have discussed the figures backward and forward and crosswise with old admirals and with young lieutenant commanders in the United States Navy. They agree that the minimum comparative figure is 104,000. If they are not liars, gentlemen, I think this House ought to follow their statement on this simple question of fact. What other information have we than the information which they give? That information as to the British figure was cabled to the Navy Department by our naval attaché in London. The figures for Japan—68,252 enlisted men—were cabled to the Navy Department in Washington by our naval attaché in Tokyo. How in the world can we reject those figures unless we want to say that the men who gave them to us are liars?

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

Mr. ROGERS. I can not yield now.

There is nothing in the hearings that gives a basis for any estimate whatever. I desire to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] if he is willing to answer me as to where he gets the suggestion that my figures, as they are given, are not accurate?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that the figures which I gave the House relative to the British strength for the coming year are matters of common knowledge printed generally in the British daily press and Army and Navy press as matters of news, and, in the second place, were verified to such an extent as was possible.

Mr. ROGERS. Does the gentleman mean the British Embassy?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I shall not quote any particular authority in relation to matters of an international character. The public reports are sufficient.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman answer me this question, whether he has been in direct personal contact with the British Embassy or the Japanese Embassy?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I refuse to answer any such question.

Mr. ROGERS. Very well, gentlemen. I prefer to have the program for the American Navy decided in the American Navy Department rather than in the embassies of Japan or Great Britain. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I should like to ask the gentleman where our representatives abroad would get their information relative to the Japanese or British naval forces or the appropriations carried for their support?

Mr. ROGERS. They would get it in the regular way, through regular channels. It is their job to get it. I do not want backstairs information from the chancelleries of Europe obtained in Washington. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman think that an examination of the book estimates of a foreign government would fall within the category which he has described?

Mr. ROGERS. I have asked the gentleman what I regard as a fair question. The gentleman does not care to answer it, and I prefer to proceed to another phase of my remarks.

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

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman want a little more time? I took a little of his time.

Mr. ROGERS. I think the gentleman has been most kind and most fair to me, and I am obliged to him.

The following is the statement referred to, comparing the enlisted personnel of Great Britain, the United States, and Japan:

	Average for year, including apprentice seamen.	Colonial navy.	Aviation (one-third of total).	Enlisted men, average per year.
Great Britain.....	87,549	7,000	10,000	104,549
United States (including aviation).....	67,000			67,000
Japan.....	68,252			68,252

In addition we carry 1,600 men in communication. Great Britain uses civilians.

In addition we man auxiliaries with regular enlisted men. Great Britain mans a considerable percentage of hers with naval reserve. British so employed are estimated at 4,000. Therefore it would be proper to add 5,600 more to figures of Great Britain.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FAVROT].

Mr. FAVROT. Mr. Chairman, in a matter of the importance of the one before us, of such vital moment to the country, a matter upon the correct determination of which may depend our future weal or woe, if we err we should err upon the side of safety. It is better that our naval personnel be too many than too few. It is better that there be no question, no doubt as to the adequacy of our Naval Establishment, because, Mr. Chairman, we are and we always will be dependent upon our Navy for our national defense. If our Navy is strong enough, no enemy can invade us. If our Navy is destroyed, no enemy need invade us. With the destruction of our seacoast cities and the blockade of our coasts, it would not be necessary to land a man upon American soil. Realizing our dependence upon the Navy, and in order that we might maintain an adequate Navy and at the same time save the enormous expense of competitive building, we brought about a conference of the naval powers, which conference fixed the relative naval strength to be maintained by those powers. The naval force for which we stipulated and which was allotted us was, in the opinion of our conferees and of our naval experts, the least consistent with the national safety, and it was the expectation of our conferees, and it should be the duty of this Congress, so to provide that we maintain the full naval strength permitted us by that treaty.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations propose to reduce our naval force, not only considerably below that which is permitted us to considerably less than that which was allotted to us but considerably less than that deemed essential to the Nation's safety. That conference fixed the naval ratio for ourselves, Great Britain, and Japan at 5-5-3. But unless we are to take as false the statement of the Secretary of the Navy, unless we are to take as false the statements of our naval experts, unless we are to take as false the statements of the men who in the time of war must command our Navy and upon

whom will fall the responsibility for the conduct of that Navy—and I do not believe these gentlemen have conspired deliberately to deceive this Congress and the American people—unless we take their statements as false the Committee on Appropriations propose to change that ratio, and by reducing our naval personnel propose to reduce our naval strength not only far below that of Great Britain but below even that of Japan, for, Mr. Chairman, the effectiveness of a Navy is dependent upon the effectiveness of its personnel, and an inadequate personnel means an inadequate Navy.

This proposed reduction is urged upon the usual ground of economy. I believe in economy, but not economy at the peril of the Nation's safety. Let me ask you, What economy can there be in an inadequate Navy? An inadequate Navy is worse than no Navy, because it represents a useless expenditure.

There could be no greater extravagance, no more criminal waste of the public money than the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars for the maintenance of an inadequate and practically useless navy; because a navy which falls in any degree short of the full power to serve the purposes of a navy is a useless navy. Gentlemen point to our enormous expenditure and to the great burden of taxation borne by the American people; but they fail to state that the greater part of that expenditure and of the resultant burden of taxation is chargeable to our unpreparedness and to the hysterical haste and hysterical waste with which we were compelled to prepare for war after we were in war. [Applause.] Why, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the whole of that war expenditure may be charged to our unpreparedness, for had we been prepared as we should have been we would not have been compelled to enter this war. [Applause.] Not only is the whole of that war expenditure chargeable to our unpreparedness but to that unpreparedness may be charged the death upon foreign soil of thousands of the best of our young manhood. Why, right across the river at Arlington may be seen thousands of little monuments, each marking the last resting place of an American boy who gave his life a sacrifice to our economy.

Mr. Chairman, why did we jeopardize safety for economy? What was the reason for our almost pitiable state of unpreparedness? It was that upon every occasion the membership of this House had been assured and had been convinced that war was no longer possible.

Mr. McARTHUR. Not all of us.

Mr. FAVROT. And now, notwithstanding our recent experience, notwithstanding the smoke of battle has hardly cleared away, notwithstanding that the world has not regained its equilibrium, notwithstanding the ruin wrought is unrepaired and the wreckage unremoved, gentlemen will calmly assure us that war is not a possibility, and to make provision for such a possibility would be extravagant folly.

Mr. Chairman, as long as the world is populated by men and not by angels there will be war. Until there is eradicated from man's nature human passions and human greed, pride and prejudice, there will be war. If war is not impossible, let me ask why any navy, why the expenditure carried in this bill for a navy? Why did we build any navy but for war? The only justification for this expenditure for the Navy is the national defense and national safety. But there can be no justification for an appropriation of hundreds of millions of dollars for the maintenance of a navy inadequate to maintain that defense or to insure that safety. [Applause.]

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

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I feel that everything possible for and against this measure has already been said on this floor. It would be far from me, with as little knowledge as I profess to have of the technicalities of the maintenance of a navy, to endeavor to add one bit of information to that which the House has already been favored.

As I have listened several days to this debate, it seemed to me that those for and against the so-called large Navy are aiming at the same point—they both want efficiency. Whether it is accomplished under the methods designated by the very able and experienced chairman of the subcommittee, my good friend, Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, or whether it is accomplished under the method as designated by other speakers, principally the former chairman of the committee [Mr. PADGETT], we Members of the House must place in the balance and decide.

We have the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] informing us that 67,000 enlisted men will keep up the personnel and detailed work of the Navy. On the other hand, are these other gentlemen supported by the authority of the department itself in saying that efficiency will suffer if the number is reduced

below 87,000. With all due respect to a fellow Member of the House, it has been my experience that, as a general rule, the proper course to follow is that of the responsible administrative head. The responsible administrative head is the Secretary of the Navy, and he has very plainly told us that if the number of enlisted men is reduced to 67,000, the ratio between the Governments will be 2-5-3 rather than 5-5-3, as agreed upon in the conference so lately held in this city. It seems to me, therefore, that we are not only obligated to follow the advice of the department from its experience and responsibility but likewise from the fact that the head of the department represents the attitude of the administration in its relations with the foreign Governments. Certainly we all desire to carry out the principles laid down in the treaties, and the opinion of the department accordingly must be given additional weight.

The gentlemen on the opposite side have made more or less objection to interference from the administrative or executive branches of the Government. Interference! Why, what a ridiculous description of advice offered to us! It is solely and simply in cooperation for the best interests of this Government. It seems to me we lack appreciation of the relative position of the executive and legislative when, in response to a letter from one of our own Members, a member of the Cabinet gives his views as to what should be done to carry out the purport, so far as our Government is concerned, of the Limitation of Armament Conference. I can not help coming to the conclusion, Mr. Chairman, in spite of the fact that I invariably favor economy in appropriations, and have so voted time and time again in this House; I can not help coming to the conclusion that it would be false economy on our part to accept the proportions as laid down in the armament conference and then not accept or adopt with that the practical ends suggested by the department itself, necessary to accomplish these results. In other words, we ought not to have a divided responsibility.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman state what number he favors?

Mr. TREADWAY. I have talked with my colleagues on that score and I am inclined to think that there should be no division of interests as to the proper number.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The Navy wants 96,000 and the General Board 120,000; what does the gentleman want?

Mr. TREADWAY. I am prepared to vote for such an amendment as will be offered by the gentleman from Oregon establishing the number at 86,000, which I understand is sufficient.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Who favors that number outside of the House of Representatives?

Mr. TREADWAY. If we have at any point a compromise, I prefer to compromise at the higher rather than the lower number. The gentleman from Michigan is suggesting the very minimum number, and I would prefer, in order to reach the wishes of the department as nearly as possible, to make the number 86,000. Evidently the department will be satisfied if it can get 86,000 rather than 67,000, which the gentleman recommends.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Has the Secretary of the Navy said that he would be satisfied with 86,000 men?

Mr. TREADWAY. He has not said so to me, and I have not asked him.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Has the General Board said that it would be satisfied with 86,000?

Mr. TREADWAY. No doubt, all officials will appear satisfied with what Congress allows, but we want to act with some degree of cooperation and with a proper interpretation of the obligations we have assumed through the recently adopted treaties.

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

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield him one minute more. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] insists with all his might and main that we must follow the advice of the experts and then turns around and disregards them all.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask just one question? I know that the gentleman is very clever, both from the standpoint of information and the power of repartee, but, nevertheless, have any of the experts asked for an amount as low as 67,000?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think not, except, possibly, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM], if he might be included in the list of experts, or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE]. I think he wants the higher number, perhaps, even more than Mr. TINKHAM.

Mr. VARE. I am hopeful of getting 86,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, the gentleman himself, then, has abandoned the experts, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRAND]. [Applause.]

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I feel I must beg pardon of the committee, and particularly those who are so vitally interested in the naval bill, for getting time in which to discuss matters not germane to this great issue.

I had what I thought was a fairly good presentation of my reasons for voting for the bonus bill at the time the vote was had upon that bill, but I did not have the opportunity to present my views at that time because of the fact that Mr. Speaker GILLET, whom everyone on both sides holds in high esteem, guillotined my friend from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD] to such an extent that I lost out on the time which he had kindly allotted to me. It will be remembered we had two hours on each side, and the gentleman, believing he would have control of his two hours, allotted me time to speak on that day, but after he signed the minority report the Speaker limited him to 30 minutes, whereby there was but five minutes left for me. I declined to use this short time and also the privilege of extension of remarks. For this reason I wish to use the time now allotted to me by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] of delivering my speech to-day. Speaking out of order in this way is not without precedents in both the Senate and the House.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which the Republican Steering and Rules Committees agreed upon in the interest of the ex-service men and which they propose to cram down the throats of the Democrats and those Republicans who in good faith are willing to enact bonus legislation which will be of substantial service to the ex-service men will not prove satisfactory to them. Under the gag rule adopted by the authors of this measure, for which these two committees are responsible, it will be utterly impossible for any real friend of the soldier to submit any amendment of any character whatever in behalf of the soldier. Under the autocratic tactics of the Republican machine we were prohibited from submitting any amendment in behalf of either the soldier or the taxpayer.

This is an open confession on the part of the Republicans not only of their unfairness toward the Democrats, as well as the ex-service men, but of their impotence in dealing with this legislation. It would seem that with a majority of 170 over the Democrats they would not fear to permit the Democrats to offer amendments thereto and allow them to be considered upon their merits.

The Democrats were therefore confronted with the proposition forced upon them by these steam-roller committees of either voting for their bill or voting against it, which if defeated means no bonus legislation whatever. We were compelled to take it like it is; otherwise leave the soldiers without anything.

The bill offers five plans for adjustment, either one of which may be chosen by the veteran, but he is limited to the single plan chosen. They are as follows:

(1) "Adjusted-service pay," which consists of \$1 per day for each day of "home service" in excess of 60 days and \$1.25 for each day of "overseas service" between April 5, 1917, and July 1, 1919, the aggregate not to exceed \$500 for a veteran who performed no "overseas service" or \$625 for one who did perform such service. This applies to all veterans of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps up to and including the rank of captain in the Army and lieutenant in the Navy. There is a long list of exceptions of persons and classes who do not receive the benefits of the bill. It is only available to those whose adjusted-service pay does not exceed \$50.

(2) "Adjusted-service certificate": The veteran receives a certificate of a face value equal to his adjusted-service pay, increased by 25 per cent, plus interest for 20 years at 4½ per cent compounded annually and payable 20 years after date of application. The total will amount to 3.015 times the adjusted-service pay. Provision is made for the negotiation of these certificates.

(3) "Vocational training aid": The veteran may receive \$1.75 for each day of his attendance on a course of vocational training, the total payment not to exceed 140 per cent of the amount of adjusted-service pay to which he might be entitled.

(4) "Farm or home aid": The veteran may receive in one payment or in installments an amount equal to his adjusted-service pay, plus 25 per cent, for the purpose, and that purpose only, of making improvements on a city or suburban home or a farm, or to purchase or make payments on such a home or farm.

(5) "Land-settlement aid": The veteran may apply his adjusted-service pay to the first payment on a farm within projects established in the various States by the "national veterans' settlement board," to be followed by small annual in-

stallment payments running over a period not exceeding 40 years."

Fair dealing demands that we should have a free and full consideration of this question, with the privilege of submitting amendments favorable to the taxpayers and the soldiers of America, both of whom contributed to the downfall of the German war machine.

I am opposed to bonus legislation which increases postage, levies a tax on gasoline, automobiles, parcel-post packages, and bank checks. I am likewise opposed to a sales tax. Taxes like these are the kind the Republican rulers and leaders first proposed. They knew that such taxes are of a character which the rich classes want, because it relieves them and puts the burden on the poor and the taxpayers of moderate means. The Republican Party has always been in favor of the classes and against the masses of the people. This is its record since its organization. It is this rich crowd whom they are serving who furnished the money in the last presidential election which put the present administration in power.

Some of this same crowd are to-day, and have been for 18 months, fighting Henry Ford's offer to the Government to take over Muscle Shoals. If his proposition is accepted by the Government the farmers of the United States will be able to purchase nitrate at half the cost they are now having to pay the fertilizer companies for nitrate. I think it the duty of the Government to accept Mr. Ford's proposition and do so without further delay, because I believe if he accomplishes what he proposes to do it will be the greatest blessing which can be bestowed upon the farmer, who at this time above all others stands in greatest need of real assistance. Some friend writing in April 22 issue of the Illustrated World states that "the destiny of mankind is at stake," and if Mr. Ford's proposition is accepted the results which he will obtain from the control of Muscle Shoals will "open the eyes of the world."

Our people are already taxed to death with State, county, and local taxes. I am unalterably opposed to increasing their burdens whether by State or Federal authorities.

I am in favor of bonus legislation for the ex-service men provided the rank and file of the people are not taxed to pay the same.

I am in favor of a bonus for the soldiers, but I think the people who made fortunes on account of their service, sacrifice, and suffering should pay it.

There are several sources from which the money to compensate these soldiers may be obtained without working any hardship upon the people generally and without levying any Federal taxes upon them.

First, I think it the solemn duty of this administration to call upon the European countries who owe us over eleven thousand million dollars to make sufficient payment on their indebtedness to provide this bonus for our soldier boys. This administration should not hesitate to make this demand for many reasons and particularly because some of these countries instead of paying what they owe us are using our money to pay a bonus to their soldiers. Such demand should be speedily enforced because it was our soldiers who went over there and saved these nations from annihilation by the German war machine.

The loans this Government made to the foreign Governments during the war are as follows:

Belgium	\$347,691,566.23
Cuba	8,147,000.00
Czechoslovakia	61,256,206.74
France	2,950,762,938.19
Great Britain	4,166,318,358.44
Greece	15,000,000.00
Italy	1,648,034,050.90
Liberia	26,000.00
Rumania	23,203,819.52
Russia	187,729,750.00
Serbia	26,175,139.22

Total 9,434,346,829.24

Among other indebtedness besides these loans which foreign Governments owe this country are the following, being obligations on account of the sale of surplus war supplies:

Belgium	\$29,872,732.54
Czechoslovakia	20,612,300.11
Estonia	12,213,377.88
France	407,341,145.01
Latvia	2,521,869.32
Lithuania	4,159,491.96
Nicaragua	170,585.35
Poland	57,369,610.59
Rumania	12,922,675.42
Russia	406,082.30
Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes	24,978,020.99

Total 572,567,891.47

There is no valid reason on earth why these foreign countries should not be required forthwith to pay the interest of this indebtedness, and such portion of the principal as may be neces-

sary to provide a bonus for our soldiers. In my judgment, this would be done were it not for the fact that a group of international bankers hold obligations against some of these foreign Governments amounting to five thousand million dollars, and the further fact that those high in authority in this Government have a common understanding that a postponement of the indebtedness due us will be made until the indebtedness due by these foreign Governments to this group of international bankers has been discharged and fully paid. I think this is the real motive for the introduction of the refunding bill which passed Congress a few weeks ago. This bill gives the Refunding Commission authority to postpone the payment of these debts due the United States for 25 years. This is the first step looking to cancellation. It is the offspring of these international bankers, conceived in Wall Street, and brought forth by a Republican Congress. These men have banks not only in New York but in the leading cities of the world, among others, in Paris, London, and Berlin.

It is a remarkable incident and, to my mind, a very significant one that in December, 1921, at Cleveland, Ohio, Mr. Justice Clarke, a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, declared to the world that these war debts should be promptly and wholly canceled.

Recently Mr. Otto H. Kahn, an international banker, of New York, made a speech, which is now being circulated throughout the country, in which he stated:

I would cancel the allied war debts to America to the extent that they are war debts, etc. I would cancel all the allied war debts to us, regardless of the solvency of the nation concerned.

It may be, in order to keep the people of the United States in a passive and acquiescent mood, that these foreign Governments will pay part of the interest due us, but it is my opinion if any part of the principal of our debts is ever paid it will not be until this group of international bankers get every dollar of their money.

I contend that the promise to pay which this Government now holds against these foreign Governments for the loans made them is as binding and valid as any contract which this Refunding Commission may make with these foreign Governments in regard to the payment of these loans.

The obligation we hold against Great Britain, for instance, is worded as follows:

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, for value received, promises to pay to the United States of America, or assigns, the sum of _____ on demand, with interest from the date hereof, at the rate of 5 per cent per annum. Such principal sum and the interest thereon will be paid at the Subtreasury of the United States in New York, or, at the option of the holder, at the Treasury of the United States in Washington, in gold coin of the United States of America of the present standard of weight and fineness, or, at the option of the holder, at the Bank of England, London, England, in pounds sterling at the fixed rate of \$4.76 $\frac{1}{2}$ to the pound sterling, and at any such place of payment without deduction for any British taxes, present or future.

This certificate will be converted by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, if requested by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America, at par, with an adjustment of accrued interest, into an equal par amount of 5 per cent convertible gold bonds of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland conforming to the provisions of acts of Congress of the United States known, respectively, as second Liberty bond act, third Liberty bond act, and fourth Liberty bond act.

My contention is that this is a valid obligation and as legal a contract to pay this money as can be written. It is as binding as any bond or promissory note or any other written obligation which this Refunding Commission may be able to secure from these foreign Governments. If Great Britain and other Governments who owe us are not honest enough to pay the debts under the present obligations we hold against them, they will not make payment under any other sort of written obligation which this Refunding Commission may take from them.

France can pay us if she wants to, because she is maintaining the greatest land force of any nation on earth. She has an army of 700,000 at home and, it is said, 4,000,000 in Africa.

France is financing a Polish army of 400,000 and is spending hundreds of millions upon military forces in Africa and Asia.

England is spending millions on military and naval armament and expeditions in Egypt and in the Near East and in maintaining her conquest of Constantinople.

If France and England would pay the accrued interest on the money they owe us, no American taxpayer would ever have to pay a cent to provide for this bonus.

These two countries are using money that belongs to us, and everything ought to be done by this administration, short of war, to compel them to pay at least a sufficient amount of their indebtedness to compensate the American soldiers for the services rendered by them and which helped to save these nations from destruction.

These European nations were practically exhausted and the war was almost won by Germany when the American soldiers

arrived in France. Marshal Joffre a little less than five years ago appealed to America, saying: "Send us men or Germany will win." It was their entrance upon the battle fields which helped stem and turn the tide of the German hordes and which ultimately ended the war and saved the world from German dominion.

Second. If the Republicans decline to adopt this course, then public sentiment should require them to collect the money to meet the bonus requirements from those who profited and amassed fortunes during the war, and from other classes of people who became millionaires by operations of the war.

These classes, and not the people generally, should be taxed for the purpose of providing compensation for the ex-service men, and taxed to the bone if necessary.

I am heartily in favor of the position taken by the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee in the minority report submitted by Mr. KITCHIN, which declares that whatever kind of adjusted compensation Congress shall deem justly due the World War veteran should be paid out of the taxes specifically levied for such purpose upon the big incomes of the millionaires and multimillionaires, whose number has more than trebled and whose wealth has increased to the extent of many billions of dollars since the beginning of the war, and upon the excessive profits of the big corporations, who have plundered and profited upon the people and the Government since January 1, 1916, to the extent of over \$40,000,000,000 of net profits. These millionaires and multimillionaires and corporations were the real financial beneficiaries of the war. It is generally conceded that 23,000 new millionaires were made by reason of selfish operations during the war and the result of the war.

Since the Republican Congress and administration, in its last tax bill, relieved from taxation the millionaires and multimillionaires to the extent of over \$90,000,000 yearly, as estimated by the Treasury Department, on their big incomes, why can not the Republicans now be equally as generous to the brave boys who made sacrifices, who braved the dangers of the sea and the trenches, and who took the risks of life for their country and their flag, and make these big incomes of the millionaire profiteers, who without making a sacrifice, without enduring a hardship, without incurring a risk, remained at home in peace and safety and collected out of the people and the Government billions of blood money, pay whatever sort of bonus Congress may pass? They were filling their coffers here while the boys were spilling their blood there.

As Robert Haines says in Treat 'Em Square for April, 1922:

It will only take a few millions of the war profits of the billions which profiteers have gained. It will not take from them their capital; it will not take a cent away from their principal, but it will take a little bit of the enormous profits that they have made because those boys were able to win the war.

What did the boys give? Did they give simply the interest on their lives? Did the boys go overseas and simply give a little bit of the profits of their daily earnings? Not a bit of it. These boys threw their capital, everything on God's earth they had, into the balance. They threw their lives in the scales in order that the great profiteers as well as the remainder of the citizenship of the country might live on in happiness.

I contend that the money to take care of the bonus for the soldiers should be taken from these classes of people and out of them alone, if the Republicans refuse to make demand for payment of what the European Governments owe us.

Since the armistice was signed Congress has taken care of every other class of people who claimed to have sustained losses by reason of this war. If it was right for Congress to authorize the appropriation of \$3,000,000,000 to reimburse war contractors who entered into contracts with the Government during the war, which were not fully executed, why is it not right to appropriate a reasonable amount to reimburse the soldiers who sustained losses by reason of this same war? Congress appropriated to the war mineral relief people \$40,000,000 and to the Shipping Board contractors \$50,000,000 and to the railroads \$500,000,000, all upon the contention that it was for the purpose of reimbursing these people for losses on account of the war. If it was honest and just for Congress to take care of these classes of people, how in the name of common sense can any reasonable man object, if the tax is properly raised, to enacting legislation which in a measure reimburses the soldiers for the losses they sustained?

The leaders of the Republican Party now in control of this administration may fool themselves, but they will never be able to make the people of the United States believe that some scheme of legislation could not be devised which would take care of the bonus proposition and do impartial justice to the soldiers without taxing the citizens who made nothing out of this war.

Those who are opposing any bonus legislation should not be unmindful of the fact that several of the principal countries which participated in the war with Germany have already provided a bonus for their soldiers. They are as follows:

Canada pays.....	\$634.40
Belgium pays.....	492.00
France pays.....	233.53
England pays.....	189.54
Italy pays.....	73.34

Australia and New Zealand have also provided a bonus for their soldiers, though I have not accurate information as to the amount paid. If the people of these countries, loaded down with heavy indebtedness, and who have suffered most during the war with Germany, are willing and can afford to extend their soldiers compensation for the losses sustained by them, why should not the United States, the richest Nation on earth, be equally generous with her soldiers?

One who has compiled statistics upon the subject says:

With the exception of Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi every State in the Union has passed legislation giving to or authorizing for World War veterans aid, exemptions, or benefits of some kind.

Over 50 per cent of our soldiers were less than 20 years of age—mere schoolboys—and most of them were taken from the farms. A fair percentage of these boys were sons of parents who were people of moderate means; most of them were engaged in manual labor on the farm and in other vocations, many of whose parents were dependent upon their boys for support. In most cases these boys were taken from their homes without the consent of their parents. While many did not protest, few mothers of these boys voluntarily consented that they should go to France. In passing upon the merits of this question I can not forget the scenes enacted in thousands of homes of the people of my district and State when boys were leaving mother, father, and friends, and, so far as they knew, never to return. The mothers of these boys, it seems to me, are entitled to some consideration for the suffering and anguish they endured. Many of them have reached the summit of life and are going down the hill toward the setting sun. I would vote for bonus legislation on their account alone, provided the tax to pay the same is raised as I have indicated. "Mother" is the sweetest word the pen of mortal man ever wrote, and hers is the sweetest face the artist's brush ever painted. Her love and prayers followed her boy wherever duty called and wherever the flag waved, whether in camp and cantonment, on the high seas, or—

On Flanders field, where poppies blow
Between the crosses row on row.

[Applause.]

Our soldiers are entitled to this bonus, not as a price for patriotism but as a compensation for the losses they sustained.

The word bonus has a well-defined legal meaning. According to the definition contained in Black's Law Dictionary, a standard authority everywhere:

A bonus is not a gift or gratuity but a sum paid for service or upon some other consideration, but in addition to or in excess of that which would ordinarily be given.

When the private soldiers were called to the service of their country and were compelled by this Government to leave their homes and farms, the office, the factory, the store, and the shop, their means of making money for their own support and the support of those dependent upon them were destroyed, whereby loss and damage inevitably followed. The object of the bonus is to restore the status quo or place these soldiers in as good condition financially as they were when they were called to the colors. It should not be forgotten that these boys only received for their services a dollar or one dollar and twenty-five cents per day, when half of their pay was kept from them and sent to dependent relatives and 25 per cent of the same was retained for insurance, which left them practically only \$7.50 a month for their personal use.

I am in favor of legislation which requires a cash bonus paid to the soldiers, and I think it should be paid to them at a time when it will not interfere with the producers, nor in any wise interrupt the agricultural interests of the country. If it is paid in the fall of the year after the crops are harvested it will be properly invested or rapidly expended before the season opens up in the following year when farming preparations begin.

The payment of a cash bonus will increase circulation, which will be the means of relieving some distress among the poorer classes of both races in my district, as students upon the subject agree that \$1 in circulation pays \$5 of indebtedness.

Our people were in the wake of the avalanche of destruction which swept over the cotton-growing sections during the year 1920. The sudden and great slump in the price of cotton, brought about, as I heretofore charged, by the unwise policies adopted by the Federal reserve system during the year 1920, almost destroyed them. The deflation of currency, the contraction of credits, the calls for loans made by member banks of this system, the forced sale of cotton to pay advances thereon made by member banks, the withdrawal from circulation by the

Federal Reserve Board during the last 18 months of certificates amounting to \$1,500,000,000, wrought untold injury to people in all walks of life unprecedented in the history of the South.

Notwithstanding reports to the contrary, no person whose income is under \$5,000 will have to pay a cent additional tax on account of this bonus. The leaders and rulers of the Republican Party now in control of this Government are not entitled to any credit for this. It is due to public sentiment prevailing and made manifest among the agricultural and laboring interests of this Republic. If this Republican element had had their way about this legislation the consuming public and the men and women who toil for a living would bear this burden and not the rich. I do not mean to charge that all Republicans in Congress are thus disposed, but it is in keeping with the policy of the Republican Party in the past to take care of the rich and let the poor take care of themselves.

The service the private soldier rendered during this war is a priceless heritage which gold can not buy. When the peace of the world was imperiled by the strongest military machine ever organized, not only America but all of its allies put their faith in and relied upon the American soldier; when the universe was in travail on account of this war and the clank of arms and the rattle of iron throats of thundering guns were menacing the world, when the fate and destiny of this and other nations were in jeopardy all classes of people on two continents relied upon the American soldier. He was then the idol of the nations and the hope of the world, and nothing too good or praiseworthy could be said or written of him. To-day he seems to have lost his identity. While bank accounts are being balanced and coupons are being clipped, while fortunes are being estimated and the clink of gold rattles upon the marble counters of the war profiteers, the private soldier is unthought of in their calculations. During the war the bravery and patriotism of these boys were heralded in the press, and the pulpit, and in song and story. The waves of the oceans rolled in their praise and the surges of all the seas leaped in their glory.

Those who went to France endured suffering and sacrifices never before experienced by an American soldier. They are heroes of the greatest war of the ages, and yet when the proposition to compensate them for the losses sustained while helping to save the world against the greatest monster which ever undertook to conquer it their sacrifices seem to have been forgotten. It is true the war is over, the machine gun has ceased firing, the roar of the cannon is hushed, the earth is free of the deadly gas, the battle fields are quiet, and the rivers of the battle scenes flow with blood and dead bodies no more—and all hope forever—and a tired and exhausted world is laboring in its efforts to get back to the paths of peace. Yet the man behind the gun who helped to bring about these happy results stands, so far as this Congress is concerned, unthanked, unhonored, and unrewarded.

It is a mistake to forget these boys so soon, for it must not be forgotten that they were called to the service of their country that the doctrine of "Peace on earth and good will to men" might survive. Neither should we be unmindful, in dealing with them, of the injunction of the great Galilean first heard on the plains of Palestine, over 20 centuries ago, announced in that immortal sentence, "And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise." [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ANDREW].

Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask that there be read in my time as a part of my remarks the following resolution which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 325.

The following resolution was presented by Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

"Whereas the Congress provided in the act of August 9, 1921, for the establishment by the Veterans' Bureau of regional offices, to exercise such powers as could be performed lawfully under this act by the central office; and

"Whereas only a small proportion of the files and folders having to do with the claims of veterans in the several regions have as yet been transferred to the regional offices, and the regional offices are still under obligation to refer the majority of inquiries and claims to the central office for information or decision, with resultant and multiplying delays, uncertainty, and confusion.

"Resolved, That the Director of the Veterans' Bureau be, and he is hereby, requested to comply with the intent of the law to decentralize the bureau, by expediting and completing the transfer of records and files having to do with veterans' claims to the several regional offices."

Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for a few moments in order to explain the resolution and

to put before the Members of the House certain facts with regard to the handling of affairs in the Veterans' Bureau, with which many are not sufficiently familiar. On several occasions recently Members of the House for the New England States have complained of the administration of the Boston office of the Veterans' Bureau. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BURROUGHS] a few days ago spoke very severely of the interminable delays and uncertainties and confusion in handling veterans' claims in that office. In the course of several other discussions, other Members of this House have said that the handling of affairs in different branches of the bureau was so unsatisfactory as to demonstrate the failure of the whole system of decentralization.

What has been said about the unconscionable delays in securing settlement of claims and about the confusion, uncertainty, and habitual "passing the buck" between the regional offices and the central office in Washington voices the experience not only of every Congressman who has been doing what he could to help along his constituents' claims, but also of most of the disabled veterans from one end to the other of the country. Our former soldiers and sailors have every right to expect a more expeditious and a more efficient administration of the Veterans' Bureau, now that it has had time to get properly organized, but unfortunately the situation, instead of getting better, has been growing steadily worse.

Most of the blame for these conditions has been attributed either to the supposed incompetence of the men in charge of the regional offices or to the system of decentralization established by the so-called Sweet Act, but the facts which I am about to present would seem to indicate that the major responsibility for the present situation lies elsewhere.

The Sweet Act was intended to facilitate the settlement of veterans' claims by establishing 14 districts in different parts of the country, in which were to be concentrated the files and records and the responsibility for handling the claims of the veterans residing in those districts. According to the central office in Washington decentralization has already taken place, in 11 of those 14 districts, and one of the first districts to be decentralized was New England. The New England district embraces all of the New England States except Connecticut, and the office in Boston is supposedly in a position now to handle the claims of all New England veterans. Instead, however, of a quicker and more certain adjudication of claims, one finds the contrary—greater delay than ever before and complete uncertainty as to where the records are to be found, and as to where the ultimate decision in any particular case is to be made. Moreover, the experience of New England would seem from the discussions on this floor to have run parallel to that of other parts of the country.

What measure of blame attaches to the men in charge of any of the regional offices I am unprepared to say, but I am quite convinced that even if these offices were in charge of men of unparalleled efficiency much of the confusion that to-day exists would continue, and the reason for this conviction is that the system of decentralization ordered by Congress and, according to public announcements, actually accomplished in the case of the New England district, has never really taken place at least in that district. The vast majority of the records and files having to do with New England veterans have never been transferred from the central office in Washington to the Boston office. Of 65,000 New England claims the folders for not more than 15,000 or 16,000 have been so transferred, and if a New England veteran writes to the Boston office with regard to his claim, the chances are more than 4 to 1 that the file dealing with his claim will still have to be sought in Washington. Under such conditions there has been as yet no real test of the system of decentralization, and no real test of the competence or incompetence of the management of the Boston office.

The claims of veterans may be grouped into several classes: First, those which have been granted; second, those which are pending; third, those which have been disallowed; and a fourth category including some of each of the foregoing groups, the claims having to do with deceased veterans. The files relating to the first group of cases—claims which have been granted—have, according to the best information I can obtain, been transferred from Washington to Boston, but these are exactly the cases which are the least likely to provoke further inquiry or correspondence, and whatever payments have been awarded under these claims will still be made, not from the district office in Boston, but from the central office in Washington.

The presence in the district office of the records of successful claimants is of importance only when the veterans concerned seek, or are subjected to, a change of award.

Second. As to the files having to do with claims called "pending," many, but not all, have been transferred. Claims, for example, for total and permanent disability are, on principle, still kept in Washington, and it is, I believe, the policy of Colonel Forbes to retain them permanently in the central bureau. In addition, cases undergoing the process of adjudication at the moment of decentralization have been retained in the Washington bureau, and it is the policy of Colonel Forbes to retain such cases "until adjudication is completed, and only then to transfer them to the district which is to have future jurisdiction over the same." In view of this latter reservation it is hard to discover what percentage of so-called "pending" cases have actually been transferred from the central office, and it is clear that a large number of the pending cases will only be transferred to the district bureau after the primary occasion for correspondence with regard to them has ceased to exist.

Third. The files with regard to disallowed claims, which probably include the majority of all claims, are, as a matter of policy, retained in the central office. If my experience is a fair criterion, a very large proportion of the correspondence from veterans has to do with the reopening of claims which have been disallowed because of insufficient evidence. The disallowed applicant is very apt to seek a reversal of the decision by presenting new evidence that his illness or disability is due to injuries or diseases incurred while in the service or that his disability is of a compensable degree. Such letters form a very large part of the correspondence from veterans, yet none of the files relating thereto are forwarded to the district offices until a claimant has actually asked for further consideration of his case. The district office upon receipt of such a request for the reopening of a case is obliged to transmit it to Washington, where, after considerable delay, the file of the case is sorted out from the archives and reforwarded in turn to the district, and all this has to be done before the request for reconsideration can even be considered.

Finally, in so far as the fourth class of claims—those of deceased veterans—is concerned, no steps have as yet been taken or are in contemplation to forward the files and folders relating to them to the several districts. The reason given for retaining such cases in Washington is that the awards are frequently divided among beneficiaries residing in different districts. But one can very well doubt whether the cases where the beneficiaries of a deceased New England veteran live outside the confines of New England are sufficiently numerous to justify the retention in Washington of the records of all the New England veterans who are deceased. It would seem probable that in the majority of cases settlements could be more expeditiously effected if these records were concentrated in the district offices.

To summarize* the whole situation, notwithstanding the impression given out by the Veterans' Bureau in Washington, decentralization has not yet taken place. Even in the case of districts supposedly decentralized, like that of New England, the records of three-fourths of the claimants still remain in the Washington archives. Despite the effort of Congress to decentralize the Veterans' Bureau, one must still turn to the central office to find the records for all disallowed claims, for all claims of deceased veterans, for all claims for total and permanent disability, and even for a large number of pending claims in the course of adjudication. Such being the case, I maintain that it is unfair to blame too severely the administration of a regional office for not handling its business with expedition, and that it is quite impossible to form any opinion whatsoever on the basis of our experience up to date, either as to the success or failure or as to the possible advantages or disadvantages of the system of decentralization.

The situation is one which demands immediate and very serious consideration on the part of Members of Congress, if the veterans who were disabled in the World War are to receive the generous and grateful treatment which Congress has endeavored to provide for them and if the purposes of the Veterans' Bureau are really to be attained.

I bespeak, therefore, the support of the Members of this House in furthering the consideration and adoption of this resolution.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I pay the tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. KELLEY] and to my other colleagues upon the committee of saying that they are profound students and closely informed upon the great subject of the naval appropriation bill. To speak upon this bill after the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] and the two gentlemen making up the minority membership have spoken is to speak upon a subject that for anything new in some ways repre-

sents Johnny's apple after he had said, "There ain't going to be no core."

Even so there are some phases of the proposition that I believe have not been stressed enough and, again, certain lines of opposition have developed that should be met. I hope I shall not be tedious, and while I shall not pretend to discuss all the details of the bill I am going to invite your attention to the broad policies involved, to the factors that determined the committee in reaching its conclusions, and to criticisms that have been made.

For many years, and especially during the last Congress and the present one, since I have been a member of the fortifications and naval subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, I have been challenged by conflicting conclusions and divergent argument, based upon a common set of facts, touching military and naval preparedness. I have listened to the arguments of the students of these problems; I have received and read books and magazine articles and studies by military and naval officers. Our committees have heard a multitude of witnesses. We are told that disarmament of nations will mean peace and that it will mean war; that large armies and navies are the surest guaranties of tranquillity and by others that they inevitably mean conflict. We are told that the World War was so dreadful that it will mean the end of such folly and by others we are told that it was but the prelude to another Armageddon more dreadful still.

So to-day we are told that by reason of the Limitation of Armament Conference and its results additional threatening difficulties confront the nations; others believe that the program will point the way to peace.

With the consideration of the pending bill, however, we have a problem where differences exist as the result of conclusions on a common set of facts, and, in addition, there is a wide divergence of opinion touching some of the facts that are vital to the case.

The letter that was read to you yesterday from the Secretary of State, addressed to Representative ROGERS, rests upon a "statement of fact." The "statement of fact" to which the Secretary refers is that the proposed number of enlisted men is far below the number required to maintain our Navy upon the basis contemplated by the treaty. This statement of fact was furnished by the naval experts to the American delegates to the conference. Then the Secretary's letter reads:

Accepting this statement of fact, the only question would seem to be whether our Navy should be reduced below the treaty standard by a provision of personnel inadequate to maintain it.

To this question I think there can be but one answer. I strongly believe that it would be most injurious to the interests of the United States not to maintain fully the standard of the treaty.

Gentlemen, if I accepted the statement of facts touching the proposed enlisted personnel carried in this bill, I would accept the conclusions of the Secretary of State, and I tell you very frankly that I believe that the country expects us to maintain our part of the 5-5-3 ratio.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman please tell the House whether or not the Subcommittee on Appropriations at any time consulted the naval experts who advised Mr. Hughes during the Limitation of Armament Conference, and to whom he refers in his letter?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, I will say that the committee had all the evidence, so far as I am aware, that the Navy Department wanted to present to the subcommittee. The Secretary of the Navy, a man who is eminently fair and broad, and well informed on this question, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Colonel Roosevelt, a brilliant and exceedingly well-informed man, were before our committee most of the time. The heads of all the important bureaus of the Navy were before our subcommittee, assisted by their aids at all times, and so far as I am aware, if there was one scrap of information that they had to give to the subcommittee that they did not give, I do not know what it was.

Mr. LINEBERGER. But the gentleman does not answer my question. I asked a specific one. I want to know whether these experts to which the Secretary of State refers, in a specific letter which was read here yesterday, were consulted by the subcommittee?

Mr. FRENCH. Who were those experts?

Mr. LINEBERGER. We can obtain their names. I do not have them here, but we know by name who the experts were.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentlemen ought to know that one of the members of the advisory council to our delegates, as I understand it, was Colonel Roosevelt, and, as I understand, another was Admiral Coontz himself, and, as I understand it, the same men were relied upon to furnish information that we

relied upon to furnish information to our subcommittee. I believe I am right in that statement.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is right. The Secretary of the Navy and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy were invited to come and be present at all times, whether they were being interrogated or not. Admiral Coontz, as the military head of the Navy under the Secretary, was with the committee, I should judge, three-quarters of the time, and told us everything that he had in his mind and presented his case fully.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Then, I assume that one of two things happened, that either the subcommittee did not follow the information that was given by these same gentlemen to which Mr. Hughes refers, or else they gave different information to the Secretary of State from that which they gave to the gentlemen of the subcommittee.

Mr. FRENCH. If the gentleman will permit me to continue, I want to refer to some of the very matters, I take it, that he has in mind, in the shaping of this bill. I think I will be able to point out some of the disagreements between the doctors themselves before I conclude my statement this afternoon.

Your committee had to meet a condition here that is a condition that never existed, so far as our country is concerned, in the past. Six years ago we had a Navy that was third among the navies of the world. Six years ago the nations of Europe were powerful in their might, measured by navies, by armies, by resources of men, and material wealth. To-day the nations of Europe are, many of them, bankrupt; some of them politically bankrupt, as well as financially, and to-day the Navy of the United States stands equal under the 5-5-3 ratio with the greatest navy, other than our own, in all the world. To-day we have a condition confronting the world that is vastly different from that which has confronted this Congress at any time it has shaped a naval appropriation bill.

From the foregoing and from common knowledge of the causes, purposes, and results of the World War it must be apparent—

First. That large standing armies and navies did not prevent the greatest and most destructive war in all history.

Second. That if an ambitious and aggressive power maintains a large army and navy, other nations, though peacefully inclined, must do the same; that is, compete.

Third. That invention and discoveries point to war devices more destructive and more demoralizing to civilization than ever before contemplated.

Fourth. That only by a common understanding and agreement among the nations of greatest power can competition in naval and military affairs be cut down and held within bounds.

Fifth. That, relatively speaking, the United States, in spite of war burdens, is the most powerful Nation in the world.

Sixth. That leadership by proposals and by example looking toward lessening military and naval burdens of our people and of the world may be made by the United States without other nations ascribing such leadership to fear and weakness.

Seventh. That such lessening of military burdens will contribute to the benefit of humanity—

(a) By lowering taxation;

(b) By permitting millions of people to engage in fruitful pursuits;

(c) By removing the thoughts of the world from war and carnage to the home and national culture and progress.

THE LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS PROGRAM.

In my judgment, no matter what else may be attained by the present administration, the outstanding achievement must be regarded as the Limitation of Armament Conference, if we shall assume that the drafts of treaties formulated in that conference shall be ratified by the nations represented. These proposed agreements look to the removal of national misunderstandings, the establishment of affirmative ways of peaceful consideration of menacing problems, and the definite limitation of naval and other military activities. In brief, the proposed terms are:

First. The four-power agreement between the United States, Great Britain, France, and Japan relating to their insular possessions and insular dominions in the Pacific Ocean.

Second. The naval treaty, providing for naval reductions and limitation and affecting the United States, Great Britain, Japan, France, and Italy.

Third. The submarine and poison-gas treaty, to prevent submarine attacks on merchantmen and to prevent absolutely the use of poison gas, subscribed to by the last-mentioned five powers.

Fourth. The Chinese general treaty, embodying the Root rules touching China and involving her integrity, the open door, aid for stable government, and unselfish policies of other nations, and so forth, and signed by the five powers last mentioned, and in addition China, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Portugal.

Fifth. Other treaties, resolutions, and agreements touching the open door in China, China's railroads and customs, exempting the homeland of Japan from the application of the terms "insular possessions and insular dominions," the restoration of Shantung and Wei-hei-wei to China, and a number of other lesser but important matters.

All of these proposed treaties and agreements have bearing upon the pending bill, and all to which the United States is a party have been ratified by the United States. All of these treaties dovetail together so as to make a composite whole, and though I shall discuss only the naval treaty to any extent, it must be remembered that this treaty depends in large part upon the conditions of others, as for instance the use of submarines, fortifications in the Pacific Ocean, and so forth.

THE NAVAL TREATY.

The naval treaty is vastly more startling and important from the standpoint of what it lops off from the naval programs of the powers to the agreement than it is from the standpoint of what may be maintained.

The general principles that controlled the conference on this head may be said to be—

First. That all capital-ship building programs, either actual or projected, should be abandoned.

Second. That further reduction should be made through the scrapping of certain of the older ships.

Third. That, in general, regard should be had to the existing naval strength of the powers concerned.

Fourth. That the capital-ship tonnage should be used as the measurement of strength for navies and a proportionate allowance of auxiliary combatant craft prescribed.

AIRCRAFT CARRIERS.

Under the treaty there was a limit placed upon aircraft carriers, as follows:

	Tons.
The United States.....	135,000
The British Empire.....	135,000
France.....	60,000
Italy.....	60,000
Japan.....	81,000

OTHER LIMITATIONS.

1. Capital ships shall be limited to 35,000 tons.

2. Aircraft carriers shall be limited to 27,000 tons, except two for each nation of not more than 33,000 tons each.

3. No vessel of war other than capital ships or aircraft carrier shall exceed 10,000 tons.

4. No capital ship shall carry a gun with a caliber in excess of 16 inches.

5. No ship other than a capital ship shall carry a gun with a caliber in excess of 8 inches.

6. The status quo as to fortifications and naval bases shall be maintained by the United States, the British Empire, and Japan in their insular possessions in the Pacific Ocean with certain exceptions; those for the United States being the Hawaiian Islands and the islands adjacent to the coast of the United States, Panama, and Alaska (except the Aleutian Islands).

So much for a general outline of world conditions and the fruits of the Limitation of Armament Conference.

I am delighted always with the speeches of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], but I do not follow him at all in his reasoning this afternoon, that the call and the results of the Limitation of Armament Conference were apart from that which the President could properly do. In the first place, the President was acting within his authority upon the basis of the resolution that you yourselves passed as a part of the appropriation bill a year ago, known as the Borah amendment. Greater even than that, the President had authority in the very Constitution under which you are serving to-day, as the head of this Government, to negotiate treaties.

Further than that, he submitted the results of the Limitation of Armament Conference to the Senate of the United States, made by the Constitution a part of the treaty-making power of our country, and the Senate has ratified the treaties. Unquestionably, if the Congress, both House and Senate, should not be satisfied with the results that have been attained, it would be within the province of the Congress to pass legislation which, even if the treaties were ratified by all the powers, could set aside the results of those treaties.

So, gentlemen, we are acting here, in shaping this bill, not only in response to the policy of the administration, reinforced by act of Congress, but in response to that splendid and substantial public opinion in the United States.

THE PENDING BILL.

In shaping this bill, manifestly we could not follow the estimates submitted by the President from the Bureau of the Budget last fall, because the new conditions have changed the basis for all estimates then made.

The chairman of the subcommittee has outlined to you very fully the number of ships, the capital ships, and all the auxiliary ships provided for under the bill that we have reported. I shall not go into detail as to that, but I want to say that it was the spirit of the subcommittee as well as that of the full committee to maintain the 5-5-3 ratio absolutely.

As I proceed I believe you will agree that we have done so. Our bill provides for 18 capital ships and for the other auxiliary craft necessary for a well-rounded Navy.

Now, with regard to the officer personnel, your subcommittee felt there that it was our duty to support the 5-5-3 agreement by giving to the support of those ships a sufficient complement of officers to handle the business of the Navy. We did that. Let me go into a little detail in showing you. To-day the navy of Great Britain has 5,264 officers of the navy proper, plus a thousand officers of aviation as of date October 24, 1921, according to information furnished to the Naval Committee of the House, or a total of 6,264. Our Navy under this bill has been given what? We have given the officer personnel that you have to-day, less 389 reserve officers but including 200 young men who will graduate from the Naval Academy in June, thus giving you an officer personnel of 6,256, only 8 below the officer personnel of the British Navy on the figures of last October. And more than that, the officer personnel figure that includes a thousand aviation men for the British Navy is an estimate. If it is eight too high, then we are exactly in the same notch.

Now, let us refer to Japan. Japan, according to the information furnished by the Navy Department, had in July last 3,641 officers. To accept those figures is to recognize at once that 3,661 is about the ratio that ought to be adopted by Japan for the coming year, according to the ratio of our officers and those of Great Britain upon a 5-5-3 basis.

THE ENLISTED PERSONNEL.

Now, let us turn to the enlisted personnel. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] told you on the first day when he discussed this bill that we had provided for 18 capital ships; that for them we had provided for an enlisted personnel of 18,259 men. He told you that the entire enlisted personnel that we had provided for the Navy that is to serve upon ships was upward of 50,000. He told you then of the other 17,000 for service at shore stations and as auxiliaries, and he told you that the total was something like 67,000 for the enlisted personnel.

I am not going into detail as to the allocation of these men upon the ships. I want to say, however, that the gentleman from Michigan told you further that we had followed, first of all, the allocation of these men upon the basis of the complements of these same ships on February 1, 1922, except where it was apparent that ships did not have their full complement or were not ready for duty or service, and there we gave, I think, in every instance the complement that was recommended by the Navy Department for the ships that are not now in service or that will be in service next year.

The total, then, after these figures had been put down and the line drawn and the columns added, was 67,000 enlisted personnel. Now, then, there are several ways of checking up on that question, and your subcommittee availed itself of the various ways. In the first place, we could check up on the question by subtracting those who to-day are assigned to services that we do not propose to continue next year. It has been repeatedly stated here that we have 96,000 men in approximate numbers as the enlisted personnel of the Navy. It has also been told to you that we propose to scrap several hundred of useless craft that were acquired during the war, that will serve and can serve no useful purpose, but the retention of which constitutes a veritable sinkhole for the people's money that you raise by taxation.

Now, then, we took the number that could be relieved from ships withdrawn from service and we took those who would be relieved from shore duty on account of the lessening of activities on the basis of the Navy under the 5-5-3 program.

We took then those who have been regarded and carried as surplusage under even the 96,000 personnel in the Navy. We added them together, and the sum total is upward of 30,000. Now take your 96,000 and put 30,000 underneath, draw your line and subtract, and again you have figures that are practically in the same notch with the other figures, or somewhere around 67,000.

Look at it in another way. The complements of the ships of the Navy in 1916 were fixed then by those who were in large part the same officers that are in the Navy to-day. And what are the complements? There are 15 of the ships that were in the Navy then that are in the Navy now. Consult, if you please, the book known as the Ship's Data Book for that year, and you will find that upon the 15 ships at that time there were

13,797 men. Divide that by the number of ships and you will have 919 men to a ship. Apportioning the same number then for the 18 ships that we now have, or substantially the same number, and you have 16,542. But we have given you 18,259.

Now, yesterday and the day before it was said over and over again that there are new services for men upon these ships made necessary by new discoveries and new devices. So there are, and your committee gave these services full attention. The three essential services occasioned by new devices and discoveries are fire control, antiaircraft guns, and radio work. Our committee considered all of these services and the number of men that would be required for each. There was so much criticism, however, that upon yesterday I telephoned Rear Admiral McVey for verification of the figures touching fire control and antiaircraft guns and Admiral McVey furnished me with the information. In addition to the information he gave over the phone, he verified the information by means of a memorandum, which reads as follows:

APRIL 11, 1922.

Additional men for fire control.....	33
Additional men for 8 antiaircraft guns.....	112
Total.....	145

Also crews were increased due to the necessity of having more men to handle ammunition than had been allowed previous to the war, as the men could not hold up. Total for battleships, 250.

As to the last item referred to by Admiral McVey, "Additional men to handle ammunition," your committee did not feel justified in granting these men. Clearly, these men are for war purposes; clearly, for all peace-time training, the number of men in the complements of 1916 could handle the work.

Admiral McVey advises that the number of men required for fire control would be 33 per ship. Multiply 18 by 33 and you have 594 men.

For antiaircraft guns Admiral McVay advises that it would require 112 men per ship. That was upon the basis of 8 guns on each of the 18 capital ships. But I turned to the ship's data book to see how many of these antiaircraft guns will be on the ships the coming year. We have not provided 8 guns upon each ship. On 10 of the ships there are but 2 guns each. Upon 8 other of the ships there are but 4 guns each. Add your guns together, multiply the 14 men per gun by this number, 52, and you have 728 men.

Then what else do you have? We are told that they need men to handle the radio work. So they do. We have at this time how many? You not only have radio apparatus upon battleships but upon cruisers and destroyers and submarines and most of the craft of any importance in the Navy. Not all of the craft have apparatus of the most complete or of the latest type, such as that upon the battleships, but if you allow 10 men to each ship, which is more than the number allowed to the average station upon shore, to every one of the 18 battleships, you have another 180 men.

Draw your line again, add these several items together, and you have 17,864 men, or, in other words, 400 less than we have provided for in this bill. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, there are different ways in which you can check up on this question. I want to say that we have checked up on it. We have not been acting upon our own judgment, but we have been trying to follow that which seemed to be the very best advice that we could receive. Turn, if you please, to the records of the hearings in the Congress about six years ago and there you will find that when Admiral Blue was before the Committee on Naval Affairs some of the ships of the very character that we have to-day were under discussion, and at that time, when it was proposed that the complement per ship should be raised above 781 men, raised 178 above that, Admiral Blue was asked where they would be placed, and he said that he could not say where they would be placed. Then Mr. Roberts, of Massachusetts, whom you will remember as a member of this House, asked, "Where will you put them?" Admiral Blue said, "That is what I would like to know."

In other words, at that time, six years ago, upon the same type of ship that we have to-day, which for the most part make up the capital fleet of the United States, Admiral Blue said he did not know where he would put those men.

Go further than that. Compare the present enlisted men upon our ships with the personnel upon the British fleet. That is another way to check up. The prize ship of the British fleet to-day is the *Hood*, which they claim is the foremost ship upon the sea, and to that ship they have allocated 1,475 men, and to their other ships 955 to 1,016; in other words, figures that are absolutely comparable with the figures that we have provided for the capital ships of the American Navy.

Now, turn to Japan and what do you find? One of her ships nearing completion is the *Mutsu*, built by popular subscription. That is the ship the Japanese people did not want to give up

when it came to the question of scrapping ships. I think if I had been a citizen of Japan I would have insisted that that ship be retained in the navy, a ship of 33,800 tons, soon to be completed. To that ship they have allocated 1,360 men. Now, if you will consult the personnel allocated to their other ships you will find that the number runs from 1,000 on up; in fact, figures that are comparable to the figures that we use for the capital ships of the American Navy.

So, gentlemen, measured by the various standards that we were able to apply, we believe we have brought to you a personnel for these different ships that adequately meets the situation.

The gentleman from Illinois, Representative MANN, asked a question Monday that was answered so promptly that I do not think it was stressed enough. Representative MANN has not only one of the keenest minds that ever participated in this Congress but the rapier that he wields is probably sharper than that wielded by any other Member of this body, and anyone of whom it can be said that he stands second to Mr. MANN in intellect or in any way is receiving a great compliment. What did he say? Let me read the colloquy:

Mr. MANN. I want to see whether I have the gentleman's position correctly in mind. As I understand it from the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan, he claims that the personnel, the enlisted men, allowed is sufficient to man a battle fleet of 18 capital battleships, and all the necessary accompanying ships which the Navy thinks ought to accompany them?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Absolutely, and about that there is no dispute.

Mr. MANN. And that in addition to that there will be personnel enough on shore to provide all that is necessary at receiving-ship barracks, shipyards, and so forth?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; and give 7,000 additional men to take the places of those who may happen to be sick or under training.

Mr. MANN. And that it does not provide a large number of men simply in training, not being used for other purposes than training?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that it is even worse than his question intimates, because they do not have now a large number in training.

That, gentlemen, is the crux of the whole matter.

There is a wide zone between men enough to care for the 18 ships in times of peace and men enough to man the same ships in time of war. On the one hand, 1,400 or 1,500 men in case of war, and on the other hand, 900 or 1,000 men in times of peace. [Applause.] Do you know that the same arguments used now were used years ago? Let me refresh your memory. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], who spoke the other day so eloquently and learnedly on this bill, spoke on the bill last year, and he called attention to the great crime that was being committed against the Navy when it was proposed to reduce the total to 100,000 men. On February 10, 1921, Mr. PADGETT said, in debate:

I have a statement, received this morning, to the effect that if the personnel was reduced to 100,000 men the ships of the Navy will be in the following status: Battleships, first line, in commission, 13—

And so forth.

Have you heard that language recently, anything that sounded like that? [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen, go further in the discussion a year ago and you find the same gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], my friend, so learned and so able in all affairs pertaining to the Navy, as well as generally, and on yesterday he thought we ought to follow the advice of the Navy. Here is what he said:

Now, the question before the House, the crucial question is, Will 67,000 men allotted to the Navy accomplish that purpose? I say not. Now, why do I say so? In the first place, gentlemen, the Secretary of the Navy, who is charged with the duty, upon whom rests the responsibility, says to us as emphatically and as positively as it is possible to express it in words, that it will not. Are we not to give any credit, are we not to give any credence to the man upon whom we shall place the responsibility of discharging the trust? Are we to ignore and pay no regard whatever to the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT is following the advice of the Secretary of the Navy. Turn, if you please, to the speech a year ago, where the Secretary of the Navy had agreed to 100,000 men, and this same gentleman from Tennessee said that he preferred to rely on Admiral Washington for the figures upon which he was then arguing, and disregarded the estimates made by this same responsible head which he now says we ought to follow.

Now, gentlemen, between the number necessary to man the ships in peace and the number necessary to man the ships in war there is an unquestionably large number, but that number represents men, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois in that wonderfully illuminating question. Are they, then, there for the purpose of training?

That is the heart of it. Of course they are, they are performing the most useful purpose in case of war, and are super-numeraries in times of peace. They are a large body of men hanging there, if you please, suspended like the coffin of Mahomet in mid-air so long as we are in peace.

Now, gentlemen, in the subcommittee and the full committee we believed in maintaining the capital ships and such enlisted

men for them as will maintain the 5-5-3 ratio, and, gentlemen, you can consider it more from the standpoint of peace than from the standpoint of war. But when it comes to the battleships and officers themselves you have a different problem. You can not build a battleship in 90 days, as was done on Lake Erie 100 years ago. You can not train officers overnight, or in six months. It requires years of time to train officers, and I think the Congress ought to maintain a substantially large number of officer personnel. If I might be bold, I would say that personally I am not satisfied with the 86,000 fixed for the purpose of 4 per cent official list for the Navy. I am inclined to think that we ought to put the number nearer to what the figures are now for the officer personnel and then remove the present ratio, and you would remove possibly something which unconsciously may enter, or is believed possible to enter, into the determination of estimates touching the enlisted personnel of the Navy.

Now, let us go a little further. I have received this morning a wonderful chart from the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. McARTHUR]. I do not have it with me, but that chart shows on its face that the personnel provided for our Navy is lower, I think, than that of the Japanese Navy, or perhaps approximately in the same line. Now, let us consider that for just a moment. I do not think the gentleman from Oregon can actually accept at the face value the assertion that he makes in this wonderful chart. Let us consider it. Remember, we are not disagreeing as to the capital ships, we are not disagreeing on the officer personnel, but we are disagreeing on the enlisted personnel of the Navy. And yet in this chart he seems to determine everything not by officers, not by ships, but by enlisted personnel. In other words, following out his reasoning, if you would raise the enlisted personnel from 100,000 to 200,000, then what would you have done to the ratio? It would be 10 for the United States, 5 for Great Britain, and 3 for Japan. Is not that absurd? You have got to have men to go on the ships, you have got to have officers in somewhat proportionate number. In saying that to maintain a sufficient personnel to maintain the 5-5-3 ratio you have got to maintain it on the enlisted personnel war basis is absolutely without merit. [Applause.]

Let me go a little bit further. There is opposition to this bill from within the committee. The minority members of the full committee have prepared a report and have said that the cost of the British Navy for the next year will be £75,605,864.66. I wonder where the gentlemen of the minority, headed by my friend the honorable Representative from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM], received that information. I turn here to the records of the Naval and Military Record, published upon March 15 of the present year in London. It is a publication that corresponds to the Army and Navy Journal of the United States. The figures that the honorable gentleman gives practically coincide with the estimates that were made in exact detail something like six months ago, before the Limitation of Armament Conference was had. Here is a magazine that boosts for the Navy of Great Britain, just as the Army and Navy Journal of our own country boosts for the Navy of the United States, and we find here the quoted report of Lord Lee, who is the first lord of the Admiralty, upon this question. This is the same Lord Lee who was the representative from Great Britain to the Limitation of Armament Conference. He says that in view of this agreement that has been entered into it was possible for him to make a supplemental estimate to the estimate that had been made some six months ago. If gentlemen will examine into the statement here of the Navy estimates, they will find that something like £10,000,000 of these estimates that are included for the support of the Navy are estimates for such purposes as civil superannuation allowances and the adjudication of old war contracts, and such things as that. Even when you eliminate all that and boil it down to its lowest at six months ago it was only £64,000,000 for what is called naval purposes alone. Then Lord Lee recommends in a supplemental estimate to Parliament that it be reduced still further, and he says the naval costs for 1922-23 have been reduced by nearly £21,000,000 from the figures that these gentlemen give.

Not only that, but he says that of this amount £450,000 are required by last year's estimates to liquidate certain war claims. So, even admitting that the £54,000,000, which is about two-thirds of the estimates, represents the budget for the British Navy for the next year, that is shown to contain, according to the statement of Lord Lee, something more than \$2,000,000 for the liquidation of certain contracts.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman recall what the gentleman from Massachusetts said as to where he received

the information as to the cost of the British Navy? Oh, I see, the gentleman is here on the floor. Perhaps he could give us the source of his authority for saying that it cost £76,000,000.

Mr. FRENCH. I thank the gentleman for that suggestion and would be glad to have that information.

Mr. TINKHAM. I got it from the Intelligence Bureau of the Navy Department, an excellent source of information.

Mr. FRENCH. So excellent a source of information that, as the gentleman says, I am sure that if he were to go there and make inquiry, he would find the supplemental estimate of £54,000,000 for the British Navy for the next year. [Applause.]

Mr. TINKHAM. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. TINKHAM. Does he know the difference in pay between the different services of the British Navy and the American Navy?

Mr. FRENCH. I recognize that there is considerable difference in pay. We have to take all of those factors into account.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If my colleague will yield, the difference in pay in some respects is vastly against us. The British officers of the highest rank all receive immensely more than the officers of similar grades in our Navy.

Mr. TINKHAM. How about the enlisted men?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The enlisted force is not so greatly different, because the figures in this bill are based on the pay of 1908.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman has mentioned the supplemental estimate made by Lord Lee. The gentleman does not mention what change has been made in the enlisted personnel of the British Navy, and we would be very glad to get that information.

Mr. FRENCH. I want to thank the gentleman for that suggestion. I had pretty nearly forgotten it. The combined personnel for the British Navy, according to the first estimate, was 118,500. According to the supplemental statement that has been reduced to 98,500, and that includes the officers, the enlisted personnel, the royal marines, and the students in the Naval Academy of Great Britain.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And the Coast Guard.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] stated that there were 38,000 men engaged in handling colliers and other subsidiary boats in the Navy which were not carried in the personnel at all.

Mr. FRENCH. I think that consideration must be taken of that. The chairman of the subcommittee, in reply to that statement, stated that it was his information that only 1,000 civilians were employed as he recalled for the handling of that particular work.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Oh, the chairman of the subcommittee did not give his authority at all, while the gentleman from Tennessee quoted his authority. You could not handle the number of ships he specified, or one-quarter of them, with 1,000 men. The chairman of the subcommittee stated the matter without any authority whatever, while the gentleman from Tennessee stated two things—first, his authority, and second, the number of boats they man.

Mr. FRENCH. I am glad to have the interruption of the gentleman, and I would say this, as regards the navies of Great Britain, Japan, and the United States, there is the element to be taken into consideration of whether men in the enlisted personnel are used to do that which is done in one country by a civilian personnel. We have tried to take all of these elements into consideration.

We have tried to measure one against the other. As the result of it, going down ship by ship, giving the enlisted personnel here in the matter of detail that we have given it, we have arrived at the conclusions we have presented.

Mr. MADDEN. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] was in the Chamber when the gentleman from Idaho called attention to the speech of the gentleman from Tennessee last year. I wish he would repeat just one section of that for the information of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I heard all the speech this year, and it was very illuminating.

Mr. FRENCH. Then, having the speech this year in mind, what I called attention to a bit ago was the argument used a year ago by the same gentleman as to what a 100,000 Navy

would do. In the words of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], if the personnel was reduced to 100,000, it would mean that we could retain but 13 battleships in full commission. With the 96,000 to-day we are maintaining 18 capital ships in commission. Let me refer to one or two other criticisms.

Mr. BEEDY. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. FRENCH. I will.

Mr. BEEDY. We have all been very much interested in listening to the gentleman. His speech discloses he has investigated the subject, and we want all the information we can get. A good many Members of the House recognize the importance of aviation. I see the gentleman's time is nearing an end. I trust he will not take his seat without discussing that branch of the service and the provisions which the bill makes. We ought to have more particular information as to whether or no this bill provides for all the men that have been asked for by the aviation department.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield further? I would like to have the gentleman tell the committee whether or not the British Air Service, the Royal Air Service, which is a separate department in Great Britain—whether the number of men carried by them as on duty with the navy is included in the number of men which he reports to be in the British Navy for the coming year?

Mr. FRENCH. Not generally speaking. I told you that 1,000 officers were included in my officer comparison. I want to say in connection with that, that while I had not purposed to discuss the question of aviation, we have provided for aviation, I think, all the department asked. We have provided something like 3,200 men, and, as I recall, we have provided something like \$7,000,000 to carry forward the work of aviation for the coming year.

Mr. MADDEN. We have provided \$7,800,000.

Mr. FRENCH. I thank the gentleman. I agree most heartily with what was said here yesterday by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCLINTIC] touching the ability of an effective naval air force in meeting an attack of any other country. The gentleman from California asked me another question, and that is whether or not the air force included in our figures here was in the British figures. We have included 3,200 in our figures. The British Government, though, maintains a separate and distinct air force, made up, as I recall, of approximately 30,000 men, and then for the purpose of increasing the number that should be, as he thought, properly charged to the Navy, Representative PADGETT yesterday said that he thought something like 11,000 of those men should be added to the total for the Navy in order to make the figures comparable with the figures I have submitted to you.

I want to say, while I agree in the importance of the personnel of the air force, the importance of the Aircraft Service, I do not agree that the statement that he made is correct, that we should charge 11,000 men to ours in order to offset them. Why should we? Why should we, if they are using 11,000 men for Air Service, charge arbitrarily 11,000 men to our Navy to do naval service, when we are not turning them over to do air service?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield in that connection?

Mr. FRENCH. All right.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman from Tennessee did not claim that we should charge off 11,000. He said 11,000 were chargeable in their case, and only 6,200 was requested by the Navy Department here. He said that number should be included and should be added.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that the Navy Department never did request 6,200 men for aviation.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What do your hearings show?

Mr. MADDEN. Thirty-two hundred.

Mr. FRENCH. I thought that was about right.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] stated was—and I can not find anything in the hearings about it—that the number was 6,200.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will give the gentleman the exact facts about it—that the Chief of the Bureau of Aviation wrote a letter to Mr. PADGETT—

Mr. DEMPSEY. I remember his reading the letter.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan (continuing). In which that statement was made. I do not know what the Chief of the Bureau of Aviation recommended to the Navy Department. We transact our business with the head of the Navy, and the chief of the bureau and the Secretary of the Navy did not ask for any such number of men for aviation. But they did ask for the number which we gave them.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Do your hearings show that? That is the question. We have either hearings or letters. The letters have been produced. What do the hearings show?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think they give the number, but I am not sure.

Mr. FRENCH. Then, while that matter is being checked up, let me proceed just a little further in answering the question of the gentleman from California. I do not think that it is at all essential for the United States to maintain a naval air service such as may be essential for Great Britain. And why? The Naval Air Service for the United States must, according to the present development of aviation science, be a defensive weapon, in my judgment, rather than an offensive one. Furthermore, it is the policy of our Government to act in that capacity rather than as an aggressive Nation. Beyond that, let me say this: The United States is so situated that we are very remote from the great nations of the world. The home base, if you please, must be on our own territory. Great Britain, lying as she does up against Europe, can in an hour's time send her aviators across the Channel and over the Continent of Europe. They can make their assault upon a city, upon a ship, or upon a navy yard, and return to the home base, if you please, within a few hours.

Not so the United States. In Great Britain you must have an aviation force according to the judgment of those in military authority there capable of offensive warfare, if you please; when, according to the military authorities of our country, thank God, we are not required to provide nor believe it necessary to provide a tremendous air force for the defense of the Union. [Applause.] There is the difference.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. McPHERSON. I understood the gentleman to state that the number estimated for the British Navy was 98,500, officers and men.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. McPHERSON. How many of that number were enlisted men or corresponding to our enlisted men?

Mr. FRENCH. I just showed the gentleman a little while ago that as regards officers, the number is approximately the same as ours.

Mr. McPHERSON. In that 98,500, is not the number of enlisted men included 81,000? In other words, 81,000 as against our 67,000?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no; not as against our 67,000.

Mr. McPHERSON. Of the petty officers and enlisted men of the 98,500, 81,000 of them are enlisted men in the British Navy.

Mr. FRENCH. Not in comparison with our figure.

Mr. McPHERSON. What is the correct figure?

Mr. FRENCH. We have 19,500 marines.

Mr. McPHERSON. You say a certain number were provided for in the British Navy for 1923, and that it was 81,000.

Mr. FRENCH. If the gentleman has checked up those figures I will suppose they are correct.

Mr. MADDEN. It should be remembered that the British Navy includes aviation service, and the officers and marines and naval cadets.

Mr. McPHERSON. The British Navy has 81,000 men, and the British colonial service has in addition about 8,000 men, and the British air service comprises—

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, we have in the United States to-day other organizations. Several of the States have availed themselves of the cooperation work furnished by the Government in building up the naval service—the Naval Militia.

Mr. SWING. I would like to ask the gentleman how many men have we in our Naval Reserve to-day? How many men have we in the United States Naval Reserve Corps to-day?

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman tell me?

Mr. SWING. I ask you.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Including the officers, it is about 11,000. But the gentleman from Idaho was speaking of the Naval Militia.

Mr. SWING. Oh, you do not undertake to compare the civilians who give one or two hours a week to that work with a British colonial force which is a professional fighting force, at the command of the British admirals, a force which must go anywhere they want them to go, just as the colonial troops went into the World War just where Great Britain wanted them to go.

Mr. FRENCH. I will say to the gentleman that the American reservist, the volunteer, the enlisted man, and the drafted man have been able to give the highest account of themselves on every battle field and in every naval engagement wherein they have had a part.

Mr. SWING. Yes; they are prepared to go gladly to the support of their country, but preparedness would have saved thousands of their lives.

Mr. FRENCH. But the gentleman forgets that when it comes to casualties our men have shown themselves as capable of taking care of themselves as have the men in the so-called highly trained armies of Europe.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Is it not the ultimate conclusion that the gentleman reaches that Air Service with the United States should content itself with a less force than Great Britain on two bases: First, that we are pacifists, and second, that we should not be adequately prepared?

Mr. FRENCH. No; absolutely not. In the first place, I am not a pacifist, and in the second place, I believe that our Air Service does not need to be determined upon the same principle as that upon which Great Britain must determine the personnel of her air service. The two countries are different, absolutely. We do not have other great nations lying up against the United States who may be our possible enemies.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Are they not crossing the Atlantic now, and do they not increase the length of flight every day, and have we not to consider the future, and are we not supposed to be doing that now?

Mr. FRENCH. But we do consider the future, but this is not an aircraft bill. This is a naval bill that we are considering now. The aircraft in Great Britain is an independent institution.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And the 10,000 men suitable to be assigned to aviation in the British Empire is purely an arbitrary estimate made by somebody down here in the department for the purpose of bolstering up certain figures.

Mr. MADDEN. And in addition to the aircraft provided in the naval bill we have an Aviation Corps in the Army.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman should not say that those figures are furnished with a view to bolstering up anybody's figures. You should consider the fact that these officers are actuated by a high sense of duty, and that they are not making an arbitrary assignment of figures for the purpose of bolstering up their position, as the gentleman suggests.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They could have made the figure 12,000 or 15,000 if they pleased.

Mr. DEMPSEY. They are men of judgment, and their opinion is entitled to more weight than that of civilians like ourselves.

Mr. HILL. Can the gentleman tell us how many enlisted men in the aviation service are contemplated in this bill?

Mr. FRENCH. Three thousand two hundred now.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The gentleman prefers to avoid aviation, does he not?

Mr. HILL. The figure given out to-day is that the Navy has at the present time an enlisted personnel in aviation of 4,796. As I understand the gentleman from Idaho to say, this bill provides for only 3,000.

Mr. FRENCH. No; I think I said 3,200.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I have it here in the hearings. On page 391 of the hearings Captain Williams testified that on January 1 they had in aviation ashore 2,100 men. Now, then, they ask in addition to that about 600 men who are to go into the fleet next year after the catapults are put upon the battleships, and some others, and in addition to that they ask for the men necessary to man the new aircraft carrier and tender, amounting to 500 men, or 1,100 in addition to those I have mentioned; and that is all the number of men I ever heard anybody connected with the Navy Department ask for in an official capacity.

Mr. HILL. May I state to the committee that my information is that the strength of the flying forces in the Navy to-day—and I obtained this information this afternoon—is 590 officers and 4,796 men? Does the chairman think that is correct?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I do not know how many civilians we may have in addition.

Mr. HILL. That includes the whole personnel?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In addition to that, I presume we may have that many civilians. They are not enlisted men. We are only dealing here with the enlisted force, and we have taken the figures on page 391, furnished us in answer to our interrogations of Captain Williams, who has charge of the personnel of the Navy, and he said on that day there were 2,100 enlisted men in the Aviation Corps of the Navy. I do not guarantee the figures, but they are the best that Captain Williams could furnish as to the number in the aviation section of the Navy.

Mr. HILL. That is at the present time, and in the present bill there are about 3,200 included in aviation. Is that correct?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Three thousand two hundred enlisted men. The officers, of course, are in addition to that, and the civilians probably an equal number, or perhaps more.

Mr. Sisson. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I want to continue my remarks.

Mr. HILL. I understand the total enlisted force in the aviation service in England is 30,000, and that 10,000 of them are assigned to the navy, but those 10,000 are not included in the

estimates of the navy enlisted personnel which has been brought before the House. Is that correct?

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] said yesterday that what I think is an arbitrary assignment of 10,000 or 11,000 men should be made to the British Navy for aviation; but, as I said a while ago, that should not enter into the question as to the shaping of the enlisted personnel in the American Navy.

Mr. HILL. Can the gentleman state why not?

Mr. FRENCH. In Great Britain aviation is a separate institution, and Great Britain may be under the necessity of building up an immense aircraft service, including not only 30,000 men but maybe more than that engaged only in aircraft work. Does the gentleman think that because England has done that we ought to do the same thing? Great Britain has her own problems to meet, as a country lying up against Europe, with the various countries of Europe in conflict and in constant suspicion of one another. The United States is more fortunately situated, and I do not think that at this time, just because Great Britain has an aircraft service of 30,000 men, we ought to follow her example and create such an aircraft service for ourselves.

Mr. HILL. The purpose of my question is this: I understand that the present bill includes the total enlisted personnel that is to be provided in the naval air service of the United States, but that the comparison of the figures which have been given here on behalf of the subcommittee omits from any estimate of the enlisted strength of Great Britain at least 10,000 men who could be apportioned to the aircraft service of the British Navy on the basis of taking one-third of their 30,000 who are in their aircraft service. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho 10 minutes more. I should like to ask a question of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL], who seems to be possessed of considerable information about aviation and who is more or less an expert on that subject.

Mr. HILL. I may say that I am expert on the lack of aviation in the last war, but not on the presence of aviation.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will ask the gentleman if he knows what proportion of the 30,000 men who he says are in the British aircraft service are civilians?

Mr. HILL. The information I have in this—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does any gentleman know? The gentleman from New York perhaps knows that.

Mr. HILL. I understand we have at the present time 4,796 enlisted men in the aviation service of the Navy. I suppose that includes some civilians. I understand that we have 9,379 in the Army aviation service, making a total enlisted force in our aviation in the two services of approximately 14,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And if we add as many more civilians on the ground, we have practically as many as Great Britain, have we not?

Mr. HILL. I understand that all the civilians we have in that service are included in the figures which I have given.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. HILL. No. That is the reason I am calling for the information. But if I may finish my question, the figures which we have discussed here for the British enlisted personnel do not include the aviation service, do they?

Mr. FRENCH. We are not including the aircraft service of Great Britain. I have said that two or three times.

Mr. HILL. But we do include the aircraft service in our own Navy?

Mr. FRENCH. To the extent that it is in the Navy.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. We do not have an independent aircraft service within the United States.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It is about comparable with the Coast Guard, which is included in the British figures and not included in ours. If you take the coast guard in the British figures and the aviation out of ours you have a comparable basis for each Government.

Mr. HILL. How many men are there in the British coast guard?

Mr. FRENCH. Two thousand eight hundred.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And in our Coast Guard there are about 3,400.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. KELLEY of Michigan] and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] both a question as to the information concerning the size of the coast guard. Was the information gained from the same source as the other information relative to the British Navy; that is, from a source that can not be disclosed?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, no.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Where was it obtained?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that the figures for the British coast guard are no great secret. If he or anybody else will take the pains to get the ordinary reports of the British Government in our own Congressional Library he will find out practically all that I have given him. I have taken the pains to do that.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The question is not where I might get the information, but where did the gentleman get the information?

Mr. FRENCH. Before proceeding let me answer the question of the gentleman from California by quoting from the Naval and Military Record of Great Britain, where the statement is made that the total coast guard and marine police of Great Britain is 2,900.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FRENCH. I can not yield further.

Mr. HILL. I will ask the chairman of the committee to yield a minute to the gentleman from Idaho that I may ask him another question.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I have been so generous to those who wanted to ask questions that almost all of my time for the last half hour has been taken up by questions. In the first place, our committee has been criticized not only in the way I have referred to, but also it has been criticized by the editor of the Army and Navy Journal. I have here a copy of the Army and Navy Journal, in which criticism is made of Congress, criticism is made of Members, which challenges the good faith of Members of the Congress and the motives of the Members of Congress who do not take the view that the Navy Department takes. And in the same editorial the different navy yards of the country are criticized by the same editor.

It seems to me in view of the fact that the minority report is signed by Members coming from States that have navy yard districts that it was an ungracious thing on the part of the editor of the Army and Navy Journal to criticize the districts. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts who signed the report can take care of himself, and doubtless will speak his mind of the Army and Navy Journal for impugning the motives of people of navy yard districts and insinuating they want money to maintain some navy yards and stations that the Journal says are useless either in peace or war. Now I want to say, and I ask the House to bear witness, that my friend from Massachusetts has never defended a navy yard of Boston in a speech made here during this debate. Does anyone suppose that any Representative who has spoken on this bill, whether he comes from Boston or New York, the Charleston or the Louisiana districts, had any thought of navy yards when he argued the question? [Laughter.]

Mr. TINKHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I can not yield. These gentlemen are able to take care of themselves. I want to say one word further in regard to the Army and Navy Journal since it reflects upon Members of Congress and my committee. The editor has sent me a marked copy of that Journal, evidently intending it shall come to me personally, and therefore I consider it as a personal message to me reflecting upon my committee and the motives of Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, during the limited, yet several, years that I have participated in political discussions and activities, I have made it my constant rule to assume that those who are opposed to me are sincere in their opposition or actuated by motives and principles that to them seemed sound and I have asked that same regard for myself. Somehow I believe that most people approximate mental and moral honesty as they discuss serious matters and so I shall assume, with regard to those who take part in the discussion of the naval program. It illy becomes those who are most active in urging a program that would mean a large Navy and a large Army to attack the motives of other people. Yet I find in a marked copy of the Army and Navy Journal under the date of March 25, 1922, which has been sent to me, an editorial which is most severe.

The editor of this paper condemns the Members of Congress in most vicious language who, perchance, may not be able to see the question as he sees it. Indeed, if the Members are governed by the motives that he asserts, they are not fit to serve in the Congress of the United States. But who is this critic? The critic to whom I refer is the editor of the Army and Navy Journal, or, at least, an editorial writer upon that journal.

I am compelled to recall an allegory of the lad who returned from driving the cattle home at evening time from the Canyon of Echoes. The boy related an amazing tale to his mother. He said that in the canyon there must be some horribly wicked person; that that person must have followed down the canyon on the side just opposite from him. He said that as he was driving the cattle along that person began cursing him and

calling him names, and said everything mean and vile to him, while he was the perfectly good little boy in the conduct of his chores. His mother, being of mature years and being wise and sympathetic, knew that her son had returned from the Canyon of Echoes. She knew that the oaths and the bad names that her son had been called were the echoes of the language that her boy had spoken, hurled back from the other side of the canyon. [Applause.] Gentlemen, do you not know that usually it is true that the man who is always challenging your motive is the man whose motive you have a right to suspect? Do you not know that the man who says you have a secret reason may have one himself?

I have said that the criticism does not come with good grace from the editors of the Army and Navy Journal, and why? Let me call your attention to the editorial list of names. Before them you will find the titles of captain or general or major, and so on. Do they not recall, and do you not know, that the authorized personnel determines the officer personnel of the Navy? Do you not remember that old story which you read in your boyhood time—I think it was the formula of Swift, given in Gulliver's Travels—that twice around the thumb is once around the wrist; twice around the wrist is once around the neck; twice around the neck is once around the waist; and twice around the waist is the height of the individual? [Laughter.] This same principle prevails in the Navy. Double your enlisted personnel and you double your junior officers; double your junior officers and you double your senior officers; double your commanders and you double your captains; and increase by 100 per cent your captains and you increase by 100 per cent your rear admirals and your admirals. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I am too good a friend of my country and too good a friend of our Navy to let myself be disturbed by the hasty expressions of some one writer, of whose statements doubtless the writer himself is now ashamed. I believe in the high integrity and honor of the officers of the Navy; they are men of the greatest ability; they are men upon whom our country can rely and who in event of war with a foreign nation will stand to the death between a foreign foe and the hearthstones of American citizens. And, gentlemen, I am proud of the Navy as it is to-day. I honor and admire Secretary Denby and Assistant Secretary Roosevelt, men of great ability and devoted to the public service. I pay homage to the active officers of the Navy to-day who were the men as officers who reflected distinction and credit upon themselves and immortal honor upon the flag of our country in the Great War where they were called to serve.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman would not make a misstatement—

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

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Idaho in order that he may answer the gentleman from another navy yard district on the Pacific coast.

Mr. SWING. Oh, I have no navy yard in my district.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, yes; San Diego.

Mr. SWING. That has no navy yard.

Mr. FRENCH. But it wants one.

Mr. SWING. No; it does not want one. I am tired of this proposal of tarring everybody with the stick of suspicion who opposes the desires of these gentlemen.

Mr. FRENCH. Let the gentleman ask his question.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I want to say that the gentleman is young here, but he has developed an infinite maw for public funds.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Oh, he has developed a faculty for defending his side of the question.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Naturally, for the navy yard.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Not at all; but the big, broad question.

Mr. FRENCH. Ask the question, please.

Mr. SWING. I want to ask the gentleman this: I am sure he has no desire to misrepresent the facts to the House, and I am sure the gentleman is fully informed that officers of the Navy are not based upon the actual number of men which are provided for in an appropriation bill. Therefore, what is under discussion is the actual number of men which you are providing for, and that in no way controls or affects the number of officers.

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. He ought to know that at this time and for something like six years, I think, the officer personnel has its maximum limit determined by the enlisted personnel in the Navy.

Mr. SWING. The authorized, not the actual.

Mr. FRENCH. The authorized personnel in the Navy.

Mr. SWING. It is not on what you are appropriating for, but what is authorized by law.

Mr. FRENCH. If I said "the enlisted personnel" I should have said "the authorized personnel," and thank the gentleman. Now I must go on.

Mr. TINKHAM. What has the gentleman been doing? [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. What about the navy yards?

Mr. FRENCH. I thought I could get a rise out of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GALLIVAN. No rise, but a pleasure. [Laughter.]

Mr. FRENCH. The same Army and Navy Journal which criticized us wipes some, at least, navy yards and stations off the map and says that they ought not to exist and that their sponsors want the appropriation merely to carry on the work for the benefit of the localities. That was the reason I said that I thought it was ungracious on the part of the editor of the Army and Navy Journal to criticize the gentleman, for when he was criticizing the bill and supporting a big Navy the gentleman did not use the words "navy yard" even once.

Mr. GALLIVAN. At that time I was not interested in navy yards. I want a big Navy.

Mr. FRENCH. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts will take care of the editor of the Army and Navy Journal when he gets time, and will tell him what he thinks of him for having passed such imputations upon navy yards in general.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I will take care of him another day.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman three minutes more. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I will.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question. I wondered if the gentleman from Massachusetts has seen the clipping from a Boston paper or knows anything about this occurrence which is said to have taken place:

Civilian employees at the navy yard at Charlestown, the destroyer base at Squantum, and the arsenal at Watertown gathered at a mass meeting on the Boston Common to-day and protested against the curtailment of their operations.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Will the gentleman give me an opportunity to answer?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. On Saturday last, when our committee was considering this bill in full committee, or when the main bill was being completed. I told the gentleman from Michigan, who has just asked me that question, that at that time there was a meeting on the historic Boston Common by these people protesting against the pending measure. He now asks me if I have read it in the newspapers! [Laughter.] Why, I am the first man that told him about it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I should like to ask the gentleman this question further. If the gentleman from Boston—

Mr. GALLIVAN. Massachusetts.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I was about to put the name of the State so as to designate the place. [Laughter.] If the gentleman had been in attendance at this great mass meeting of employees from Squantum, where they had been manufacturing destroyers during the war, and this mass meeting from the navy yard at Charlestown, because their operations had been curtailed under the terms of the treaty, would he have joined with them in that protest?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I was invited to address the meeting and declined to address the meeting because my business was here in Washington, watching this one-man bill being put through my committee.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. But the gentleman has not answered the question, and I shall not press him for an answer. Had he been there, had it been a Saturday, when a good many people who live in these cities along the Atlantic seaboard find time to go home, or had it been on the Sabbath when he had been there, would he have joined in the protests?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I would join in any protest which is going to disarm our Navy.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman just one question more?

Mr. FRENCH. I can not yield. I have only another couple of minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I shall yield the gentleman two minutes more in order that he may answer the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I wanted to ask the gentleman this: In the course of his remarks he has offset the coast guard in the English service as against the aviators in our service. Is not the gentleman aware that the functions of the two classes of service are entirely different?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That does not affect the number.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Oh, yes, it does. It affects the number on the question of the personnel. In the one case the coast guard is simply to save life in peace or war. The coast guard employee is a civilian employee, and in the other case the aviator pursues the most dangerous, the most daring, and the most useful branch of the military service.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. But the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] was saying that in the 98,500 there were included the 3,000 for the Coast Guard, so that those could be taken out, because there is nothing there for aviation.

Mr. DEMPSEY. He simply includes them as though they were a part of this.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; they are a part of the 98,500.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What about the 38,000 that you have not included at all?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will take that up in my own time.

Mr. DEMPSEY. There never will come a better time than now.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman need not worry about that.

Mr. FRENCH. Let me say this in conclusion: The people of the United States have reason to expect results from the Limitation of Armament Conference. If we are to turn to the first fruits of the conference, they might be recognized in the bringing in of this bill and omitting to carry forward the building program of the Navy, which means the saving of \$300,000,000. If you turn to the question of fortifications and consider the estimates that were made by responsible officers of the Army and Navy, not officially to Congress, but talking to Members of Congress, about a project on the island of Guam that to-day we will not fortify under the treaty, we would find a project proposed that carried an amount of money something like \$80,000,000 or \$90,000,000. It would have required for the Philippine Islands, to have made one place impregnable for our Navy program, \$100,000,000. In addition to that, according to the estimates furnished by the department to the Naval Committee some four years ago, to maintain or keep up the Navy following the building program of 1916, and the three-year program added to it, it would have required, I say, from \$800,000,000 to \$800,000,000 every year.

The bill we present is less by \$70,000,000 almost than half that amount. Call it \$300,000,000, multiply it by 10, the years covered by the limitation of armament treaties, and you have the stupendous amount of \$3,000,000,000 saved in 10 years in the maintenance of the Navy. Add to that the cutting off on the building program; add to that the amount you save by refusing to follow a building program for the next 10 years; add to that the millions you will save on fortifications, and the people of this country have a right to be proud and to be hopeful, as they look into the future and contemplate the steps that have been taken in the Limitation of Armament Conference. Gentlemen, the people of this country hope for results, not only measured in dollars and cents but, what is much more, measured in human life, measured in culture, measured in that which is best of all in all the nations of the world. In other words, that which was in the hearts of the people President Harding voiced when he spoke these words at the conclusion of the armament conference:

It may be that the naval holiday here contracted will expire with the treaties, but I do not believe it. * * * The torches of understanding have been lighted, and they ought to glow and encircle the globe.

And they further believe in the words that were written by the immortal bard of our country, words that you learned in your boyhood from "The Arsenal at Springfield":

Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts.

Gentlemen, I am for a Navy, not the little-size Navy that gentlemen speak of, and that was referred to insinuatingly here upon this floor, but an adequate Navy. I am for a 5-5-3 Navy, one that will protect at all times the honor and the glory of the American people, and that will be comparable to the navy of Great Britain and the navy of Japan on the ratio of 5-5-3. That is what we have provided for, gentlemen, as we bring the Navy appropriation bill before you. [Loud applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

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

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, what is a "big Navy" and what is a "little Navy"? The answer depends altogether upon what you are comparing the navy with. Since the surrender of the German fleet there has been no navy of the world other than those of Great Britain and Japan which might be compared with the American Navy. So that answering the question as to our Navy, it is "big" or "little" as compared with the British and Japanese Navies.

Under the situation now presented, the Four-Power Treaty having been adopted, it has become impossible that Great Britain or Japan should attack the United States in the Western Hemisphere. It is likewise impossible for the United States to make war on Japan or Great Britain in the spheres set apart to them. Neither of the nations is given a navy sufficient to meet the navy of the other if it should give battle near the naval base of its adversary. In short, the practical result of the Four-Power Treaty is to divide the world into three parts—the Orient which is given to Japan, the Western Hemisphere, in which America is made supreme, and Europe, Africa, and the Near East, the hegemony of which has been granted to Great Britain. It is not possible for either of the powers to attack another unless it should be in combination with one of their associates.

The Four-Power Treaty has made this situation stable for 10 years. We are foolish if we do not recognize and accept that fact.

I am thinking of the Four-Power Treaty. I wonder whether the price we have paid has not been too great. We have put it definitely out of our power to question the authority of Japan in the Orient. We have conceded her supremacy by agreeing not to fortify our eastern possessions. We have said to Japan, "We trust your good faith. We commit to your hands the destiny of the Philippines, Guam, and all American interests on the other side of the Pacific."

THE DEMOCRATS HAVE ALWAYS HAD THE PRINCIPLES, BUT—

Some seventy-five years ago a prominent American, in discussing the partisan politics of that day, said that the Democrats had always had the principles, but their opposition had had the leaders. I deny that it was true then. It would place the Democratic Party upon a low plane to admit that it is true now. But I am reminded of this saying by the utterances of a former Democratic candidate for the Presidency, delivered recently in New York at a Jefferson Day dinner. He urged that the League of Nations should be made the issue of the next campaign.

Why should the Democratic Party make the League of Nations the issue in another campaign? The people have spoken upon it in so far as the treacherous currents of partisan expediency permitted them to speak. So far as the 1920 election constituted an expression upon the league, the decision of the people was against it.

The Republican Party came into power virtually without a program. Its campaign was a campaign of negation, of unjust criticism, of sectional appeal, of hypocritical pleas and of promises impossible of performance. Of all its professions it has as yet redeemed but one, that for a separate peace with Germany. All the remainder rest in pretense and apology. Having control of every branch of Government it has allowed the country to drift into an economic depression unprecedented in our history. In the meantime the invisible masters of the party have been busy getting "theirs"—the railroad owners, the war contractors, the profiteers, the tax dodgers, all have been busy.

The Republican administration has failed. It would now divert attention from its domestic failure to its pretense of foreign success. It would point the people from the things about which they know—from its indifference to distressing unemployment, from its incapacity to deal with conditions which have brought business to the door of bankruptcy, from the complacency with which it has permitted a vast coal strike to occur, from its favoritism toward big business and big finance, from its universal incapacity and ineptitude in dealing with the public welfare—it would point them to pretended success in foreign matters, with which they are little familiar. In this situation for Democratic leaders to acquiesce in the Republican scheme to substitute foreign affairs for domestic questions as issues for the next campaign is not only foolish from the standpoint of party but is unpatriotic as well.

Why a Jefferson day dinner was made the occasion for the utterance of sentiment in behalf of a League of Nations I can not imagine. Jefferson must have turned in his grave when the occasion designed to do him honor was so perverted. I remember that he said:

I am for free commerce with all nations, and political connections with none; I am for not linking ourselves by new treaties with the quarrels of Europe, or entering that field of slaughter to preserve their balance or join in the confederacy of kings to war against the principles of liberty. The first object of my heart is my own country.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

The League of Nations had serious faults. It was in certain particulars a surrender of American sovereignty. It committed us morally, along with the other nations, to the exercise of force in keeping the peace of the world and in punishing those who might break it. It committed us to a policy of entanglement with European issues and meddling with European concerns. But overshadowing even these serious matters was the awful fact that the league carried in its bosom the monster of the treaty of Versailles. It bound us to defend that treaty, to see that its terms were performed, to stand surety for the good faith of our associates, to all the complex conditions of reparations and arbitrary national boundaries. Coupled with that treaty the league would have subverted every principle of American foreign policy from the beginning of our history to the present. Had we committed ourselves to it, it would have been for Americans to die in order to collect British and French war indemnities and to defend the foolish and, I might well say, the wicked rearrangement of national boundaries which the treaty made.

But despite its intolerable faults, the fundamental of the league was to secure the peace of the world; it held its head high in the clouds of idealism.

THE REPUBLICAN POSITION.

The opposition of the Republican Party to the League of Nations was evasive. They did not meet it with candid frontal attack, but thrust it with pin-pricking criticism. The Republicans deemed it expedient from a partisan standpoint not to oppose the principle of an agreement among the nations for the preservation of world peace. To the contrary, they expressly approved that principle. The Republican platform of 1920 made this pronouncement upon the League of Nations:

The Republican Party stands for agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world. We believe that such an international association must be based upon international justice and must provide methods which shall maintain the rule of public right by the development of law and the decision of impartial courts, and which shall secure instant and general international conference whenever peace shall be threatened by political action, so that the nations pledged to do and insist upon what is just and fair may exercise their influence and power for the prevention of war.

Mr. Harding, in his speech accepting the Republican nomination for President, said:

I can speak unreservedly of the American inspiration and the Republican committal for an association of nations, cooperating in sublime accord, to attain and preserve peace through justice rather than force, determine to add to security through international law so clarified that no misconstruction can be possible without affronting world honor.

These statements are clear. They need no interpretation. They promise a world association which all the nations would be invited to join, and which would afford a forum in which justice could appeal against might, in which the weak might appeal against the strong.

I ask you, gentlemen on the Republican side of the Chamber, how have you kept that solemn promise to the American people? How have you made good upon your word? You answer me and say that you have made it good by the Four-Power Treaty. Your promise was for a world court for the ordering of justice, for an association of nations which all would be free to join. Your performance is a league among the four great military powers of the world for their own selfish benefit and to perform their own purposes.

The concept advanced by your promise is the same as that of the League of Nations. The league was impracticable, some have called it, too full of idealism, and holding its aim too high. That is the criticism made. But whatever may be said about it, always it looked to peace and to justice and righteousness in this world.

I have heard criticism of the brave and patriotic Democratic Senators who favored the League of Nations but who oppose the Four-Power Treaty, based upon the alleged inconsistency of their positions. I am proud of the Democrats who oppose the treaty. They have proven themselves good Democrats and good Americans. But perhaps they have not enough resented the unfair criticism. It is unfounded, as I shall show.

THE FOUR-POWER TREATY.

This is the four-power treaty:

I.

The high contracting parties agree as between themselves to respect their rights in relation to their insular possessions and insular dominions in the region of the Pacific Ocean.

If there should develop between any of the high contracting parties a controversy arising out of any Pacific question and involving their said rights which is not satisfactorily settled by diplomacy and is likely to affect the harmonious accord now happily subsisting between them, they shall invite the other high contracting parties to a joint conference, to which the whole subject will be referred for consideration and adjustment.

II.

If the said rights are threatened by the aggressive action of any other power, the high contracting parties shall communicate with one another fully and frankly in order to arrive at an understanding as to the most efficient measures to be taken, jointly or separately, to meet the exigencies of the particular situation.

III.

This treaty shall remain in force for 10 years from the time it shall take effect, and after the expiration of said period it shall continue to be in force subject to the right of any of the high contracting parties to terminate it upon 12 months' notice.

IV.

This treaty shall be ratified as soon as possible in accordance with the constitutional methods of the high contracting parties and shall take effect on the deposit of ratifications, which shall take place at Washington, and thereupon the agreement between Great Britain and Japan, which was concluded at London on July 13, 1911, shall terminate. The Government of the United States will transmit to all the signatory powers a certified copy of the procès verbal of the deposit of ratifications.

The present treaty, in French and in English, shall remain deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States, and duly certified copies thereof will be transmitted by that Government to each of the signatory powers.

The dynamite in the treaty is in article 2:

If the said rights are threatened by the aggressive action of any other power, the high contracting parties shall communicate with one another fully and frankly in order to arrive at an understanding as to the most efficient measures to be taken, jointly or separately, to meet the exigencies of the particular situation.

To understand the deadly import of this language compare it with article 1 of the British-Japanese alliance, which reads:

It is agreed that whenever, in the opinion of either Great Britain or Japan, any of the rights and interests referred to in the preamble of this agreement are in jeopardy the two Governments will communicate with one another fully and frankly, and will consider in common the measures which should be taken to safeguard those menaced rights or interests.

Mark you, that the Anglo-Japanese treaty was confessedly an alliance. It was an alliance for war. Under it Japan was brought into the World War. It is couched in substantially the same language as article 2 of the Four-Power Treaty. It means exactly the same thing. Speaking with the duplicity of diplomacy, Great Britain and Japan agreed to "communicate with one another fully and frankly." The same words are used in the Four-Power Treaty. It binds America to go to war as Japan, under the Anglo-Japanese treaty, was forced to do in 1914. Japan nor Great Britain can engage in no war which does not involve their Pacific "insular possessions," and this means that the United States is bound by the treaty to become a party to any war in which Great Britain or Japan may choose to engage.

LEAGUE AND TREATY FACE IN OPPOSITE DIRECTIONS.

The amazing thing about the discussion of the Four-Power Treaty is that it appears to have proceeded upon the assumption that the Treaty partakes of the nature of the League of Nations. Men seem to assume that those who supported the League are bound to support the Treaty. The actual fact is that the League of Nations and the Four-Power Treaty represent opposing poles. They face in exactly opposite directions. They have nothing in common, in scope, or purpose. Consistency would require those who favored the League to oppose the Treaty.

The League of Nations was *inclusive*; the treaty is *exclusive*.

The conception of the League of Nations was that all the nations of the world should become members and that a forum should be provided in which the weakest might appeal against the strongest—where right might appeal against might. The chief purpose of the Four-Power Treaty is to provide an opportunity for conference among the four greatest nations concerning their mutual defense and for the imposition of their will upon any who may challenge their authority.

The League was an agreement for peace; the Treaty is a covenant for war. The League was intended to prevent war; the Treaty deals with the means to carry on war.

Under the Treaty no act of aggression by one of the four powers against any other nation is prevented. The four powers agree to respect each other's rights, but not the rights of nations which are not parties. It can not operate to protect any weak or helpless people from the aggression of one of the four powers. It contemplates not peace but war—not methods of peace but processes of force—not discussion of means to prevent quarrels but consideration of means to conduct war. It is everything but a world court in which justice may be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for five minutes additional.

AN AMAZING PARTNERSHIP.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The least that may be said of the Treaty is that so far as it goes, it commits us to a partnership with Great Britain, France, and Japan in matters of world

policy. We enter upon world politics upon an equal footing with them.

To justify parties in entering a copartnership the aims of the partners must be identical. Traders do not form partnerships with professional men. The conditions of the partners must be similar. Men who are solvent do not become partners with bankrupts. Men of reputation and integrity do not join with drunkards and profligates. All partnerships mean that the strongest and best of the partners puts himself upon an equality with the poorest and meanest, and that his possessions will be jeopardized by his partners' faults.

Partnerships between nations are not formed upon different principles from those between individuals. The partner nations must have identity of aims and similarity of conditions. Great Britain and Japan are great imperialisms; France little less so. Their aims are for the extension of their dominions, for conquest by force, for commercial subjugation of undeveloped peoples. Great Britain and Japan in particular aim at a sort of world dominion—Japan of the Orient and Great Britain of India, Africa, and the Near East.

America has no similar aims; we seek neither commercial nor political advantage over any other people. At the most, our world policy is merely to seek trade opportunities upon a basis of equality. I am not unmindful that we have our own imperialists, with their dreams of sharing with Great Britain and Japan in the division of the world for political and commercial exploitation, but I am happy to believe that these constitute a small fraction and that the great bulk of our people still believe in real Americanism. As our aims are totally different from those of Great Britain, Japan, and France and as our situation is wholly different, we can not afford to enter a partnership with them.

TREATY BETRAYS AMERICAN INTERESTS.

But if we may assume that America has forgotten her principles and is committed to a policy of competition with Great Britain and Japan in world subjugation and exploitation, what answer does our selfish interest give to the Four-Power Treaty?

If we aspire to world dominion, we come into sharp competition with Great Britain and Japan. The danger of war with either or both of them is ever present, and the treaty will probably preserve peace for its period. But what then?

If we are in competition with Great Britain and Japan in the business which they have been doing and obviously expect to continue, it is to our interest to weaken them, not to add to their strength. The 10-year treaty period will give those nations time in which to consolidate their World War gains. They will be able to "dig in" on the new line, so as to be ready for the next advance. They will be able to further solidify their possessions, their strength, and their powers. Great Britain will solve her difficulties in Ireland, Egypt, and India; Japan will bring Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia under her complete dominion even as Korea now is. Perhaps also she will have intrenched herself in Eastern Siberia. If things go well with Great Britain and Japan, the 10 years of security which the treaty gives will leave them immensely stronger in every way than at present. At the end of 10 years we will be confronted with the choice between a new alliance which will bind us to the wheels of their imperial chariots or we must face Great Britain and Japan, grown immensely stronger, more arrogant, and more deadly.

AMERICA'S DESTINY.

If it be our destiny to try the strength of democratic America against Great Britain and Japan, it were better to try it now than to face them with their added powers and strength. With the Treaty they will have no distractions—no nation dare question their decrees—the development of possible rivals will be throttled, so that the 10 treaty years will expire and leave no nation to hold the balance of power, no great friend whose help we might have.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It does much violation to my principles to assume that we are to enter into competition in world policies with Great Britain and Japan. America's true destiny does not lie that way—it is that we shall remain a democracy, loving liberty ourselves and according it to all others—that our ideal shall not be of a new Rome levying tribute from the corners of the world and at last expiring in riches and selfishness. Surely America has not been in vain. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SWEET].

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa 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. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party has always been a constructive party. During the last year it has brought the Nation back to the principles of established government. It is scrapping the "war machine" as rapidly as possible. It has lessened expenditures and eliminated waste in governmental departments. It has enacted a Budget law, the greatest reform in governmental procedure in a half century. It has reduced appropriations to a minimum consistent with efficiency and service. It has taken care of the disabled ex-service men of all our wars, and for the first time in our history has legislatively recognized the importance of motherhood. As a result of the great Disarmament Conference at Washington appropriations for the Navy have been reduced by two hundred millions. It has relieved the people from the burdens of excessive taxation. It is endeavoring to revive business, stimulate agriculture, and rebuild our economic and industrial structure along safe lines and upon an enduring foundation.

Important bills for the benefit of disabled ex-service men have been passed by the Sixty-sixth and Sixty-seventh Congresses. They are known throughout the country as the "Sweet bills." One was signed by the President on December 24, 1919. It liberalized the insurance features of the war-risk insurance act and increased compensation. The compensation provisions of the act were retroactive, and within 90 days after it became a law over \$31,000,000 were distributed by the bureau to the disabled ex-service men of the country. About three-quarters of a million came to Iowa. The other bill was signed by the President on August 9, 1921, and consolidated all governmental agencies for the benefit of the disabled ex-service men. It centralized at Washington and decentralized in the field. It provided for the establishment of 14 regional offices and 140 suboffices. My own State has four suboffices—Des Moines, Cedar Rapids, Fort Dodge, and Waterloo. The ex-service men are thus being acquainted with their rights, under the law, and splendid results must of necessity follow.

The Langley bill recently passed Congress providing for over \$16,000,000 for the construction of hospitals to properly hospitalize the ex-service men.

Two adjusted compensation bills have passed the House within the last two years, one in June, 1920, and the other on March 23, 1922.

Bills have also been passed for the benefit of the soldiers of the Civil and Spanish-American Wars.

During the last two years Congress has given special attention to legislation for the benefit of the farmers of the Nation.

Some of the most notable measures which have been passed and are now being considered by Congress are:

First. Capper cooperative marketing bill.

Second. Future trading bill, regulating grain exchanges.

Third. The Federal land bank relief bill.

Fourth. The revival of the War Finance Corporation as an aid to helping move farm products. As a result of this legislation over \$23,000,000 have already been sent to Iowa.

Fifth. Increasing funds available for loans by the Federal Farm Loan Board by fifty millions.

Sixth. The passage of the emergency tariff act on agricultural products to prevent flooding of our markets.

Seventh. The passage by the House of the permanent tariff bill for the benefit of the agricultural and business interests of the country.

Eighth. The packers' act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in live stock and dairy products, poultry, and eggs.

Ninth. The passage of the bill giving agriculture a representative on the Federal Reserve Board. This bill has passed the Senate and will soon be passed by the House.

Tenth. The Anderson intermediate credit bill should be immediately considered and passed.

Eleventh. The French-Capper truth in fabric bill should be passed by Congress.

Twelfth. The Federal "blue-sky bill," to prevent the sale of spurious and fraudulent stocks and securities. This bill has passed the Senate and will soon be passed by the House.

The foregoing legislation had the approval of the farm organizations of the country.

On December 23, 1921, Mr. J. R. Howard, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, wrote me a letter expressing his personal views of my work in Congress for the farmers of Iowa, which was as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Chicago, Ill., December 23, 1921.

Hon. BURTON E. SWEET,
Representative Third Iowa District, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SWEET: Having spent a considerable portion of my life in the third Iowa district, I desire to extend to you at this time my best wishes for a merry Christmas and a happy New Year, and also to assure you that the farmers of the State and of the Nation appreciate the very excellent work you are doing in your official capacity.

Such measures as the Federal land bank relief bill, the emergency tariff, the War Finance Corporation, the packer control bill, and the Capper-Tincher bill, all of which you supported, are very helpful. Knowing, as I do, your stand on cooperative marketing, and with regards to the Cummins-Esch bill and other important measures before Congress, there is no doubt of your continued opportunities in service.

It has been my good pleasure to tell a number of your constituents that whenever I am at Washington I find you hard at work on some important measure. I have even said that I do not know of any farmer in Iowa who works harder for his own welfare or puts in as many hours per day as you do in your legislative functioning.

I trust many years of service may yet be added to your public career.

Yours very truly,

J. R. HOWARD.

The lowering of freight rates is of utmost importance to agriculture. There are two or three things which Congress may do:

First. Enact the Sweet bill, which has been favorably reported to the House, revising the valuation powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, reducing by about three billions the present recognized valuation of the railroads. There is no doubt but the value now recognized is far in excess of real value. The Senate has already passed a like bill.

Second. Pass H. R. 6861, a bill introduced by me, (a) restoring to the State railroad commissions power to correct abuses and discriminations in local rates; (b) repealing all of section 15a of the so-called guaranty provisions of the Esch-Cummins Act—15a provides a rule of rate making which is economically unsound and impossible of operation. Hearings are now being held on this measure before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Governor Kendall representing the State of Iowa, Charles Webster representing the State railroad commissioners, and J. R. Howard representing the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Iowa Farm Bureau, made statements before the committee in support of the bill.

The present Congress has endeavored to lessen the burdens of taxation. It has endeavored to eliminate waste in the various governmental departments, and has opposed the establishment of a bureaucratic government in Washington. The rights of the States must be preserved and centralization and unnecessary supervision at Washington prevented. Our dual form of Government must not be impaired or destroyed.

I believe that our inland waterways should be speedily developed, that water and rail transportation should be coordinated, and that together they should constitute one great transportation system.

I am in favor of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project. As business grows better the demand for adequate and better transportation will increase. The railroads as now constituted will not be able to take care of the traffic and our water facilities must be utilized. Transportation rates must go down if the products of the Mississippi Valley are to reach our domestic markets and the markets of the world.

The manufacturer practically determines the selling price of the manufactured article, and the farmer has for many years been required to sell his products for any price he can get, without reference to the cost of production. He has had little or nothing to say about the marketing or the market price of his products. This must be changed through organization and proper methods of cooperative marketing.

The price of products sold by the farmer must go up and farm machinery and other necessary articles purchased by him must come down.

The producer and consumer must be brought closer together.

The differential between the selling price of the producer and the purchasing price of the consumer is too great and must be reduced, if we expect harmony to prevail, the farmer to succeed, and industry to thrive.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill as reported by the committee fails to provide the amount of money that both the President and Secretary of the Navy say is necessary to maintain the Navy that was agreed upon at the peace conference. In other words, the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, with the chairman of the committee, say they will fix and determine the size and character of the Navy the United States shall maintain and the advice of the President and Secretary of the Navy shall be disregarded, as shall be the advice of Washington, Roosevelt, and practically all the Presidents from the foundation of the Government until the present.

Ex-President Roosevelt, in referring to the advice given by Washington in his Farewell Address, says:

A century has passed since Washington wrote "To be prepared for war is the most effectual means to promote peace." The truth of the maxim is so obvious to every man of really farsighted patriotism that its mere statement seems trite and useless; and it is not overcreditable to either our intelligence or love of country that there should be, as there is, need to dwell upon and amplify such a truism.

How is it possible that anyone who reflects on the loss of life and enormous squandering of money that resulted during the World War from want of preparation can question the wisdom of that advice?

Preparation for war is certainly the surest guaranty for peace. A nation does not differ materially from the individuals that compose it; the same general ideas prevail; and one nation will not seek a quarrel with another that is prepared to resist. Does anyone believe the *Lusitania* would have been sunk if the Central Powers had thought the United States was fully prepared and would join the Allies?

I can not understand how the gentleman from South Carolina, who is on the subcommittee, can approve the report when he must know that the great advantage that the North had over the South in the Civil War came from the fact that when the war began the North had the Navy and were enabled to blockade the southern ports at once, thus depriving the South of imports and exports, that finally reduced the South to almost starvation. Then, again, everyone who is familiar with our political history since 1865 knows that it was Secretary Whitney, in President Cleveland's Cabinet, who, by his stand for a larger and better Navy, received the approval of all red-blooded Americans, and was the one man in that administration who was lauded by all without regard to party.

Is it not to Great Britain's Navy that she owes the position she has held, and still holds, among the nations of the world? Without Admiral Nelson and the valiant services his men in the navy performed England would certainly have succumbed to Napoleon. The fleet was Napoleon's only fear, and he sought in various ways to overcome it, but without success, and as a result met his final overthrow at Waterloo.

Roosevelt also said:

It may be that some time in the dim future of the race the need for war will vanish, but that time is yet ages distant. As yet no nation can hold its place in the world, or can do any work really worth doing, unless it stands ready to guard its rights with an armed hand. That orderly liberty, which is both the foundation and the capstone of our civilization, can be gained and kept only by men who are willing to fight for an ideal; who hold high the love of honor, love of faith, love of flag, and love of country.

Of course, no country should fight except to save its honor, and the fact that it is prepared is the best guaranty that its honor will be protected without fighting. From the Declaration of Independence until to-day the patriotic and fighting qualities have been dominant in this country. Every schoolboy loves Ethan Allen and John Paul Jones, and since the Civil War the wearer of the blue has been respected and honored in the North and the wearer of the gray in the South, and since the Spanish-American War the wearer of the blue and the gray in both the North and the South. And now, after our Army and Navy rendered such noble and valiant service in the late war, so that they were lauded at home and abroad, are we to declare to the nations of the world that an Army and Navy suitable to a great country are to be dispensed with, and every soldier and sailor caused to believe that the dollar has supplanted the flag?

No one doubts but the treaties that have just been approved are steps toward peace, but we must not forget that in many parts of the world there is strife and great unrest. In China, Russia, India, and among the Mohammedans generally revolt is rampant to such an extent that England is making concessions that she certainly would not otherwise make. Even in Mexico and Ireland the people do not seem entirely satisfied with the Government.

We are now about to extend our commerce into new fields, and for this purpose will spend millions on our merchant marine. More or less friction with other countries is almost certain to arise, a large part of which will be avoided if it is known we intend to and are prepared to defend our rights.

You will all recall how, when the Italians assassinated the chief of police of New Orleans and we proposed to bring them to justice, Italy complained, but the second note from James G. Blaine, who was then Secretary of State, ended all controversy. Any nation that has prospered to any great extent has always had an adequate navy to maintain its rights and enforce its demands, but none of them ever had the cities and coast to defend that we have; and certainly it is far better to be prepared to meet an enemy on the high seas than that we should ever have to battle on our own soil. The Central Powers were not invaded, but Belgium and France show the result of fight-

ing at home. Is it not far better to err on the side of preparedness, so that if trouble does come our cities will be protected, always remembering that the 3-mile limit, which was once sufficient to protect against cannon shot, is now no protection, as shown when the Germans dropped cannon balls on Paris?

The Spanish fleet in the Spanish-American War was a good illustration of unpreparedness, and one by which we should profit. Everyone knows it was the antiquated ships and their equipment and untrained crews that enabled Admiral Dewey and Admiral Sampson to gain their great victories.

The older men will soon become infirm and young men will have to take their places, and if we expect that the Navy is to maintain the high position in the future it has in the past we must make that service honorable and respected. As the President and Secretary of the Navy are directly charged with the responsibility of maintaining an adequate Navy, I believe that their judgment should be respected and their recommendations prevail.

The Secretary of the Navy has repeatedly stated that the number of men provided for by the committee is entirely inadequate to properly man the Navy arranged for in the treaties recently ratified; in fact, that they will be but little, if any, in excess of what Japan will provide for. Has the time come when Japan is to be considered the equal of the United States and that we should, on the plea of economy, be placed on the same basis? I can not believe that any true American so desires. Remember that until Japan defeated Russia but little attention was paid to her and that it was her victory that put her on the map, and that two, at least, of the commanders who contributed to her success were educated at Annapolis.

The countries that have advanced in civilization from time immemorial have been those that maintained competent armies and navies. We have only to remember who were invited to the peace conference to prove the fact that the military spirit is necessary to a nation's advancement. Why is China being exploited by Japan, and Spain and Portugal no longer given any consideration when great international questions are to be considered? Solely for the reason that they are no longer prepared to maintain their position among nations, which I trust will never be the case with this country.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the report shows a disagreement in the committee on this bill. Out of 35 members of the committee 6 have taken issue with the committee bill. Thus we have 29 to 6 in favor of the committee bill. It is reasonable to assume that the 29 members of the committee have been equally diligent with the 6 in ascertaining the facts and framing the bill that will harmonize with the truth and maintain our Navy in proper condition under the 5-5-3 treaty agreement. Those that have spoken in support of the committee bill have done it on the ground that it grants the necessary amount. Those who have opposed the bill have seldom mentioned economy, which is a fundamental duty of the hour. I shall cast my lot in favor of the majority report, with 29 of the committee, as against the 6 who oppose the bill. But under the 5-minute rule I shall seek an opportunity to express my views upon this measure and will proceed to another topic which I desire to suggest at this time.

Without money in the National Treasury you can not load the guns, you can not hire the men, you can not build the ships, and you can not fly in the air. The fundamental proposition is that the Army and the Navy must hold close to their base of supplies, and the National Treasury is the necessary base. You can not persuade the Army and the Navy officers to economize for the taxpayers of the United States and the National Treasury. You will never get economy along that line, but must get it in some other way.

Mr. Chairman, the question to which I desire to refer is that new though very familiar question—

THE TARIFF.

The Fordney tariff has almost completed its period of hibernation in the second greatest legislative body of the world. Having passed the House on the 21st of last July, it has been resting almost silently under the influences of legislative chloroform for eight months. But with the return of springtime it gives visible signs of a resurrection with the flowers and foliage in the Capital City of the Nation. It is now expected to receive all of the adornments that have been prepared for it during the winter months by the legislative artists of the Senate of the United States.

Figuratively speaking, it should join hands with the revenue act of August 20, 1921, and add at least four hundred million dollars to the revenues of the National Treasury as soon as

normal conditions are restored. Of course, tariff legislation naturally involves the consideration of the methods of levying duties on imported merchandise. More than one-half of the total imports is admitted to our markets free of duty. More than one-half of the remainder is admitted under specific duties; that is, so much per pound, per yard, ton, or other unit of measure, while less than one-fourth of our total imports is admitted under ad valorem or compound duties.

Ad valorem duties, of course, mean certain percentages of the market value of the merchandise. The compound duty consists of a combination of a specific duty and an ad valorem duty. A piece of broadcloth, or silk, may carry a duty of 50 cents per yard, plus 25 per cent of its value. If its market or wholesale value should be \$2 per yard, the combined duty would amount to \$1 per yard.

The greatest source of frauds against the customs revenues of the Treasury exists under the ad valorem rates of duty. For an extended period of time the foreign market value of imports has been taken as the basis upon which ad valorem duties are computed. To guard against undervaluations by foreign dealers in collusion with American importers it has been necessary to maintain a very large and expensive force of customs officers in foreign countries from which large amounts of merchandise are shipped into the United States. Any method that will destroy the practice of undervaluation through collusion of foreign shippers and American importers will enable us to discontinue the expensive official force patrolling foreign countries.

Many times a foreign manufacturer or shipper may establish an importing house in the United States under such arrangements as will conceal its identity and business connections with the foreign shipper or manufacturer. Some of the shrewdest schemes devised by the keenest intellects in the business world are found operating in this undervaluation of foreign merchandise.

For nearly 18 years as Auditor for the Treasury Department I had direct contact with this business in the examination and settlement of all the customs accounts of the United States. Through that channel of observation I obtained the proof of what is generally known, namely, that most American importers are honest and straightforward while a few are the shrewdest manipulators that can be found anywhere in the world.

The serious conditions created by the few make it absolutely necessary to devise ways and means to protect the revenues of the National Treasury against fraud.

Theorize as we may, we can not remove this significant fact. Every man who has had personal contact with the Customs Service knows that it is true.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE.

These difficulties have been greatly increased by the low state of foreign exchange. It is well understood that the values of foreign currency have fallen to a very low grade and that some of them have approached the vanishing point.

Suppose that a cargo of farm products were sold in a foreign market at a German port, for instance, and the German currency received in payment therefor. When the German marks are transferred into American money, how much will you have? This illustration is sufficient to show at a glance the financial embarrassments that our National Treasury and American merchants and manufactures would be compelled to meet if the foreign market value of German goods should be made and perpetuated as a basis for reckoning ad valorem duties under the laws of the United States.

AMERICAN VALUATION VERSUS FOREIGN VALUATION.

Some writers assert that the adoption of the American valuation plan would increase the cost of imported merchandise for the consumers in the United States. That argument is not valid. The primary purpose of levying taxes in any form is to supply the National Treasury with the revenues necessary to pay public expenses. In the enactment of a tariff law we should first determine what amount of revenue such an act ought to produce in connection with the necessities of the Government.

It has been wisely assumed that the Fordney tariff should yield at least \$400,000,000 of revenue annually. With that basis in mind, we proceed to the arrangement of a free list for non-competing articles of merchandise and a dutiable list for competing articles. This method of procedure is perfectly consistent with the protective theory, while it is entirely out of harmony with the theory of a tariff for revenue only.

Experience has shown that more than one-half of the foreign merchandise entering our markets is admitted on the free list, while the remainder bears rates of duty. The theory of protection distributes those rates of duty according to domestic and foreign costs of production. The recent war, however, has completely destroyed a permanent basis of reckoning on that question, hence the additional difficulties that we now meet in

writing a tariff. As stated before, less than one-fourth of the total value of foreign merchandise is admitted under ad valorem duties. The discussion of the domestic and foreign values has frequently been indulged in to furnish conclusions.

If we are to secure a fixed amount of revenue from a customs law, the foreign market value being lower than the domestic market value, the rate of duty must of necessity be higher to produce the proper amount. While the American valuation, being higher in comparison with the foreign valuation, the rate of duty should be correspondingly lower, hence to the consumer there would be no difference in the cost of his commodities. Just, for instance, as you find it in payment of taxes on real estate. If the State needs a fixed amount of revenue from that source, and the valuation of the land is low, the rate must be higher; but if the value of the land be advanced, the rate of taxation will be correspondingly reduced. So we should dismiss at once the fallacious notion that the adoption of the American valuation plan will enhance the value of the imported merchandise to the consumers in America.

The duty on common crockery is 50 per cent ad valorem and on china 70 per cent ad valorem in the Senate bill, on the basis of foreign valuation, while in the House bill the rates are 28 per cent and 40 per cent on the American valuation.

This argument is somewhat akin to the false assumption that a duty on imported merchandise in any and all cases creates trusts and increases prices to consumers.

That argument can not stand careful examination in the light of facts written in the history of tariff procedure. To illustrate: When conditions were normal tea and coffee imported on the free list were sold to consumers at an advance over the import cost of from 100 per cent to 400 per cent, without contributing one cent of revenue to the Treasury. At the same time sugar was imported on the dutiable list, and it paid into the National Treasury for a given year \$50,000,000 in revenue and was sold to the consumer at 33½ per cent over the import cost, duty paid. These significant facts completely destroy the supposed argument oft repeated that free goods pass into the hands of consumers in this country with a smaller margin of profits than are realized on dutiable goods.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, and to include in that extension an address delivered by the Hon. James T. McCleary, a former Member of this House, which unfolds many important practical lessons upon this topic, American valuation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Many of us remember Mr. McCleary as the man who delivered the principal speech on the coinage question on the floor of this House in February, 1896, in the opening days of the Fifty-fourth Congress. The Hon. Charles A. Towne, of Minnesota, had delivered his speech on the free coinage of silver. Mr. McCleary, from the same State, followed with his speech in support of the existing gold standard. Mr. McCleary's speech swept away every argument advanced by his colleague for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 and laid the foundation for the Republican campaign of 1896 in support of the proposition to continue the existing gold standard which is to-day the basis of our monetary system.

Mr. McCleary's address on the subject of American valuation as the basis for levying ad valorem duties under the Fordney tariff reads as follows:

WHY AMERICAN VALUATIONS?

Although for short periods from time to time throughout our national history domestic valuations of imports have prevailed at our customhouses, we have in the main been content heretofore to accept foreign valuations. As a result of the Great War the question has arisen as never before, Has this acceptance of foreign valuations in raising national revenues been wise or unwise? Would Uncle Sam be sensible or otherwise if hereafter he used domestic valuations as the basis for assessing ad valorem duties? The question is a reasonable one, to be decided in soberness and good nature.

Let us begin by ascertaining the extent of this problem. Under a protective tariff noncompeting articles—things the like of which we can not produce economically in this country—are admitted duty free, unless they are luxuries wanted by people who prefer "imported" goods at any price to domestic goods at a lower price. Such goods constitute our normal importations, and are always more than half of our total importations. They are not included in this question.

Everyone who has given serious thought to the subject, including practically every Secretary of the Treasury except Walker, has recommended specific duties, whenever practicable. They are usable as to more than half of our competing imports. The question of valuations has nothing to do with goods the duties on which are specific, and they constitute more than half of our dutiable imports. So the problem of valuations has to do with less than half of less than half of our total importations.

The amount of ad valorem duty to be paid at the customhouses is determined by two things—the assessed value of the goods and the rate of duty on such goods. This rate of duty has always been fixed by Uncle Sam without the interference of other countries. (Under a

trading or "bargaining" system of tariff, sometimes improvised as reciprocity in competing articles, we would let the foreigner have a say even as to that—a very unwise thing for us to do.)

So the question of valuations narrows down to simply one element, affecting less than a quarter of our imports. In its essence the question of valuations is simply this: Shall Uncle Sam fix both factors of the ad valorem duty—the base as well as the rate—or shall we let foreigners fix one of these two factors? It is not a very big part of the whole tariff question, but it involves a principle of vital importance: Shall this Nation be, in this matter, wholly independent, or shall it divide its sovereignty "50-50" with other nations? Every patriot grave from Lexington to Yorktown cries out to us in vibrant tones, "Preserve what we won." Our heads unite with our hearts in the only answer possible to real Americans. This is in no sense a party question. No matter which party frames the tariff law, Uncle Sam should have the say as to both factors of the duty.

OPPORTUNITY FOR FRAUD IN FOREIGN VALUATIONS.

Bobbie Burns reminded us that "If self the wavering balance shake, it's rarely right adjusted." Many people who would scorn to steal from a neighbor do not hesitate to cheat Uncle Sam by evading the payment of duties at the customhouse. "Lead us not into temptation" was a wise recognition of human weakness. It is not peculiar to any nation or to any time. This human weakness is world-wide and age-long. It has always existed and always will exist. Which affords less temptation to fraud on the customs, the fixing of values on imports by foreigners, or by our own people? The right answer will go far to help us to a proper solution of the pending problem. "Have faith in America."

There is less of crime by day than by night. Why? Darkness is the cloak of crime, helping to hide it; daylight makes detection easier, and so acts as a deterrent. Where are we more likely to get the truth, from foreigners who are beyond our national control, or from our own people who are answerable under our own laws? It is the rule rather than the exception that, under foreign valuations, two invoices are given the buyer, one showing the real price paid and the other for use at the customhouse, the latter being of course much lower and intended "to fool the customs officers." As shown by quotations elsewhere in this book, under foreign valuations fraud on Uncle Sam has always been rampant.

WHICH SYSTEM DOES THE IMPORTER PREFER?

As to the dishonest importer, there is no difficulty in answering this question. He naturally prefers the system of valuations that offers the largest opportunities for fraud on Uncle Sam. But how about the honest importers, who are in the majority? Let us see.

It has always been the instinct of the mere merchant, useful as his function is in the social establishment, to wish to have his customers and his producers as far apart as possible. We saw in chapter 17, that the Hansards established only a few factories and that they were set far apart. What the Hansards wanted was the commission of the middleman, the man who brings the producer and the consumer together. That idea was very old when the Hansards flourished centuries ago. It is a mighty force in the business world to-day. Why is this the fundamental instinct of the merchant? Because the farther the producer and the consumer can be kept apart, the less they know about each other, the bigger the profits of the middleman.

This instinct has been immensely emphasized since the World War. The destruction in Europe was so awful as to wipe out the accumulations of at least a century. Never before, not even as a result of the mad ambition of Napoleon, has Europe been set back so far in human progress. She will never catch up to what she would have been but for that devastating curse.

Europe has great needs, but she lacks the ability to meet them. Work is greatly needed, but Europe lacks the capital to do it. Working people, as always when capital is wasted or endangered, are in sore distress. They are glad to work on almost any terms. For the hard-hearted it is a great opportunity for treble profit. Advocates of foreign valuations are not satisfied with even that; they wish fourfold profit. In the first place, they can get their work done in Europe at lower cost than ever, and it can be paid in depreciated money, a double profit to the producer. And the less they have to pay to get their goods into this best market in all the world, the higher their profit. And there are people galore in the United States who want "imported" goods regardless of price, and who are glad to pay fancy prices for anything imported, even when they can get domestic articles of better quality for less money. So they are open to the tremendous temptation of huge profits by buying foreign goods instead of domestic goods. It takes a person of the sturdiest kind of manhood and Americanism to deny himself such opportunities.

UNPRECEDENTED PROPAGANDA.

Elsewhere in this book is quoted from the Washington Times an admirable editorial, "Listen to suggestions," by Arthur Brisbane, chief editor of the Hearst newspapers, that are published in many cities all over the Nation. Here Mr. Hearst is pictured as a fine example of listener. His annual business is given at \$80,000,000. He is the sole owner of this unequalled publishing business. He has built it up himself, and is still a comparatively young man. It is certainly a noteworthy achievement. Born an only child, the heir to the Hearst millions, he might have chosen to live a life of ease. But he chose deliberately a life of greatest toil. Probably no one employed by him works as hard or as many hours each day as does Mr. Hearst himself. Doubtless he regards it as one of the least of his achievements that he has multiplied his inheritance many times.

Such a man, with such experiences, might reasonably be expected to cherish as his dearest possession "independence." In the promotion of things in which he really believes Mr. Hearst is notably generous. An example of this generosity is his recent taking of a whole trainload of Congressmen, at his personal expense, to Canada to enable them to make first-hand study of the sales tax which is working so successfully in the great Dominion. In his efforts to help our people to an adequate understanding of this fine substitute for certain uneconomic national taxes from which our country is still suffering, even after the move in the right direction that Congress has made, he will succeed because in this he is fundamentally right.

But Mr. Hearst is also a fine example of the old saying, "When he is good he is very, very good, but when he is bad he is horrid." An example of his being horrid is a recent 2-column, full-page length editorial in the Washington Times, an editorial which was probably not written by Brisbane. It is largely the merest nonsense, but it is about as good as the stuff usually set forth as reasons for continuing the infamous system of foreign valuations. In his efforts to promote this

wholly unpatriotic thing, Mr. Hearst will fail because he is wrong, and no one knows this better than he. Why does he lend his great influence to this unhallowed thing? We'll see.

Among the utterances in this miserable editorial are a few sentences that show where the Hearst heart and conscience really lies. Among other things in it are the following: "Protection is a good thing, properly managed. . . . The tariff should protect all legitimate American interests against unfair or impossible European competition. All we Americans want to spend our money with our brothers that produce goods at home, and wherever possible to give the preference to the home product. . . . We want to first labor against starvation competition, whether from the East or the West." That is the real Hearst doctrine. Why does he advocate in the rest of the editorial what would surely help to break down this protection that Hearst really believes in? We'll see later.

Another noteworthy sentence in this foolish editorial is this: "What is said in this newspaper to-day will be put before the eyes of at least 15,000,000 voters throughout the United States in other newspapers." How could he be so sure that this matter would reach nearly half of all the American electorate? He could have the say as to only the Hearst publications. Did he mean to intimate that he, through his own newspapers, can reach such a large number? Perhaps. But he may have meant that such sentiments would find expression in all metropolitan newspapers throughout the length and breadth of the land. Did anyone ever hear of such unanimity before about anything else? Never. It is altogether too unanimous to be natural. And this brings up the related question, "Why are there so few really unshuttering protectionist editorials in great metropolitan newspapers? Is it because they have changed their minds, or is it because they are all under some mysterious influence that controls them all?" It does not require any marvelous power of insight to understand it all.

WHY THE IMPORTERS ARE SO ANXIOUS FOR FOREIGN VALUATIONS.

It is mighty important to the American people to know exactly whose voice they are really listening to. In the best of all books is the story of how blind Isaac was deceived. After investigating as well as he could without sight, he exclaimed, "The hand is the hand of Esau but the voice is the voice of Jacob!" The newspapers throughout the land are largely run by their owners, who take just pride in the confidence of the people that most of them so deservedly enjoy. But they who are demanding support of this infamous foreign valuations policy are hard taskmasters. Even Hearst, the richest of publishers and one of the most independent of men, dare not disobey their imperative demand. What wonder that other publications, less well financed, bow their head, though the owners groan inwardly at their shame!

What is the chief source of newspaper income? Subscriptions? No one is so poorly informed as to think that. The effort to get subscribers is only a means to an end. What is the end to be obtained thereby? Advertising. What governs the rates for advertising? The amount and character of circulation. And who are the great advertisers in the metropolitan newspapers? Manufacturers? No; their advertising, except in a few lines, is done largely in trade publications. Who are the real, worth-while advertisers in the great newspapers? Examine any of them anywhere throughout the country. The advertisers that take half-page and whole-page and two or more page advertisements throughout the year are the big stores. Can you guess why the metropolitan newspapers everywhere all over the country are singing the same song about the continuance of this long-used system of foreign valuations? There is one hand at the organ all over the land. Whose is it? Unquestionably the voice heard in all the great newspaper offices, the voice that absolutely dictates the editorial policy on this question, is that of the big stores. Read again the story of how blind Isaac was deceived, and think over its application in the case of these foreign valuations.

It is told of the late James Gordon Bennett that a big advertiser once came to him with a demand that he do a certain thing or the said big advertiser would discontinue his advertising. Bennett called for his advertising manager. The storekeeper felt that he had won an easy victory. When the advertising manager arrived, Mr. Bennett said to him, "Remove all advertising of this firm and never put another advertisement for that firm into the Herald." The pompous advertiser collapsed and begged that his advertising be continued, but Bennett's decision stood. *The advertising is just as important to the store as to the paper.* A little of Bennett's spirit would help the owners of newspapers to get back their self-respect.

LEADING DEPARTMENT STORES HAVE FOREIGN FACTORIES.

All of the big stores pride themselves on carrying a large line of "imported" goods. Why? Because so many of their best customers demand imported goods and will pay fancy prices for them. What is needed in this connection is a new declaration of independence by buyers, a new baptism of the spirit that will say "No imported goods for me, if I can get domestic goods." A nation-wide outbreak of this thoroughgoing Americanism would be mighty wholesome. Why not clubs everywhere with a slogan like that?

The leaders of this movement for a continuance of foreign valuations have factories in Europe and elsewhere abroad. These factories they are anxious to enlarge. If they could get approval from the party whose foundation stone is protection to American industry, they would have all their manufacturing done abroad. What would be the result to the well-paid American workman? Many of these American producers in Europe and elsewhere feel that the foolish demands of American labor would be avoided if they could have their factories in foreign lands. Can the American workman see his duty to himself and his country in this situation? He should be unequivocally for three things: Ample adequate protection to every American industry, American valuation of imports on which duties are ad valorem, and an honest day's work for an honest day's wage. These things are vital to the revival of American prosperity. Whoever tries to tell him anything else is not his friend.

WHAT THE SELF-SEEKING IMPORTER FORGETS.

Of course a little real thought would help him wonderfully. When he has obtained his goods, the big part of his business problem remains. How is he going to sell them? The Soviets of Russia were in clover so long as the accumulations of the past were available to be stolen. These are now pretty well exhausted and the real problem of the "rule of the proletariat" has begun. They are already feeling the pinch that will plague them more and more, and by and by even the dullest will understand the simple old proposition that only by doing honest work and saving part of one's earnings can man or nation progress.

Similarly, so long as the importer has stored wealth, the accumulations of preceding years to draw on, and there are enough people of wealth who prefer "imported" goods, the importer may get along with his sales. But without the regular employment of American workmen in producing American goods, the masses can not buy and the rich will soon find themselves poor. Now, as never before in our national history, we need an amply adequate protective tariff for every American industry, wholly controlled by America in the real and abiding interest of her own people. In carrying out our plans for the benefit of the American people, one thing absolutely essential is the permanent policy of unadulterated American valuations.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I shall consume all of that time, as the hour is very late, and I now ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing some figures at the conclusion of my speech.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I want to state that, in my judgment, the chairman of this subcommittee has made a statement of the real facts involved in this whole question, and that the subcommittee has presented a bill that ought to pass this House practically as it has been reported. I do not believe that we are justified in appropriating another dollar at this time for a battleship. I have heard some complaint on this floor about no appropriation for aviation. The chief opposition to the enlargement of the aviation service, a positive opposition to the creation of the separate Air Service, comes from the Army and the Navy. In my judgment, it has been clearly demonstrated that the battleship is a back number in war.

I know when I make that statement I make a statement which will be controverted by many of the admirals in the Navy. I was present at the time the German so-called nonsinkable ship, the *Austerfriesland*, was sunk off the Capes by bombs from the air. In less than 20 minutes from the time the airplanes were given orders the ship was going to the bottom.

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

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. How many aircraft were in operation on the *Austerfriesland* during that time?

Mr. Sisson. At the time the ship was sunk there were four airplanes in operation. There was nobody on board the German ship. [Laughter.] I know one of the Secretaries of the Navy said that he would not mind standing on the deck of the vessel at that time, but no man would say that now.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it not a fact that the airplanes came down until they almost touched the superstructure of the boat—the masts?

Mr. Sisson. I was sitting on another boat myself—

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, I was there and saw it all.

Mr. Sisson. If the statement that the gentleman makes is true, then he saw something that no other gentleman saw, and there were many looking, and he saw something that the report says is not true, because those airships were from two to four thousand feet above the battleship when they dropped the bombs that sunk the ship.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman mean to say that the airplanes did not sweep down within three or four hundred feet of the boat?

Mr. Sisson. A great many of them did a few days before that in order to show how closely they could come to it. The gentleman ought to read the report or inquire of others.

Mr. KNUTSON. Better still, I saw the thing myself.

Mr. Sisson. I was there and saw it myself. I state that the gentleman saw no such thing at the time the ship in question was sunk, and he is just as nearly correct about the other things he states as he is about this. I say the airplanes were over 2,000 feet above the ship when they dropped those 2,000-pound bombs, and the gentleman is simply mistaken if he saw the bombing. But he talks like one who did not see it. General Mitchell will be over here to-night and you will be able to ask him about how high they were. He is the man who had charge of the whole matter and knows. I have talked to him and he says the lowest plane was 2,200 feet.

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

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. CURRY. I do not think that there is any question but that one bomb sunk the ship. Of course, she was not in battle array, but she could have been sunk if she had been. I call the gentleman's attention to one thing that probably has escaped the attention of the House, and that is that Japan has authorized for experimentation and development of the army and navy air forces \$200,000,000, to be used over a period of seven years.

Mr. Sisson. I was aware of that.

Mr. Curry. And that Great Britain has appropriated \$97,000,000 for this year and France \$84,000,000 for this year. That shows that Great Britain, France, and Japan recognize the fact that the offensive and the defensive first line for the offense and defense of the nation will be from the air.

Mr. Sisson. I am very glad the gentleman called my attention to that fact. The only difference between us is that I understood it was a 10-year program on the part of Japan. Perhaps the gentleman is correct. It may be a seven-year program.

Mr. Curry. It is a seven-year program.

Mr. Sisson. It is immaterial whether it be 7 or 10 years. It is to extend over such a period that they will be able to have not only money to accomplish great things but they will have 10 years in which to experiment before they shall finally decide upon the character of craft that they will adopt, and in this way get the very best possible that has been invented up to that time. I think that is the wise thing to do. Personally, I would be glad to see the United States embark on a very much larger program in the air, because in my judgment a battleship—

Mr. Curry. Does not the gentleman think that the only way that we can develop in the air is through having a unified service?

Mr. Sisson. Personally, I would be glad to see a department created for aircraft—an aircraft department. I do not believe that we will be able to develop it to its fullest capacity and as rapidly as it ought to be developed as long as there is so much rivalry within the Army and the Navy in respect to the development of aircraft.

By the way, I heard some gentleman say, sotto voce, over here, something about the Post Office Department. I think we will make a mistake to deprive the Post Office Department of that service. I do not think the battle plane is the proper plane for commercial purposes, and I believe the European nations are commencing to develop a commercial plane where the conditions are different.

Mr. Curry. That kind of a plane develops the pilots.

Mr. Sisson. Yes; it does develop the pilots.

First, as I started to say when I was interrupted, in my judgment, with what we have now demonstrated, if you have the right sort of airplanes every battleship is a floating cemetery. Now, I know it is a pretty hard thing for our Navy men to admit. One of the admirals told me, "It has been my ambition from the time I entered the Naval Academy to pace the deck of a battleship as an admiral. We are all wedded to the battleship. We all love it. But, as much as I love the battleship, I must confess with amazement that this test has demonstrated"—speaking of the test off the Capes—"that from the air a battleship can be destroyed successfully and quickly." He said, "That is a very hard statement for me to make, but I have always tried to keep my mind open for the reception of the truth."

There is no question but that the airship will play the most important part in the next great war. These principles are now clearly demonstrated: First, the nation that controls the air will control the sea; second, the nation that controls the sea will control the world. For this reason the American people should control the air. Our air program should be enlarged. We can cut out one of our battleships and put one-half that money in the air and have a better defense. Great Britain and France have both practically abandoned big ship construction and are turning largely to aircraft. The price of one battleship would give us control of the air. No ship would dare come within 300 miles of our coasts if our Air Service were properly developed. Why spend all this money now? Why not look a little further into the future and not foolishly spend all these millions until we know that it is necessary and that we are spending it for what we need?

So in building up our Navy we should take into consideration in expending so much of the people's money what the next few years may develop. If there ever was a time in the history of the world when we could afford to take a holiday in the expenditure of the people's money, now is the time, because it is admitted by almost everyone that no nation is in a financial condition to make war upon us at this time. Not only that, if the professions of nations mean anything, these four powers having agreed on this 10-year period in which no enlargement of navies shall be made, we can certainly relieve our people of some of the burdens of taxation. If we mean what we say, is not this the hour to practice some real economy?

This was one of the boasted accomplishments of the peace conference. They promised great relief to the taxpayers. Has this promise, too, been already repudiated? If these proposed

amendments are urged by the President and the Secretary of State, then, indeed, the peace conference is a farce, and the people of the world know it. At this very hour England and Japan are considering the size of their navies. If the United States reduces her personnel, they will reduce theirs. So it is of great importance to every selfish interest to enlarge as much as possible now, for it means so many, many millions to them in profit not only for next year but all the years to follow. Why, gentlemen of the committee, the bill now provides for the very identical ships allowed under the treaty and for the maximum number of ships. This is admitted by everyone who knows anything about this treaty Navy. The only ones who deny this are people who are careless with the truth and who are ignorant. The only question in controversy is whether there are enough men provided in the bill to properly man and operate the ships.

The entire fleet that the Navy Department say they want to keep under the terms of the peace treaty is as follows, as shown by the hearings:

THE FLEET AND NECESSARY AUXILIARIES.		
18 battleships:		Men.
Delaware	-----	935
North Dakota	-----	995
Florida	-----	868
Utah	-----	879
Wyoming	-----	1,048
Arkansas	-----	1,074
New York	-----	1,039
Texas	-----	1,039
Nevada	-----	959
Oklahoma	-----	929
Pennsylvania	-----	1,029
Arizona	-----	988
New Mexico	-----	1,062
Mississippi	-----	997
Idaho	-----	974
Tennessee	-----	998
California	-----	1,294
Maryland	-----	1,154
		18,259
11 cruisers, armored:		
Huron	-----	684
Seattle	-----	791
First class, Rochester	-----	366
Second class, 3 light cruisers (building)	-----	990
Third class—		
Birmingham	-----	276
Cleveland	-----	288
Denver	-----	288
Galveston	-----	288
Tacoma	-----	277
		4,248
103 destroyers (93 men each)	-----	9,579
84 submarines (30 men each)	-----	2,520
6 destroyer tenders:		
Melville	-----	332
Black Hawk	-----	349
Bridgeport	-----	520
Altair	-----	450
Denebola	-----	450
Rigel	-----	450
		2,551
7 submarine tenders:		
Camden	-----	344
Savannah	-----	308
Beaver	-----	292
Bushnell	-----	179
Fulton	-----	131
Rainbow	-----	297
Canopus	-----	282
		1,833
1 aircraft carrier, Langley	-----	216
1 aircraft tender, Wright	-----	286
2 mine layers—		
Baltimore	-----	301
Shawmut	-----	314
		615
10 light mine layers—		
Mahan	-----	99
Murray	-----	95
Maury	-----	85
Israel	-----	99
Ingraham	-----	99
Ludlow	-----	93
Burns	-----	99
Anthony	-----	99
Rizal	-----	99
Hart	-----	92
		959
10 mine sweepers (tugs)—		
Chewink	-----	46
Curlew	-----	44
Lark	-----	44
Mallard	-----	52
Penguin	-----	51
Seagull	-----	54
Whippoorwill	-----	54
Tanager	-----	52
Finch	-----	54
Bittern	-----	47
		498
2 repair ships—		
Vestal	-----	357
Prometheus	-----	370
		727

3 storeships—	Men.	
Rappahannock	235	
Bridge	189	
Artic	188	
14 fuel ships—		612
Arethusa	78	
Brazos	112	
Cuyama	95	
Jason	152	
Kanawha	101	
Nereus	141	
Orion	164	
Patoka	91	
Proteus	153	
Ramapo	91	
Sapelo	91	
Trinity	91	
Naches	101	
Pecos	107	
2 ammunition ships—		1,568
Nitro	177	
Pyro	177	
2 hospital ships—		354
Mercy	268	
Relief	361	
		629
276 Total for fleet and necessary auxiliaries		45,454
PATROLS AND VESSELS OTHERWISE CLASSED.		
7 cargo ships:		
Bath	88	
Beaufort	71	
Kittery	87	
Newport News	113	
Capello	81	
Sirius	91	
Vega	81	
3 transports:		612
Argonne	211	
Henderson	397	
Chaumont	214	
9 gunboats:		822
El Cano	83	
Monocacy	46	
Palos	46	
Pampanga	30	
Quiros	47	
Sacramento	152	
Villalobos	56	
Wilmington	151	
Asheville	148	
6 yachts and patrol vessels:		759
Isabel	83	
Mayflower	160	
Nokomis	66	
Scorpion	132	
Sylph	32	
Vixen	72	
8 fleet tugs:		545
Contocook	39	
Montcalm	37	
Napa	39	
Ontario	54	
Osceola	34	
Potomac	42	
Somona	54	
Tadousac	39	
10 fleet towing vessels (tugs):		338
Bobolink	45	
Robin	45	
Vireo	45	
Rail	45	
Quail	45	
Brant	45	
Cardinal	45	
Kingfisher	45	
Partridge	45	
Tern	45	
1 survey vessel, Hannibal		450
2 Bureau of Fisheries:		137
Albatross	81	
Fish Hawk	44	
5 miscellaneous:		125
Gold Star	97	
Regulus	91	
Antares	26	
Procyon	17	
General Alava	19	
		250
51 Total for patrol and vessels otherwise classed		4,038
327 Grand total		49,492

This table shows the exact ship and its name retained in the bill and is the identical list asked to be retained by the Navy. The number of men opposite each ship is the number of men on the ship on the 1st day of February, 1922. This list of ships was furnished by the Navy Department without any suggestion

of the number of men. But the committee took the number of men on board on the 1st day of February, 1922. To this should be added 632 men serving in aviation ratings on that day and 700 additional men for flagship duty. Then there has been allowed 93 on 103 destroyers, when on February 1, 1922, the average on the destroyers was only 87 men on board, which number, if applied to the 103 destroyers, would permit reducing the total down to 50,000 men. So, without doubt, the 50,000 men will keep afloat all the treaty Navy.

Now, about the shore stations. At the present time 12,633 men are assigned to the various shore duties, there are 4,981 being trained and 7,833 absolutely unassigned, making a grand total on shore of 25,447 men. But this now, under the contention of the Secretary of the Navy, is not enough. They now say they need 32,000 men on shore. That is to say, they now want 32,000 men, with jobs for only 12,633. Oh, Mr. Chairman, when did our taxpayers become so vastly rich that they can pile up 20,000 men on shore with nothing to do, no navy yard to work in, no training stations to train in, and no ship upon which to serve?

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have allowed 8 per cent of the entire enlisted personnel for those who may be sick, in prison, or in transit. The department now requires only 12,633 men for specific assignment with a 96,000-man establishment. This bill provided 10,000 men with an additional 7,000 unassigned, out of which the necessary number for training and replacement can be had. That makes a total of 67,000 afloat and on shore. What need have we for more? Some uninformed or careless men on this floor say that this will not give us a 5-5-3 Navy. They are just ignorant of the facts. The London Times is in the Congressional Library, and that paper publishes the proceedings of Parliament, and it is as reliable as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Here are the facts about the British Navy. The personnel of Great Britain's Navy, as shown by her budget, is 98,500. This includes officers, enlisted men, marines, coast guard, and students in her naval academies. Now, look at ours. This bill carries 67,000 men, plus 19,500 marines, plus 1,000 marine officers, plus 6,150 officers of the line and staff, plus 1,500 warrant officers, plus 2,500 boys in the Naval Academy, which gives us a total of 97,656 in the American Navy. In other words, each Nation has about 98,000 men. But Great Britain counts many mechanics and machinists in hers which we carry as civilian employees. So, really, we have more than she has.

Now, as the chairman of the committee says, we are giving the Navy all the men it had on these ships on the 1st of January and 2,000 surplus, and this number was the maximum of men on the ships when there were 96,000 men in the Navy. So it is bound to resolve itself now into one proposition, and one alone, and that the officers of the Navy are more solicitous about their own promotions and the kind of straps they wear on their shoulders, perhaps, than they ought to be. I do not know that I ought to make this statement, because I believe it ought to be the ambition of every young man in the Navy to be an admiral. I glory in that ambition. But I do not believe a Congressman should share that. You have a higher trust than that. When you have given an adequate defense and an adequate Navy, you ought not to be swept off your feet by selfishness. I am not complaining of the men on this floor who have navy yards in their districts and are clamoring to keep them. I suppose if we should swap places with them we would be like they are. I suppose if I were living in a district where my landlord and my groceryman and all the people that live there got business out of a navy yard, I would be like they are.

Mr. CURRY. How many navy yards are there?

Mr. Sisson. In the United States?

Mr. CURRY. Yes.

Mr. Sisson. I am glad that there are not more than there are now.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Do you mean that the position of the proponents is measured by the number of navy yards?

Mr. Sisson. The gentleman did not catch what I meant, or he is indulging in a great deal of imagination. I know my friend is an imaginative and a splendid gentleman, and I know that when he differs with you he differs honestly. I do not know that there is anything miraculous about it, that where you have a navy yard your people wish for a large Navy. And there are other influences. There are a great many people who want to sell steel for a battleship. There are men who sell buttons for the coats. That makes business good. The Moloch of war—and I had not intended to discuss this—the Moloch of war can not be satisfied. It is the most devouring god that the devil ever set up. It not only commits crime in war time, but in peace time. It has the most unsatisfied appetite in the world.

We gave you \$233,000,000 in this bill, and there is \$71,000,000 in the building fund, making \$304,000,000, and then after that the \$60,000,000 that is going to be demanded and must be had for the settlement of these claims on these contracts—it may go to \$100,000,000—but take the small figure, and you have the stupendous sum of something over \$360,000,000 that this Navy is going to cost you during the next fiscal year. Is not that enough to satisfy a considerable maw? What sort of a paunch has an animal that it takes more than \$360,000,000 to feed in one year—over a million dollars a day? And yet the country is in a financial condition that it was never in before.

The counties are paying enormous taxes. The States are paying enormous taxes, and the Federal taxes are enormous now, with both of these political parties, both the Democrats and the Republicans, pledging their sacred honor to reduce them; their sacred honor; yes, bound almost by a Jesse James oath, for on every stump in this Nation both parties, in effect, said: "If you will return us to power we will reduce expenditures."

The Democrats were arraigned on every stump in the last campaign for their ruinous extravagance. And yet when a servant of yours like my distinguished friend from Michigan, Governor KELLEY, comes and, as a courageous statesman, as a man of great brains and great heart and great courage, tries to fulfill the pledges to the American people and the taxpayers, he is assailed by the departments; his courage is attacked on every side, his judgment is attacked, and you would imagine by what they say that he was endeavoring to wreck the whole country.

Mark this little prophecy that I now make: When he goes back to that inarticulate mass which Mr. Carlyle speaks of; when he goes before that inarticulate mass which is so little cared for in this Congress by men who so cruelly forget those people back there who are laboring and toiling, the men you do not see about the clubs, the men you do not see riding in palace cars, the men whom you do not meet in the counting rooms of banks, but that inarticulate mass that Carlyle, that wonderful philosopher, that great old Scotchman, spoke of—that inarticulate mass—be sure they will be heard some time, and when they are heard the sound of their voice will be like the roar of the mighty waters of Niagara, and the force of them will be irresistible.

And when Governor KELLEY goes before that great mass of uncorrupted and incorruptible minds and hearts of the masses of the American people, you will hear a most overwhelming verdict, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things in the House of Representatives and we propose, because you have been patriotic and courageous, to promote you to the body that you desire to enter." He is the kind of men who will save this Republic, and the people know it. [Applause.]

Mr. DEMPSEY. Now, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. Sisson. Yet selfishness knows no politics. Selfishness knows no patriotism. The Bible never had a truer sentence written into it than "The love of money is the root of all evil." It is the love of money that is the root of all evil. It is not money that is the root of all evil. No; that is not the root of evil at all, but it is the love of money that is the root of all evil. Oh, my friends, you might think differently about this bill if you knew more about that Book and about that passage in that Book. I think it is the greatest of all books. There you find the truth.

But the Moloch of war has blinded men. They do not look at or care for the suffering taxpayer. They do not see the quiet suffering on the farm; they do not see the suffering in the mines; they do not see the suffering of all this inarticulate mass; they do not hear the cries of this mass at this time here on this floor; I may plead for them now in vain, but they will be heard nevertheless, gentlemen. They are going to speak some of these days.

Now I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In connection with the gentleman's statement as to economy, I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Did he hear the chairman of the subcommittee state that the estimate of the Budget was \$192,000,000 in excess of the amount in this bill, and that only a small amount, about one-half of that, was accounted for by the discontinuance of the building program?

Mr. Sisson. I heard all that the gentleman from Michigan said, and I indorse all that he said. When he said that he told the literal truth.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is not wonderfully generous treatment that the committee is giving. The total, you said, is \$233,000,000?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; and you cut the Budget estimate down \$192,000,000, so that you give about 50 per cent of what the Budget provided.

Mr. Sisson. We did, and I think we did very well when we did that. I think we did very well, indeed. The gentleman from New York must be very peculiarly minded. I have seen many men who are peculiarly minded, but this is the first time I have ever heard of a complaint or a complaining tone of voice which conveyed the effect of a criticism and by virtue of the emphasis with which it was said carried a terrible reflection on the committee because it saved \$192,000,000. I am a member of this committee and I am glad to share the honor or the blame with those who composed it. But it is a terrible criticism to hurl at a man to charge him with having saved \$192,000,000 in these hard times! The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] ought to get the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] to make that statement out in his State. I want him to come down in my district and make that charge against me. I will plead guilty. I have been instrumental in assisting in saving to the taxpayers \$192,000,000. I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ELLIS] that if such a charge as that was made out in that good old Missouri district of yours that you, as one of 435 Members, had assisted in saving \$192,000,000 of the taxpayers' money, which would be \$441,000 as the share saved by each Member, a result obtained by dividing \$192,000,000 by 435, it surely would not do you any harm. I wish I could live long enough to draw out of the Federal Treasury that much money! I would make Methuselah look like a boy. [Applause.] In my own district it amounts to over \$40,000 for each county in my district.

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

Mr. Sisson. Let me tell you another thing. When you speak of the Budget you must understand that the man who is at the head of the Budget is liable to fall under the influence of my friends, the Army and Navy officers, and my friend Dawes is subject to such influence, no matter how much he may try to resist it.

I do not know what the Budget would have done, nor does the gentleman know what the Budget would have done, nor can any man speak for the Budget or General Dawes now. After that treaty was signed, and after it was ratified by the Senate, I do not know but General Dawes and the Budget might have cut off a few millions more. Nobody has any right to say that they know what they would have done; but with the light before us we have done the best we could to carry out what we believed to be the terms of that treaty. If President Harding does what the big Army and Navy people want him to do, he will be the first to repudiate his own treaty. This will be a real test of the confidence he has in his own treaty. If he shall yield to the clamor of the pork-barrel Navy people, those who profit by the Navy, then he will come to Congress before the final vote is cast and ask for an increase in the personnel of the Navy over what is allowed in this bill. Let us hope that the oppressed American people may be spared that additional burden. The President should not use his big stick on Congress and drive them to this increase.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I do.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I merely made the statement I did and asked the question I did to comment upon the gentleman's statement that we had been so very generous.

Mr. Sisson. Let me ask you a question. Do you think \$233,000,000 for the Navy is not a generous appropriation?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me finish my question.

Mr. Sisson. Wait. You have asked me a great many questions. You have put me on the stand, not so much for the purpose of eliciting information as to find out how I stood for the purpose of criticism. I do not think it important to the House or the American people about how I stand. The question is whether I am right or wrong. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think we can form a very reasonable estimate as to what the Budget would have done after the disarmament conference. I think we can form an absolutely arithmetical estimate, because last year we appropriated \$90,000,000 for construction, and if we take the same appropriation this year—and that is a fair way to treat it—

Mr. Sisson. Oh, I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, and I can not tell—

Mr. DEMPSEY. We would still have \$102,000,000 for construction.

Mr. Sisson. I might say that I can not tell what might or might not have been done. I am simply dealing with facts. I know these pork-barrel Navy people want to try to get away

from the cold-blooded facts as stated in this report and as borne out by a close study of this bill in order to go off into some dream or into the realms of prophecy and have the House act upon imaginary enemies and ghosts rather than upon facts. But the fact is that the Navy Department itself admits that so far as craft are concerned we have given them all that the treaty requires. The only controversy is as to the number of men that it takes to man the ships. Now, they have got more men on them than they usually have on these ships, and I do not know of any better way to do than to do like Governor KELLEY and the subcommittee did. They asked, "How many did you have on such and such a date when you had 96,000 men? Now, if you did not need them in time of peace at that time, why do you need them now?" But to be on the safe side we gave them a leeway of 2,000 men over any peace-time force on the ships.

I have heard a good deal here about the comparison between the British Navy and our own. Oh, my! If the British people were as panicky as we are, and if they saw as many ghosts as walk up and down in this House every time we are considering a Naval or Army bill, the English Navy would be more than double what it is. You know I am rather amused at some of the arguments made by gentlemen here about the Australian Navy and the colonial navies of Great Britain. Do you know that some of the English naval officers say that is one reason why the mother country ought always to maintain a very much stronger navy; that as between Great Britain and foreign nations these colonial navies are a great help to Great Britain, but that if there should be a revolt in Australia or in Canada, it would simply mean that Great Britain would be required to have a navy to overcome her colonial navies and repel a revolution, and that, too, when perhaps she was in a foreign war.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a question right in that connection?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A member of the British Parliament stated a while ago in a debate on the floor of that body that not only was a war with this country unthinkable, but that it was absolutely impossible, and that he hoped and believed that, if such a war was ordered in the manner that George III ordered one, the officers of the English Navy would not obey the order.

Mr. SISSON. With everything that we have done since the Great War and even with the lessons of that war, some people do not learn anything. You will hear people saying that preparedness means peace, that the best-prepared nation will never be attacked. Yet Germany was the best-prepared nation on earth. Germany supposedly had the best army, and if you believe what our friends say during the debate on naval bills, she had a navy about twice as good as ours. Yet where is her mighty war machine now? What has become of her boasted preparedness? They do not urge that now. The German preparedness did not prevent her being attacked and did not save her. The big Army and the big Navy advocates have been driven from one thing to another.

But now what do they say? They say, "Yes; we have entered into that pact, but the other nations have not ratified as yet and we must take no chances." In other words, they try to move Congress by fear. The fact is there is not a naval officer or an Army officer around the Army and Navy Club who believes in that four-power pact. Any world movement for the reduction of arms or armament is resisted by them. You can not blame them, for they have selected the Army or Navy as a life work, and to have reduction of armies and navies means less promotion and less salaries for them. Ask any of these officers concerning some fact and they will tell you the truth. They are truthful men. They despise liars. As a rule, they are absolutely honest and as fine a lot of fellows as you ever saw, but still they are human beings. They have the same ambitions that you have. They have the same feelings that you have; and I would not belong to a profession that I did not think was a good one. Would you? I believe in belonging to a profession where I can rise all my life and continue to rise, and still feel that I am not what I ought to be in that profession. I think a soldier who does not believe in his profession or a naval officer who does not believe in his profession ought to be out of the service and his uniform ought to be taken off him. Therefore, I glory in the fact that they feel that they ought to have promotion. But keep constantly in your minds that they are human beings and that they are ambitious.

It disgusts me to hear some of my good friends in the House get up and ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], or some other member of the subcommittee, "Did you have before you all those experts in the Navy, and did you get those experts to tell you about what we ought to have and what they ought

to have according to the treaty?" Let me tell you that if I had to do that I would forego my seat in Congress and I would go back home.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

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

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. How does the appropriation compare with the prewar appropriation?

Mr. SISSON. The prewar appropriation in 1915 was \$141,000,000.

Mr. LONDON. And the appropriation is now larger than the prewar appropriation?

Mr. SISSON. The figures I have in mind—

Mr. MADDEN. It was \$141,000,000 in 1915 and \$149,000,000 the next year.

Mr. SISSON. That was the year immediately preceding the war.

Mr. LONDON. With all the international conferences and treaties the appropriation is \$100,000,000 greater than before the war?

Mr. SISSON. Yes; and if you take into consideration that they have \$71,000,000 available to spend for the balance of the fiscal year and all of next; \$71,000,000 in the Treasury to complete or continue the building program, and in addition to that the \$60,000,000 which is going to be appropriated for the purpose of taking care of the claims, it will make the stupendous sum of \$360,000,000.

Mr. LONDON. Is not the personnel larger than it was in 1915?

Mr. SISSON. I think the limit was 54,000 before the war, and they usually had about 40,000 actually enlisted in the Navy.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman said there was \$71,000,000 unexpended.

Mr. SISSON. For the building program.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman does not want the House to assume that that will be carried over in the next fiscal year. There are three calendar months remaining, which is one-quarter of a year, and that will be expended—

Mr. SISSON. I do not think anybody got that idea. I think the gentleman from New York understood what I said.

Mr. KNUTSON. It will be practically all expended.

Mr. SISSON. Not over \$30,000,000 will be expended at the most, and there will be at least \$41,000,000 available on the 1st of January.

Mr. MADDEN. There will be \$48,000,000 available for the construction of airplane carriers on the 1st of January.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The rate is about \$90,000,000 a year.

Mr. SISSON. With that stupendous amount of money it seems to me that the party in power with its great majority should be satisfied.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Certainly.

Mr. TINCHER. As I understand the proposition from questions asked by the gentleman from Illinois and others, it is not a question of how many men we are going to have on the ships, but how many men we are going to have left to be on shore on parade.

Mr. SISSON. That is it; they want the American people to have two men on shore when one is busy. I can not agree to that. Will you Republicans now repudiate your own President and the much-boasted accomplishment of the peace conference which he called, and which he claims as one of his great services to the American people? It is said by some here that he is for a larger Navy than is provided in this bill. It is said by some that he will ask Congress to increase this bill. Will the President thus so soon renounce his position on the good accomplished by his peace conference? Do the big interests who are clamoring for a bigger Navy have such a hold on the President that they can make him eat his own words? Many contend that he belongs to the big interests, and that they will cause him to turn his back upon his boasted "peace conference," and that he will ask Congress to do the bidding of the naval officers. This hour will test him. If he is a real man, if he is a real leader, and if he is to live in history as a blessing to mankind, he will not do this thing. If he believes what he has said to the world and to the American people, and if he has any confidence in the work of his own hands, he will insist on carrying out in good faith the real reduction of armaments. If

he is playing cheap politics, if he is trying to run with the hare and the hounds, he will come and try to coerce you Republican Members to turn this committee down and do the bidding of the Steel Trust, the General Electric Co., the navy yards, the gunmakers, the naval officers, and all that selfish interest who, moved by a love of money, have always cursed the human family with war.

There are only two kinds of Congressmen. Both branches of Congress have only two classes. They are like verbs. They are either "indicative" Congressmen or "subjunctive" Congressmen. They are either acting or they are being acted upon. A very small minority are in the "indicative mood." The vast majority are in the "subjunctive mood." That is to say, the majority of both Houses of Congress are in the "subjunctive mood" class. They are acted upon. They do as they are told. This is well enough if the controlling or telling power is wise and unselfish. But the rule is the other way. The controlling and telling power is selfish. The selfish interest is always active. It is always wide awake. It is present at the ballot box. It controls Presidents and Cabinets. They in turn control Congressmen and Senators.

Let us hope and pray that in this trying hour a good influence may move the President to exercise his power for good, for peace, and for economy. Let us pray that the President may be moved by truth and for the good of the suffering world to insist upon Congress reducing the instrumentalities of death and to take the lead of the whole world in a march for peace, universal peace, and thus remove from the backs of men this burden of taxation which is now too heavy to bear. May we not see the sad spectacle of the President turning his back upon his splendid professions and deserting the path of truth and peace and marching at the head of error, selfishness, suffering, and war.

AMEND THE FARM LOAN ACT.

Now, there is another body of men that I want to call attention to. No nation is stronger than its farmers or stronger than its agriculture. You imitate Germany in a great many things, but you are unwilling to imitate Germany in agriculture. Germany recognizes fully, as Napoleon did, that the army moves on its belly. It is utterly impossible to make an army or navy unless you feed it. It is equally impossible to make an army or navy unless you feed the father, the mother, the brother, and the sister back home. Therefore, no nation is stronger than its agriculture. No great military power ever succeeded unless it had a great agriculture or access to agriculture. While we are talking about these matters of a great army and navy that they say we need, we have not had to bother about agriculture because we have been and are the greatest agricultural country in the world, but we are reaching the point where agriculture is beginning to wane. Sir Thomas Buckle says that there never has been a great nation whose agriculture has commenced to wane that was ever able to overcome that condition; that it continues to get worse. I want to call your attention to an amendment that ought to be made, and made at once, to the Federal farm loan act. The last clause in the section enumerating the kind of indebtedness for which loans may be made provides that all indebtedness that the farmer owes may be paid from the money loaned, provided it was incurred for agricultural purposes.

Indeed, during the last few years a great many men out in the State of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCER] and down in my State were prosperous because they got such splendid prices for their farm products.

Mr. ELLIS. But they were war prices.

Mr. SISON. It is immaterial what they were. The farmer did not analyze that fact. He bought his wife and child a musical instrument or perhaps a flivver. They never before, perhaps, had had any comforts. Suddenly the war was over, and prices dropped, and he found himself in debt, and it was necessary to borrow money to make the crops and to save his farm. He applies to the Farm Loan Board for a Government loan. They are powerless to help him, because the indebtedness was not incurred for agricultural purposes. I have consulted within the last few days with the Federal Farm Loan Board because of certain conditions in my own district, and without a single exception everyone of them said that that clause ought to be repealed. It is immaterial with the farmer what he contracted the debt for. And I think it ought not to be the policy of this Government to deny a man who has contracted a debt any loan because he bought a musical instrument or a flivver. The only question ought to be whether or not he is able to pay and will be able to pay and whether his land is worth the money.

Mr. TINCER. What the gentleman is advocating is that he should have the same right to borrow money to save his farm that he would have to buy it with.

Mr. SISON. Absolutely. In other words, I think he ought to have the same right to borrow money that any other class of borrowers has in any banking institution. I think it is all right for the Farm Loan Board to find out what he is going to do with the money. I think that is proper and should be done. I think it is right for the banker to ask what he is going to do with the money before he loans it, because he is interested not only in the security but also in whether the borrower will be able to pay when the loan matures.

I have no objection to that. However, if I should go to the chairman of the committee, who is a good business man, and should want to borrow money, he would not want to know how I got in debt, but he would want to know about my ability to pay. He would want to know about the moral risk and then what kind of security I had to offer. That is all the Federal Farm Loan Board says it ought to have and the Federal Farm Loan Board has asked this Congress to amend that law, and we ought to amend it. I believe if that matter is brought to the attention of the Committee on Banking and Currency they will report the bill. I introduced a bill the other day which has been referred to that committee, and at the first opportunity I want to go before the committee and see if we can not get them to report the legislation.

In the case mentioned, however, the farmer who invested in the little Ford and still owed for it in whole or in part is denied the privilege of liquidating that indebtedness through the farm loan system. I say without hesitation that the only possible way by which the losses of agriculture during the last two years are to be absorbed is through the utilization of their capital investment as a basis for credit under a system which furnishes a low rate of interest and a plan for the gradual annual liquidation of the indebtedness. This the farm loan system provides, and it is not fair to agriculture that these restrictive limitations in the law should be allowed to continue to work their harmful effects.

When the merchant or professional man goes to his local bank to borrow money, while it is true the good banker will want to know the uses to which he puts the money if the loan is made, yet it is important to bear in mind that he is not confronted with any statutory prohibitions or limitations. It would seem that the farmer has been singled out by Congress as the one class of people that the Congress feels called upon to tell how he may use his money. Under normal conditions, and before the days of deflation and the perpendicular drop in farm prices, this limitation, perhaps not working any peculiar hardship, went unnoticed. The situation is entirely different at this time, and there is real need for positive relief. If the Banking and Currency Committee will take this bill of mine under consideration and report it favorably there will be performed a service to agriculture of immense importance, and I strongly urge action upon this bill at once.

The Farm Loan Board has asked Congress for the repeal of this restrictive provision, and again repeats that recommendation in its fifth annual report to Congress. I quote the language of the report:

The second has had to do with the purposes for which loans may be made. Again, section 12, paragraph 4, defines purposes for which loans may be made, and subdivision D deals with loans to liquidate indebtedness of borrowers, and it will be noted that loans to liquidate indebtedness can only be made to discharge a mortgage upon the premises, or "to liquidate indebtedness of the owner of the land mortgaged incurred for agricultural purposes."

Thousands of applications have been made by farmers with unencumbered farms for loans with which to retrieve losses of the past 18 months, many of which could not by any construction be classed as "indebtedness incurred for agricultural purposes," and had ultimately to be denied. The board seriously questions the wisdom of this limitation, and has once before pointed it out to Congress, recommending that loans may be made to an "actual farmer" to liquidate any indebtedness. While it is no doubt economically highly to be desired in agriculture, as in other vocations, that persons should not incur indebtedness outside of their usual line of business, yet where such indebtedness has been incurred by mistake or by misfortune and exists as an obligation which an actual farmer must pay, the board is unable to see the soundness of the restriction which deprives him of the right to liquidate such indebtedness by a long-time amortized loan upon his farm, and we renew our recommendation that this provision of the farm loan act be modified so that loans may be made to actual farmers for liquidation of any indebtedness.

I want to say while I am on my feet that no agency of the Government is performing a more useful service to the agriculture of the Nation than is the farm loan system. Its progress has been fought at every step by the old-line mortgage companies through their association, the Farm Mortgage Bankers' Association of America, and from circulars being received by Members of Congress recently the fight is still on.

I know it is a distressing contemplation upon the part of the old-line mortgage companies to realize that their grip upon the throat of American agriculture is being gradually broken by the operation of the farm-loan system, and that they are soon

to be forced to make a reasonable rate of interest and to charge reasonable commissions. Heretofore these concerns, as is well known, have never been content except to lay upon the backs of the farmers in interest and commission precisely as much and not one whit less than the traffic would bear. Their real competitor at this time is the farm-loan system, and that they have realized it and are undertaking to hamper it is, as I have already said, demonstrated, not only by the fact that they contested the constitutionality of the act in the Supreme Court of the United States and tied up the loaning operations of the system for nearly 15 months, and at a time when its services could have been of such tremendous value to agriculture, but it is shown in the recent disingenuous circular which has come to the attention of many of us, in which the secretary of this association undertakes to discredit the system by the publication of many totally untrue statements and of many half truths.

These gentlemen had as well save their money, because the farm-loan system has proven itself to be such a vital necessity to the agricultural life of the Nation that no Congress is going to be insane enough to tamper with it except to improve its services.

As an indication of the work of this system, I may say that within nine months the Farm Loan Board, acting for the 12 Federal land banks, has put upon the market and sold to the investing public \$175,000,000 of farm-loan bonds. These bonds, as is well known, are based upon first mortgages on agricultural lands, and they are the instrumentality by which the farmer is enabled to buy money upon the security of his land. This bond has been declared by the Supreme Court to be the instrumentality of the Government, and as such it is the duty of Congress and of the administrators of the law to guard it with the same care as is exercised by the Government itself in the issuance of its own bonds or certificates of indebtedness. These bonds are now being quoted at a very good premium and they have become a standard form of investment.

The Federal land banks, 12 in number, being the regional banks of the system, are now loaning on a basis of about eighteen and one-half million dollars per month, and the joint-stock land banks, these being organized by private capital, are loaning in the neighborhood of about \$8,000,000 per month, and with the rapid growth in number of these institutions it is safe to predict that the joint loaning operations of the system, if the bond market will absorb their bonds, will be loaning in the next six months on a basis of forty or fifty million dollars per month, for even now these joint agencies are loaning on a basis of slightly in excess of \$1,000,000 per each workday in the week. This is a huge volume of business for an institution of this character, but the delinquencies in interest and installment payments of the Federal land banks amount to but 1.4 per cent of the total maturities and but 0.17 of 1 per cent of the total loans closed to March 31, 1922, clearly indicating that the loans have been conservatively made and that the management of the banks as well as the policies of the board look to safety as a first principle in their business operations. This is as it should be.

I have a peculiar personal pride in the bank of my own land bank district, located at New Orleans and serving the States of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Alabama. The farm loan act was intended to furnish a basis of credit, or an avenue of approach to credit, to the small farmer to whom such approaches were closed. While the average loan for the farm loan system through the Federal land banks is \$2,939, the average loan for the New Orleans bank district is \$1,759. The New Orleans bank is more nearly serving the original purposes of the farm loan act than any bank in the system. During the month of March I am informed this bank closed 1,035 loans, in an aggregate amount of \$1,957,250, making the average loan for the month \$1,891.

Gentlemen unfamiliar with rural conditions can not appreciate what \$1,500 or \$2,500 may mean to the average farmer of the country, nor do they appreciate what this system as a whole is doing to stabilize agricultural conditions and to lift agriculture from a mere state of existence to the dignity of a real profession which should, but frequently does not, give as good return upon the investment as a similar investment would bring in returns when put into any other business.

In conclusion, permit me to urge again upon the membership of the Banking and Currency Committee the very great importance of this bill which I have introduced. The Farm Loan Board is powerless to relieve the situation which the restrictions referred to in my opening remarks place upon the farmer. It is not enough to criticize the board. They are helpless to remedy it. If criticism there be, that criticism should be

aimed at us who refuse to take action to relieve a situation that should not have been created in the first instance.

My bill will liberalize the farm loan act in such a manner as to enlarge the uses to which the money loaned may be put. In paragraph "D" of section 12 of the farm loan act, the borrower is permitted to use the money borrowed, if to pay a debt, only when such debt was incurred for an agricultural purpose, as I have just stated. Those of us who are familiar with the agricultural developments of the past two years will recognize in this limitation a grave injustice to the farmers of the country. During the days of high-priced farm products many farmers incurred debts that were not perhaps for agricultural purposes. Some of these farmers, having for the first time in life money or credit sufficient with which, we will say, to buy a Ford car, went in debt and bought one, furnishing for the very first time an opportunity for his hard-working life companion to break the dull monotony of her life by taking a little trip to some near-by town or city. Perhaps it was bad business judgment upon the part of the farmer to incur this indebtedness for the pleasure of his hard-working wife and children. I do not think so. I know something of the ceaseless drudgery that is hers. I know that her workday never ends. Her cares are many. She never complains. I know, for I was raised in the country far from the railroad, and I have never forgotten how these God-fearing country mothers sacrifice and toil and complain not. I know that her opportunities for contact with the world are few, and I do not begrudge her this little pleasure. No; and I want this good farmer to know that his Government will not deny him a loan to save his farm, even if for once in his life he did make a business mistake. Much has been spoken and written of the tendency of the country boy and girl to leave the farm and to cast their lots among strangers in the cities and towns of the country. Yes; and this tendency is going to increase unless something is done to lighten the burden and increase the pleasures of the good country women. These good women are the very salt of the earth. They are the mothers of the men and women worth while. We must make life for them contented and happy, relieve it somewhat of its isolation and its hardships, and the country boy and country girl will view country life in a much different way. This Nation must depend upon the country boy and the country girl for its real men and women. The country has furnished, and will furnish, the men and women who will make our Nation great; for—

Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay;
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade;
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroyed, can never be supplied.

It is a deep conviction with me that my country is no stronger than its agriculture; that its peace, its prosperity, depend upon the prosperity of the farmer, because there is the source of all life, all strength, all happiness. If I serve the farmer, I serve the whole people. If I fail to serve him, I fail to serve all the people. If I hurt him, I hurt all the people. If I destroy him, I destroy the Government. If I save him, I save the Government. If we are able to erect a permanent haven of liberty on these shores of ours, if we are to build that temple high, on solid foundation, all the governmental agencies must take always into consideration the fact that we must not cripple agriculture, because it is the foundation on which the whole structure stands. No Congressman, whether he lives in the city or in the country, who has the right idea of strength of Government, who has the proper love for his wife and children and friends and neighbors, would in anywise willfully cripple agriculture. Where there is an injustice in the law that operates against the farmer we ought at once to correct that defect and teach him and his family that this Government is his friend. You must not talk about the terrible tendency of the boy and the girl to leave the farm unless you can increase some of their pleasures and their hopes and aspirations on the farm. There is the beginning and the end of the strength of this great Republic. [Applause.]

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I will say that it has been my ambition, as all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will bear testimony, to relieve the farmer of the enormous interest burden which he now bears. This service this Congress can perform. When the Democrats were in power this farm loan act was passed. It was relieving thousands of farmers. The Republicans came into power in the House and the Senate and withheld financial support for nearly two years. The Farm Loan Board was paralyzed for want of funds. But finally the West and South got together and relieved the situation somewhat. Not half of what ought to have been done was done. But a few small farmers did get a little relief. What I now

want and ask this Congress to do immediately is to pass the bill I have introduced and also a bill reducing the rate of interest to the farmer so that his money will not cost him more than 5 per cent. This is as much interest as he should pay on a long loan secured by a first mortgage on his land. If this were done, the southern and western banks would at once be in shape to finance the crop loan to the farmers. The merchant could pay all of his obligations and the stress of hard times would be relieved and the song of contentment would again be heard in the land.

The following statement, which I asked to put in the RECORD, will show how much has been loaned in my congressional district. If this Congress will now do its duty, thousands of other farmers in my district could be relieved. If you Republicans who represent agricultural districts will get busy, this Congress can be made a blessing to millions of suffering farmers and save their homes. This list shows what has been done in my district:

1407. Ackerman National Farm Loan Association, of Ackerman. Number of borrowers, 82. Amount granted, \$62,000.
 1621. Calhoun County National Farm Loan Association, of Pittsboro. Number of borrowers, 88. Amount granted, \$137,350.
 1520. Coffeeville National Farm Loan Association, of Yalobusha. Number of borrowers, 63. Amount granted, \$136,275.
 851. Cumberland National Farm Loan Association, of Dancy. Number of borrowers, 59. Amount granted, \$50,075.
 1340. Duck Hill National Farm Loan Association, of Duck Hill. Number of borrowers, 49. Amount granted, \$88,975.
 2427. Starkville National Farm Loan Association, of Starkville. Number of borrowers, 16. Amount granted, \$44,550.
 81. Eupora National Farm Loan Association, of Eupora. Number of borrowers, 149. Amount granted, \$160,875.
 939. Farmers' National Farm Loan Association, of Grenada. Number of borrowers, 42. Amount granted, \$56,200.
 2178. French Camps National Farm Loan Association of French Camps. Number of borrowers, 48. Amount granted, \$36,425.
 2104. Goodman National Farm Loan Association, of Goodman. Number of borrowers, 1. Amount granted, \$700.
 1640. Gore Springs National Farm Loan Association, of Gore Springs. Number of borrowers, 38. Amount granted, \$81,850.
 2593. Grenada County National Farm Loan Association, of Grenada. Number of borrowers, 64. Amount granted, \$163,375.
 1412. Houlika National Farm Loan Association, of Houlika. Number of borrowers, 37. Amount granted, \$42,125.
 1735. Houston National Farm Loan Association, of Houston. Number of borrowers, 40. Amount granted, \$95,850.
 2362. John Leigh National Farm Loan Association, of Tillatoba. Number of borrowers, 41. Amount granted, \$31,875.
 1332. Kosciusko National Farm Loan Association, of Kosciusko. Number of borrowers, 148. Amount granted, \$187,515.
 1410. Liberty Chapel National Farm Loan Association, of Kosciusko. Number of borrowers, 88. Amount granted, \$66,645.
 2259. McCool National Farm Loan Association, of McCool. Number of borrowers, 42. Amount granted, \$42,825.
 902. Mount Vernon National Farm Loan Association, of Eupora. Number of borrowers, 23. Amount granted, \$16,700.
 1639. Okolona National Farm Loan Association, of Okolona. Number of borrowers, 24. Amount granted, \$65,600.
 940. Spay National Farm Loan Association, of Spay. Number of borrowers, 35. Amount granted, \$28,850.
 725. Sturgis National Farm Loan Association, of Sturgis. Number of borrowers, 2. Amount granted, \$3,350.
 1725. Tupelo National Farm Loan Association, of Tupelo. Number of borrowers, 31. Amount granted, \$41,775.
 1207. Tri-County National Farm Loan Association, of West. Number of borrowers, 6. Amount granted, \$18,750.
 1245. Pontotoc National Federal Loan Association, of Pontotoc. Number of borrowers, 133. Amount granted, \$178,400.
 855. Vaiden National Federal Loan Association, of Vaiden. Number of borrowers, 73. Amount granted, \$93,025.
 3135. Valley National Federal Loan Association, of Carrollton. Number of borrowers, 35. Amount granted, \$97,375.
 1506. Vardaman National Federal Loan Association, of Vardaman. Number of borrowers, 53. Amount granted, \$67,525.
 2341. Winona National Federal Loan Association, of Winona. Number of borrowers, 39. Amount granted, \$72,475.
 1271. Woodland National Federal Loan Association, of Woodland. Number of borrowers, 13. Amount granted, \$20,600.
 903. Yalobusha-Lafayette National Federal Loan Association, of Water Valley. Number of borrowers, 38. Amount granted, \$77,350.
 Total number of borrowers in fourth district, 1,600.
 Total amount granted in fourth district, \$2,267,060.

Thus, you see, gentlemen of the committee, 1,600 families have been benefited by this law. God grant that it may be twice that number before the end of this year.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the question of naval defense is purely a matter of national policy and has no relation whatever to partisanship.

Before going into a general review of the appropriation bill now under consideration, I desire to take up in detail a few of the more salient points and address myself to the differences existing between the committee and those who are charged with the responsibility of providing adequate naval defense for our country.

Now, let us go a little more into detail in this bill as reported by the committee; let us see whether they have made use of all the information available, and let us see whether they have presented the case in its entirety fairly and squarely

before the House, or whether they have taken just partial truths and presented them in such a way as to be somewhat misleading. Most of us are not familiar with the details of the naval question. The gentleman from Michigan has found it comparatively easy to jump into the discussion of small details and befog the main issue before the House. Upon reading the hearings, however, I find that he was unable to do this when dealing with the Secretary of the Navy and his naval advisers; every question raised by Mr. KELLEY had a good answer, and any of the gentlemen who will take time to read the hearings, especially that portion relative to the distribution of enlisted men afloat, will find there the answer that must have satisfied even the gentleman from Michigan as to why 18 battleships could not be manned with 67,000 men.

In those hearings you will find that the gentleman from Michigan, after all his questions to the people familiar with the details, apparently was satisfied that the only proper thing for the committee to do was to depend upon those technical people for the proper distribution of the men allowed by this body. In several places during this discussion he told the Secretary of the Navy that he would leave the distribution of the men entirely to the Secretary—that the committee most assuredly did not wish to run the Navy. In the statement accompanying the bill the committee states further that it desires to keep in full commission the 18 battleships and the full number of auxiliaries named by the Secretary of the Navy that go to make up the full treaty Navy; and yet having been told by the Secretary of the Navy that 67,000 men will be distributed to man only 13 battleships, and having assured the Secretary of the Navy that the committee would depend upon the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy in making the distribution, yet in the report accompanying this bill the committee has the audacity to intimate that the Navy Department and the committee agree upon the ships quoted in the tables on pages 3, 4, and 5 of the report, and that is why I will endeavor at this time to show that it is in absolute disagreement with the statements of the committee when talking to the Secretary of the Navy.

The Secretary of the Navy told them flat-footedly that 50,000 men at sea could not be maintained by 17,000 men ashore. He told them also, and in an equally positive manner, that with 50,000 men at sea 18 battleships and the remainder of the treaty navy could not be manned, and would not be manned; therefore, when the committee states on page 2 of the report that this bill provides for 18 capital ships and a full treaty Navy, and on page 3 when they intimate that the department and the committee are in agreement regarding this list of ships which can be manned, again I wish to emphasize the fact that they are absolutely misleading the Congress of the United States. No one here will dare dispute the right of the Secretary of the Navy to distribute his men as he in his judgment thinks best for the interests of national defense. He is the technical adviser of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy; he is the man solely responsible for the naval defense of this country; he and his naval advisers are the ones in case of emergency upon whom this Congress will lean and throw all the responsibility, and, in case of failure, throw all the blame for such failure.

Knowing this, and knowing that it is the executive right to distribute the men allowed by the legislative branch, the Congress of the United States must accept the distribution as laid down by the Secretary of the Navy. They must acknowledge that if 67,000 men are provided that only 13 capital ships and approximately two-thirds of the treaty Navy will be manned. Thank God, however, those 13 will be efficiently manned, and ship for ship will be better than anything in the world. That is the situation which this Congress has to discuss, what the Secretary of the Navy says he will do with those men, so let us stop discussing this misleading statement in the committee's report wherein they say that the bill will provide for the full treaty Navy and come right down to brass tacks and acknowledge that we must accept the distribution of the Secretary of the Navy, and that this bill will provide for only two-thirds of the treaty Navy.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I have only 10 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will be very glad to yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. Very well, I yield for a question.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Was the gentleman present this afternoon when some testimony was read by one of the speakers to the effect that that same thing was said last year, that if we did not give more than 100,000 men we could keep but 13 battleships in commission?

Mr. KNUTSON. I was out of the room for about 15 or 20 minutes this afternoon and I did not hear the statement made.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It was said to be a statement made by Mr. PADGETT in a speech made in 1915 or 1916.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, no; last year.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I did not hear the speech and I did not see it. Of course, we have not the speech before us and we do not now know what he said.

Mr. KNUTSON. That has been the trouble throughout this debate. We have been asked to accept hearsay.

Mr. MADDEN. But this is not hearsay. It is in the record.

Mr. KNUTSON. The question of national defense is involved here and not candidacies for other offices.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman from Tennessee would, I think, be able to take abundant care of himself if he were here.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I want to say right now that there is nobody who is more patriotic than the gentleman from Tennessee. There is not a man in this House who knows more about naval affairs than the gentleman from Tennessee, and I am not afraid to follow him at any time, because I know he is actuated by the highest and most patriotic motives, although he does not belong to my party.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The gentleman means he would follow him in matters involving naval affairs?

Mr. KNUTSON. I say in naval matters. Oh, I do not follow him in tariff matters. [Laughter.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the gentleman going to give me more time?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will yield to the gentleman a minute.

Mr. KNUTSON. I can not yield for a minute.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Two minutes, then.

Mr. KNUTSON. I can not do it for two. The gentleman has been stringing me along now for two days. It has taken me two days to get the floor, and I am going to hold it. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has seven minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have said before that this report of the committee was misleading; it most assuredly is. Let me call the attention of the committee to page 10 of the report accompanying the bill. This shows more clearly than anything in this report the fact that your committee has not been quite fair in presenting the case regarding this most important arm of our national defense. The Navy Department has not been given a chance. [Applause.]

On page 10 the committee states in regard to "Fuel and transportation" that the department's revised estimate submitted at the hearings for this appropriation was \$17,426,000. Does the committee in this statement inform the Congress of the United States that this revised estimate was made on the basis of a 12-battleship Navy? Does the committee in this statement inform the Congress that this revised estimate was made on the basis of only 65 destroyers in full commission? Most assuredly not. The committee does not intend to bring in the full evidence here, so that we can vote intelligently, because they know that we will vote them off their feet. They have come here with that statement in a deliberate endeavor to choke back the facts that appear in the hearings that accompany the bill. Those estimates as revised were fully discussed in these hearings. The committee is aware of the fact that they provide for only 12 battleships in full commission. Why do I say that? Because the figures for "Fuel and transportation" were based purely and simply upon a mileage basis for each and every ship. The department in presenting its estimates based them upon the fact that battleships, destroyers, and other vessels of the fleet in full commission were each to steam a total of 16,000 miles at economical speed during the year, and there in the hearings we see these estimates worked up ship by ship for this two-thirds treaty Navy, and yet the committee again would have us believe that this estimate, reduced further by them by a total of \$1,426,000, will provide the fuel for the full treaty Navy.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. If the gentleman will give me five minutes, I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I have not the time to yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will answer any question anybody wishes to ask at the rate of five minutes to the question. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to correct the figures.

Mr. KNUTSON. I wish to say if they are wrong, then the fault lies with the committee and not with me. I take them from the hearings. I am not taking the figures from somebody's mind. I am taking them from black and white.

Mr. MADDEN. I will give the gentleman some figures from the Secretary of the Navy over his own signature.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am taking the figures from the hearings.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will yield to the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will not do it. It is five or nothing. [Laughter.]

In presenting the estimates and in arriving at the basis of 16,000 miles for the year for active vessels of the fleet, was the Navy Department extravagant or basing its claims on nothing but fancy? No. They were doing just exactly what the gentleman from Michigan had been insisting be done throughout the entire hearings—they have gone right back to the fiscal year 1916 and taken the averages that were found necessary at that time to maintain efficiency of the various units of the fleet. Could anything be more conservative or more fair than this? But does the committee tell you that? No. They know that all of this data is so completely hidden in the hearings that you and I and all the other nontechnical Members of Congress will never be able to find it, and so they figure they can get away with it here on the floor when they say that they are providing fuel for a full treaty Navy. [Applause.]

Of what importance is fuel to the Navy? We have had a great deal of talk regarding the personnel, and the fact that the mere existence of tonnage does not maintain the treaty ratio; we have had many references to the fact that personnel must be fully trained, but have we stopped to realize that in order to obtain the full training of both the officer and enlisted personnel our ships must spend a goodly portion of their time at sea? Surely we do not want a Navy which never goes to sea and which is not proficient in all the things that go to make up a homogeneous and tactically efficient fleet. But under the terms of this provision, contrary to the statements of the committee, our battleships will be able to steam only two-thirds of what they did in 1916, and therefore be, ship for ship and fleet for fleet, only two-thirds as efficient. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. And the fuel cost was only \$5,630,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will not yield unless the gentleman gives me five minutes.

Just one more point to illustrate that the committee in discussing this weighty question have not, in my opinion, gone at it in the proper way. In maintaining any ratio of three powers is not the surest method of checking up on the maintenance of such ratio that of comparing with such other powers what we propose to do and what they propose to do? Personally, I think that is the only way in which to arrive at a proper conclusion. But has this been done by this committee? It has not, and this is a question I feel to be very important and which I feel should be borne in mind by every Member of Congress before the vote comes. Has the gentleman from Michigan ever, during the entire time devoted to the hearings on the naval appropriation bill, asked the Navy Department for information relative to the proposed naval establishments for next year of Great Britain and Japan? Think of that, gentlemen. They provide money in this bill to establish a system for obtaining such information, and yet in the making up of this most important bill they absolutely turn their backs upon this source of information and never once endeavor to get it. [Applause.] Instead of that, what does the chairman do? The gentleman from Michigan himself informed you during the first day of debate that he had depended upon the newspapers for certain information regarding these foreign navies. [Applause.] Think of that, gentlemen. In a question of this importance and with machinery for which he himself provides to furnish him this information, turning his back upon all this and going to the newspapers for this data. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan if ever during the process of these hearings he has asked the Navy Department officially for this information? I would like to ask him, further, if during the hearings it was not on two occasions at least suggested to him that this information be inserted in the record of the hearings, and if he did not wave it aside as a matter of no importance? These are the things, gentlemen, which, to my mind, form conclusive evidence that the Congress of the United States can not depend upon the recommendations of this committee, and I do not believe for one moment that, knowing these things, and with these misleading statements having been called to the attention of the Congress, that we can do otherwise than sustain the contention of those who plead for a 100 per cent efficient Navy.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. My dear friend, we have got all the documents—

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not speaking of documents. Has the gentleman asked the Navy Department for official information?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The records down there do not show it. I looked it up to-day. [Laughter and applause.]

I have stated before that the committee in reporting out the bill, which supposedly provides for the maintenance of the definite ratios with two other powers, has ignored the facts in regard to the proposed plans of those powers. I wish at this time to sum up some of these comparisons which have been presented to various Members of Congress by the Secretary of the Navy.

First, the total enlisted personnel to be provided by the three countries in question for the next fiscal year are as follows:

Great Britain	104,000
Japan	68,252
United States	67,000

Second. Of these totals it has been brought out that Great Britain finds it necessary to keep 38 per cent of her men ashore. Japan finds it necessary to keep 35 per cent of her men ashore. The Secretary of the Navy requests sufficient men so that he can keep 33½ per cent ashore, and the bill, as reported to the House, states that 25 per cent is plenty to be kept ashore.

Third. Again, the Secretary of the Navy has informed Congress that for the next year Great Britain proposes to keep on her battleships an average of 1,214 men; Japan proposes to keep on her battleships an average of 1,292 men. Again, the Secretary of the Navy has stated that the minimum number of men that he can recommend per battleship is 1,175. Yet here we have the situation of our committee ignoring all of these facts and stating that they are perfectly content to have our battleships manned with only an average of 1,014 men. Those are the facts, gentlemen, which must be borne in mind in voting upon this bill. The gentleman from Michigan can confuse the main issue by talking to we nontechnical people about little details, but those comparisons he can not get around, and I do not see how, in the face of those comparisons, we can afford to say that the estimates of the Secretary of the Navy, shown by these comparisons to be conservative, can be discarded.

In closing I wish to append a comparative statement of the enlisted personnel of Great Britain for 1922-23:

Summary of British personnel for the next fiscal year is quoted below. It will be noted that the British propose to reduce their personnel gradually between this date and March 31, 1923, so that an average must be considered in comparing with the strength of other navies.	
Present enlisted strength (excludes marines and officers)	96,900
Enlisted men in colonial navies	6,500
Enlisted men of Royal Air Force doing duty connected with navy (this figure is taken as one-third of the total enlisted force of United Air Force, namely, 30,000)	10,000

Total enlisted force March 31, 1922..... 113,400
British estimates provide for reduction to the following by March 31, 1923:

Enlisted men (excludes marines and officers)	78,000
Enlisted men in colonial navies (no reduction)	6,500
Enlisted men of Royal Air Force doing duty connected with navy (this figure is taken as one-third of the total enlisted force of United Air Force, namely, 30,000)	10,000

Total enlisted force March 31, 1923..... 94,500
Average total for the year, 103,950.

[NOTE.—This total of 103,950 does not include men doing duty in the naval communication service, which in our Navy totals, roughly, 1,600; naval recruiting service, which in our Navy includes about 800; nor does it include naval reservists manning, to our knowledge, 37 auxiliary vessels.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Griffin].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, we have been overwhelmed by expert authorities; we have heard them commended and heard them condemned. I do not intend to get into the controversy with regard to the extent of the personnel of the Navy at this time. I feel, rather, in the position of the judge who at the conclusion of a long case feels that he ought to take the papers and reserve decision.

My purpose for the present is to examine the suggestion of my colleague from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] that the making of a treaty by the President whereby the armament of the United States is in any way affected is an invasion of the prerogatives of the lower branch of Congress.

This raises the question as to how far the treaty-making power provided in our Constitution may go in obligating the Congress and it also suggests a limitation on the treaty-making power.

It is tantamount to saying that the Constitution of the United States, which vests the power in the Executive to enter into a treaty and in the Senate to ratify it, has no force and effect where that treaty may happen to call for an appropriation in this House or seem to limit the volition of this House or to curtail its control over its military or naval appropriations.

In my opinion there is no doubt that the Executive has the right to enter into a treaty embodying anything short of a violation of our Constitution—a right which appears to be only limited by the proviso that the Senate ratify it. In short, he has the power, if he cares to exercise it and the Senate agrees. But here is a paradox—an anomaly: The House is perfectly within its rights, if it uses its power to appropriate, to make other and even incompatible or conflicting arrangements.

The making of such a treaty does not violate the prerogatives of this House, because we still maintain our right to utterly ignore its terms, and, if it is conceivable that the Senate could be induced to alter its views with respect to the four-power pact and were disposed to cooperate with us, the work of the conference could be completely disregarded, repudiated, and even reversed.

This presents an anomalous situation, an incongruity, which constitutes a peculiar, and possibly a dangerous, loophole in our constitutional armor. It raises the vital question, Why should not the power to ratify have been extended to the House as well as to the Senate? I think that it is manifest that in framing the Constitution and giving the Senate the sole power to ratify a treaty the founders of the Constitution departed from the basic principles which otherwise guided their sound judgment in the framing of that instrument. It would seem as if the Nation's founders were unwilling to trust the popular legislative branch of the Government in matters of diplomacy, and were still tied to some of the old prejudices against the admission of light into the dark recesses of international dealings. Once before in our history, when the Texas treaty was rejected in 1844, this question was the subject of much debate, and the issue was tested by President Tyler by sending the rejected treaty to the House, where an effort was made to have it ratified by a joint resolution. This failing, the idea of accomplishing annexation by treaty was abandoned and it was eventually consummated directly by joint resolution, without further treaty preliminaries.

I do not agree with the contention that if the House fails to make a necessary appropriation to maintain the Navy at the ratio which was established in the four-power pact, their action is equivalent to a repudiation of that treaty. The only way in which the four-power pact can be violated is by the creation of a larger Naval Establishment than the treaty provides. I doubt whether any of the other parties to the pact would grieve a single moment if we cut our Navy down to nothing.

Yet it might happen that the House at some time might take advantage of the door which our national Constitution leaves wide open for the crippling of a treaty through the exercise of its power to deny appropriations. The remedy is to give the House the right to pass on a treaty.

In three successive Congresses I have introduced a resolution embodying an amendment to the Constitution giving to the House of Representatives equal power with the Senate in the ratification of treaties, and I hope that gentlemen will give that proposition some consideration, in view of recent international developments and of the trend which this debate has taken. The French Chamber of Deputies, the English Parliament, the Italian Chamber, all have a part in the ratification of treaties. The United States House of Representatives is the only body among democratic governments in the world to-day which is deprived of the right to participate in the making of that part of the law which is embraced in a treaty. Vesting the treaty-making power in the Senate was a survival of ancient mistrust of the people and its representative body. Independent of this consideration, as a treaty is a law and Congress is the law-making body, the plain deduction is that treaties, as well as statute law, should be ratified or enacted by both bodies of Congress.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] to-day fired a very pertinent question at one of the speakers, in which he said that the Supreme Court of the United States holds that the provisions of a treaty and of statutory law are on a parity. So they are. But that determination of the Supreme Court of the United States is based upon the assumption that each branch of the Government will confine itself to its legitimate function and jurisdiction. No treaty can compel the House of Representatives to pass a law to conform to its terms, notwithstanding that there may be an ethical obligation to do so. There ought not to be this conflict between duty and power. There will always remain the danger of deadlocks or embarrassing conflicts between executive power and legislative rights so long as the lower House of Congress is deprived of its proper share in the making of all laws, whether by treaty or by statute. The safest way to protect the jurisdiction of the House is to accord to it the same right as the Senate has to pass upon

treaties negotiated by the Executive. Then if the compact entails appropriations to carry it into effect the very terms of the ratification by both branches of Congress will make it a matter of good faith ever after to do all things necessary to carry the treaty into effect.

In conclusion let me say that no one need fear that he is violating the Constitution in respecting the four-power pact, or that he is impairing the Constitution either by increasing or diminishing the naval ratio which the four-power pact provided. And in saying this I do not want to be understood as committing myself as yet on either side of the personnel proposition. [Applause.]

APPENDIX.

Griffin's proposed amendment to Constitution giving House of Representatives concurrent power in the ratification of treaties.

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 13) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of paragraph 2 of section 2 of Article II of the Constitution of the United States, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States:

"He shall have power to make treaties, provided the same are ratified by a majority of the Senate and House of Representatives; and he shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. McARTHUR].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege for about five years to serve on the Committee on Naval Affairs of this House. This committee at one time enjoyed the privilege of considering and reporting the annual naval appropriation bill. This and other committees that formerly considered large questions of policy were, to a large degree, emasculated by the action of the House some two years ago in centering its appropriating power and a very large portion of its legislative policy in the Committee on Appropriations, which now seeks, through measures such as the one we are now considering, to determine the legislative policies of the Government. But nevertheless those of us who remain on the Committee on Naval Affairs are not unmindful of the welfare of the American Navy, and while I have no authority to speak officially for the membership of the committee, yet as one of its ranking members and as a Member of this House, I come here to-day to tell you that I view with alarm the action of the Committee on Appropriations in reporting this bill, which proposes an enlisted personnel of only 67,000 men for the next fiscal year. [Applause.]

The action of the Committee on Appropriations in reporting a bill in which it is proposed to reduce the enlisted personnel of the Naval Establishment during the coming fiscal year to 67,000 men is in direct violation of the spirit and purpose of the recent Conference on the Limitation of Armament, which established the 5-5-3 ratio for the capital ship and aircraft carrier tonnage of Great Britain, the United States, and Japan. The American people approve of the results of this great conference, but I can not believe that they are in sympathy with the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations in this matter.

It is axiomatic that the officers and men constitute the backbone of the Navy. Battleships, destroyers, submarines, and aircraft are useless unless properly manned, and no Navy can keep in fighting trim without a full complement of men. Great Britain realizes this, and, according to information available, on March 25, 1922, made provision for 104,000 enlisted men for the ensuing fiscal year. This includes the colonial navy and one-third of the enlisted personnel of the united air force, but excludes the marines, the coast guard, the naval communication service, the recruiting service, and the naval reservists manning auxiliary naval vessels. In comparing the enlisted personnel of Great Britain with that of the United States, it is not proper to consider the marines in either instance. British marines do not perform certain of the most important functions that are performed by the United States marines—expeditionary and occupational work, such as is now being performed by our marines in Haiti, Santo Domingo, Nicaragua, and Peking. These functions in the British Empire are performed by regular troops of the army. The British Navy does not carry the air force as a part of the naval establishment. In Great Britain

the air force is carried separately. There will be 30,000 enlisted men in the British air force during the next fiscal year. A conservative number of these to allot to the navy would be one-third, or 10,000. In addition, there are the colonial navies approximating 7,000 enlisted personnel at the present time. These are an integral part of the naval force of the British Empire. The United States carries the communication personnel as a part of its regular establishment. The British Navy does not. We need 1,600 regularly enlisted men of the Naval Establishment to be engaged in this work, which is similar to that performed for the British Navy by men not carried as a part of its enlisted force. The British man at least 37 of their auxiliaries with naval reservists, whereas we man all of ours with regularly enlisted personnel. A careful estimate of this gives not less than 4,000 men so employed by the British establishment. Besides, the British recruiting is handled by civilians and not by members of the regular establishment. Adding all of these figures, we get as the potential strength of the British enlisted force during the next fiscal year 110,149. In order to be absolutely on the safe side, we can deduct 6,000 men from this number, leaving the British enlisted personnel at 104,000, as compared with 67,000 carried in this appropriation bill. [Applause.]

Japan proposes during the next fiscal year to maintain an enlisted personnel of 65,252. These figures are based on authentic information available as late as February 17 of this year. This proposed enlisted personnel is sufficient fully to man every present Japanese ship which can be retained under the treaty and every new ship which can be completed by July 1, 1922, and still leave 35 per cent of Japan's total personnel available for shore establishments, aviation, and training. [Applause.] Do the people of the United States want an enlisted personnel of 67,000, as compared with 65,252 for Japan? Does any red-blooded American who loves his country and who wishes to see her supremacy maintained among the powers of the earth wish to see her sink to the level of the third naval power of the world?

The figures which I have quoted have been furnished by reliable and trustworthy officers of the Navy Department. There is no reason to doubt their authenticity. These officers in turn obtained their information from the published records of the actions of the British Admiralty and of the British Parliament and from unquestioned official sources in Japan. All of this information was obtained by the same people and in the same manner as was the information on which the entire American plan for the Conference on Limitation of Armaments was obtained. [Applause.] This plan was found to be accurate in all particulars. It may be interesting if the Committee on Appropriations would advise the House just when, where, and under what circumstances it obtained all of its information relative to the British and Japanese enlisted personnel. Not a single line of it is in the hearings. [Applause.]

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

Mr. McARTHUR. Certainly.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Did not the chairman of the subcommittee practically decline to answer that question when propounded to him by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS]?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The chairman of the subcommittee could answer that better than the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I would be glad to have the gentleman answer.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will be glad to answer, but not in the time of the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. McARTHUR. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], whose ability and talents are worthy of a better cause than that of relegating the United States Navy to third place among the powers of the world, during the debate on Monday said that an enlisted personnel of 40,000 would give Japan men galore during the next fiscal year. This would undoubtedly be true if Japan were so foolish and short-sighted as to adopt a small-navy policy such as that now being advocated by the gentleman from Michigan and his colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations who have arrogated to themselves the right to determine the naval policy of the United States Government by withholding funds for the proper maintenance of our Naval Establishment. [Applause.]

The Conference on the Limitation of Armament agreed upon certain general proposals limiting naval expenditures and scrapping certain large types of ships. Its object was to reduce the burden of taxation involved in competitive navy building, but by no stretch of the imagination can it be conceded that the

function of the conference was to make provision for the destruction of any navy. [Applause.] There are gentlemen who seriously believe that all the navies of the world should be scrapped, or at least reduced to insignificant proportions. These are the same pacifists and peace-at-any-price gentlemen whose leadership this Congress followed when the immortal Roosevelt and the lamented Gardner were attempting to arouse the people of the United States to the danger of their state of unpreparedness during the two or three years prior to our entrance into the World War. If Congress and the country had followed the leadership of these two great Americans and their little band of faithful followers in Congress, thousands of American lives and billions of American treasure would have been saved. Those of us who advocated preparedness in 1915 and 1916 were told that we were in a state of nervous excitement and that our line of thought was good mental exercise. And yet the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] and other gentlemen in this House are now seeking to disregard every lesson of the World War and to foist upon this country a pusillanimous third-rate naval policy. [Applause.] I for one protest; and even though others do not join me, I shall vote against the passage of the pending bill unless it is amended to meet the requirements of our Navy as to enlisted personnel.

I have every confidence in the distinguished Secretary of the Navy, a former Member of this House and a veteran of two wars. I believe he has the proper conception of the dignity and standing of the United States of America among the powers of the earth, and that he views with alarm the efforts of gentlemen to weaken our Naval Establishment. I have every confidence in Assistant Secretary Roosevelt, a man who has bared his breast for his country and who has a proper conception of America as a naval power. I have every confidence in Admiral Coontz, the distinguished Chief of Naval Operations. These gentlemen have all told me of the threatened danger to the United States Navy in the 67,000 enlisted personnel proposal. [Applause.] I have a much higher regard for their opinion on naval matters than I have for the opinion of even so distinguished a Member of this body as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], and I concede that his knowledge of naval matters is profound and comprehensive. I only regret that his distinguished talents are not applied to the maintaining of a naval policy commensurate with our wealth and standing among the nations.

It is well known that for a certain complement of Navy men afloat there must be a certain number in the various activities of shore duty. The British Parliament has been asked to provide enlisted men at the rate of 60 men ashore for 100 men afloat. And a safe policy for any country to follow would be to provide 50 men ashore for every 100 men afloat. The Secretary of the Navy, based on years of experience, has recommended 50 men ashore for 100 men afloat, yet the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] and the other gentlemen who are standing sponsor for this bill would reduce the American ratio to 34 ashore for 100 men afloat.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman is a very distinguished member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and has given the subject of the Navy a great deal of consideration. I wonder if, in working out what he thinks to be the proper number for the Navy, he has decided about the number that should be afloat and the number that should be ashore.

Mr. McARTHUR. Does the gentleman mean as to the percentage?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No. How many men has the gentleman figured necessary for the ships and how many ashore?

Mr. McARTHUR. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that if we appropriate—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I understand the gentleman is in favor of a personnel of 86,000.

Mr. McARTHUR. Two-thirds afloat and one-third ashore, I would say, as a general line of policy, and yet if the men are allocated according to the proposal of the Secretary of the Navy—and we can not question his right to allocate them as he sees fit in order to maintain such a Navy as we give him—they will be apportioned at the ratio of only 34 men ashore for every 100 afloat—a ratio of 3 to 1 instead of the correct ratio of 2 to 1.

It is idle to attempt to compare the Naval Establishment of this year with that of 1916. Naval experts the world over use in common two expressions—post-Jutland and pre-Jutland. Post-Jutland is taken to mean modern, pre-Jutland archaic. The late war formed a dividing line in military and naval tactics. Naval tactics, weapons, and construction have been radically modified since 1916. In 1916 aviation, submarines, radio, fire control were either nonexistent or in their in-

fancy. The complement of a battleship depends upon the functions which that battleship is called upon to perform. The battleship to-day, on account of the above developments and others of a kindred nature, is radically different from the battleship of 1916.

A few of the specific developments which necessitate the increase in personnel are:

- Eight antiaircraft battery guns with their necessary equipment.
- Four broadside directors with their necessary equipment.
- Concentration party in mast.
- Main-top torpedo control.
- Improvements for the handling of ammunition in the turrets.
- Increases in radio communication, fire control, electrical devices, etc.
- Range converter.
- Range keeper.
- Director correction setters.
- And certain highly confidential installations.

The men on board the battleship *Texas* in 1916 numbered 932. The number of men the department wishes to place on board her this year is 1,243. The difference between these numbers, namely, 311, is more than taken up by the number of men assigned to these new activities.

On Monday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] based his main contention on the allotment of personnel to the fleet, afloat, on the report given to him by the Navy Department, of the number of men so employed on February 1, 1922. The explanation for the small numbers of personnel on our ships on this date, which inadequate numbers are those used by the committee, as against the complements required by the Navy Department, is simple.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman think it was easier to take them off the battleships than off the destroyers, which were only in half commission?

Mr. McARTHUR. Certainly, because most of the destroyers had only skeleton crews, and in reducing the Navy the department had to go where they could find the largest number of men. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman will probably recall that the destroyers—

Mr. McARTHUR. Did the gentleman say I would probably be recalled? [Laughter.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No. I hope the gentleman will be recalled to the House as often as he desires to come, because he is a very valuable Member. But as I say, the gentleman will probably recall that at the time he is speaking about, the reserve destroyers with about 12,000 men on board were very accessible, many of them being at Charleston, S. C., were they not?

Mr. McARTHUR. That is correct.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. So that it would have been quite as simple a matter to get the men from the destroyers?

Mr. McARTHUR. Probably not so simple, for most of the destroyers had small crews. The fact that the department considers the reduction as merely an emergency measure is indicated clearly in the very report of Admiral Jones, read by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. In the first paragraph of this report Admiral Jones states that on January 1; that is, after these discharges had taken place, the battleships had 80 per cent of their complement on board. In the second paragraph of his report he states that soon after their arrival in Cuban waters this percentage was increased to 89, thereby indicating that the department immediately took steps to remedy this deficiency, and had done so to the extent of approximately 10 per cent, in a very short period of time.

The Committee on Appropriations, on pages 6 and 7 of the majority report, stated in substance that on March 1, 1922, the Navy had in its possession 254 vessels of a nondescript character, including Eagle boats, subchasers, tugs, yachts, motor boats, and various miscellaneous craft. The suggestion is made that if these craft are kept in full commission tens of millions of dollars will be required for their upkeep and operation. They are characterized as dead weight and a millstone around the neck of the Navy, and the suggestion is made that they all be sold. The studied inference to be conveyed to Congress here is plainly and unmistakably to the effect that the Navy Department wants to keep all these ships in commission and fully manned. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] on Monday positively confirmed this impression. He eloquently painted a picture of tens of millions of dollars spent on ships of no military value and men by the thousands scattered up and down our coasts on vessels so small that the Navy Department can not find them. Upon investigation, I find that the committee's "hundreds of vessels, thousands of men, and tens of millions of dollars" turns out to be 170 small vessels manned by 2,450 men—an average of about 15 men a ship—whose operating cost by no stretch of the imagination can exceed \$7,000,000, and whose operation is of real constructive value to the public

interest and to the national security. The committee's partial statements of fact, unfair inferences, and unsound reasoning in this particular case are characteristically indicative of its whole report on the personnel situation, and as such should be pondered on by all Members of this House having the public interest at heart.

The American people love their Navy and its traditions. They properly regard it as our first line of defense, as the guardian of our commerce, as the protector of our territorial and insular possessions. They wish to see it maintained at its full strength on the 5-5-3 ratio authorized by the recent treaty. They wish to see it maintained on an equality with the British Navy, as one of the two great naval establishments of the world. They do not wish to see it relegated to a position inferior to that of Japan. [Applause.]

Gentlemen tell us that we will maintain substantially the same tonnage as Great Britain, but the Secretary of the Navy is authority for the statement that not less than five of our first-line battleships will be in ordinary, which means that they will not be in active service if our enlisted personnel for the coming fiscal year is reduced to 67,000. The Secretary of the Navy knows just what he can do with an enlisted personnel of this size, and at my request the Navy Department has prepared a chart, a copy of which I mailed to each Member of the House, which shows just what an enlisted personnel of 67,000 will mean to our Navy during the coming fiscal year. It is not for gentlemen in this House to question the authority of the Secretary of the Navy to equalize and distribute his personnel over the various naval activities or to question the figures in the chart, which has been prepared by men in his department. This chart shows that an enlisted personnel of 104,000 for Great Britain, 67,000 for the United States, and 68,252 for Japan means that capital ships will be maintained at the ratio of 5-3.2-2.6; that aircraft carriers will be maintained on the ratio of 5-1.2-0.6; that submarines will be maintained on the ratio of 4.1-5-2.8; that cruisers and destroyers will be maintained in the ratio of 5-2.1-2.6; that mine layers will be maintained in the ratio of 4.8-1.25-5; and that the total combatant vessels will be maintained in the ratio of 5 for Great Britain, 2.8 for the United States, and 2.75 for Japan. Can any thinking man fail to understand what this sweeping reduction means to our Navy and to the people which it protects?

Gentlemen, I respectfully submit that our Navy should be maintained at its full strength authorized by the recent treaty, and, believing that it can not be so maintained with an enlisted personnel of only 67,000 men, I shall, at the proper time during the consideration of this bill, offer an amendment proposing to increase this number to 86,000. I bespeak your earnest consideration of the arguments in support of the 86,000 enlisted personnel and hope that you will decide to give this amendment your support.

I can not believe that you will adhere to the "penny-wise and pound-foolish" policy of the Committee on Appropriations or that you will shift the responsibility for the writing of this bill onto the shoulders of the Senate. Let us face this question fairly and squarely and decide for ourselves whether or not the United States is to maintain a Navy which will glorify the traditions of the Republic or whether we are to drop to the third place among the naval powers. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LARSON].

Mr. LARSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I had no intention of making a speech. My purpose was merely to listen to the discussion and then vote according to the dictates of my best judgment.

We are told that "democracy is government by discussion." We have had a splendid exemplification of that statement. The bill has been most ably and thoroughly discussed from every viewpoint. I am indebted to my colleagues for the facts they have presented and the deductions they have drawn therefrom.

I do not rise to offer any substantial contribution to this discussion. I possess no expert knowledge on naval affairs that entitles me to speak with authority upon this matter. I feel, however, that I should state some of the reasons that prompt me to vote as I shall. This measure is of supreme importance to the people, and they are entitled to know not only how we vote but why we vote as we do.

Had no discussion been had on this bill I would vote for a larger appropriation than that proposed by the committee. I probably would vote for an appropriation that would give the Navy 86,000 enlisted men. I came to that conclusion from reading the Washington newspapers and such other propaganda as was furnished me by those who champion a big Navy personnel. While I am not a so-called big Navy man, I do not

want the efficiency of our "first line of defense" crippled in the least. No American should. That was my notion when the discussion was opened by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY]. In the language of the street, I was from Missouri; I wanted to be shown. I placed the burden of proof on the committee to prove clearly and conclusively, not by mere assertions but by facts and figures, that the appropriation proposed is ample to man the United States Navy without jeopardizing its efficiency.

When the chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations had concluded his speech, one of the most remarkable speeches that it has been my privilege to hear, I was thoroughly convinced that the appropriation proposed is sufficient. All the arguments that have been presented to the contrary, including the letter of our great Secretary of State, have not changed that opinion, and I shall vote accordingly.

They say that parliamentary oratory is a lost art. I do not believe it. Real oratory is as effective now as it was when Demosthenes spoke. If a man has anything to say and knows how to say it in fitting form—that is, with clearness, force, and eloquence—he will always be assured of an appreciative and responsive hearing. The masterly presentation of the committee's proposal by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan brought to my mind Speaker Reed's epigrammatic definition of eloquence—"Logic on fire." That speech was logic on fire, alright. It burned up the opposition completely. Mr. KELLEY's arguments have not been answered; they are unanswerable. In this discussion they stand as solid as the Rock of Gibraltar.

That speech was received by the House with spontaneous enthusiasm. Even his opponents were carried away by his eloquence; but the following morning I read in one of the Washington papers of brilliant and able speeches having been made by the big Navy advocates, and the chairman's remarkable speech was barely mentioned. In effect, the paper I read stated:

Mr. KELLEY also spoke.

[Laughter.]

I mention this merely to show how powerful these big Navy people and their supporters are here in Washington. The press is at their command; but let me say that we who believe that 67,000 men are ample to man our Navy in these "piping time of peace" should not allow ourselves to be influenced by the Washington atmosphere. What we should be concerned about is the atmosphere at home and in the country at large.

We know that the folks at home want actual, concrete results from the arms conference—results that will be reflected in their tax bills. Let us express by our votes on this measure the convictions of the American people. As James Bryce says:

What is democracy for except to represent and express the convictions and wishes of the people?

In their dire distress the advocates of a big Army personnel threw out the S O S signal to our great Secretary of State, who gallantly came to their rescue with a letter in which he expresses his personal views on the proper size of the "Hughes Navy." I do not agree with those of my colleagues who look upon Mr. Hughes's epistolary medium of instructing us benighted Members of Congress as an unwarranted and gratuitous intermeddling in the affairs of this House. Personally, I welcome his views. We should seek the truth, no matter whence its source. It is entirely proper that Mr. Hughes should give us and the country the benefit of his opinion. Any contribution that he may see fit to make to the discussion of any public question will always receive my thoughtful consideration, for I, in common with many of my fellow citizens, regard him as America's greatest living statesman. His beneficent work in connection with the arms conference alone entitles him to a place in the galaxy of the world's great statesmen. As an American I am proud that my country has produced a man of his preeminent intellectual ability and superb moral courage.

But let us see whether Mr. Hughes's letter has the persuasive force that the advocates of the big Navy personnel claim for it. What, in fact, does the Secretary say? Is his opinion based upon facts or is it predicated upon a mere assumption of what the facts are claimed to be? Let me quote from his letter. He says:

You say that you are advised by the Navy Department that the proposed reduction in personnel will mean that not exceeding 12 capital ships can be kept in commission.

As to this—

He continues—

I am not qualified to express an opinion.

And like the careful lawyer that he is, he predicates his opinion, you will observe, upon the strength of the statement that the Navy Department has furnished him with, for he says:

Accepting this statement of fact, the only question would seem to be whether our Navy should be reduced below the treaty standard by a provision of personnel inadequate to maintain it.

But the soundness of the statement of alleged facts to which Mr. Hughes refers is challenged by the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations and other opponents of a big naval personnel. Mr. Hughes begs the very question that is practically the main issue in this discussion. Therein lies the probative weakness of his letter. If you grant his premise, his conclusion is obviously correct, but the committee has demonstrated, almost to a mathematical certainty, that with a personnel of 67,000 men the 18 capital ships and all other craft that go with them can be kept in commission, thereby giving us a Navy of the treaty standard.

But while it is our duty to weigh carefully the views of the President and of the "best minds" constituting his great Cabinet on the merits or demerits of pending legislation, as representatives of the people we have no moral right to abdicate our judgment and follow blindly their proffered counsel. We can not shift upon their shoulders our constitutional responsibility. In the last analysis, we, and we alone, are responsible to the people for the character of the measures this House passes.

The committee's proposal will save the American people close onto \$200,000,000 a year, as compared with the appropriation for the last fiscal year. Is not this great sum worth saving? It is true that the United States is the richest country in the world. Although we have only one-seventeenth of the world's population, we own one-third of the world's estimated wealth. But let us not forget that we have an enormous public debt and that our annual Government expenses are stupendous.

Our people are burdened with taxation—municipal, state, and national. They are tax-ridden. They are complaining, and justly. They are demanding of us relief from their tax burdens. Under such circumstances, I ask, what right have we in peace times to sanction the employment of several thousand superfluous men in our Navy? No red-blooded American wants to be a sinecure or a parasite. He prefers to be engaged in a service in which he can be of use to his country. To keep men in unnecessary public positions is a waste of the people's treasure and of human energy. Let us save the money and also give these superfluous men an opportunity to engage in the development of our natural resources.

In the name of common sense, what reason is there for a big Navy personnel in these peace times? If there were any reasonable fears of an immediate invasion, that would be justification for a big Navy. But who is to invade us? Surely no European nation. Europe is bankrupt. Great Britain, France, and Italy are bled white. The militarism and imperialism of Germany are no more. Is Japan, thousands of miles removed from us, our international hobgoblin? Japan may be militaristic and imperialistic, but she is not insane. Japan has no desire to commit national suicide. Japan wants to exist. She does not want to measure swords with America.

The fact of the matter is that no government for many years to come, perhaps for many generations, could induce its people to engage in another war. The people have had enough of hell. They have just finished fighting "the war to end war." What they want is "less of armament and none of war." [Applause.]

It is the law of human nature that imputation of distrust excites in others a corresponding sentiment. As Charles Sumner said in his plea for universal peace more than a half century ago:

War preparations in a period of professed peace must naturally prompt adverse preparations, and everywhere within the circle of their influence quicken the spirit of war. So are we all knit together that the feelings in our own bosoms awaken corresponding feelings in the bosoms of others, as harp answers to harp in its softest vibration, as deep responds to deep in the might of its power. What in us is good invites the good in our brother; generosity begets generosity; love wins love; peace secures peace; while all in us that is bad challenges the bad in our brother; distrust engenders distrust; hate provokes hate; war arouses war. Therefore are we admonished to avoid such appeal, and this is the voice of nature itself.

It is to be deplored that any Member of this House should allow himself to be carried away so far by his zeal and enthusiasm for a big Navy personnel as to deem it necessary to charge a nation that participated in the arms conference on the invitation of our Government with engaging in propaganda to disarm America. Such imputation is not only extremely bad taste but it has a tendency to engender distrust and hate in the minds and hearts of those with whom we are desirous of living on terms of international good will and comity. And that means every nation on the globe. That accusation may reflect the sentiments of a few militarists and alarmists, but I am sure

that it does not reflect the sentiments either of this House or of the American people.

This effort on the part of Congress to reduce armaments is not prompted by Japanese propaganda; it is prompted solely by a desire to give concrete and practical expression to the enlightened Christian sentiment of the American people.

It is utterly absurd to charge the committee and those of us who concur in their views with a purpose "to wreck the Navy." Such an accusation is the child of militaristic hysteria. We are not "wreckers" simply because, in the interest of national economy and for the promotion of international friendship and enduring peace, we advocate a reasonable reduction in our Navy personnel.

We concede that the champions of a big Navy are actuated by patriotic motives, but we deny that they have a monopoly on American patriotism. Whatever our views may be as to the size of the Navy personnel, we are all actuated by a desire to promote the highest welfare of our common country. We may differ as to the proper naval policy, but we are all Americans.

No naval officer who advocates a big Navy personnel should take umbrage because we do not adopt his views. We question neither his veracity nor his sincerity. We know that he is intensely patriotic. We appreciate that he stands for "our country, right or wrong." We acknowledge his service to the Republic. But we also know that he is likely to have a mania for a big Navy—the biggest in the world—for the bigger the Navy the greater the glory. He will not willingly give up any of his prestige and power as the head of a big fighting machine. He is actuated by the philosophy of—

The good old rule, the simple plan,
That he should get who has the power,
And he should keep who can.

That feeling is perfectly natural. It is the result of his training and environment. Whoever heard of an admiral who advocates a small navy or of a general who favors a small army? Such an admiral or a general is a *rara avis*.

If we refuse to follow the advice of these naval experts who advocate a big Navy personnel, it is because we think that they are prejudiced. If Congress were to give them a free rein, we would soon have the biggest navy on the seas. Listen to what Capt. L. M. Overstreet, United States Navy, says:

I believe—

Says he—

that we need approximately 120,000 men to man the so-called Hughes Navy and should increase rather than decrease our present force.

The naval board also wants that number.

That is disarmament for you! That is carrying out the will of the American people as expressed through the action of the Washington conference! What would happen to the United States Treasury if Congress were to allow the naval experts to dictate the size of a Navy personnel? It soon would become like unto a dime savings bank.

I prefer to follow the sound judgment of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations as to the size of our Navy personnel. The members of that committee have had years of experience in dealing with naval affairs and naval appropriations. They have thoroughly and conscientiously investigated the matter from every possible viewpoint, and their unbiased, deliberate judgment is that 67,000 men are ample to man efficiently the United States Navy. That number is large enough for me, and I am sure the American people feel that that number of their fellow citizens, with the ships at their disposal, can and will in these peace times maintain the rights, prestige, and honor of the Republic. [Applause.]

What this war-weary world needs now is less of distrust and hatred and more of confidence and love. The true grandeur of our Nation consists not in a big Navy or a big Army, the machinery of force, but rather in the spirit of justice and right. If we are to lead the world, as we are expected, to a higher and a better civilization we can do so not only by preaching "less of armament and none of war" but what is more important by translating our preaching into actual practice. A good example is the best sermon. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING].

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, no one can be more opposed to the expenditure of unnecessary money upon our Navy than I am myself. I hope the time will come when the resources of this country shall be turned from the creation of destructive agencies to the creation of constructive agencies. I would like to see the time come when this country could devote its resources to internal improvements and the construction of those great projects in our midst which return prosperity and happiness to our people. [Applause.] However, we owe an obli-

gation, under conditions as they exist to-day, to give to our people absolute security, even at a considerable cost to the country. The greatest minds of the world that met here at the Limitation of Armaments Conference rendered this verdict to the world and to us if we will but hear—not that there will be no more wars but that there will be more wars. Otherwise, instead of a mere limitation of armament, they would have agreed to a total disarmament. [Applause.]

With that verdict in our minds, and knowing from history that from the earliest dawn of time down to now there has been war after war, and knowing, as we do, when we use our common sense, that until God sees fit to change the hearts and minds of men, there are going to be still more wars, I think we should be prepared. When the millennium comes—and I pray that its coming may be hastened—we may do away with the Navy, but we will do away with the Navy when, and only when, we may also do away with the police in the cities and the sheriffs and the constables in the country.

If the Committee on Appropriations had made the issue here simply that 67,000 men were enough, that would have been one thing, but they take the position here that 67,000 men will furnish our Navy with a fighting strength commensurate with the treaty ratio of 5-5-3.

I glory in the accomplishments of the Limitation of Armaments Conference, and I stand here now striving to preserve to the American people the benefits of those accomplishments—not to destroy them. [Applause.] It was thought by those who made that agreement that the 5-5-3 ratio was the best ratio that could be agreed upon to preserve the peace of the world—between the two great Anglo-Saxon countries an equality, and between America and Japan a substantial increase in the strength of the American Navy.

This bill has been called a one-man bill, and I think there is some evidence to justify that statement. If we must take the judgment of one man, then I know of no man whose judgment I would rather take than that of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, but experience tells us that it is not safe to rely upon the judgment of one man. In the report a great deal is said about the treaty ratio and the maintenance of that ratio. But it is my opinion that the question of how the fighting strength of our Navy would compare with the navies of Great Britain and Japan was an afterthought. During the hearing the inquiry seemed to be how few men could be put on the ships and still keep them afloat. The hearings ran from the 6th of March to the 21st of March, and all the experts of the Navy were called before the committee. On the third day of the hearings the learned chairman of the subcommittee virtually said to the Secretary of the Navy, "Take 50,000 men afloat and 15,000 men on shore, and cut your cloth accordingly." He did more than that. He told the Secretary of the Navy what ships he desired him to keep in commission, viz, the 18 battleships, the 103 destroyers, and the 84 submarines. He said, "Take the rest of the 50,000 as far as it will go, and then cut off wherever it stops." Then and there the control of the Navy passed from the Secretary of the Navy to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations. [Applause.]

The Secretary of the Navy, in a letter to the committee, clearly pointed out just what the consequences would be if this arbitrary cut was put into effect. He said that with only 65,000 men the Navy would find—

(1) That our available force for sea is 46,000, because in the opinion of the department it is vitally necessary for the best interests of the Navy and the Government to keep the vessels referred to in commission and the shore station activities as a necessary adjunct.

(2) Six battleships of the first line, being all the 12-inch gun ships, will of necessity go into ordinary with complements only large enough to preserve them and keep them ready for as quick action as possible. I also call your attention in this connection to the fact that this involves the withdrawal of the flagship *Utah* from the European Squadron and the abandonment of that station. It is the opinion of the department that for the national defense it is better to have 12 full complement, ready-for-action ships than it is to have 18 part complement ships not ready for action. I personally believe that a ship too greatly undermanned is a sick ship and will be of little account in battle.

(3) In addition to the 46,000 actually serving on ships, the arbitrary 7 per cent replacements bring up the figure to 50,550, leaving for shore stations only 14,450.

(4) The destroyers are reduced to 65 with 90 per cent complements, with 50 in reserve with 50 per cent complements.

(5) All submarines, second line, are placed out of commission.

(6) Practically all Eagle boats, subchasers, and other small craft now used for training reservists or other purposes go out of commission.

(7) If we are to consider the appropriation for the year as of July 1 to be on the basis of 65,000 men, we must start the year on July 1 with 65,000 men. That means we must reduce between the date of the approval of the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1923, should it contain the figure of 65,000, by getting rid, by discharge or otherwise, of approximately 31,000 men.

In regard to the figure submitted, I must further inform you that it is wholly inadequate in the estimation of the department to properly man the United States Navy. It will necessitate leaving ships of vital importance out of the battle line. The ratio established in the naval treaty is for the three great naval powers—the United States, Great Britain, and Japan—5-5-3. Under the personnel allowance of 65,000, according to our best information, this ratio will be reduced to 24-5-3 for the United States, Great Britain, and Japan, respectively.

However, it appears that the committee paid no attention to this warning. Their decision seems to have been made up on the third day of their hearings.

From that day on to the finish of the hearings I find no deviation from the preconceived opinion of the chairman of the committee, and after hearing the evidence he rendered his decision which he had already formed at the beginning, a Navy of 65,000 enlisted men and 2,000 entered apprentices. In fact, I am betraying no confidence when I say that before the hearings ever started I was informed that this 65,000 was to be the strength of the Navy. What was the use of having the hearings, what was the use of going from ship to ship and man to man, what was the use of working the adding machine, when it had already been determined what the strength of the Navy was going to be? [Applause.] It is easy for a man who is familiar with the Navy to talk to the Members of the House, the majority of whom are not familiar with the technical organization of the Navy, and say to them that "We have furnished a personnel for 18 battleships, a personnel for 103 destroyers, and a personnel for 84 submarines, and what more do they want with men, where would they put them?" Because Congressmen from the Middle West can not think of any other class of vessels than those named and can not suggest where to put them—can not think of an answer to the gentleman's question—they come to the conclusion which the defenders of this bill want them to form, namely, that there can be no other place to put the men, and therefore they are not needed. I have heard of men who say, "What do you want with mine sweepers and mine layers in time of peace, and all of the other 57 different varieties of boats and craft that it takes to make up a modern navy?" The comparison of the personnel of to-day with the personnel of 1916 means nothing, because fighting on sea to-day is totally different from what it was in 1916.

The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] undertook to make this allowance. He finally got down to the aircraft, and because that looked as though it was going to swell the personnel beyond what was provided for in the bill he said, "Well, we did not allow them any money to put the antiaircraft guns on the ships so that we can hold down the personnel." If that were true, it would be a crime against the men who have to fight on these ships—to refuse them the necessary protection in order to reduce the personnel.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, I think the gentleman misunderstood the gentleman from Idaho. What he did say was that we did not have all the aircraft guns or mounts manufactured yet to put on them.

Mr. SWING. He said you had not appropriated for them.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, no.

Mr. SWING. And I will say this: They are appropriated for and they are manufactured and they are going to be on these ships this coming year [applause] if I can take the word of Admiral McVay, Chief of Ordnance.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If the gentleman has the fact about that, then we can cut out what we have included for antiaircraft guns when we get to the right place in the bill.

Mr. SWING. Well, I find the gentlemen in charge of the bills are good on cutting; but let me say that it is not every cutting that is economy.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman would not want us to appropriate money for guns if we have them already, would he?

Mr. SWING. No. But I want you to appropriate for the men to man the guns. What good are hulls without the men behind the guns? [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Whether we have the guns or not?

Mr. SWING. Admiral McVay says we have the guns, and I want the men to man them. You can not bluff the world with empty hulls. Ships without men are no better than a scene painted on canvas. You must have both ships and men to make a fighting force, and that is where this bill falls down.

Now, the chairman of the subcommittee accused the Secretary of the Navy of having 20,000 men piled up on the shore some place with nothing to do. The accusation is a serious one, that the officials of our Navy, who are willing to give their lives in defense of their country, are conniving, if not actually in a

criminal conspiracy, to raid the Treasury of the United States by keeping on the Navy pay roll 20,000 men who have nothing to do.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman is a very prominent and influential member of the Naval Committee. Will he tell the House just where the 20,000 extra men are on shore?

Mr. SWING. I thought you would ask that, and so I have prepared a statement, which I will read or introduce in the RECORD.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman had better read it.

Mr. SWING. Will the gentleman extend my time if I read it?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. How long is it?

Mr. SWING. It consists of one page.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What is it?

Mr. SWING. It shows in detail where these 20,000 men are and what they are doing—the men you said were piled up on shore with nothing to do.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Go ahead and read it.

Mr. SWING. I will. It says:

Distribution of enlisted personnel as of January 1, 1922.

OPERATING FORCE ON SHORE.

Navy yards and naval stations.....	1,359
Receiving ships and barracks, operating force.....	1,945
Training stations and trade schools (instructors and overhead).....	2,032
Hospitals (operating crews).....	1,978
Prisons (cooks, etc.).....	23
Communications.....	1,228
Aviation stations.....	2,754
Ammunition depots and torpedo stations.....	605
Recruiting stations.....	709

Total operating force on shore..... 12,633

District vessels (crews)..... 3,352

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What are they?

Mr. SWING. Does the honorable gentleman from Michigan not know?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I want to know if the gentleman knows.

Mr. SWING. Yes, sir; I know. You call them "yachts and nondescript vessels," implying that they were pleasure boats for the commanders, and other useless craft, but you know that they are mostly tugs that pull vessels into their places in the harbors, that haul out to the vessels barges loaded with coal for fueling, and self-propelling oil barges. You know that as well as I do.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There are men and tugs in the yards to handle the vessels that carry the coal. These are district craft.

Mr. SWING. I am talking about district vessels. Have I answered your question on that?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I rather think not.

Mr. SWING. Well, the gentleman can be very hard to satisfy when he wants to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman because I interrupted him.

Mr. SWING. I had already accounted for 15,985 men when I was interrupted. I will now continue:

Replacements:	
Patients in hospitals.....	2,258
Prisoners in prisons.....	1,339
Under training and instruction at training stations and trade schools.....	4,981

General detail:	
Yards and stations.....	27
Trade schools and training stations.....	329
Receiving ships and receiving barracks.....	3,603
Ammunition depots and torpedo stations.....	225
Aviation stations.....	52
	4,236

In transit and delayed reports..... 28,799

..... 4,062

Total afloat..... 32,861

..... 68,138

Grand total..... 100,999

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is why the gentleman desires the additional 20,000 men.

Mr. SWING. No. That was in reply to your proposition that there were 20,000 men that Secretary Denby could not account for.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Have you accounted for them?

Mr. SWING. There is the statement which shows exactly what they are doing, and it is satisfactory to me.

Now, the whole issue in this thing is just this: It is whether or not we have what we have told the American people we were going to have, a Navy equal to any in the world. I charge that

this bill was drawn in total disregard of the comparative strength of the personnel of our Navy with that of other nations.

In this whole volume there is not a single inquiry by the chairman of the committee or any of his associates asking for information as to the relative strength of any other navy, and it seems to me it did not occur to them important until after they had been criticized for not maintaining the Navy according to the treaty ratio. Then the gentleman from Michigan, having previously decided that our Navy should have only 65,000 enlisted men and 2,000 apprentices, started out to find the evidence to support it. And where did he look? The Lord only knows. It is a great mystery as to where this committee went for assistance.

This colloquy between the learned gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] took place while the chairman of the subcommittee was making his opening statement on behalf of this bill:

Mr. BUTLER. I have listened with very great care to the comparison he was making of the number of men proposed by the English and by the American navies. I do not know where the gentleman got his information. He can not supply it. Will not the gentleman state to the House whether or not it was the very highest that could be obtained, absolutely official?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. As far as I could go.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What is the gentleman's inference?

Mr. SWING. The inference is that there are only officials of three countries who could possibly be appealed to for this information—the American, the British, and the Japanese. It seems that you place no confidence in the naval officials of our own country, so it is hardly likely that you got your information from them.

And I am afraid that the sad spectacle is presented to the American people of a committee of this House preparing a naval bill for the defense of our country, asking Japanese and British officials to assist in framing it. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman say that the committee had no information from American representatives?

Mr. SWING. I went to the only source that was afforded abroad?

to me, the official hearings of your committee, and nothing can be found—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman say that the committee had no information from our representatives abroad?

Mr. SWING. I say this, that you have not disclosed it. If you are willing to disclose it, you may do so now.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for this permission.

Mr. SWING. We maintain through appropriations the Naval Intelligence Bureau, and the gentleman knows that its function is to acquire from most official sources the most authentic information obtainable regarding the navies of the world. Only a part of it is published; most of it is secret.

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

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, may I have two minutes more?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I regret I can not yield more time.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. SWING. Now, something was said in this tarring-stick act of these Members of the House who took exception as a matter of conscientious duty to the conclusions reached by the committee about their being from navy-yard districts. Well, the answer to that is that enlisted men do not work in the navy yards, and the issue now before this House is the size of the enlisted personnel, and its decision will neither increase nor decrease the size of any navy yard.

The district I represent, as well as my State—in fact, the whole Pacific coast—is interested in this bill solely from the standpoint of adequate national defense. We on the west coast face the only source of danger from which danger can come to this country. We believe that we have a right to look to our Government to furnish us absolute security and not leave us dependent upon the word of some foreign power. We have a Navy which is capable of giving us that absolute security if this Congress will only appropriate for its adequate support and maintenance. In this connection, and as typical of the sentiment of the people of my State, I want to read a telegram received this morning from John R. Quinn, commander of the American Legion of the State of California. It does not represent navy-yard employees who are seeking to raid the Treasury of the United States, if any there are. This represents men who fought and bled and who have learned the lesson of the Great War on the battle field at the risk of their lives

and their health, and who do not want our country to again pay the awful price of unpreparedness. It says:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., April 11, 1922.

Congressman PHIL D. SWING,
Washington, D. C.:

Representing 50,000 California Legionaries, I feel that we would be derelict in our duty if we did not protest against the reduction of the naval forces of the United States below 90,000 men, as we should have under the disarmament pact 5-5-3 pro rata. Our late experience seems to be too soon forgotten. We must maintain a sufficient personnel for our national defense.

JOHN R. QUINN,
Department Commander.

[Applause.]

And now, finally, since the chairman of the subcommittee himself read a statement from the President delivered before the Limitation of Armament Conference, I would like to read what President Harding wrote regarding maintaining the American Navy:

We want no Navy for conquest. We would all like to reduce armaments; but so long as there is need for national defense we must maintain our Navy, not only in its material strength but in the moral capacity of its officers and men. Our Navy is the great wall of America. A navy that is almost good enough will, in the end, prove more costly to the safety of the United States than no navy at all.

[Applause.]

Now, taking the facts before us, 67,000 men as the enlisted strength of this country, and taking the like elements from the navies of Great Britain and Japan, we find that for the ensuing fiscal year the average enlisted strength for Great Britain will be 104,000 men and for Japan 68,252, as against our 67,000. We know the facts or we can learn them. We can not fool ourselves, and in Heaven's name let us not commit the crime against the country of fooling the people into thinking they have a 5-5-3 ratio Navy when we have only a 5-3-3 Navy.

[Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOGAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, the issue in the debate upon the proposition of cutting down the estimates submitted by Secretary Denby for the personnel of our Navy from 96,000 men to 67,000 men is simply this: Shall we resort to national short-sightedness in the name of national economy.

In my opinion the American people would resent our meeting that issue as the Appropriations Committee would meet it. Extreme parsimony with our Navy has never been popular. From the days of John Paul Jones and Farragut and Schley and Dewey until now that Navy has defended our coast line in both great oceans and has never been beaten. It has upheld liberty and opposed tyranny. It has done its full share in the work of making this the first nation in the world.

Let us not forget that if we were enabled to break the shackles of the British Empire and become free to preserve the integrity of our Union, to become a world power by rescuing from Spain her down-trodden possessions, and to assume the leadership of mankind following upon our turning the tide in the bloodiest war of history, it was because we did not rely entirely upon our prayers, but kept our powder dry. It was because we upheld fine and honorable traditions in our Navy as a fighting machine. It was because we kept the old fighting spirit at the highest pitch. It was because the protection of America was the highest consideration.

It is now proposed by the statesmen of the Appropriations Committee to abandon all of our naval traditions and to make the United States accept a place as a third-rate naval power. Some of the members of the committee who urge the reduction would have us believe that white is black and black is white. They would have us accept their statement that by a reduction in the personnel of about one-fourth of the number of men asked for the Navy would be kept up to the same maximum as the British Navy, which will not be permitted to dwindle to the smaller total. These statesmen have attempted to nullify the splendid work of the Harding administration in bringing about a 10-year limitation of naval armament. This Republican administration has been replete with measures of great distinction for the benefit of all the people of the country, but in the century to come nowhere will it so resplendently shine in achievement for the public good as in its sincere effort to bring about world peace on a practicable basis. When Charles Evans Hughes laid down the terms of the armament treaty subsequently adopted I do not believe he had any thought that his proposal to scrap the ships of Great Britain, the United States, and Japan to a 5-5-3 basis would be met by an attempt on the part of the Appropriations Committee of the House to cut our diminished Navy to the point of inefficiency. Our national in-

terests were not jeopardized by President Harding and Secretary Hughes. On the contrary, they safeguarded them with treaties which are not to be considered scraps of paper. Is Congress, then, to be less careful of our national interests? Are we, the Representatives of the people, to appear before our constituencies and explain a vote against a personnel of 86,000 men on the ground that it equally carries out the terms of the arms treaty in the face of the diametrically opposite opinion by Secretary Hughes himself?

There are some here who would have us believe that in the nature of things we shall never have another war with England. As the result of our saving her cause in the World War she now has a third instead of a fourth of the globe as her domain. In order to placate opinion in this country, she has given dominion government to Ireland, in some respects a greater move in the direction of world peace than the arms conference. For the same reason she has accepted equality on the sea of the Stars and Stripes. I hope no further wars will ever come. I hope that all nations will be so beneficently imbued with the blessings of peace that they will never think of again taking to bloodshed to settle their differences. But I do not believe they will, and because I wish to protect America from theory and shortsightedness I want to see it fully prepared for any eventuality that may arise in the future with Great Britain or any other power. There are those also who would have us believe that we shall never war with Japan. I hope so, but I can not believe that Japan has lost all ambition as the result of the arms treaty, and I want to see our Navy maintained at a standard which will enable us to be reasonably sure of victory in the event of a fight. "Speak softly, but carry a big stick" was Theodore Roosevelt's maxim, and it is good enough for me. Let us all be in favor of peace, but take no chances. And toward Great Britain and Japan let us have the most altruistic good will. Let us believe their good will toward us. But in the event that their will should not be so good, let us be ready with a broadside that will sweep empires off the seas and preserve for mankind the ideal of liberty and republicanism.

Sixty-seven thousand men will not be sufficient to maintain our Navy on an equality with that of England. This is testified to by naval experts. Their word and that of the Secretary of the Navy and the son of Theodore Roosevelt, who is now Assistant Secretary of the Navy, are sufficient evidence to me as against the cheeseparing contentions of the Appropriations Committee. Eighty-six thousand men will save our Navy from sinking into the third class. I am for it and for the Navy and the fighting spirit of John Paul Jones and Dewey. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. CURRY, as Speaker pro tempore, having assumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11228) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, in two prepared speeches delivered yesterday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] made numerous and in many cases very damaging accusations against certain Army officers. The general impression left by these charges is that other officers, including the War Department itself, have either connived at, condoned, or ignored the acts upon which these accusations are supposed to be founded. That such an impression is accurate or that it has any substantial foundation in fact no fair-minded man, in my judgment, believes. If there be crookedness or corruption of any kind in the War Department or in the Army, the person most interested and who would be most active in finding and getting rid of it is the Secretary of War. No one who knows his high character will dispute this. Nor should we allow the fact, even if proved, that a few Army officers in very rare instances have been unfaithful to cast a cloud of suspicion upon the whole Army. As we all know, Army officers were called upon during the war to perform tasks unprecedented in magnitude and difficulty. With exceptions so rare as to be noteworthy on that account they accomplished these tasks with honor and

credit to themselves and with great advantage to the country. If any man has disgraced himself and his country by dishonesty, he should be uncovered and punished, but let us not besmirch the honorable records of the many who gave the very best that was in them to their country in the time of its great need.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

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

To Mr. MALONEY, indefinitely.

To Mr. STEVENSON (at the request of Mr. McSWAIN), for two legislative days, on account of important business.

To Mr. HUDSPETH, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. SANDERS of Indiana (at the request of Mr. PURNELL), indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. VESTAL (at the request of Mr. PURNELL), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 13, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LANGLEY: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. S. J. Res. 186. A joint resolution authorizing the transfer to the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on the Library certain reservations in the District of Columbia for use in connection with the Botanic Garden; without amendment (Rept. No. 894). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. S. 156. An act for the relief of the heirs of Julio Carrasco, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 895). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 636. A bill for the relief of the Delaware & Hudson Co., of New York City; with an amendment (Rept. No. 896). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 862. A bill for the relief of Vivian Hood; with an amendment (Rept. No. 897). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOX: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4145. A bill for the relief of Leonidas Sawyer; with an amendment (Rept. No. 898). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LOGAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4421. A bill for the relief of John Albrecht; with amendments (Rept. No. 899). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9472. A bill for the relief of the Canadian Pacific Railway Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 900). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9941. A bill for the relief of the Maryland Casualty Co., the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. of Baltimore, Md., and the National Surety Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 901). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9942. A bill for the relief of the Maryland Casualty Co., the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland, and the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. of Baltimore, Md.; with amendments (Rept. No. 902). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

* PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 11281) to regulate interstate commerce in coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 11282) to create Federal local option districts, to provide money to pay the expected deficit in the Treasury, to amend the revenue act of 1921, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARDY of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 11283) to continue the land office at Del Norte, in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: Resolution (H. Res. 325) requesting the Director of the Veterans' Bureau to comply with the intent of the law to decentralize the bureau by expediting and completing the transfer of records and files having to do with veterans' claims to the several regional offices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 11284) granting a pension to Alice McCarty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11285) granting a pension to Christiana Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11286) granting a pension to Mary A. Bunker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 11287) for the relief of W. B. Moses & Sons, the Willis-Smith-Crall Co., American Home Furnishers Corporation, the Western Electric Co., and S. A. Curtis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 11288) granting a pension to Walter B. Kelley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 11289) for the relief of the children of William Wheeler Hubbell and his wife, Elizabeth Catherine Hubbell, both deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 11290) granting a pension to Almira L. Boutelle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11291) granting a pension to Joseph J. Chevrete; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11292) granting a pension to Lucinda Hayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 11293) granting a pension to Elmira Pariseaux; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11294) granting a pension to Phoebe Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 11295) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia L. Godfrey; 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:

5058. By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution adopted by the board of estimate and apportionment of New York City, urging the continuance of the Brooklyn Navy Yard and hospitalization for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5059. By Mr. ANSORGE: Petition of Mount Morris Community Council of Defense and the Harlem Tenants' Association, of New York, urging necessary appropriation to provide private sanatoriums at Saranac Lake and Liberty, N. Y., for tubercular soldiers; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

5060. By Mr. BIXLER: Petition of Warren County (Pa.) citizens, urging support of the Voigt bill (H. R. 8086); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5061. Also, petition of Mercer County (Pa.) citizens, urging the passage of the Voigt bill (H. R. 8086); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5062. Also, petition of citizens of Elk County, Pa., urging the passage of the Towner-Sterling bill (H. R. 7 and S. 1252); to the Committee on Education.

5063. Also, petition of Warren County, Pa., citizens, urging support of the Voigt bill (H. R. 8086); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5064. By Mr. CAREW: Resolution unanimously adopted by the Broadway Association of New York City, relative to the Senate amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5065. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolution adopted by the board of estimates and apportionment of New York City, relative to the Brooklyn Navy Yard and hospitalization for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5066. Also, resolution adopted by the Broadway Association of New York City, favoring the enactment of the Senate amend-

ment to the Post Office appropriation bill to reestablish the pneumatic-tube system in the New York post office; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5067. By Mr. FAUST: Resolution signed by citizens of St. Joseph, Mo., favoring passage of the Towner-Sterling educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

5068. By Mr. GRIFFIN: Resolution unanimously adopted by the Broadway Association of the city of New York, on April 7, 1922, urging the House of Representatives to support the Senate amendment to the Post Office bill providing for the continuance of the pneumatic-tube system in New York City; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5069. Also, resolution adopted by the board of estimate and apportionment of the city of New York, urging the continuance of the Brooklyn Navy Yard and hospitalization of the veterans of the New York district for the purpose of relieving the employment situation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5070. By Mr. KAHN: Petition of citizens of Oakland, Calif., against Sunday closing legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5071. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the American Association for Labor Legislation of New York City, N. Y., relative to the Fitzgerald accident compensation bill (H. R. 10034); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5072. Also, petition of the Edward Hines Lumber Co., of Chicago, Ill., relative to the conservation of forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5073. Also, petition of the board of estimate and apportionment of the city of New York, relative to the Brooklyn navy yard and hospitalization of disabled veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5074. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of 248 citizens of Healdsburg, Calif., protesting against the enactment of House bills 9753 and 4388, compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5075. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Leo H. Mix and other residents of Hamburg and vicinity in New York State, protesting against the passage of House bill 9753 and other Sunday bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5076. By Mr. RADCLIFFE: Petition of citizens of Paterson, N. J., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 9753; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5077. By Mr. RIORDAN: Resolution adopted by the Broadway Association, relative to a Senate amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill reestablishing the pneumatic-tube system in the New York post office; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5078. Also, resolution adopted by the board of estimate and apportionment relative to the Brooklyn Navy Yard and hospitalization for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5079. By Mr. ROSSDALE: Resolution adopted by the Broadway Association of New York, that the pneumatic-tube system be restored in New York City; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5080. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of L. G. Hess and Fred C. Foster, of Rome, N. Y., favoring passage of the Chandler bill (H. R. 9198) providing old-age pensions for veterans of the War with Spain; to the Committee on Pensions.

5081. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Charles G. Martin, Esq., of New Castle, Pa., in support of House bill 7213; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5082. Also, petition of Chapter No. 1, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, of Philadelphia, Pa., in support of Senate bill 1565; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5083. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Boston, protesting against the closing of the Charlestown Navy Yard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5084. By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolution of the Gen. H. W. Lawton Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, of Springfield, Mass., in favor of maintaining an adequate Army and Navy; to the Committee on Appropriations.