

5120. Also, petition from Humbert F. DeRosa, of Utica, N. Y., suggesting amendments to the watch schedule of the pending tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5121. Also, petition of Clark and seven others, of the thirty-third district of New York, 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.

5122. By Mr. STINESS: Memorial of the Varnum Continentals, of East Greenwich, R. I., urging that the minimum strength of the Army be 150,000 men and 13,000 officers and that the Navy personnel be at least 93,000 men; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5123. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Chartiers Presbytery, United Presbyterian Church, Hickory, Pa., indorsing Senate Joint Resolution 31, proposing a constitutional amendment authorizing Congress to enact uniform laws on the subject of marriage and divorce; also indorsing House Joint Resolution 131, proposing a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy and polygamous cohabitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5124. Also, petition of Chartiers Presbytery, United Presbyterian Church, of Hickory, Pa., indorsing House bill 9753, to secure Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5125. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution adopted by the United Veterans of the Republic, Unit No. 12, of Charlestown, Mass., relative to the personnel of the Navy and the Boston Navy Yard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5126. Also, resolution adopted by the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, opposing any amendment of the transportation act which will deprive the Interstate Commerce Commission of its power over intrastate rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5127. Also, resolution adopted by the Navy League of the United States, urging that the personnel of the Navy be maintained at not less than the ratio of 5-5-3 to that of the British and Japanese Navies; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, April 15, 1922.

(Legislative day of Friday, April 14, 1922.)

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gooding	La Follette	Sheppard
Borah	Hale	Lenroot	Shortridge
Bursum	Harreld	Lodge	Simmons
Calder	Harris	McCormick	Smoot
Capper	Harrison	McNary	Spencer
Caraway	Heflin	Moses	Stanley
Colt	Hitchcock	Nelson	Sterling
Culberson	Johnson	Newberry	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Norbeck	Swanson
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Townsend
Edge	Kellogg	Oddie	Trammell
Ernst	Kendrick	Overman	Wadsworth
Fernald	Keyes	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	King	Pomerane	Watson, Ga.
Glass	Ladd	Reed	Willis

Mr. HEFLIN. My colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is absent on account of illness in his family. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. DIAL. My colleague [Mr. SMITH] is detained on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may continue through the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, 1923 (S. DOC. NO. 185).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Department of State (foreign intercourse), fiscal year 1923, for revision of Chinese customs tariff, and inquiry into extraterritoriality in China, \$68,750; for commission of jurists to consider amendment of laws of war, \$3,750; and for claims of the Government of Norway, \$2,200; in total amount \$74,700, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## PETITIONS.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Emery-Eckington Parent-Teachers' Association, of Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of Senate bill 3136, providing for increased salaries to school-teachers in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LADD presented a resolution adopted by Dominion Local No. 1, Western Progressive Grange, of Dominion, Wash., favoring the passage of Senate bill 2604, the Ladd honest money bill, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented the petitions of J. I. Framvorg and 10 others, of Bergen; B. J. Swang and 46 others, of Harvey; and W. G. Safford and 92 others, of Hillsboro and vicinity, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation reviving the United States Grain Corporation, so as to stabilize prices of certain farm products, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## COMMISSIONS TO MIDSHIPMEN IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Mr. PAGE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 274) authorizing the commissioning in the Marine Corps of midshipmen under certain conditions, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 602) thereon.

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. STANLEY:

A bill (S. 3465) to amend section 42 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 3466) for the relief of the widows of certain officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 3467) granting a pension to Mary G. Grover (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 3468) to empower the Bureau of Efficiency, subject to the approval of the President, to establish a system of efficiency ratings for the classified service in the several executive departments and independent establishments, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, based upon records kept in each department and independent establishment with such frequency as to make them as nearly as possible records of fact; to the Committee on Civil Service.

## TARIFF BILL AMENDMENTS.

Mr. JOHNSON submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7456, the tariff bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is before the Senate and will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) extending the operation of the immigration act of May 19, 1921, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration with an amendment, in line 5, after "June 30," to strike out "1923" and insert "1924, unless otherwise repealed," so as to make the joint resolution read:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the operation of the act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved May 19, 1921, is extended to and including June 30, 1924, unless otherwise repealed.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desire to offer a substitute for the pending joint resolution. I do not ask to have it read at this particular time. I have offered it and I will give some explanation of the substitute.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, as this matter is likely to be passed upon now, if it does not interfere with the Senator's plan I would like to have the substitute read so that we may understand what it is.

Mr. HARRISON. May I say before it is read that the substitute which I have offered for the pending joint resolution includes the recommendations of the Commissioner of Immigration. Only one exception is made. It excludes the recommendation of the commissioner that the quota from any one country may be 1,500. It was my opinion that under the 3 per cent restriction if a country's quota was 250, no more than that number should be permitted to enter the United States. With that single exception the substitute which I have offered includes the recommendations of the Commissioner of Immigra-

tion as to the amendment of the present immigration law. It does not change the 3 per cent quota at all.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Mississippi how his substitute differs, if at all, from the substitute which I presented some days ago?

Mr. HARRISON. I have forgotten what the Senator's substitute is.

Mr. HARRIS. The substitute which I have offered limits immigration for five years, but excludes clauses (1) to (8), inclusive, of the present law.

Mr. HARRISON. I will proceed with my explanation and then have my substitute for the joint resolution read.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WILLIS. I am anxious to understand the Senator's substitute. Does it include the amendment proposed to the committee as set forth on page 9 of the committee report?

Mr. HARRISON. It is carried in the report of the Commissioner of Immigration.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator will recall that the commissioner made certain recommendations to the committee. If he has the report of the committee before him he will find those recommendations set forth on page 9.

Mr. HARRISON. It includes all those recommendations.

Mr. WILLIS. And what else?

Mr. HARRISON. It is exactly the confidential print which was before the Committee on Immigration, and which did include all these suggestions. I am going to yield to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], in a moment, but before doing so I wish to say that my proposed substitute makes it a matter of permanent law. It changes the 2 per cent limitation which was applied and merely carries it out, leaving the 3 per cent quota as it was. As I understand the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], he proposes a complete restriction for five years.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; with certain exceptions which are mentioned in the substitute which I have offered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I only want to say that I have not examined the substitute which the Senator has offered, and so I do not know that I have any objection to it, but it seems to me that what we ought to do now is to make sure that the present law does not lapse on the 30th of June. If we undertake at this moment to revise the entire immigration act, it will take us a good while. The most important thing is to get the pending joint resolution passed in order to make sure that the present law is extended. I am in favor of a revision of the present law. I know that the Commissioner of Immigration has made some very important suggestions. I think we ought to go over the whole law and I suppose that will soon be done. But it seems to me that it is of first importance at this moment to make sure that the present law does not lapse on the 30th of June.

Mr. HARRISON. May I say to the Senator from Massachusetts, before I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island, that I have suggested in my substitute no change of the 3 per cent quota provision; I knew that would start discussion and that the two Houses might not agree on it; but I do think, and I believe if the committee had investigated the proposition they would have thought, that the recommendations of the Commissioner of Immigration were wise. They are not included.

I wish now to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, and then I shall answer the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts that it might kill the joint resolution if we did not adopt it exactly as the House passed it.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. I promised to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, I wish to make a short statement.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield for a moment to have read, so that he can discuss in connection with his substitute, the amendment which I have proposed?

Mr. COLT. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an amendment pending, but the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be read for the information of the Senate.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 1, line 6, insert the following:

No alien shall be admitted under the immigration laws to the United States unless transported to the United States in a vessel documented under the laws of the United States, as defined in the shipping act of 1916, as amended; but this provision shall not apply to persons included in clauses (1) to (8), inclusive, of subdivision (a) or in the

second proviso of subdivision (d) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved May 19, 1921.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) which has been favorably reported by the Immigration Committee and is now before the Senate, continues the present immigration law for two years instead of for one, as passed by the House. That is the effect of the amendment reported by the committee.

The two most striking facts brought out in the operation of this law are, first, that the immigration from northern and western Europe is of a permanent character, while the immigration from southern and eastern Europe is of a temporary character; and, second, that the immigration movement from southern and eastern Europe is offset by the departures, or home-returning movement, of this group of aliens.

The following figures are taken from a report of the Commissioner General of Immigration, giving the quotas, the admissions, and the departures under the present 3 per cent law from July 1, 1921, to February 28, 1922, a period of eight months:

Table giving the quotas, admissions, and departures under the present 3 per cent law from July 1, 1921, to February 28, 1922.

NORTHERN AND WESTERN EUROPE.			
	Quota.	Immigrant aliens admitted.	De-parted.
United Kingdom.....	77,296	23,248	6,903
Germany.....	68,039	11,678	2,908
France.....	5,692	3,445	1,507
Belgium.....	1,557	1,459	818
Norway.....	12,116	2,745	956
Denmark.....	5,644	1,742	494
Sweden.....	19,956	4,026	1,212
Switzerland.....	3,745	2,339	632
Netherlands.....	3,602	1,299	600
Total.....	197,557	51,981	15,930
Net gain.....			36,051

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?  
Mr. COLT. I prefer, as the statement I am making is a short one, not to be interrupted until after I have finished.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.  
Mr. COLT. Now, contrast the statistics of immigration from northern and western Europe with the statistics of immigration from southern and eastern Europe, which are as follows:

Table giving the quotas, admissions, and departures under the present 3 per cent law from July 1, 1921, to February 28, 1922.

SOUTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.			
	Quota.	Immigrant aliens admitted.	De-parted.
Italy.....	42,021	39,181	42,371
Poland.....	25,800	27,108	27,395
Russia.....	34,247	9,539	4,665
Greece.....	3,286	3,384	5,667
Portugal.....	2,239	1,723	4,928
Other countries (southern and eastern Europe).....	46,750	38,638	28,217
Total.....	154,373	119,606	113,243
Net gain.....			6,363
Total net gain in immigration.....			42,411

It will be noticed that from Poland the immigration exceeded the quota, but that more Poles departed from our shores than were admitted.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—  
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. COLT. I would prefer not to be interrupted until I have finished this short statement.

It will be noted that out of 51,981 alien immigrants admitted from northern and western Europe only 15,930 returned, while out of 119,606 alien immigrants admitted from southern and eastern Europe 113,243 returned. In other words, out of a net increase of 42,411 in our alien-immigrant population from Europe during eight months, 36,051 were from northern and western Europe and only 6,363 from southern and eastern Europe.

These figures further show that there is no marked immigration movement to the United States from northern and western Europe. There were admissible under the quota law 197,649 from northern and western Europe and only 51,981 were admitted, or less than one-third the number admissible. There

were admissible from the United Kingdom 77,206 and only 23,248 came. Out of 68,039 admissible from Germany only 11,678 came. Out of 12,116 admissible from Norway only 2,745 came, and out of 19,956 admissible from Sweden only 4,026 came. Instead of conditions following the Great War producing, as many predicted, an increasing flow of immigration from these countries, especially from Germany, these conditions have tended to check immigration.

In regard to the immigration from southern and eastern Europe we find this situation, a relatively strong immigration movement to the United States and a substantially equal return movement. From Italy 39,181 came in during eight months and 42,371 departed—and, mind you, Mr. President, I am confining myself strictly to immigrant aliens—from Poland 27,108 came in and 27,395 departed; 3,384 came in from Greece and 5,637 went back; from Russia 9,569 came in and 4,665 departed—that is the only important exception where the number of those who departed was not in excess of the number who came in—from Portugal 1,726 came in and 4,928 returned.

These figures show that however strong the tide of immigration may be from southern and eastern Europe it is met by a counter returning movement. If there are causes which impel a large body of these immigrants to come to this country, there are also causes which impel a large body to return to the country of their birth.

One of the causes of the movement of peoples from one country to another is economic and another cause is political. I believe that the economic rehabilitation of Europe has tended to check immigration and also has tended to increase the returning flow. I also believe that the destruction of autocracy and the establishment of new republics in Europe have tended to retard immigration and have also tended to increase the return movement. A striking example of the effect of political changes upon the return movement is shown in the case of the Polish race. During eight months, from July 1 to February 28, 5,963 Polish immigrants were admitted to the United States and 25,166 returned to Poland.

Mr. TOWNSEND. During what month was that?

Mr. COLT. During the eight months of the operation of the law, from the 1st of July to the 28th of February. In round numbers 5,000 Polish immigrants were admitted and 25,000 Polish immigrants returned to Poland during that time.

As to the general effect upon immigration of the operation of the law for eight months it may be said that the number of alien immigrants from southern and eastern Europe admitted to the United States is only about 6,000 more than the number who have departed, and that the number of alien immigrants from northern and western Europe admitted to the United States during this time is only about 36,000 in excess of those who have departed.

Such defects and hardships as have been disclosed in the practical administration of the law have been in part corrected and these corrective efforts will be continued. I might say with regard to immigration that the facts are so complex that it is very difficult to frame even a reasonably perfect immigration law; and, therefore, there ought to be a great deal of administrative power lodged in the Department of Labor. In other words, the law should be made elastic enough to prevent what might be called tragedies, so that the law could be administered with humanity.

The Commissioner General of Immigration, Mr. Husband, says—and mark this:

I am quite sure that some of the administrative difficulties of the past can be avoided or considerably minimized in the future, even though the law is extended without amendments as the House joint resolution provides.

With respect to amendments, there was such a division in the committee as to what amendments should be adopted, and the whole subject of amendments opened up such a wide field that the committee deemed it best at this time simply to extend the law without any change in its provisions. When you once opened the door to amendment you had three classes of amendments proposed, and each one of those classes represented a distinct opinion in the committee. You had restrictive amendments, you had amendments which liberalized, and you had constructive amendments. When once you had opened the door to the admission of amendments, all the parties who offered these different kinds of amendments would be entitled to be heard. As was said by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] a moment ago, the country ought to know and the world ought to know what the immigration law is going to be for the next year, because in an immigration law it is necessary that the law should not go into effect until a considerable time after its passage. One of the difficulties with respect to the administration of the present law was that there was not

sufficient time to give notice to the peoples who wanted to come to this country, and therefore during the month of June there was great confusion.

Since the next session of Congress is the short session, the committee also deemed it wise to make the extension for two years instead of one. This extension for one or two years—and the committee, by a majority, thought it was best to make it for two years—it is believed will give time to frame a bill covering constructive legislation along two lines—along the line of selection at the source, and along the line of distribution upon arrival in this country.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, how does this joint resolution tend to correct the tragedies that the Senator talks about in the interest of humanity? Is any latitude given to the commissioner to admit those who ought to be admitted?

Mr. COLT. I might say that the Commissioner General of Immigration has met that situation by requiring the immigrant to give bond. I might say that this law is supplemental to the old law of immigration, and under certain conditions of hardship the commissioner general has fallen back upon the rules of the old law, of which this law is an amendment. I believe that the Commissioner General of Immigration and the Secretary of Labor have endeavored in every way to meet and to overcome these hardships and difficulties. Those hardships and difficulties arose largely in the beginning of the operation of this law, in the beginning of this restrictive legislation, before the immigrants had had full notice of the law. I believe, as the Commissioner General of Immigration says, that those hardships have been largely corrected by administrative rules and regulations, and that if we pass this joint resolution just as it is, extending the time, there will be little or no complaint as to hardships in the future.

I might say that the time is short between now and the 1st of July. I believe that this joint resolution should pass at once. Then if there are any amendments to the act which it is thought best to bring before the Senate for consideration we shall have plenty of time to perfect the law. The situation to-day, to my mind, is that this extension should be granted at once and that whatever amendments may be deemed necessary should come up as separate pieces of legislation.

I want to say that the experience of the House, when they entered into the question of perfecting this measure or of framing a constructive bill, was that they found such a difference of opinion after prolonged hearings and discussion that they reached the conclusion I have reached under similar conditions, that the only thing to be done now to meet the present situation is to continue the present law for one or two years.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, there is nothing complex about this proposition. I concede to no Senator here a greater interest in the restriction of foreign immigration than myself. I would not do anything to jeopardize legislation that will take care of the situation, but we must have courage in dealing with these questions. This is the 15th of April. The present law does not expire until the 30th day of June, so you have a long time to legislate if you will get busy.

There is not a suggestion embodied in the substitute I have offered that has not been considered by the House Immigration Committee. More than that, there is not a suggestion embodied in the substitute I have offered that has not already been adopted by the House Immigration Committee. If that be true—and no one will deny it—then where will any delay come from adopting a substitute that carries out the recommendations of the Commissioner General of Immigration, who says in his report that in some cases they are necessary to the strict enforcement of restriction on immigration?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HARRISON. I do.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator claim that the provisions of his substitute have received consideration at the hands of the Senate Committee on Immigration?

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator will just let me proceed, I do not want to take up the time of the Senate, and I shall be very brief, because I know that the substitute I have offered is important, and I know that if Senators will stay in their seats and consider this proposition they will adopt this substitute.

Here is what happened in the Immigration Committee, and I am not revealing any of its secrets. We met for the first time in months and months. The immigration question has long been an important one. I might say that there are few questions of greater importance to the American people than the restriction of immigration, and that has been true for some time. Why, when we had this matter up before the Senate

Committee on Immigration, I think a year ago, the evidence that came to us was that at Danzig and other places prospective immigrants by the thousands were standing in line for days and for nights waiting to get their passports viséed so that they might come to America. Those were the facts. Periodicals and newspapers and all kinds of organizations had urged Congress to take care of the situation, and it was that menace that forced Congress to pass the present law; so when the Senate committee met a week ago, after a long delay, this joint resolution that has been passed by the House was presented to us. The Commissioner General of Immigration had made certain suggestions as to changes in the present law. Those changes are incorporated in my substitute. I made a motion to the committee to invite your Commissioner General of Immigration to appear before the committee that he might present this matter to the committee and that the committee might consider and pass upon it. Aye, I went further than that. Some weeks ago the President selected Mrs. Lillian Russell Moore—a very splendid lady, accomplished, versed, I presume, in immigration questions—and she was commissioned by the President, your President, to go abroad and study this question from every angle and to return to this country as soon as she could and make a report to the Secretary of Labor. I assume that the President thought it was an important question, and pressing, or he would not have looked all over the country and selected Mrs. Lillian Russell Moore to make this investigation; and so she went abroad. She returned only a few days ago. She filed a report—I have it here—to the Secretary of Labor, and she says that what we ought to do is to have a holiday for five years, preventing any immigration to this country within that time. She says that there are hordes of people, undesirable immigrants, who are waiting anxiously, desirous to come to this country to live.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I suggest to the Senator that it will add strength to his argument and to the report of Mrs. Moore to remember that we have 6,000,000 men unemployed in this country now.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; 6,000,000 men unemployed in this country to-day, factories closed down, wages being cut, empty box cars everywhere, men and women going hungry and in rags and tatters. Yet you say we have not time to study a proposition in which the American people are vitally interested and have been urging us for months and for years to do something about. The trouble is not a lack of time; it is a lack of courage upon our part to handle the question.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, I think we ought to remember in this connection that since this administration went into power and the deflation policy of the Federal Reserve Board went into effect there has been a suicide for every 25 minutes.

Mr. HARRISON. There is a terrible and deplorable situation in this country. You admit it; you know it. I want to read just a few extracts from Mrs. Lillian Russell Moore's report, which the Committee on Immigration, of which the distinguished Senator from Ohio is a member, considered. What the committee did was discourteous to Mrs. Moore; it was discourteous to the Commissioner of Immigration and to the President of the United States not to have called in Mrs. Moore and Mr. Husband, and let them make their reports to the committee when that matter was being considered. This is what Mrs. Moore said in part:

The higher civilizations of past ages, history teaches us, succumbed to such foreign invasions as now threaten us.

Allen infiltration wrecked Rome and Greece. \* \* \*

I believe it would be a good thing for America if an immigration "holiday" of five years could be declared. \* \* \*

If the present law restricting immigration by quotas from other countries is continued, it should be materially strengthened, as I have suggested.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. One moment; just let me finish reading this. The report continues:

If Congressmen should go abroad they could see the facts as I saw them. One particular fact is that no good immigration is turning our way. The good inhabitants of every foreign country are needed there, and can possibly be happier and more contented there than in America.

There is more to this immigration problem than the economic side. Warning has been issued through the German Red Cross that the United States must be on its guard against the introduction of cholera and typhus by Russian immigrants. Hordes of these people, Dr. A. Schlesinger officially announced, are pouring into Germany over the Polish, Letvian, and Esthonian borders, and many are seeking passports to America, where they have relatives and friends who are financing them for their journey.

It is fortunate for the United States that Congress enacted the 3 per cent quota law. It is doing much good. With some of the additions I have suggested it would be quite efficient. Its chief weakness is the lack of power held by our consuls abroad. There, it seems to me, is the foundation of all the trouble.

If we do not keep up the bars and make them higher and stronger there will no longer be an America for Americans.

Before I yield, Mr. President, I ask permission to incorporate this report following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See Appendix A.)

Mr. HARRISON. I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The inquiry I was going to propound was not very important, but I wanted to inquire when Lillian Russell became an authority on the rise and fall of the Roman Empire? I admit she is a pretty high authority on matters theatrical, and perhaps on cosmetics, but I never knew until just now that she had entered the other field.

Mr. HARRISON. I did not know she was an authority on the rise and fall of the Roman Empire until I read this report. Indeed, I did not know she was an authority on the immigration question until President Harding commissioned her—

Mr. MOSES. The Senator seems to quote her with great approval.

Mr. HARRISON. But she must be or she would not have been selected by the President. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. I remarked that the Senator from Mississippi seemed to quote Mrs. Moore with great approval.

Mr. HARRISON. Does not the Senator like to have me quote from the appointee of his own President, one who was commissioned in such an important task as this? Are the Senator and his colleagues not to take into consideration any of the reports made by these people? When these people are appointed and go abroad and travel in foreign countries, trying to serve their people and their Government, is not the Senator to pay any attention at all to their reports?

Mr. MOSES. I have read this report. I simply wanted to point out the incongruity of the Senator criticizing Mrs. Moore in one breath because she was not an authority on immigration, when he had already been quoting her with great approval before that. I wish to say further with reference to the particular matter now under discussion—that is, this immediate phase of the debate—that I think it highly undignified and most ungentlemanly.

Mr. HARRISON. That is about the height to which the Senator from New Hampshire can go.

Mr. MOSES. I admit that I do not rise to the height of assailing ladies on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. I refuse to yield to the Senator. I have not said a word in criticism of Mrs. Moore. I would not. I agree with her views. She has voiced my sentiments. I think she is quite a remarkable and accomplished lady. I said that in the course of my remarks. I did not know that she was an authority on immigration questions until she was appointed by President Harding. If that carries with it a criticism, then the Senator can accept it as such. He is just about that big.

Mr. MOSES. I have already done so.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to say, so that I will not be misunderstood, that I am not criticizing the Senator for quoting this authority. It is probably the best agency that has been employed by this administration. The Senator naturally has to turn to that source for his facts, under the circumstances, but I still raise the question as to the high authority and the controlling weight of an opinion by this lady upon international law or immigration questions.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HARRISON. Before I yield let me answer the Senator from Missouri. I am not basing my argument on any report of Mrs. Moore; not at all. That is just part of the case. I am basing my substitute on the recommendation of Mr. Husband, the Commissioner of Immigration, and appointee of this administration, a man who I believe knows more about the immigration question to-day than anyone else in the United States. I have great respect for his judgment, and I am willing to follow him more quickly than those Senators on the other side who are opposing his recommendation and refusing to follow him in this instance. I have the good of the country at heart.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator's substitute leaves the 3 per cent provision as it is, and I offer an amendment changing that so as not to allow any but the accepted class to come in for five years, and I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi will not accept that amendment?

Mr. HARRISON. I am in this attitude, Mr. President, that I would vote and I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, but my substitute is pending. I do not believe the Senate will accept a holiday of five years, although I am going to vote for it, and I am in favor of it in the event my amendment is not adopted.

I am hoping that my substitute will be adopted. I have drawn the substitute conservatively, because I did not want to complicate the proposition. I wanted to keep the simple issue before the Senate, not change the 3 per cent quota but only to carry out the recommendations of the administrative officer having the immigration question in charge.

Mr. HARRIS. I withdraw my amendment, and will offer it if the substitute offered by the Senator from Mississippi is voted down.

Mr. HARRISON. In the year ending June 30, 1921, 978,163 immigrants of all kinds entered this country. Of course, some went away. Eight hundred and five thousand two hundred and twenty-eight immigrant aliens entered this country that year, and, mark you, for about 26 days during that year this 3 per cent quota was in operation, which cut down the number of immigrants coming into this country. If it had not been for that, there would have been many more.

For the 10 years up to 1912, I think, approximately 11,000,000 immigrants came into the United States. In my opinion, the 3 per cent quota law, which is now on the statute books, has worked well. It is a good law. It does not go as far as I would have had it go, but it has cut down the number of immigrants coming into this country.

For instance, during the time this law has been in operation something over 200,000 immigrants have come into this country. I think under the 3 per cent quota 350,000 immigrants a year are allowed to come in, there being a particular quota each country can send here.

Mr. CALDER. If the Senator will permit me, that is 350,000 from Europe, I believe. The figures show that the quota was 351,930 from Europe.

Mr. HARRISON. I would like to have the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island. The 3 per cent law allows only 357,000 immigrants to come into this country each year. No such number do come, because certain countries do not send their full quotas. No country can send more than its quota, although during the last year, because of peculiar circumstances, some countries have sent more than their quotas. I believe during the operation of the 3 per cent quota law there have been 15 countries which have sent more than their quotas, but I assume it was because in the beginning of the operation of the 3 per cent quota law a great many immigrants came to this country through the encouragement of the steamship companies, landed at New York, had to be taken care of, and were admitted into this country. They had started from their respective countries before the law was passed. This should not and doubtless will not happen again.

A remarkable situation is presented under this law, however, which illustrates more than anything else, and will convince anyone more than any other proposition, that it is a good law or that the quota system is an improvement over the old system. We have desired immigration from western Europe. The undesirable immigration to this country has come from eastern and southern Europe, and under the 3 per cent quota law immigration coming to this country from the desirable sections of Europe has shown a large increase, proportionate to the number of immigrants, and immigration has fallen off proportionately from the eastern and southern sections of Europe.

For instance, the figures show that from northern and western Europe for the period from July to December, 1913, 142,776 immigrants came to the United States. From southern and eastern Europe and Asiatic Turkey there were 568,001.

In the period from July to December, 1921, the number had fallen off. From northern and western Europe there were 70,974, and from southern and eastern Europe there were 112,239.

In the period from July to December, 1913, the immigrants coming into the United States from northern and western Europe were 19.4 per cent of all the immigrants during that period who came into this country. In the period from July to December, 1921, it rose to 38.5 per cent, showing that there was an increase in the number of desirable immigrants to this country; while from eastern and southern Europe, in 1913, from July to December, the percentage was 77.2, and in the period from July to December, 1921, it had fallen down to 56 per cent. So the system is working well; but we want to remedy the defects in the present law, and the person above all others in the United States who knows the defects in the present law is the administrative officer of the Immigration Bureau.

Now, what does he say? Under the present law immigrants can come into the country from Canada, from Cuba, from Mexico, after one year's residence there. The Commissioner of Immigration has said that there are thousands upon thousands of undesirable immigrants from Europe and elsewhere who have gone to Canada, Mexico, and Cuba in order to live there one year and then obtain admittance into the United States. So he recommends that the law be changed, and he says it is necessary to change it, that it is imperative that it be changed from one year's residence in Cuba, Mexico, or Canada to five years' residence there. I submit if there were no other amendment adopted by the Senate, that one amendment should be adopted. If we do not adopt it, the whole 3 per cent quota law will fail and can not be successful.

The other change that is suggested by the Commissioner of Immigration is this: The present law imposes no penalty upon steamship companies for violating the rules and regulations and laws of the land respecting immigration. They may go abroad, they may encourage any number of undesirable immigrants to come to this country, who may come into the port of New York and flood every part of Ellis Island or other port of entry, as the case may be. They may be hungry there and penniless, as they were, and organizations of various kinds have had to take care of those people when they were landed there.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I will yield to the Senator in just a moment.

They were landed there through the instrumentality of the steamship companies, encouraged by them, and the quota that should have come was gradually increased because of the activities and influences of the steamship companies. Under the present law no penalty can be imposed upon the companies, and the Commissioner of Immigration has suggested that the law should be amended so as to impose a penalty of \$200 on every steamship company that brings an alien to this country from a country whose quota has been exhausted and to compel the steamship company to pay back to that alien the expenses incurred in coming here upon a fruitless mission. Is not that important? The Commissioner of Immigration says it is. We all know the steamship companies should be punished when they violate the regulations, and so I have proposed in my substitute an amendment carrying out that idea.

Now I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. That provision as to steamship companies exists, as the Senator well knows, in existing law, but it is not applied to the law now under discussion.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; it is not applied to this law.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator stated specifically that it did not exist at all.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, it does not exist as applied to the 3 per cent quota law.

Mr. LODGE. It does not exist as applied to this law, but the Senator gave the idea that we have no penalties applicable to the steamship companies. Such a provision has been carried in the law for years and it ought to be applied to this law. I entirely agree with the Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. That is what I am complaining about—that the penalty now in force does not apply to the 3 per cent quota law, and it should apply to it. Does anyone tell me we should not make that change because we have not the time? We ought to have the courage to take the time and amend our laws when conditions demand it.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Has the Senator studied this question from the standpoint of the vast increase of crime in this country? Does he see any connection between foreign immigration and the increase in crime?

Mr. HARRISON. I think there is no doubt that crime increases according to the increase of undesirable immigration into the country. Crime and everything in the way of disorder increases.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in nearly every one of the brutal, fearful crimes, which seem to be organized, systematized, commercialized, the names of the leading criminals are foreign names. They are not American names.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Virginia. Mr. SWANSON. As I understand the provision reported by the committee, it extends the law for two years. If the amendment proposed by the committee is not adopted it means only

a nullification of the existing law, because under the present law, even if it be extended two years, all an immigrant has to do is to go to Canada or Cuba or Mexico and stay there one year and then he will be permitted to come into this country without any restriction whatsoever. That is really a nullification of the present law.

I think possibly the statistics which were given by the Senator from Mississippi did not include the immigrants who came in from Canada, Mexico, or Cuba, which is permitted under the law. If we are going to have the 3 per cent law extended two years and allow Mexico, Cuba, and Canada to be a mere dumping ground where foreigners can come simply for the purpose of staying one year and then coming into the United States without restriction, I can not see why Senators should object to an amendment covering that situation. Does the Senator expect to offer the amendment separately?

Mr. HARRISON. No; I am offering mine as a substitute for the joint resolution, that carries with it the various amendments which I am going to discuss. I do not think the Senator from Rhode Island has any objection to the amendments. The only question is that he is afraid that the joint resolution might not be agreed to by the House with those amendments, but I do not feel that way about it because the House can adopt every amendment that I am proposing in the substitute by moving to concur in whatever the Senate has done or otherwise, and it will become a law just as quickly as it would if we passed the joint resolution extending it as the committee has suggested.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HARRISON. Very gladly.

Mr. COLT. The Senator is dealing with the amendments proposed by the Commissioner General of Immigration. I entirely agree that certain of his suggestions would perfect the law, but when in the committee we opened up the question of amendments there were other members of the committee who wanted to go beyond these suggestions, and there were other amendments offered and the time was getting so short that we reached—whether the judgment was right or not—the conclusion that it was better to pass the pending joint resolution in the form in which the House passed it and then supplement it later with other legislation.

I would like to ask the Senator if he has considered the Husband amendment referred to on page 13 of his letter to the chairman, increasing the quotas from Australia, Africa, other Europe, and other Asia?

Mr. HARRISON. I have not included that amendment in my substitute.

Mr. COLT. So the Senator does not agree to some of the suggestions of Mr. Husband?

Mr. HARRISON. As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, I do not agree with that one. That would tend, in fact, it would have the effect of increasing the number of immigrants permitted to come to the United States over the 3 per cent quota now allowed. I shall vote for no amendment, nor champion any suggestion, that will increase immigration to this country. My tendency is to decrease, rather than increase, the number.

Mr. COLT. The Senator does not agree with the commissioner general's suggestion where he says, substantially, that it would not be just to admit from Australia only several hundred British subjects and that there ought to be a pre-war minimum admitting 1,000?

There are two schools of thought here, and we must dwell upon it—those who are in favor of absolute suspension of immigration for five years and who are in favor of every restrictive measure and those who are not in favor of such restrictions but are in favor of the quota provision.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi allow me to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Virginia for that purpose.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, under the interpretation given to the existing law there is no limitation upon the number of people from any country who can go into Canada, Mexico, or Cuba, and if they stay there one year there is then absolutely no limitation on the number of those people who can legally come into this country. Is not that true?

Mr. COLT. Under the present law there is no limitation.

Mr. SWANSON. Then we are in this condition under the existing law, if not modified by the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi, that really we have no immigration law restricting immigration from anywhere if the steamship companies wish to take foreigners into Canada, Cuba, or Mexico and let them re-

main there one year for the purpose of then coming to the United States without restriction.

Mr. COLT. The present law says they must remain there for one year.

Mr. SWANSON. Yes; they can go there for the purpose of coming to the United States and violating our laws, and in that way we get all the undesirables. Those who desire to do so can remain there, of course. It really nullifies our existing law at the end of a year under those conditions, does it not?

Mr. COLT. Will the Senator deal with facts somewhat and not with the fear that there are thousands and thousands going to those border countries?

Mr. SWANSON. I have information to that effect.

Mr. COLT. As a matter of fact, Mr. Husband says immigration from Mexico and Canada has fallen off.

Mr. SWANSON. I have been informed, though I do not know whether it is true or not, that great colonies are being formed of people coming to those places for the purpose of later coming into the United States; that the steamship companies carry them to those countries and in that way effect really a nullification of our immigration law.

Mr. COLT. So far as I have any opinion, I concede as a matter of precaution that it would be well to extend the time from one year to three or five years. I agree to that.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, along the line of the question suggested by the Senator from Virginia, Mr. Husband said in his report in speaking of immigration from Canada and Mexico:

There are plenty of indications, however, that systematic violations on a considerable scale will be attempted during the remainder of the present fiscal year, or, in any event, during the coming fiscal year, provided the law is continued in force. I shall not go into details in this regard but can assure you that the bureau is quite fully aware of the situation and will employ every possible means to insure a strict enforcement of the law.

Then further over in his report he said:

Various immigrant aid societies and similar organizations, and possibly also steamship agents in foreign countries, have, according to reports believed to be authentic, fostered and promoted this movement of aliens to foreign contiguous and neighboring countries. It is known that thousands of aliens from countries with exhausted quotas have entered Mexico in recent months; that there are perhaps a larger number of such aliens now in Cuba, with no employment and no prospect of securing same, and that others have gone to Canada and to South America (principally to Brazil), all apparently with the one purpose in view of eventually gaining admission to the United States.

With a situation such as that confronting us, does anyone tell me we should not amend the law when the joint resolution is here for consideration?

Before I was interrupted I was discussing the penalty features as applied to the steamship companies. The amendment suggested in my substitute carries the penalty to the steamship companies which violate the law. There is none in the present law touching the 3 per cent quota provision.

Here is what President Harding had to say about that proposition. Now, you Republicans will all prick up your ears and listen to this, I know. I wish to ask unanimous consent to incorporate, following my remarks, this very remarkable document on immigration and the 3 per cent restriction law by Robert De C. Ward, professor at Harvard University.

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

(See Appendix B.)

Mr. HARRISON. President Harding replied to a letter written by Representative ISAAC SIEGEL, of New York, in September, 1921, and, among other things, said:

I haven't any doubt in the world but the enforcement of the immigration laws is working many a hardship. My own distress has been very great over some of the specific instances which have been reported to me. If I have the situation correctly presented, the difficulty must be charged to the dishonest steamship agents who have brought to this country innocent immigrants in spite of our continued warnings during a period of very great leniency. I know how very persistent have been the impositions which have been made on the Government agents who have been disposed to be sympathetic and more than generous in carrying out the law.

Here is what the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Davis, says about the steamship companies bringing over undesirable immigrants in violation of the regulations:

Secretary Davis reiterated the statement by the President that much of the trouble is caused by dishonest steamship agents and that pitiful stories of hardship are being circulated in the deliberate attempt to discredit the law.

Assistant Secretary of Labor Henning, on September 3, said:

Unfortunately, the law has no teeth, and the only way the offending companies can be punished is to compel them to take back aliens who are not admissible.

It is a pitiful sight. I have never seen it, but I have heard of it. I know it must appeal to the sensibilities of men and women everywhere that poor, unfortunates brought here by steamship companies from Europe and elsewhere and landed at New York

without money, without friends, are sent back home because the quota of immigrants permitted to come is exhausted. If the human heart could be touched, that sight would touch it.

The coming here of people under such conditions through the influence of steamship companies should be prevented. We shall never be able to stop it so long as we have no law which penalizes the agents of steamship companies for bringing over these unfortunates under such circumstances, and yet the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Ohio say we have not the time to amend the existing law, that the date of expiration of the present law is the 30th of June, and we may not be able to enact a new law by that time. I am not surprised at Senators on the other side making such a statement and believing in it, because they realize that they have taken so long to do nothing in relation to all other matters.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Mississippi is giving a perfect illustration of the reason why it is necessary to pass this joint resolution by the time he is wasting instead of trying to amend the joint resolution.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, if the Senator from Massachusetts will not listen to argument and Senators on the other side merely wish to sit here and say, "No; we have not time for that," well and good; but such action furnishes the reason why the Republican leadership is now being denounced from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. LODGE. I am perfectly willing to listen to argument when argument is made.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has agreed with me on two or three propositions which I have advanced.

Mr. LODGE. Exactly. I want to help get the joint resolution through.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from Massachusetts vote for my substitute for the joint resolution?

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. HARRISON. I did not think the Senator would.

Mr. LODGE. But I will vote for some amendments if the Senator from Mississippi will frame them properly.

Mr. HARRISON. I had hoped that the Senator occasionally would vote for something that is right. I am offering a good proposition, and yet the Senator will not take it.

Mr. LODGE. I am ready to vote for any amendment which I believe should be made; I do not know that there is anything in the Senator's substitute to which I object; but I know there are certain amendments that ought to be made to the pending joint resolution, and it will not be done by standing here and bellowing about the Republican Party. The thing to do is to proceed with the consideration of the joint resolution and perfect it.

Mr. HARRISON. I know that the Senator from Massachusetts when he is hit is bound to rise. God knows I have been, and other Senators on this side have been, very lenient with the Republican Party—more so than we should have been.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Mississippi does not need to be lenient. He does not do the Republican Party the slightest harm.

Mr. HARRISON. I know that. One can not do any harm to a thing which is dead, for it does not feel.

Mr. LODGE. The Republican Party has enough feeling to win in the next election.

Mr. HARRISON. That is what I call optimism of the rarest kind.

Mr. LODGE. Not a bit. I remember that the Senator from Mississippi was optimistic in 1920; and so I doubt if there is any foundation for his present optimism.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; but the Senator's party stacked the cards and played them from under the table on us at that time.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, I thought that the business before the Senate was the joint resolution proposing to extend the existing immigration law. I desire to say to the Senator from Mississippi that I should like to see the joint resolution perfected along the line of some of the amendments which have been suggested by Mr. Husband. I have always taken that position; but the reason why I can not vote for the amendment or substitute of the Senator from Mississippi is that he includes some of the commissioner general's amendments and rejects others, these amendments all being included in the committee print, which is the basis of the Senator's amendment or substitute.

I wish to call attention to one of the amendments the adoption of which Mr. Husband could not recommend in its present form. I refer to the amendment which requires cooperation of the Department of State with the Department of Labor. It is an amendment along the line of constructive legislation, along the line of selection at the source. The amendment is to the effect that when the consul visés a passport he shall also issue a certificate that the alien comes within the quota. The consul having the quota before him will know the number of immigrants that may be admitted from that particular country, and he will issue a certificate to the alien immigrant applicant. That amendment has not been perfected; the Secretary of State has not consented to it. That was one of the difficulties which the committee met when it came to constructive legislation. We could not frame such legislation hastily, for it involved a redrafting of the certificate provision.

The committee were met at once with the question, "What are we going to do with the excepted classes under the 3 per cent limitation? Is the consul going to pass upon those?" In other words, there were practical difficulties which had not been solved in connection with the certificate plan, and there has been no agreement as yet by the Secretary of State to cooperate with the Department of Labor. That is one of his amendments that Mr. Husband did not ask the committee to adopt.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HARRISON. I shall yield in one moment. Mr. Husband did recommend the adoption of that amendment; he dictated it himself, and said that if some plan like that were not incorporated the department would be very much embarrassed.

Mr. COLT. I beg the Senator's pardon. I know the Senator from Mississippi never intends to make a misstatement and I certainly do not. I think I made the statement a little too strong. Mr. Husband did recommend a certificate provision, but, to speak in somewhat ordinary language, he "passed the buck" to the committee and asked the committee to perfect the amendment and to get the consent of the Secretary of State.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, the committee also passed the buck.

Mr. COLT. He said that was as far as he would go. As to many of the other amendments which he suggested, I approve of them.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. In regard to the suggestion as to consular inspection, I think that is a very old idea and a very good one. We tried to get it adopted some 25 years ago, but the difficulty which then met us was that other countries would not permit it. The trouble is not with our own State Department, but other countries will not allow an American consul to say whether or not a citizen of Germany, for instance, or France or whatever country may be affected, shall sail from that country. They objected to our consuls exercising that authority.

Now, under the changed conditions since the Great War, it may be possible to make some arrangement of that kind, and I see no objection to giving the authority to our Government to endeavor to make such an arrangement, but it is not something which we can accomplish ourselves; it is necessary to have some arrangement with foreign governments in order that our consuls may be allowed to issue certificates. It would be the most valuable thing that could be done, if we could once bring it about, but it has been prevented by the action of other countries. I remember in past days Germany particularly objected very strongly.

Mr. HARRISON. The Bureau of Immigration, as I understand, fear that the State Department in the future might abolish the passport system in some particulars. They are, of course, using that system now; but, if it should be abolished, the Bureau of Immigration are afraid that a very undesirable class of immigrants may be admitted to our shores. There would in that event be no examination or certification by our consuls or agents abroad.

Mr. LODGE. We can maintain the passport system.

Mr. HARRISON. We can do it, unless the State Department decides otherwise.

Mr. LODGE. We are now maintaining it.

Mr. HARRISON. We are now maintaining it; but, as I have said, the Bureau of Immigration are fearful that a change may be made. That is according to the statement made to me by Mr. Husband.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, provision concerning the passport system is carried in the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, and there has been no suggestion from the State Department of abolishing the system.

Mr. HARRISON. That is a matter which may be worked out in conference, but what I have stated was the suggestion of Mr. Husband. If there is objection to that particular provision, it is easy to strike it from the proposed substitute, and then if the other provisions of the substitute which are recommended are all right we could reach an agreement. I assume that no one is combating the suggestion that there should be a penalty on the steamship companies.

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. HARRISON. I also assume that no one is combating the suggestion that the one-year limitation as to residence in Canada, Mexico, and Cuba should be raised to three years or five years.

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not think there is.

Mr. HARRISON. So if that be true there should be no great difficulty in reaching an agreement. The other suggestions which I have made are merely to provide some slight administrative changes. For instance, under the present law students who come from a foreign country can not be admitted here merely to attend college. The commissioner thinks that they should be excepted, so that they may come to this country to attend college. Those are small matters. The two main propositions suggested by the Commissioner of Immigration are a penalty on the steamship company and a greater limitation on residence in contiguous territory. If we could agree on those two suggestions, it would be easy to pass this joint resolution, and we would then really enact legislation of a constructive character. If I thought that the House would dillydally about such amendments and would not accept them, and that they would delay the bill beyond the 30th of June, I would be the last Senator here to offer such an amendment.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator will admit that it would be a great misfortune to have the bill fail.

Mr. HARRISON. I think it would; but, in view of the fact that practically everybody seems to agree that the two proposals are all right, they could be put in.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say there are two main propositions?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; there are but two main propositions.

Mr. COLT. What are those two?

Mr. HARRISON. The two which I have named. I am perfectly willing to leave out everything else, except the amendment raising the one year's residence requirement in Canada, Cuba, and Mexico and other contiguous territory to five years—that is one—

Mr. LODGE. That ought to be done.

Mr. HARRISON. The other is the imposition of a penalty on steamship companies for violating the rules and regulations and bringing here immigrants from countries the quota of which have been exhausted.

Mr. LODGE. And that ought to be done.

Mr. HARRISON. That should be done.

Mr. LODGE. It is absurd to deport an immigrant and compel a steamship company to take him back for one violation of the immigration laws and not compel it to take him back for another.

Mr. STERLING. I wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi and other Senators that I have an amendment covering the suggestion in regard to residence in contiguous territory, amending the present law so as to require five years' residence.

Mr. HARRISON. I am perfectly willing to agree on any proposal of that kind.

Mr. STERLING. I suppose the regular order would be to perfect the joint resolution before the Senator's substitute comes up for consideration.

Mr. HARRISON. Perfecting amendments, of course, should first be offered to the joint resolution.

Mr. STERLING. By the amendment to which I have referred and some other amendments, the objections which the Senator from Mississippi has to the joint resolution might be met.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. May I ask the Senator from Mississippi whether his substitute in any wise deals with subdivision 5, section 2, of the present law which provides that excepted classes as defined therein embrace "aliens from countries emigration from which is regulated in accordance with treaties or agreements relating solely to immigration"? Does the Senator's suggested substitute in any wise touch that provision?

Mr. HARRISON. It does not change that at all.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I assume the Senator knows how important that provision is.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; the effort has been made to take care of that situation, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. The provision to which the Senator from California refers is left entirely unchanged.

Mr. HARRISON. I certainly do not propose to change it in my substitute at all, and I do not think that it is changed by the joint resolution at all.

Mr. COLT. May I ask the Senator if he would accept the amendment relating to penalizing the steamship companies as drawn up by Mr. Husband, and also the amendment requiring five years' residence in Canada and Mexico?

Mr. HARRISON. I am perfectly agreeable to adopt the amendments in that form even, but I think they should change, for instance, the 20 per cent monthly limitation under the present law. That is suggested by him as quite desirable. I do not think, however, it is so important that that be done.

Mr. COLT. I will tell the Senator why it is not necessary. It is because the law says "shall not exceed 20 per cent," so that the department could regulate that.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator thinks that other suggestions of the commissioner can wait, then, that is perfectly agreeable to me; but I do think it is highly important and, indeed, necessary that the two amendments to the present law which I have suggested be now adopted—one respecting the time of residence in contiguous territory and the other penalizing steamship companies for violations of the law.

Mr. COLT. I might say to the Senator in regard to the amendments which the commissioner general wanted, that the two which the Senator has suggested do not increase the number of immigrants in any way.

#### APPENDIX A.

Report to the Secretary of Labor by Lillian Russell Moore on European emigration conditions as affecting the United States.

MARCH 28, 1922.

HOB. JAMES J. DAVIS,  
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I beg leave to submit the following report of my observations on immigration, as commissioned by you, during a visit to European countries:

Immigration, in my opinion, is the gravest question to-day confronting the American people and the most serious problem demanding solution by the American Government.

Time was when our shores were a haven for the politically and religiously oppressed, and when our gates opened the way to opportunity for the ambitious and aspiring of other lands. Time was, too, when our Nation, in its period of construction and reconstruction, needed the brawn of the sturdy European to extend civilization into uncultivated and undeveloped territory.

To-day European conditions are such that a haven of refuge is not required. There is no longer political oppression abroad. Men are not being driven from their homes for disputing the divine right of Kings to rule. The war has restored human rights to the peoples of Europe, and the new conditions permit to all free expression of thought and peaceful possession of property. There may be suffering; there is depression; but there is freedom, and none need seek sanctuary here.

Nor does America need labor to aid in the development of its resources. That stage has long passed, and it is a fact that the immigration of recent years has been from that class of people which arrests, rather than aids, the development of any nation. When I declare that most of those now seeking to come here have not any of the inspiration or the necessity of the early settlers from abroad, I am stating facts that impress everybody who makes any study of European conditions.

In this immigration problem, then, there is only one thing that demands serious attention, and that is, What is best for America?

We must be just before we are generous.

We must think of the future as well as of the present.

The higher civilizations of past ages, history teaches us, succumbed to such foreign invasions as now threaten us.

Alien infiltration wrecked Rome and Greece.

It is against such a fate that America must protect itself—that the American Government must protect its people, including those of foreign birth or extraction who have loyally taken up the duties of American citizenship.

I believe it would be a good thing for America if an immigration "holiday" of five years could be declared. But if we must keep our gates open, I would urge a new system by which the sifting process should be carried on abroad, so that none but those who, physically and mentally, would make valuable additions to our population would be admitted to board ship for America.

There should be rigid tests of mental qualifications by American consuls. One rigid requirement should be that applicants must be able to read, write, and speak their own language.

Physical tests should be conducted by American physicians, and any bodily weakness should mean rejection. The Wassermann blood test ought to be employed in every case.

I am insistent upon the employment of American physicians to make these tests, because I believe that racial sympathies might lead to too liberal a view of bodily infirmities. It is just possible, too, that some foreign government agencies might not object too severely to the departure of undesirables. It has been intimated that foreign governments might protest against the employment of American physicians as health examiners, but there is no logical ground for such objection. Protest might just as reasonably be made against the quarantine officials of home ports who examine incoming passengers.

If the present law restricting immigration by quotas from other countries is continued, it should be materially strengthened, as I have suggested. There should be also a central headquarters, possibly in London, where American consuls should regularly report the number of their visés, so that the quota could not be exceeded any month, thus avoiding the hardship of deportation for the excess immigrants.



In present circumstances every intending immigrant needs simply to apply at the nearest American consulate for a visé, for which he pays \$10. It is the consul's duty to ascertain all the facts in relation to the individual, including details respecting health, morals, contract labor, and the like—but the consul is absolutely limited as present conditions exist. He has no power to refuse a visé for any reason other than that the quota of the country is exhausted, and in which event alone he may refuse a visé. This is unfortunate, for it necessarily leads to thousands of departures of unfit persons to America, who succeed either by influence or trickery in entering the country and being turned back upon inspection at Ellis Island.

These people lose by breaking up their homes in their own countries, and America loses by the cost of their return. Much human misery could be avoided, periodical congestion at Ellis Island prevented, and the entrance of unfit persons into the United States most conveniently checked by the application of the following suggestions:

Consuls should be authorized to refuse visés to all unfit persons. All applicants for visés in the case of immigrant persons should be required to submit details three months before final action is taken. This should include a certificate from their native doctor stating that a blood test has been taken, thus proving they are physically fit. In case of male immigrants, a penal certificate should be presented giving a record of their career, on which is attached a photograph of each man, thus allowing the consul to obtain close information of the most definite character with regard to the alien's past history, physical condition, qualifications as farmer, laboring man, etc.

Questioning of the immigrants has not proven satisfactory. It is quite obvious that an applicant is not likely to admit anything to a consular officer which will damage his chances of obtaining a visé. Therefore, as I suggested, the penal certificate, accompanied by a photograph of each man, would give a direct line upon his record. It would also be advisable to have the Bureaus of Immigration and Naturalization subject every foreigner living in the United States who wishes to bring over an immigrant to the same examination as the immigrant himself must pass before a consular officer. Such a foreign resident should be required to submit a police record covering the entire time of his residence in the United States, and an affidavit of support executed by the relative in the United States should be demanded of every applicant. And after this affidavit has been executed, and before it is sent abroad to the immigrant, it should be stamped by the immigration authorities, so that when it is presented to a consular officer, with a request for a visé, he will know that the immigrant intends to join a decent, law-abiding resident of the United States.

There should be additional laws making it a felony for any resident of the United States making a false statement concerning the admissibility of any relative or other immigrant. This law should be so drastic that it will seal up one of the most intolerable loopholes in our immigration system.

A change in the immigration law from the legal 3 per cent quota would perhaps be advisable to read instead that the number of immigrants to be allowed in the United States should be agreed upon by the Secretary of Labor and foreign countries, establishing the number of passports to be issued for three months in advance, and that the total quota of 3 per cent of all countries, added together, shall not be surpassed. This would give the Secretary of Labor the power to choose such countries as he thinks have the most desirable immigrants for the United States. And instead of the steamship lines all depositing their immigrants at Ellis Island license could be given for disembarkation of immigrants at such ports as New York, Boston, Baltimore, Savannah, New Orleans, Galveston, San Francisco, and Seattle. With our own merchant marine this could easily be done. This would scatter the immigration throughout the country, place the farmers in the farming countries, and relieve New York from increasing its present foreign population.

This system would likewise put a stop to clandestine immigration. The newspapers in Italy publish, after the sailing of practically every steamer for the United States, that a number of clandestine immigrants have been found hidden on board and were arrested, and in almost every case they were criminals.

While I was in Rome the steamer *Arabic* sailed from Naples, and advice came from the Italian authorities by wireless that there were 100 clandestine immigrants on board. These men pay large sums of money to be smuggled on the steamer, and if they succeed in reaching New York disembark as members of the crew. It is therefore advisable that all the crew of any steamer sailing for a United States port should have a proper book or certificate, with their photograph on it for identification, and stating that they are one of the crew of the steamer, and should not be allowed to disembark and pass through the customs gate without showing such card or certificate.

In this manner these undesirables would be unable to land. At present many are taken from alongside in small boats and carried to some convenient landing place.

When I arrived in Cherbourg I was met by the doctor in charge of the immigrants. He gave me the inclosed certificate, which shows that he vaccinated 200 immigrants bound for America, out of which 21 proved to have fatal diseases, which would compel them to be turned back upon their arrival at Ellis Island. Neither the examining doctor, the consul who viséed their passports, nor the consul general at Cherbourg were endowed with the power to forbid them to go aboard the steamer. It seems to me that this is the foundation of all the trouble. And it takes but a small mind to realize that if more power is not invested in our consuls abroad and if every immigrant is not compelled to have a blood-test certificate at the very beginning of his intentions to come to America as an immigrant, our civilization of the future will deteriorate to a marvelous extent.

I further believe that all of the personal information of each man gathered by the consuls and immigration inspectors should be available to examining judges before certificates of naturalization are granted. We are menaced, and we must avoid that condition. Take the consul at Vienna, for instance:

During the years of 1920 and 1921, long before office hours, crowds of unwashed, ill-fed, prospective immigrants—most of them of very low mentality and moral fiber—surged around the consulate. These people were from Poland, Russia, or Rumania, and claimed to have blood relatives in America who would take care of them and guarantee them support. They did not know the meaning of the word "truthfulness," and were carriers of disease caused by their extreme bodily filth. It was discovered that large numbers of Poles were applying for visés at Vienna, claiming the necessary one year's residence in the place of departure, and bringing with them documents to prove such residence. So many of these documents were false that the practice was adopted throughout the year 1921 of having every Sienna document—including the police certificate of morality required—which was pre-

sent by a Pole examined and checked by the investigator. It was found that underground channels of information existed among these people as how to have false documents prepared by meeting certain "agents" in given "café houses." Other means of pressure were brought to bear on consular officers. In these cases lawyers would appear as intermediaries or friends from the United States. Usually naturalized American citizens would appear as spokesmen. These often proved to be promoters of immigration, who would obtain in New York the names of persons wishing their so-called relatives to come over, and who, for the consideration of usually more than a hundred dollars in each case, would fill out a large list of names and undertake to go to eastern Europe to "see them through" all visé and traveling formalities. In one case a New York notary public, who had obtained names of people coming to him professionally to make out affidavits, undertook to bring over 50 immigrants, whom he declared to be his relatives, and who all claimed a year's residence in Austria. An investigation proved that they all had false documents and that they had been in Austria only a few days. One of them divulged the fact that the intermediary was to receive \$300 apiece upon their arrival in the United States.

Of the several thousand Polish immigrants who obtained visés in Vienna in the years 1920-21 it was the personal observation of a consular officer stationed there that only two were not bound for New York City, and just one claimed to be a farmer—all nonproductive, so-called citizens.

There are several organizations formed for helping certain elements which undoubtedly have a considerable humanitarian value, but which, at the same time, have encouraged this kind of immigration. One relief representative assured me that they had a great amount of money in the banks of Europe which was to be used to help immigrants to get to America.

From Italy we get a more productive immigrant. While some of them come to us as truck gardeners, the greater number go into railroad, excavating, and mine work. The majority of immigrants from southern Italy and Sicily are of the peasant type. Their standards of living are low. Their ultimate destinations are the industrial towns of the East. As potential American citizens they afford reasons for considerable apprehension. From Naples come farm laborers, and their physical condition is generally good. From Florence, Venice, Milan, and Genoa the immigrant is productive, as many of them are stone-masons, carpenters, miners, mechanics, braziers, etc. From Trieste the great majority, and practically all of those who obtain visés from this quarter, are of the Slav nationality. The opinion from that consular district maintains that, in spite of the present system of control, it is almost impossible to prevent agitators, criminals, and other dangerous undesirables from obtaining visés, and the local authorities do not desire to cooperate to the extent of furnishing the names of persons under suspicion.

We have laws and regulations of a most painstaking character which prevent the shipment of live stock, living plants, and seeds to the United States, and we prohibit entirely shipments under these heads instantly when danger arises; but until the last few months we have opened our national gates to human beings desiring to settle among us without much restriction as to moral consideration or purity of blood. And as a result we have a huge problem with which to deal. It would be a wonderful thing if all immigration could take a rest for a few years, for the adjustment and reconstruction of its principles and regulations, and meantime requesting our Congressmen to visit the countries from which the majority of immigrants come. They could do this in their vacation months—not as a pleasure trip, but as a matter of information, which can be used to the greatest advantage in future discriminating rules for immigration, that we may protect ourselves permanently by a drastic prohibition as respects the unfit, as described in section 3 of the present immigration law.

If Congressmen should go abroad they could see the facts as I saw them. One particular fact is that no good immigration is turning our way. The good inhabitants of every foreign country are needed there, and can possibly be happier and more contented there than in America.

It is a fact that in France there are only 65,000 in the ranks of the unemployed. Reconstruction is being elaborately carried on in France, and every able-bodied man is not only needed but his prospects are made so alluring that he has no inclination to emigrate. Only those who are useless to France and would be a burden to America show any tendency to depart. Italy needs men to till the soil, to grow food, and to keep her own country prosperous. It is to the interest of France and Italy to keep the best of their sons at home—if not forever, at least for a long time to come.

There is more to this immigration problem than the economic side. Warning has been issued through the German Red Cross that the United States must be on its guard against the introduction of cholera and typhus by Russian immigrants. Hordes of these people, Dr. A. Schlesinger officially announced, are pouring into Germany over the Polish, Latvian, and Esthonian borders, and many are seeking passports to America, where they have relatives and friends who are financing them for the journey.

Already nearly 50,000 cases exist in Germany, traced to refugees, and German immigrants from the Volga region have been infected. Seventy-five per cent of the recent arrivals in the concentration camps were diseased, according to Red Cross statistics.

The minister of health has called attention to the necessity of vaccinating everyone arriving from Russia, declaring that children especially are carriers of typhus.

We take in too few productive immigrants and too many destructive. An intelligent, cohesive, loyal citizenship is closely associated with that of citizenship. Personally, I believe that no alien should be naturalized until he has lived in the United States 21 years. Our own men have to live here 21 years before they can become voting citizens.

It is fortunate for the United States that Congress enacted the 3 per cent quota law. It is doing much good. With some of the additions I have suggested, it would be quite efficient. Its chief weakness is the lack of power held by our consuls abroad. There, it seems to me, is the foundation of all of the trouble.

I want to say for our American consuls that I never met a more patriotic class of men as a rule. Their Americanism is pronounced, and I believe it is accentuated by their knowledge of America's peril. They see, and they know, better than any class of our citizens, the difficulties and dangers of laxity in immigration laws.

Our America has passed the transition stage. It is to-day a world power. An intelligent, cohesive, loyal citizenship is its propulsive force. Solidification of all its elements is essential to perpetuity. The melting pot has been overcrowded. It has boiled too quickly and is running over.

It were better to put out the fires under it and allow its contents to solidify before adding any more raw material.

If we don't keep up the bars, and make them higher and stronger, there will no longer be an America for Americans.

Respectfully submitted.

LILLIAN RUSSELL MOORE.

#### APPENDIX B.

(Reprinted, without change of paging, from the Journal of Heredity (organ of the American Genetic Association), Vol. 12, No. 7; Washington, D. C., August-September, 1921.)

#### IMMIGRATION AND THE 3 PER CENT RESTRICTIVE LAW.

[Robert De C. Ward, Harvard University.]

##### THE NEW LAW AND ITS ENACTMENT.

The new 3 per cent immigration restriction act was designed to meet postwar conditions which our previous laws were never intended to cope with. It passed both Houses of Congress by tremendous majorities, and after being "pocket vetoed" by President Wilson was again passed by similarly large majorities and promptly approved by President Harding. The backbone of the new law is as follows: Section 2. "That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted under the immigration laws to the United States in any fiscal year shall be limited to 3 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910." Eight classes of aliens are excepted from this provision, including "(8) aliens under the age of 18 who are children of citizens of the United States." Provision is made for the determination of the exact numbers of aliens of the different nationalities who may be admitted. The number of any nationality that may be admitted in any one month shall not exceed 20 per cent of the total number of aliens of such nationality who are admissible in that fiscal year. Preference shall be given, "so far as possible," to wives, parents, brothers, sisters, children under 18 years of age, and fiancées of citizens of those who have applied for citizenship, and of persons eligible for citizenship who were in the service of the United States during the war and were honorably discharged. Provision is further made for the preparation of rules and regulations necessary to carry the act into effect and for the publication of statements showing the exact numbers who may be admitted. The act continues in force until June 30, 1922.

##### THE REASONS FOR THE NEW LAW.

The enormous majorities by which Congress passed this bill clearly reflected the firm conviction of the great mass of our people that immediate and effective restriction was imperative. There has never been a time in the history of immigration legislation when the popular demand was so widespread and so vehement. The practically unanimous opinion of Government immigration officials and of all unprejudiced experts was that immigration was certain to increase, and increase rapidly, to numbers greatly exceeding those of prewar days, and that the quality of the bulk of the newcomers would be distinctly inferior. Very important testimony along these lines was received from United States consular officers at numerous foreign ports and submitted by the Department of State to Congress. These reports, coming from many different men and many different places, are distinctly to be regarded as unprejudiced and authoritative. They practically all agree in certifying that the majority of the prospective immigrants are both physically and mentally undesirable. Such expressions as "physically deficient," "mentally deficient," "economically undesirable," "socially undesirable," "of low standards of living," "not of the most desirable class" occur again and again. Furthermore, numerous competent and unprejudiced observers who had been making a first-hand study of the conditions in Europe fully concurred in the views expressed by our own consular officers.

The predictions made by these various competent authorities have been fully verified. Immigration during the year ending June 30, 1921, exceeded 800,000, almost doubling that of the preceding year. Furthermore, the opinion of those who have had opportunity to observe the new arrivals, and who are unprejudiced and honest in their views, is to the effect that our consular officers and our experts were fully justified in their statements regarding the inferior quality of most, not all, of these people. An immigration official at New York has recently reported that the majority of the aliens now coming in expect to be fruit peddlers, shoe blacks, soft-drink vendors, and sweatshop workers. (New York Times, Sept. 12, 1921.)

##### THE OPPOSITION TO RESTRICTION.

In spite of the extraordinary popular demand for restriction in accordance with which Congress acted, there was insidious, active opposition, thoroughly organized, heavily financed, issuing misleading information, playing upon all sorts of alien prejudices, endeavoring by every possible means to counteract the plain will of the vast majority of the American people. One of the best known and most reliable Washington newspaper correspondents, Mr. Mark Sullivan, writing of the hearings before the House Committee on Immigration February 7, 1921, said:

"The great bulk of the hearings consisted of testimony from special interests, either racial or business, who opposed the bill strenuously. No thoughtful American, equipped with knowledge of the background, can read the stenographic report of those hearings without being deeply and soberly concerned."

Still more striking is the evidence brought forward by Hon. JOHN C. BOX, of Texas, in the House of Representatives January 8, 1921. Judge Box said:

"Mr. Chairman, recently by a vote of 295 to 41 a bill suspending immigration was passed by this House, in which vote the will of the American people spoke and party lines disappeared. But powerful influences oppose restriction. Two of these are:

"First. A demand by the foreign born among us that their kinspeople and racial comrades be admitted freely.

"Second. Individual and corporate greed which disregards the present and future welfare of the mass of Americans and their children because it wants money and power over labor.

"The interracial council is a mouthpiece of the opposition of these two groups. To it I invite your attention."

"The interracial council is a concern of some magnitude. Some months ago it had 40 or 50 executives and other full-time paid employees in its offices in New York, and an unascertained number of other agents and employees. It is financed, in part at least, by its industrial or subscribing members, numbering several hundred. The following are some of its subscribing members whose names I get from its printed literature and from the testimony of Mr. Mayer, its executive secretary:

"Phelps Bros. & Co., 'owners of an Italian steamship line'; the International Mercantile Marine Co.; Barber Steamship Lines; Cosmopolitan Shipping Co.; Downey Shipbuilding Corporation; France & Canada Steamship Co.; Green Star Steamship Co.; Pacat Steamship Co.; Pacific Steamship Co.; Todd Ship Yards Corporation; Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; Allegheny Steel Co.; American Beet Sugar Co.; American Locomotive Co.; American Woolen Co.; Armour & Co.; Atlas Powder Co.; Chattanooga Coke & Gas Co.; Colt's Patent Firearms Manufacturing Co.; General Electric Co.; Henderson Shipbuilding Co.; Hillman Coal & Coke Co.; Indiana Pipe Line Co.; Inland Steel Co.; Kelley-Springfield Tire Co.; Lackawanna Steel Co.; National Sugar Refining Co.; National Shipping Co.; New Home Sewing Machine Co.; Oliver Iron & Steel Co.; Pennsylvania Coal Co.; Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corporation; Pennsylvania Textile Co.; Phelps-Dodge Corporation; Southern Cotton Oil Co.; Standard Steel Car Co.; Studebaker Corporation; Underwood Typewriter Co.; Worthington Pump & Machinery Co.; Bethlehem Steel Co.; Cudahy Packing Co.; Dold Packing Co.; Du Pont de Nemours & Co.; General Motors Co.; Libby, McNeil & Libby; Swift & Co.

"These are only a few of the several hundred big financial, industrial, and steamship concerns whose money is financing the propaganda of the interracial council. It will be noted that many steamship companies are among them. One list of these subscribing or industrial members will be found in the committee hearings of April 22, 1920; another list, containing some names not given in the testimony, will be found printed on the literature of the interracial council.

"These subscribing members pay annual membership fees amounting to as much as \$2,500 for some concerns, and more than that for a few, and smaller sums for each of many others. 'It runs from \$100 a year to \$2,500 as an average. A few are larger.' (Testimony of Mayer, executive secretary, p. 167.)

"The expenditures of the interracial council in certain of its activities, which manifestly do not cover all of them, amounted to \$213,955.19 for the period beginning March 1, 1919, and ending March 31, 1920. (See testimony, Mayer, p. 167.) That was the first year of its existence. Its activities have continued with apparently increased magnitude, but I am without information as to later expenditures.

"Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. BOX. Yes.

"Mr. BLANTON. Is it any wonder, then, that this splendid piece of legislation has been sidetracked and held up?

"Mr. BOX. It is not any wonder; but it is an ominous thing if the will of the American people is to have to give way to influences like these. Nothing but a sense of duty prompts me to present these facts as they have been disclosed. The statement that I have made is based upon testimony. I have the hearings."

The situation is perfectly clear. Further comment on this point is unnecessary.

##### THE WORKING OF THE LAW.

It was natural that there would be certain difficulties in the early working of the new law before the exact numbers of admissible aliens from each country could be officially determined. Numerous steamers arrived during the early part of June with aliens far in excess of the numbers which were admissible. Congestion resulted. To each port there had been assigned a percentage based on the usual percentage entering that port. When these numbers had been filled efforts were made to borrow from other ports "rights" to land additional immigrants. There was great confusion. Immigration officials in Washington went to the limit in showing humanity and consideration. Aliens in excess of the June quota were allowed to land under bonds. By joint resolution Congress later provided that the excess numbers of any nationality thus admitted should be deducted from the totals of that nationality admissible during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1921.

But even in the early days of the new law, and all the more since then, the complications and the hardships to incoming aliens have been chiefly due to the disregard of the law by the steamship companies. In the whole history of our immigration legislation these companies, with rare exceptions, and then usually only when infractions of the law meant payment of fines, have never tried to obey our laws. Their tactics under the new percentage limitation act have been as usual.

The percentage bill was before Congress in one form or another during most of last winter. There never was any doubt that it would become law before summer. Although the exact number of aliens of each nationality could not be officially determined at the moment of the enactment of the measure, the steamship companies had ample time to make plans to meet the new conditions. They were in no sense "caught," as one editor has expressed it. The logical and the humane policy on their part would have been to refuse passage to all aliens who might, when the exact percentages of admissible immigrants were announced, be refused permission to land. But these companies accepted as steerage passengers several thousands of aliens who would, beyond a doubt, be excludable. There is little doubt that these excess aliens were shipped with the conviction that the sympathies of "sentimentalists" and of certain Congressmen who are interested in the "foreign vote" would be so aroused that some special provision would be made for the landing of the excess numbers. The steamship companies deserve absolutely no sympathy. They accepted the passage money of thousands of aliens who should never have been allowed to embark. They have no interest in their steerage passengers beyond the receipt of their passage money. The Commissioner General of Immigration said in Washington on June 10 last that there were then more than 10,000 immigrants in excess of the June quota already on their way to the United States, and all were accepted for passage after the new law had gone into effect.

The monthly "immigrant Derby," when, during the last few minutes of each month, incoming steamships race from beyond the 3-mile limit to quarantine in the effort to land their steerage passengers in time to have them come within the quota, and the numerous cases of hardship when the excess aliens have to be debarred could be avoided if all the steamship companies were honestly endeavoring to live up to the law. The trans-Atlantic steamship lines have a system of daily exchange of information as to the numbers of alien passengers who are embarking on their several ships. No excess over the allotted quota need therefore be started on the voyage.

Although practically all of the difficulties and the hardships to debarred aliens were due to the flagrant disregard of the law on the part of the steamship companies, the administration very properly felt that everything possible should be done to save needless suffering of perfectly innocent aliens. Hence, about mid-September, the State Department sent instructions to American consular officers abroad not to visé passports from any country whose annual admission quota to the United States is approaching exhaustion, or has already been exhausted.

This should do a great deal to reduce the number of cases of hardship and of disappointment for which, be it reiterated, the steamship companies, not the laws, are chiefly responsible.

#### PROPAGANDA AGAINST THE NEW LAW.

Even before the new law went into effect, a very active press campaign against it was begun. The law has been subjected to an organized attack by "interested" individuals, alien racial groups and hyphenated societies, and certain influential newspapers. All of these are bent on making any percentage limitation scheme appear unreasonable, unjust, and inhumane. All of them are, fundamentally, opposed to any action on the part of the American Government to protect our country against practically unrestricted and unselected immigration. In the case of influential newspapers which are incessantly attacking the new law, it may incidentally be noted that they all carry heavy steamship advertising. In the case of other papers also, the motive is plainly that of the pocketbook. Thus, the bulletin of the Associated General Contractors has said that the effect of the law will be to "prevent the immigration to this country of the most useful class of immigrants—the common laborers who come here to work in the construction industry." The "influences" against restriction have also been very busy in Washington, interviewing Senators and Congressmen, attacking not only the percentage limitation measure but also all restrictive legislation.

The propaganda against the new restriction law has not been confined to this country. In a dispatch to the Philadelphia Public Ledger, dated London, October 16, 1921, the following statements were made:

"European steamship companies, the traditional enemies of United States immigration restrictions, have started propaganda aiming at the breaking down of the barriers put up by the '3 per cent' law. They hope when the present temporary measure expires next June to have so prepared the ground that again they will be in a position to fill the holds of their ships with Europe's surplus humanity and pour it into the United States. This law which limits the number of immigrants to a very small proportion of the number allowed to enter the United States heretofore was a severe blow to the steamship lines, and they fought it hard when it was before Congress. In the days before the war steamships carried thousands of immigrants, at approximately \$100 a head, whereas now they carry dozens. The loss of that revenue came at a time when the trans-Atlantic passenger business was less remunerative than for years, because of the high costs of operating ships.

"To get back some of this business the big companies have outlined a plan for a campaign of propaganda, and already have got it working in England. The plans rest on the idea of digging up specific cases of alleged improper treatment of foreigners at Ellis Island and spreading them broadcast in the European press."

The attitude of the steamship companies and of the other influences which are seeking to bring the new law into disrepute has been clearly set forth by Government officials. Representative ISAAC SIEGEL, of New York, wrote to the President in September, 1921, citing instances of cruelty to aliens which had occurred in the enforcement of the law. President Harding replied as follows:

"I haven't any doubt in the world but the enforcement of the immigration laws is working many a hardship. My own distress has been very great over some of the specific instances which have been reported to me. If I have the situation correctly presented, the difficulty must be charged to the dishonest steamship agents, who have brought to this country innocent immigrants in spite of our continued warnings during a period of very great leniency. I know how very persistent have been the impositions which have been made on the Government agents who have been disposed to be sympathetic and more than generous in carrying out the law."

Secretary of Labor Davis reiterated the statement by the President that much of the trouble is caused by dishonest steamship agents, and that pitiful stories of hardship are being circulated in the deliberate attempt to discredit the law. Assistant Secretary of Labor Henning on September 3, 1921, said:

"Unfortunately the law has no teeth, and the only way the offending companies can be punished is to compel them to take back aliens who are not admissible."

That, he added, was being done, the department "having exhausted its milk of human kindness." Mr. Henning here emphasizes the fundamental deficiency in the law. It has no teeth. There is no fine or punishment for the companies which disregard its provisions, nor is the company required to refund the deported alien's passage money. The only way is to compel the companies to carry back at their own expense the surplus, and when this has been done in a few hundreds of cases it is perhaps not too much to hope that these companies will begin to cooperate among themselves. As soon as they do so the law will prove entirely workable.

Finally on September 15 Assistant Secretary Henning added:

"Those in control of the flood of aliens coming into this country deliberately exceed the monthly quotas and depend upon compelling us, with their sob stories and tales of families being separated, to permit the law to be disregarded."

Patriotic Americans, in whose hearts patriotism is above pocketbook, can not give too much praise to President Harding, Secretary Davis, Assistant Secretary Henning, and Commissioner General Husband for their firm stand on this whole question of the enforcement of the law. In the face of aggressive, persistent, and thoroughly organized opposition on the part of selfish interests they have held their ground, tempering the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States with the utmost possible justice and humanity. They deserve well of their country, and they may be assured of the support and high commendation of the vast majority of plain Americans, who are not organized to work for the enforcement of these laws and who seldom take it upon themselves to make their views known to Government officials, either personally or by writing. The highest commendation is also due to the Senators and Representatives who in the face of fierce and bitter opposition, heavily financed and thoroughly organized, secured the passage through Congress of the new act. To Senator DILLINGHAM, of Vermont, and his supporters in the Senate and to Congressman ALBERT JOHNSON, of Washington, chairman of the House Committee on Immigration, and his staunch supporters on his committee and in the House the country owes a great debt of gratitude which it will not forget.

#### THE NEW LAW VINDICATED.

The percentage law, in spite of its crudities and of difficulties in its enforcement, has been abundantly vindicated. Immigration was fast assuming its pre-war rate when the new law went into effect. Although it did not begin to function until early in June, the commissioner general estimated that it probably reduced immigration in that one month by about 50,000. As one of the Washington correspondents puts it:

"Incidentally, the sudden appearance of unemployment in America illustrates the wisdom of the act restricting immigration which was

passed during the first few weeks of Harding's administration. Otherwise our unemployment problem might have been greatly increased. Throughout the world great numbers of human beings have been displaced by war and postwar conditions. These derelicts float toward us as inevitably as water flows down hill. There was some degree of truth, although more mere cleverness, in the saying that America was becoming the 'cesspool' of the human race. \* \* \* The new law puts a limit, even if only a loose and partial limit, on the number of immigrants who can increase and complicate our unemployment problem."

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE LEGISLATION.

The 3 per cent limitation act expires on June 30, 1922. What shall take its place? The "emergency" which led to its adoption still exists and will continue to exist. There is no longer an "emergency." We are facing a permanent condition of rapidly increasing and of steadily deteriorating immigration. And there are millions of prospective immigrants overseas who are simply waiting for the 30th of June, when they will rush in in a seething, chaotic mob unless Congress takes steps to stop them.

A calm, unprejudiced survey of past legislation and of the workings of the temporary 3 per cent restrictive law leads the writer to the following conclusions regarding the lines along which our new legislation should be planned.

First. The percentage-limitation principle, long and strongly advocated by leading authorities, should be made permanent. Whether this should be the present 3 per cent, based simply on the number of aliens of each nationality in this country, or a somewhat larger percentage, say, 5 per cent or 10 per cent, based on the numbers of each nationality who have become citizens, is relatively immaterial. The latter, on the whole, seems the more consistent and more rational plan.

Second. Heavy fines of at least \$200 should be imposed upon the transportation companies in the case of every alien who is brought here in excess of the quota and in violation of the general immigration laws. Such fines would immediately put an end to most of the cases of hardship and suffering which have occurred during the past few months because the present law has "no teeth." It is a very strong argument in favor of heavy fines that, by this means, we can force the steamship companies, without expense to us and with the minimum of hardship to the intending immigrant, to make a careful examination and count of their passengers on the other side, and thus to prevent the embarkation of all aliens in excess of the quotas and of those who are inadmissible, for any other reason, under our laws.

Third. Every prospective immigrant should have a passport, viséed by an American consul after the alien has been "passed" by an immigration inspector and a medical officer of the United States Public Health Service attached, as vice consuls, to various consular offices abroad. This provision is embodied in a bill introduced by Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, of Washington, on July 16, 1921 (H. R. 7864). Such foreign inspection would obviously be a wise and humane way of stopping most of the inadmissible aliens before they started on their voyage. This plan would be to the advantage of the prospective immigrant, and it would also be better for the steamship companies, for it would mean that very few rejected aliens would have to be taken back at the companies' expense. Canada has for years eliminated her undesirable immigrants "at the source." Passports would not give the alien the right to land if, after a second examination at our own ports, he were found to be inadmissible. Cases of this sort would, however, be rare. Furthermore, the number of passports issued in each foreign country should not exceed the official percentage quota of that country.

Fourth. Some plan of registration of arriving aliens such as that suggested by Secretary Davis might well be inaugurated. This would not in any way constitute the alien a suspected or an undesirable person, but it would help us in our task of Americanization and of exercising a sort of watchful supervision over our new arrivals.

The logical thing to do is to plan our new legislation along existing lines. Experience has shown that these are on the whole wise, sane, and reasonable. Canada, for example, has, in her immigration laws, closely followed our general immigration law, although she has added many additional restrictions. With the changes and additions above suggested, certain perfectly definite results would follow, viz, (1) a reasonable restriction, to something like an assimilable quantity, of the number of immigrants; (2) a far more careful selection, and a more effective elimination of the unfit; (3) a very great reduction in the number of cases of hardship now arising when aliens reach our shores only to be deported.

In the light of all available facts, it would seem in the highest degree unwise, illogical, and dangerous to embark upon any new and untried schemes of immigration legislation such as those of putting almost unlimited discretionary powers in the hands of a commission, of repealing any portion of our general immigration act of 1917, and of superseding the Chinese exclusion act and the "gentlemen's agreement" with Japan by a plan for admitting orientals on any percentage basis.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from South Dakota a question?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand the Senator says he has an amendment pertaining to residence in contiguous territory?

Mr. STERLING. Yes; I have an amendment proposing to change the present law so as to make the requirement five years.

Mr. HARRISON. We could embody both propositions in one amendment, if that would be agreeable to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. STERLING. I send the amendment to the desk and offer it if it is in order at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 1, after line 6, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

SEC. 2. That subdivision (7) of section 2 (a) of the act of May 19, 1921, entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"(7) Aliens who have resided continuously for at least five years immediately preceding the time of their application for admission to the United States in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Mexico, countries of Central and South America, or adjacent islands."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask if the Senator from South Dakota will not extend his amendment so that it will incorporate section 4, as suggested by the Commissioner General of Immigration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will permit the Chair, he will call the Senator's attention to the fact that there is a pending amendment, offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], which affects the text of the joint resolution, and was offered prior to this one, and should be considered first.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not mean to have this voted on now; but I hoped the Senator would incorporate the two propositions in one.

Mr. STERLING. That I will do, and I offer this as an amendment to follow the one just suggested, found on pages 9 and 10 of the print which I send to the Secretary, beginning with section 4.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, has the Senator from Mississippi withdrawn his substitute?

Mr. HARRISON. I am going to withdraw my substitute if the chairman of the committee will accept this other proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, the question now is on perfecting this amendment if possible.

Mr. HARRISON. What the Senator from South Dakota has offered is for the purpose of trying to perfect the joint resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. The substitute of the Senator from Mississippi is before the Senate. I have a substitute to offer if that is voted down.

Mr. HARRISON. May I say to the Senator from Georgia that I have not yet withdrawn my substitute, but I am going to do so just as soon as the Senator from South Dakota puts in good form his amendment carrying out those two propositions.

Mr. STERLING. I understand that there is the right, of course, to perfect the pending measure.

Mr. HARRISON. As I understand the Senator from Georgia, he is then going to offer a substitute for the proposition.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from South Dakota also proposes to add, as section 3, the following:

SEC. 3. That it shall be unlawful for any person, including any transportation company other than railway lines entering the United States from foreign contiguous territory, or the owner, master, agent, or consignee of any vessel, to bring to the United States, either from a foreign country or any insular possession of the United States, any alien not admissible by virtue of the terms of this act, or otherwise in violation of any rule or regulation, not inconsistent with this act, prescribed by the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor; and if it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor that any alien, not admissible because of the terms of this act, has been so brought, such person or transportation company, or the master, agent, owner, or consignee of any such vessel, shall pay to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the port of arrival is located the sum of \$200 for each alien so brought, and in addition a sum equal to that paid by such alien for his transportation from the initial point of departure, indicated in his ticket, to the port of arrival, such latter sum to be delivered by the collector of customs to the alien on whose account assessed. And no vessel shall be granted clearance papers pending the determination of the question of the liability to the payment of such fine, or while the fine remains unpaid, and such fine shall not be remitted or refunded: *Provided*, That clearance may be granted prior to the determination of such question upon the deposit of a sum sufficient to cover such fine.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. That is an amendment that is offered to this joint resolution. Of course the substitute is more in the form of a bill. There is no difference, as I understand, between a joint resolution and a bill. Both have to receive the signature of the President.

Mr. LODGE. Just the same.

Mr. HARRISON. So it is perfectly permissible for this amendment to be offered to a joint resolution. Now, Mr. President, I withdraw my substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for the joint resolution as amended, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause of the joint resolution as amended and to insert:

That no alien shall be admitted under the immigration laws to the United States from June 30, 1922, until July 1, 1927; but this resolution shall not apply to persons included in clauses 1 to 6, inclusive, and clause 8 of subdivision (a) or in the second proviso of subdivision (d) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved May 19, 1921.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am not going to take the time of the Senate to discuss this matter, except to say this:

There are several million unemployed men in this country. There are 750,000 unemployed ex-service men in this country. Every one of these men who come into this country and gets a position takes a job away from an American. The class of men that are coming into this country now are nothing like the class that formerly came; and I believe we ought to prevent any immigration, except such as I have stated in this substitute, and shut them out for five years.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I trust that the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] will not be adopted, for a perfectly practical reason. As the Senator knows, I agree with his general view of this proposition. Personally, I think I should be willing to vote for such a limitation; but it is perfectly evident that if this amendment is adopted we shall get into a situation where we shall get no immigration legislation at all, because the House will not adopt this provision, and the law will expire, and the country then will be exposed to a deluge of immigration.

It seems to me the sensible thing to do is to pass this joint resolution as it has already been amended. That will afford immediate relief. Then I shall join the Senator and other members of the committee in hearings to perfect legislation such as the facts may show to be necessary.

In that connection, Mr. President, because in the course of this debate the attitude of Mr. Husband has been called into question, in that he is represented as saying that all of these amendments that were suggested by him were absolutely necessary, imperatively necessary—

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. It may be that the Senator got that impression from what I said.

Mr. WILLIS. I did.

Mr. HARRISON. If so, I did not want to give that impression. Mr. Husband in the report said that he thought all of these amendments were advisable. He did not say in his written report that any of them were absolutely necessary and imperative; but Mr. Husband did tell me, and it was not confidential at all, that, so far as the one-year residence proposition was concerned, it was, in his opinion, absolutely imperative.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not disagree with the Senator and with the commissioner in that; and for that reason, and to make the position of Mr. Husband clear, I think it would be desirable to print just here in the Record a portion of his statement, appearing on page 9 of this report, giving his views touching these amendments.

I trust that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia will be voted down at this time, though I favor the principle of it. I think, if it is adopted, it will imperil this whole legislative program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to by the Senator from Ohio will be printed in the Record.

The matter referred to is as follows:

While the administration of the act of May 19, 1921, has been attended with perplexing difficulties, some of which could not have been foreseen at the beginning, I think it can be said without qualification that the law has proven to be both workable and effective to a somewhat surprising degree. It went into effect, on short notice, at a time when immigration from Europe was rapidly approaching pre-war proportions, and in view of the many interests and influences involved it has seemingly accomplished its purpose, and for the time being at least is operating smoothly.

Of course, the law has been violated, as must be inevitable in the case of any legislation which drastically interferes with the plans and ambitions of human beings, but it can be said advisedly that there have been no wholesale violations, and, in fact, relatively few aliens have entered the country who would have been debarred solely because of the quota law. There are plenty of indications, however, that systematic violations on a considerable scale will be attempted during the remainder of the present fiscal year or, in any event, during the coming fiscal year, provided the law is continued in force. I shall not go into details in this regard but can assure you that the bureau is quite fully aware of the situation and will employ every possible means to insure a strict enforcement of the law.

#### SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS.

If the act of May 19, 1921, is to be amended, it is desirable from an administrative standpoint that the following provisions shall be made:

1. Limit the number who may be admitted in any month to 10 per cent of the yearly quota instead of 20 per cent, as in the present law.
2. If possible, the number admitted monthly or annually ought to be regulated at ports of departure rather than at ports of arrival, or preferably in countries of origin, if this can be accomplished through limiting the number of visas issued each month.
3. A sufficient penalty for violations of the act to insure observance on the part of transportation lines.
4. Increasing materially the period of time (now one year) during which aliens who are natives of countries within the operation of the act shall be required to live in foreign contiguous territory, etc., before they are exempt from the provisions of the law.
5. Giving legal authority, through administrative discretion or otherwise, to the end that immediate families shall not be separated because children and parents happen to be born in different countries.

6. Insuring that the always very limited immigration of European origin from New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa shall not be prohibited.

You will note that I have suggested these proposed amendments as desirable rather than indispensable additions to the law from an administrative standpoint. They would be desirable, and in some instances highly desirable, but you have asked me verbally if the law in its present form is not reasonably satisfactory, and I shall answer by saying that with the experience of the past eight months as a guide I am quite sure that some of the administrative difficulties of the past can be avoided or considerably minimized in the future, even though the law is extended without amendment as the House joint resolution provides.

With the hope that the foregoing may be of some value to you and the committee, I am,

Faithfully yours.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I voted for the 3 per cent restriction bill when it was passed a year ago. It has worked well. It has filled the purposes for which it was enacted. It was intended to restrict immigration, and that result has been accomplished.

I have analyzed the statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] a moment ago that would seem to indicate that 351,930 immigrants were admissible from Europe this year under the quota fixed by the 3 per cent law. Of that number, 51,000 actually came from northern and western Europe and 119,606 from southern and eastern Europe; but the figures also show, Mr. President, that 15,930 aliens, citizens of northern and western Europe, and 113,243 aliens, citizens of eastern and southern Europe, departed from this country, making a total of those who were admitted of 171,000, and a total of those who departed of 129,000; so that the total gain during the eight months referred to in the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island was only 42,414 people from all of Europe.

Mr. COLT. And only 6,000 from southern and eastern Europe.

Mr. CALDER. Yes; the Senator points out that of that total our increase in population from southern and eastern Europe is only 6,000 and 36,000 from northern and western Europe—surely, Mr. President, a very small number, indeed.

For my part, I am not willing to vote yet to shut out all immigration from all countries in the world. I believe that the restriction has worked well; I believe that it was a good thing to adopt; but I also believe there are very many good people in some of the other countries of the world that can do no harm to us by coming here.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask for a division on my substitute. In order to save time, I will not ask for a roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Georgia.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRIS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and I ask that it may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read by the Secretary.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Georgia proposes to add at the end of the amendment already agreed to the following:

SEC. 4. No alien shall be admitted under the immigration laws to the United States unless transported to the United States in a vessel documented under the laws of the United States, as defined in the shipping act of 1916, as amended.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wish to remind the Senate that when the President of the United States made his address to the Congress in regard to the merchant marine and reached this subject he received more applause than for anything else in his address. I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss the amendment, but I hope that it will be incorporated in the joint resolution.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, personally I am heartily in favor of this amendment. I am satisfied, however, that we could not pass through Congress a bill requiring that all aliens coming to the United States shall be carried in American ships. I want to say to the Senator from Georgia that we hope to provide in the merchant marine bill which will be reported to the Senate that at least 50 per cent of such immigrants shall come in American ships. As I said, personally I shall vote for the amendment, but without any special hope that it will be adopted. However, I do want to assure the Senator from Georgia and the Senate that we hope to include in the merchant marine bill a provision requiring that at least 50 per cent of such immigrants be carried in American ships.

Mr. COLT. With regard to this amendment, I may say that the feeling of the committee was, as stated by the Senator from Washington, that it is premature; in other words, that it perhaps could not be applied at the present time; that it might be included in the merchant marine bill, but that now, by reason

of the fact that the merchant marine question is not settled as to the number of vessels and all of such things, it would not be proper to adopt the provision at this time. Therefore the committee voted it down.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It may be asked why we do not put the 50 per cent provision in this joint resolution. We have found that it is quite a difficult proposition to work out the provision under which 50 per cent of the immigrants coming to the United States shall be carried in American vessels. So that can be taken as the reason why we do not propose anything of that sort in connection with the pending measure.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, what I desire to say is merely corroborative of what has been said by the Senator from Washington. The Committee on Commerce is working on this general subject and giving it very close attention. The majority of the committee is in harmony with the principle expressed in this amendment; at any rate I am, and I know the chairman of the committee is. But it seems to me that it would be very unfortunate to lug that question into this measure. Therefore I trust the amendment will be voted down.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a committee amendment, which the Secretary will report.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In line 5 the committee proposes to strike out "1923" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "1924, unless otherwise repealed."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

Mr. COLT. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. COLT, Mr. DILLINGHAM, and Mr. KING conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10740) authorizing the use of special canceling stamps in certain post offices, requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEENERSON, Mr. GRIEST, and Mr. BELL were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills:

H. R. 2556. An act to advance Maj. Benjamin S. Berry to the permanent rank of major; and

H. R. 7589. An act for the relief of Maj. Ellis B. Miller.

#### NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN WYOMING.

Mr. KENDRICK. I offer a resolution of peculiar importance to the people of my State, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 277) was read and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Whereas there have recently appeared in the public press statements purporting to have been authorized by the Department of the Interior to the effect that the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy are negotiating with private parties for the operation of lands included in naval petroleum reserve No. 3, Wyoming No. 1, withdrawn by Executive order of the President dated April 30, 1915, known as the Teapot Dome; Therefore

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy are hereby requested to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interests, whether such negotiations are pending, and if so the names of all parties, the terms and conditions of all proposed operating agreements, and whether opportunity will be given the public for competitive bidding for the operation of these lands, or whether it is proposed to award a lease or other operating contract or agreement for the entire area to one person, corporation, or association.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, in the subject matter of the resolution there are two questions involved: First, whether there is any present need for the development and operation of the Wyoming naval reserve, known as the Teapot Dome; and, second, if there is such need, whether the interests of the Government would be best preserved by a private or a public sale. I have no doubt that the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy have very excellent reasons for any program they may have adopted, and if it is really their

intention to permit the operation of the Teapot Dome within the near future, that they have a very good explanation for that intention. I am constrained to believe, however, that the interests of the State of Wyoming and the interests of the people of the United States are so intimately involved in this matter that before any arrangement by contract or otherwise is made for the development of this field, the public should be permitted to have some inkling of the terms upon which it is proposed to act.

It has been announced, apparently on the authority of the Secretary of the Interior, that the policy of the Interior and Navy Departments is now to abandon the storage of oil underground and to store it rather in surface tanks prepared for this purpose on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. That such a policy would be in all respects a wise and commendable one with respect to the California naval reserves I am ready to agree, if the information which I have received with respect to the condition of those reserves is correct. I am told that oil wells which have been sunk upon private lands within the boundaries of the California reserve would, in a comparatively short time, drain those fields of their contents, and therefore that it is to the interests of the Government to have similar wells drilled upon the land in the same fields which have been reserved for the use of the Navy. But this is not the condition that prevails in the Teapot Dome. There, if I am correctly advised, no wells whatever have been drilled to production, and no wells have been drilled in the vicinity through which by any possibility this reserve could be drained. It would appear, therefore, that there is no danger of the oil in the Teapot Dome being removed until the Government acts. All the land in this field is owned by the Government, and no one may remove the oil until the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy shall consent.

Is it, then, to the interest of the Government to authorize the development of this field at the present time, to pay private operators for drilling the field, to authorize the necessarily heavy expenditures that would have to be met if tanks sufficiently large to store the content of this dome are to be erected, in order that this oil may be taken from its natural storage place to the seaboard? We have just ratified a treaty by which the size of the Navy has been reduced. It is to be presumed, therefore, that unless the use of coal is to be abandoned on our naval vessels, the Navy will have less rather than a greater need for oil in the immediate future. Not only that but the oil fields on the public domain outside of the naval reserve are not now being worked to capacity. The Government derives a royalty of from 12½ per cent to 33½ per cent upon all oil removed from the Salt Creek field, which lies immediately north of the Teapot Dome. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to take this royalty in oil, and in Wyoming he is doing that, but within the past year the drilling requirements of the Government leases in the Salt Creek field have been suspended and the field is producing scarcely more than one-third of its capacity with the present number of wells. It would seem to follow from this that there is no great need for oil at the present time. Of course it may be said that the royalty oil from the lands outside the naval reserve is used by the Shipping Board; but, of course, since the Shipping Board is not using the full amount of the Government oil which could be produced, the difference between what it is using and the capacity of the field, so far as the Government is concerned, could be assigned to the use of the Navy if the Navy needs more oil. I take it, however, that there is no present need for naval fuel oil, because all of the announcements emanating from the Interior Department indicate that if the Teapot Dome is developed its production will be stored for future use. The question, therefore, is simply whether it is wiser and of greater benefit to the Navy to allow this oil to remain stored underground or to remove it across the country to be stored in surface tanks.

If it should appear from the information afforded by the department that it is expedient to develop the Teapot Dome now, there still remains the inquiry whether the interests of the Government would best be preserved by a private or a public sale. There can be no doubt that if these lands are to be let to private interests for development it should only be after all operators have been given a full and complete opportunity by competitive bidding to offer the Government the best possible return.

Only last June approximately 2,000 acres of outside land in the Salt Creek field were sold at public auction under the authority of the Department of the Interior. Although the price of oil at that time was only 50 cents a barrel, the bonuses paid by the operators, who were eager to secure the leases, amounted to the sum of \$1,687,000. That the lands in the Teapot Dome

are vastly more valuable than these which sold for bonuses of over a million and a half dollars is the general belief of all Wyoming operators, and if these lands were put up at public auction the profit to the Government would be proportionately greater.

Mr. President, in connection with the resolution submitted by me, and as indicating the interest in this matter on the part of the people of my State, I send to the desk a telegram from the Hon. B. B. Brooks, of Casper, Wyo., former governor of the State. Governor Brooks is not only one of the first citizens of Wyoming but he is one of our largest oil operators and is regarded as one of the best authorities on the oil business in the West. His telegram speaks for a large number of oil operators and incorporates the substance of a resolution passed by a convention of oilmen. It also reflects the general sentiment of the people in reference to this question. I ask that the telegram may be printed in the RECORD.

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

CASPER, WYO., April 14, 1922.

Hon. JOHN B. KENDRICK,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

At a meeting of the Rocky Mountain Oil and Gas Producers' Association held in this city to-day a resolution was unanimously adopted protesting against the drilling and development of naval reserve No. 3, known as Teapot Dome, and the reported letting of a private contract to Harry Sinclair or any other person or corporation for the following reasons: There is no present market or outlet for the present production of oil. The present production of oil does not affect this naval pool. The oil is not adapted to naval uses nor is there any present naval requirement for additional oil. This association is opposed to the letting of contracts for the development of Government oil reserve by private arrangement and without opportunity for general competitive bidding. Furthermore, the proposed additional production will seriously increase the already overproduction of crude in this territory and result in continued reduction of prices of crude oil to the loss of the producers, the State of Wyoming, public schools, good roads, and national reclamation fund; also the proposed drilling of the Teapot Dome means transporting that oil from the State of Wyoming in its entirety, whereas if produced in the future and when actually needed it will be refined in this State; and we deem the present proposed development and withdrawal not in harmony with purposes of original withdrawal or the policy of the leasing law. The Rocky Mountain Oil and Gas Producers' Association includes in its membership fully 95 per cent of the producers and more than 95 per cent of the production in the State. The association urges upon the Wyoming delegation immediate action to prevent the consummation of the proposed contract affecting the Teapot Dome. Immediate action is necessary.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN OIL AND GAS PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION,  
By B. B. BROOKS, President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Wyoming.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS.

Mr. CALDER. I move that the Senate take up for consideration Senate Joint Resolution 188, which authorizes the appointment of a committee of three Senators by the President of the Senate and three Members of the House by the Speaker to inquire into the conditions of industry and commerce in the United States, for the purpose of securing information on which to base legislation.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let the joint resolution be reported.

The joint resolution was read by title, as follows:

A 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.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let the resolution be read in full, Mr. President.

The reading clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

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 cannot 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 affect 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. OVERMAN. Is this measure brought before the Senate by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. I hope it will not be taken up to-day.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator from New York intend to go on with it to-day?

Mr. CALDER. Yes; I desire to have it made the unfinished business.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator does not intend to ask us to go any further with it to-day after it has been made the unfinished business?

Mr. CALDER. I hoped there might be no objection to taking it up.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is the joint resolution which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] said he would ask to have taken up on Monday?

Mr. CALDER. It is the joint resolution to which the Senator from New Jersey referred.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I thought the Senator from New Jersey said he would not ask to have it taken up until Monday.

Mr. FLETCHER. There are several Senators opposed to it, and I do not think it would be fair to take it up in their absence.

Mr. CALDER. Why not let us have it made the unfinished business, and then I will ask to have it temporarily laid aside for any other business which may be brought up?

Mr. LODGE. I think we can take it up, if it is so desired.

Mr. OVERMAN. It can be taken up by a majority vote.

Mr. LODGE. We can take it up by a majority vote.

Mr. OVERMAN. We may want to debate it.

Mr. CALDER. There is no objection to taking it up that I know of.

Mr. LODGE. It can be made the unfinished business.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has said that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] stated to some Senators that it would not be taken up until Monday.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from New Jersey said he wanted to have it made the unfinished business, and that he would not press it until Monday; that he understood some Senators desired to be heard on it, and that he would have to be away himself to-day, and would not press it until Monday.

Mr. CALDER. If there is no objection to having the joint resolution made the unfinished business, I shall agree to lay it aside temporarily.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am opposed to taking it up to-day.

Mr. LODGE. It can be laid aside for to-day.

Mr. CALDER. I will not ask for a vote on it to-day; I shall not press it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. OVERMAN. I object.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Let me read from the RECORD what the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] said on yesterday:

I wish to announce that on Monday next, immediately following the routine morning business, providing the calling of the calendar does not interfere, I shall ask unanimous consent to consider Senate Joint Resolution No. 188, which provides for a committee of inquiry to endeavor to find some solution of the problem. As I do not want to interfere with the regular business of the Senate, I desire further to announce that should the morning hour on Monday be consumed by the calling of the calendar I shall renew my request for unanimous consent the first morning thereafter when we have a morning hour.

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator from New Jersey left this afternoon he said he would like to have it taken up and made the unfinished business, but with the understanding that we should not go on with it before Monday.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the joint resolution being made the unfinished business?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider 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.

Mr. CALDER. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be temporarily laid aside.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Mr. CAPPER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up for consideration at this time the bill (S. 2040) to provide for compulsory school attendance of children, to provide for the taking of a school census, to create the department of school attendance and work permits for the administration of this act and the act to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, within the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask, has the bill the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. CAPPER. The report of the committee was unanimous, except that one member of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] was not present. The bill has the approval of the District Committee, of the District Commissioners, and of the Board of Education. They have been anxious for several months to get action upon it. It is a very meritorious measure. The District of Columbia has no compulsory school attendance law and those in charge of the schools here say it is exceedingly important that we have enacted for this city as quickly as possible a law which will require attendance in the public schools.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. This is an extremely important bill. It is such a sweeping and vitally important measure that I hope the Senator from Kansas will not press it at this time. I would like to look into it myself.

Mr. CAPPER. It has been before the Senate for two or three months.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. We have been constantly busy on something here in the Senate. I know I have been constantly in my seat and busy on the floor from time to time.

Mr. CAPPER. How much time would the Senator like to have?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Let it go over until some day next week and I shall look into it in the meantime.

Mr. CAPPER. We have delayed it here a number of times and given way to other measures. However, if the Senator asks for more time and will indicate the time he would like to have, I shall not insist upon the consideration of the bill now.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I would like to have it to go over until next week so that I may examine the bill and the report. Compulsory school attendance and the regulation of child labor are important questions.

Mr. CAPPER. The bill is in line with the compulsory school attendance laws of every State in the Union, and the work permit feature of it is exactly the same that we now have in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Two or three days could not possibly make any difference. I hope the Senator will not think me unreasonable if I request him to let the bill go over until Monday.

Mr. CAPPER. Very well.

#### PENSION LEGISLATION.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, there are a number of pension bills on the calendar which have passed the lower House and which have been pending in the Senate for several months. They ought to be taken up and disposed of. I desire to give notice at this time that on Monday, immediately after the passage of the joint resolution which is now the unfinished business, I shall move to make the pension legislation the unfinished business, commencing with House bill 2158, to provide for the monthly payment of pensions.

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

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. I was going to suggest, if there are several pension bills, that some agreement might be entered into that those matters could be taken up some night early next week.

Mr. BURSUM. That course would be very agreeable to me.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the calendar will be called on Monday, and I presume the bills referred to by the Senator from New Mexico will be reached then. So very likely they may be taken care of when they are reached in the regular order, and it will not be necessary to set them for a special time.

Mr. BURSUM. I desire to bring them up by agreement or by motion for the reason that they are nearly always objected to on a call of the calendar, when the understanding generally is to take up only such bills as are not objected to. Therefore, I desire to give notice that I shall move to take up the bills to which I have referred immediately after the disposal of the unfinished business now before the Senate.

#### INCOME TAX ON FOREIGN VISITORS.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I have just noticed a very remarkable statement in the New York Times of to-day. I see where Mr. Ralph D. Blumenfeld, who is a part owner of Town and Country, published in London, and chairman of the board and editor of the London Daily Express, recently paid our country a visit and spent about three weeks in the United States. While he was here he purchased somewhere between \$220,000 and \$225,000 worth of machinery. When he attempted to return home, before he could get his sailing papers, he was asked by an official in New York his occupation, his business, and how he spent his time in the United States. The conversation proceeded and the official then desired to know the salary that he drew. He said that he was on no salary, and thereupon the official arbitrarily put him down as worth \$17,000 salary and assessed him \$93.50 income tax for the pleasure of visiting the United States and the further pleasure of purchasing some \$225,000 worth of machinery to be shipped out of the United States.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that if such is the law it should not be continued, and if such is not the law the officials should not so disturb people who come to our country to spend their money. If we expect to build up trade in this country by building a tariff wall around us so high that no goods can come in, and then in addition to that when people visit here to spend their money if we are going to tax them before we let them go home, it seems to me we will dry up the industries of our country.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

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

Mr. DIAL. I yield.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the Senator from South Carolina if we pursue a course of that character what effect it would have upon Americans who might go abroad, and buy or sell there? Would they not be subjected to some sort of retaliatory legislation?

Mr. DIAL. In the same manner, I should think, and we would then soon have our home products dried up almost absolutely, except as far as we ourselves could use them. It would stop the encouragement of trade with the people of the world. This is one of the most remarkable instances I have ever known. It is, however, just about what could be expected at the present time when we remember the way in which we enact our laws and the defective execution of the laws.

Mr. KING. It seems to me if the present law permits that, it ought to be promptly amended, because that is such an oppressive thing that it will appeal to everyone as being injurious to the American people.

Mr. DIAL. I agree with the Senator. I am satisfied that it will drive away millions of dollars' worth of foreign trade.

#### J. B. GLANVILLE AND OTHERS.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 854) to reimburse J. B. Glanville and others for losses and damages sustained by them through the negligent dipping of tick-infested cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture. The bill was read and considered the last time the calendar was called and it went over upon the objection of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], to whom I have spoken and who has no further objection to urge.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. On page 4 there is a clerical error which I wish to correct by an amendment. In the amendment reported by the Committee on Claims, line 13, page 4, I move to strike out "forty-eight" and to insert in lieu "four thousand two hundred and thirty-one."

Mr. FLETCHER. What does that change?

Mr. CURTIS. It states the exact number of cattle. There was a clerical error in the number.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand the claim grows out of the negligence of the agents of the Government?

Mr. CURTIS. It does.

Mr. FLETCHER. It has been reported on favorably by the department?

Mr. CURTIS. It has.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does the Department of Agriculture recommend it?

Mr. CURTIS. It is recommended by the department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute reported by the Committee on Claims having been agreed to, it will be necessary to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to. Without objection that vote will be reconsidered and the amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 4, line 13, strike out "forty-eight" and insert in lieu "four thousand two hundred and thirty-one," so as to read:

For losses and damages sustained by them through the negligence of the veterinary inspectors employed by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, in their failure to properly dip 4,231 head of Texas cattle, etc.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 17, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, April 15, 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:

Our Father in heaven, the height and the depth, the length and the breadth of Thy love are beyond our knowledge. We praise Thee, for Thou art the King of Love whose goodness faileth never. As we wait in the foreglow of the great Easter day, there comes to us the sublime truth, "Greater love hath no man than this." It glorifies all there is in earth and sky and places supreme value on the worth of man. Be with us this day, and as the light of the morrow breaks upon us may our hearts respond to the heavenly strain that celebrates the world's redemption. O Son of God, rise upon all darkened lands and touch all things and bring them forth into beauty. We would accept the eternal law of achievement, namely, defeat of conquest through sacrifice. May no one in all the world be big enough to make us little enough to hate. Through Christ. Amen.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3317. An act to authorize the State of Minnesota to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River between Cass Lake and Bemidji, in or about section 25, township 146 north, range 32 west, Beltrami County, Minn.;

S. 2919. An act to extend for the period of two years the provisions of title 2 of the food control and the District of Columbia rents act, approved October 22, 1919, as amended;

S. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of a tablet to the officers of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

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

S. 2919. An act to extend for the period of two years the provisions of title 2 of the food control and the District of Columbia rents act, approved October 22, 1919, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.



## CORRECTION.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in an address I made on the floor of the House on April 11, I made several remarks about Brig. Gen. George W. Burr, of the Regular Army, stating that at the time referred to he was in charge of the Sixty-seventh Field Artillery brigade in France. The latter statement came from The Adjutant General's records, but I find that those records have been confused with the record of another General Burr in France who was in charge of the brigade I mentioned. I have received a letter from Brig. Gen. George W. Burr of date April 13, 1922, stating the facts with reference to his service with this organization, and an investigation of the record convinces me his statements are correct; that he had no connection with the artillery brigade referred to, was not censured in France; and I am going to ask unanimous consent to insert a copy of his letter in the RECORD, together with a copy of my reply to him, which will state the facts.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. If I understand it, the general rules of the House give the gentleman permission to correct the RECORD. Of course, they do not give him the permission to insert letters or to correct statements concerning some individual.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will state to the gentleman that I am asking unanimous consent to do that very thing. I am going further, to submit a unanimous-consent request that all the statements with reference to Brig. Gen. George W. Burr be eliminated from the permanent RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to insert the letters indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. There is another request, Mr. Speaker, that all reference to Brig. Gen. George W. Burr be eliminated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the further request that the statements referred to be eliminated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to are as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE,  
Washington, April 13, 1922.

Hon. ROYAL C. JOHNSON,  
United States House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Your attention is invited to the following extract from a speech made by you on the floor of the House, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 11, 1922:

"Brig. Gen. George W. Burr, of the Regular Army, was in charge of the Sixty-seventh Field Artillery brigade in France. I have with me a photostatic copy of a report made at Toul, France, February 7, 1919, by General Bullard, and it might not be amiss to say the ex-service men who are interested in seeing a reform in the Army have a great many photostatic copies of exhibits which can not be controverted. This report shows that General Burr showed inexcusable neglect. Corrections were duly pointed out. An inspection made some three weeks later showed continued similar inexcusable neglect, with corresponding resulting damage to motor transportation. As this brigade was under orders to go and has now gone to the Lemans area, taking its motor transportation with it, discipline and corrections could not be made here. I recommend that this matter be followed with General Burr, even though he has now been relieved and ordered back to the United States, and that it be followed also with the brigade now in the Lemans area. In the great effort being made to keep motor transportation in condition, both General Burr and the officer in charge of this transportation should be held responsible.

"General Burr, after he had been found inefficient in France,

This entire quotation in so far as it refers to Brig. Gen. George W. Burr, of the Regular Army, is in error, since I was not in command of the Artillery brigade referred to, was not in France at the time, and was not the officer referred to in the report to which you have reference. These statements are readily verified from the records.

Since you have done me a gross injustice in the above quoted reference to me in your speech, I request that you take immediate steps to have made a suitable correction.

Respectfully,

GEO. W. BURR,  
Brigadier General, Ordnance Department, United States Army.

APRIL 15, 1922.

Brig. Gen. GEORGE W. BURR,  
Office of the Chief of Ordnance, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Replying to your letter of April 13, I wish to say I find the facts with reference to your service with the Sixty-seventh Field Artillery as stated in your letter.

The error was due to a confusion in the records of The Adjutant General's Office in that your name was confused with that of the other officer.

In order to make as full amends as possible I have to-day given the facts to Congress in a short statement, have included for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of your letter and of my reply, and have secured

unanimous consent that all reference to you in connection with this matter be stricken from the permanent copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I regret this error as much as you, and have tried to correct it with as much publicity as was given to the original statement.

Most respectfully,

ROYAL C. JOHNSON.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman from South Dakota made the correction in reference to Brig. Gen. George W. Burr.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Does he wish to ask unanimous consent to address the House?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. I am very glad the gentleman from South Dakota has seen fit to correct the RECORD with reference to Brig. Gen. George W. Burr. Brig. Gen. George W. Burr was in command of the Third Post Supply Department in London, England, during five months, and made such an exceptional record that he was ordered returned to the United States and was put in the permanent force of the Supply Department, where he made an exceptional record.

## SPECIAL CANCELING STAMPS IN CERTAIN POST OFFICES.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 10740, with Senate amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 10740, with Senate amendments, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A BILL (H. R. 10740) authorizing the use of special canceling stamps in certain post offices.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are there any serious objections to adding to the number, already provided for, of canceling stamps for these two illustrious affairs that have been included in the Senate amendments?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not exactly understand the question.

Mr. GARNER. Is this a unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the gentleman could bring it up as a matter of right, a House bill with Senate amendments.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it a Union Calendar bill?

The SPEAKER. No; it is a House Calendar bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would a motion to concur in the Senate amendment take precedence of the motion to consent to the conference?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would.

Mr. STAFFORD. What objection would there be to concurring in the Senate amendments?

Mr. STEENERSON. I am trying to save the House some time. Since this amendment was put on adding two new places there has been an urgent request made to have another one put on, and we desire to do that in conference.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think the gentleman will be able to accomplish that by such parliamentary tactics. If the gentleman wants to block concurrence, it is in his power to do so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. STEENERSON, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. BELL.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE.

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

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

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

Ackerman	Anthony	Blakeney	Brand
Andrew, Mass.	Bacharach	Bond	Britten
Ansorge	Bixler	Bowers	Brooks, Pa.

Brown, Tenn.	Hammer	Lampert	Schall
Burke	Hawes	Langley	Shelton
Campbell, Pa.	Hayden	Linthicum	Siegel
Cantrill	Herrick	London	Snyder
Clark, Fla.	Hickey	McSwain	Speaks
Cole, Ohio	Hill	Maloney	Sproul
Copley	Hogan	Mansfield	Stiness
Dale	Hudspeth	Michaelson	Stoll
Davis, Tenn.	Husted	Mills	Sullivan
Drane	Hutchinson	Moore, Ill.	Sweet
Drewry	Ireland	Morin	Taylor, Ark.
Dunn	Jeffers, Nebr.	O'Brien	Taylor, Colo.
Dyer	Jeffers, Ala.	Olpp	Taylor, Tenn.
Fields	Johnson, Miss.	Perlman	Tincher
Focht	Kelly, Pa.	Radcliffe	Vaile
Fordney	Kennedy	Rainey, Ala.	Volk
Foster	Ketcham	Rainey, Ill.	Volstead
Frear	Kiess	Reber	Walsh
Gahn	Kindred	Robertson	Ward, N. Y.
Gilbert	Kirkpatrick	Rosenbloom	Wason
Goldsbrough	Kitchin	Rossdale	Williams
Gorman	Klecza	Rouse	Wilson
Gould	Knight	Ryan	Winslow
Graham, Pa.	Kreider	Sabath	Wood, Ind.
Griffin	Kunz	Sanders, Ind.	Young

The SPEAKER. On this call 317 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

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

The motion was agreed to.

#### THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the fourth Sunday in May, May 28, 1922, be set apart for the delivery of addresses on the life, character, and public service of the late HENRY D. FLOOD, formerly a Representative from the tenth congressional district of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that Sunday, May 28, be set apart for memorial addresses on the late Representative FLOOD. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, 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.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$101,400: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder, other than as a draftsman or such other technical capacity, at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum, except the following: One at \$2,200, one at \$2,000.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for one minute.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, last night the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] asked unanimous consent that the bureau appropriations be passed over until after the enlisted strength of the Navy had been disposed of. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE] objected to that request. I understand this morning that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is asking the Chair to be recognized for the purpose of withdrawing his objection? Am I right about that?

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan is correct. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the objection and proceed to discuss the bill under the item "Personnel."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that he be allowed to withdraw his objection that he made. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It is the understanding that we start in with the pay of the Navy, on page 31.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS.

##### PAY OF THE NAVY.

For pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty and other duty, and officers on waiting orders, \$25,893,986; officers on the retired list, \$3,114,840; commutation of quarters for officers, including boatswains, gunners, carpenters, sailmakers, machinists, pharmacists, pay clerks, and mates, naval constructors, and assistant naval constructors, \$1,310,400; and also members of Nurse Corps (female), \$1,000; for hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government, and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them or commutation of quarters not to exceed the amount which an officer would receive were he not serving with troops, and hire of quarters for officers and enlisted men on sea duty at such times as they

may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable, \$20,000; pay of enlisted men on the retired list, \$675,566; extra pay to men reenlisting under honorable discharge, \$3,772,000; interest on deposit by men, \$10,000; pay of petty officers, seamen, landsmen, and apprentice seamen, including men in the engineer's force and men detailed for duty with the Fish Commission, enlisted men, men in trade schools, pay of enlisted men of the Hospital Corps, \$51,832,351; pay of enlisted men undergoing sentence of court-martial, \$520,520; and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint; and apprentice seamen under training at training stations and on board training ships, at the pay prescribed by law, \$422,400; pay of the Nurse Corps, \$366,720; rent of quarters for members of the Nurse Corps, \$25,000; retainer pay and active-service pay of members of the Naval Reserve Force, \$5,689,233; reimbursement for losses of property under act of October 6, 1917, \$10,000; payment of six months' death gratuity, \$150,000; in all, \$93,814,016; and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Pay of the Navy," shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law as "Pay of the Navy," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That retainer pay provided by existing law shall not be paid to any member of the Naval Reserve Force who fails to train as provided by law during the year for which he fails to train.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, line 10, strike out the figures "\$3,772,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$5,981,900."

Page 32, line 15, strike out the figures "\$51,832,351" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$62,108,534."

Page 32, line 16, strike out the figures "\$520,520" and insert in lieu thereof "\$858,000"; page 32, line 19, strike out the figures "\$422,400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,207,200"; page 32, line 20, strike out the figures "\$366,720" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$447,580"; page 32, line 25, strike out the figures "\$93,814,016" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$107,503,239."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In order to bring the matter fully before the committee, the gentleman's amendment should include page 34, where the bill provides for 67,000 men. I understand the gentleman's amendment is based on 86,000 men.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VARE. I will state that I conferred with the Chair a few days ago as to the parliamentary situation, and I understood that on the question of amendment the senior member of the Appropriations Committee being opposed to the present bill, he would be recognized to make an amendment as to the personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. This is not the paragraph relating to the personnel, and therefore the Chair recognized the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. VARE. My understanding was that an agreement was made that all the other items would be passed over until such time as we reached the personnel, and that was the purpose of my withdrawing my objection.

Mr. McARTHUR. Let me state my understanding of the situation and probably it will be satisfactory to all the gentlemen interested. The figures that I have presented are based on the necessary enrollment of a personnel of 86,000. They are not haphazard figures, but have been prepared by the Paymaster General of the Navy. I have no objection to letting the matter go over until the next paragraph is read and the gentleman from Pennsylvania can offer his amendment for 86,000 personnel and we can discuss the amendments together.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet at the time the gentleman from Oregon was recognized.

Mr. McARTHUR. I will say that I also have an amendment to that paragraph, but I am willing to let the gentleman from Pennsylvania offer his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oregon make a request that this may be passed?

Mr. McARTHUR. I am willing to have it passed until after the item with reference to the personnel is read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. OLIVER. If the personnel is increased to 86,000, of course the figures will have to be changed to conform with that increased personnel, so the question of pay should be deferred until we see what the result of the vote on the increase will be.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The only thing I am anxious about is that these gentlemen shall not fall out about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. VARE. I ask unanimous consent to present this amendment.

Mr. McARTHUR. I am willing to have my amendment pending until the other paragraph is read, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent that this paragraph be passed until the question of personnel is decided, on page 34.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I did not so understand the request of the gentleman

from Oregon. The request of the gentleman from Oregon is to have his amendment considered as pending until the next paragraph is read and then let the gentleman from Pennsylvania offer his amendment, action being taken first on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and then on the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the Chair's understanding. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Perhaps I can help these gentlemen clear up their difficulty. I would be glad if I could divide the thing equally between them, but I do not know that I can; but I would suggest that whatever arrangement is made between them the first proposition to be disposed of is the size of the Navy and that the amendment seeking to increase the number from 67,000 to 86,000 be first considered; then, if that should carry, the figures of the gentleman from Oregon would be next in order.

Mr. McARTHUR. I will object to that.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, chairman of the subcommittee, agreed that the first supply sections of the bill should be passed in order to accommodate the gentleman, and with the understanding that the first question to be voted on was the question of the size of the personnel. Now, queerly enough, after having agreed to that with the gentleman from Oregon he disagrees with the gentleman about this.

Mr. McARTHUR. The gentleman from Wyoming is furnishing some gratuitous advice in this matter. I want to be reasonable and I am willing that the two amendments shall be considered at the same time, providing the gentleman from Pennsylvania can control half of the time on our side of the question.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What is the real objection to the suggestion that I have made?

Mr. McARTHUR. I am willing to withdraw any objection and accommodate the gentleman.

Mr. VARE. I want to assure the gentleman from Oregon that he may control half the time.

Mr. McARTHUR. I do not care to control any more than half the time. Let us read the bill, then.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I trust the Chair will now have the amendment read which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent has not been agreed to as yet.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. McARTHUR] be considered as pending, that first consideration be given to the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE], and that upon the matter of the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania there shall be four hours of debate, the four hours to be divided equally between the two sides of the proposition, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] controlling one hour and some one on that side who is against the committee proposition controlling the other hour.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, of the time allotted to me I would grant one-half to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN], the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations opposed to the committee amendment.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And that the other two hours will be divided, one hour to be retained by myself and the other hour to be given to either Mr. VARE or Mr. McARTHUR, whichever one of them will consent that he withdraw.

Mr. McARTHUR. I am perfectly willing to let the gentleman from Michigan control the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. McARTHUR] shall be pending, and be taken up for discussion under the amendment which is proposed to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE]; that upon those amendments there shall be four hours of general debate, two hours to be controlled for the amendments offered by Mr. VARE and Mr. McARTHUR and two hours against, to be divided between the respective sides of the House, to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan on the majority side of the House and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE], and on the minority side of the House to be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will permit, my request is that there be four hours of debate on these two amendments, but that the vote shall come, first, on the amendment offered by Mr. VARE; that two hours of time shall be given to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], who will divide with Mr. GALLIVAN, and two hours

shall be given to the proponents of the bill, one hour of that time to be given to Mr. VARE, who yields one-half of it to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. McARTHUR].

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, with the understanding that the vote shall be had at the conclusion of the debate?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think that better be made a part of the request.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And that the vote be had at the conclusion of the debate.

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

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. We are asked to consent to an agreement that it is a pig in a poke. What is the amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania proposes to offer?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Let it be read for information.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I stated that it was to change the personnel from 67,000 to 86,000.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I did not so understand it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment may be read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment which is to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE] will be read for information.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. VARE: Page 34, line 7, strike out the figures "2,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "6,000," and on page 34, line 8, strike out the figures "67,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "86,000," making the paragraph read as follows:

"Immediately upon the approval of this act the Secretary of the Navy shall begin to reduce the enlisted strength of the Navy, by furlough without pay (and no refunds shall be required of men so furloughed), discharge, or otherwise, under such regulations as he may prescribe, without regard to the provisions of existing law governing discharges, so that the average number of enlisted men, including 6,000 apprentice seamen, shall not exceed 86,000 during the fiscal year 1923."

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

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. There is so much confusion in the Hall that I could not hear all that has been said. We have an understanding over here on the Democratic side that provision is only made for the proponents of the 67,000 idea, which is the bill, and the 86,000 personnel. What provision is made for those gentlemen who will offer an amendment to increase the Navy to the authorized strength, demanded by the experts? I think those who want to follow the experts should be given equal opportunity to offer an amendment.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I would say to the gentleman from Arkansas that the morning mail has not yet arrived. [Laughter.]

Mr. WINGO. Oh, it has not? That gives me the information I wanted, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed 200 graduates of the Naval Academy of the class of 1922 shall be commissioned as ensigns in the Navy, and the graduates to be commissioned shall be selected by the Academic Board of the Naval Academy after giving equal consideration to the scholastic standing and adaptability for naval service of each graduate: *Provided*, That each graduate of the Naval Academy of the class of 1922 who is not commissioned as an ensign in the Navy shall be paid mileage at the rate of 5 cents per mile from the Naval Academy to his home and a sum equal to three months' pay as a midshipman, such payments to be made from the respective appropriations in this act providing for the transportation and pay of midshipmen.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I want to know if an amendment will be in order to be offered at this time to that part of the section which the Clerk has just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks an amendment may be offered at any time.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all of these other matters be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to find out if an amendment offered at this time to the paragraph which has just been read, would it be in order to have the amendment disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not now.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Then I ask that my amendment be read, and then I shall agree that it may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, so that there may be no question, I make the point of order against that provision, and let

the point of order be pending with the gentleman's request that this go over until the personnel has been fixed.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is entirely agreeable to me. The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be read, with the understanding that it goes over until the other matters are disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] to be considered pending.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCLINTIC: Page 33, strike out lines 8 and 9, and including "in the Navy," in line 10, and insert in lieu thereof: "that in determining the number of the members of the 1922 Naval Academy graduating class who shall be commissioned the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to bring about the retirement of 75 per cent of such officers in the Navy as are eligible for retirement. He shall cause to be commissioned out of 1922 Naval Academy graduating class 200 members, and an additional number equal to the number of officers retired under the provisions of this section."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, the reservation of the point of order would go to the amendment, and the whole matter is pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the record show that the reservation of the point of order also goes to the amendment. Let the Chair state this matter. It is the understanding of the Chair that if amendments are offered to any of these provisions included in the reading down past the paragraph commencing on page 34, that the debate on them will be limited to the four hours, unless otherwise arranged; so that the Chair can not recognize anyone outside of the four hours unless arrangement is made to that effect.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the Chair restate what he has just said?

The CHAIRMAN. It occurs to the Chair that debate on amendments that might be offered to any of these paragraphs will all be included in the agreement ordered, unless otherwise arranged.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No, Mr. Chairman. The intention was that the debate should be upon the question of 86,000 men or 67,000 men, and all other matters should be included outside of this four hours.

The CHAIRMAN. And matters depending upon that?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And all amendments to those would, of course, be included in the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, of course, has no objection to that interpretation, so that independent amendments offered shall be considered for debate after the other matter has been decided.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think that is right.

The CHAIRMAN. With that understanding the paragraph is passed, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The authorization contained in section 2 of the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921 for the employment of 500 reserve officers in the aviation and auxiliary service is hereby repealed.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the section.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, I reserve all points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] and also by the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING]. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Immediately upon the approval of this act the Secretary of the Navy shall begin to reduce the enlisted strength of the Navy, by furlough without pay (and no refunds shall be required of men so furloughed), discharge, or otherwise, under such regulations as he may prescribe, without regard to the provisions of existing law governing discharges, so that the average number of enlisted men, including 2,000 apprentice seamen, shall not exceed 67,000 during the fiscal year 1923: *Provided*, That enlisted men who have served not less than 25 years shall, unless sooner discharged by sentence of court-martial, be permitted to reenlist and continue serving until they are eligible for retirement after 30 years' service as now provided by law: *Provided further*, That enlisted men of the Navy who would be eligible under existing law for transfer to the Fleet Naval Reserve after 16 years' service at the expiration of the current enlistment in which serving, or who have completed 16 years' service, may be transferred to the Fleet Naval Reserve at any time after the passage of this act in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, and shall, upon such transfer, receive the same pay and allowances as now authorized by law for men transferred to the Fleet Naval Reserve at the expiration of enlistment after 16 years' service: *Provided further*, That enlisted men of the Navy, who have completed 18 years' service, may be transferred to the Fleet Naval Reserve at any time after the passage of this act in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, and shall, upon such transfer, receive the same pay and allowances as now authorized by law for men transferred to the Fleet Naval Reserve after 20 years' service: *Provided further*, That enlisted men who have served for more than 12 but less than 16 years shall be permitted to reenlist and continue serving, unless sooner discharged by sentence of a court-martial, until they have completed 16 years' service, whereupon they shall, upon their own application, be permitted to transfer to the Fleet Naval Reserve: *Provided further*, That no enlisted men of the Navy shall be

transferred to the Fleet Naval Reserve unless they have completed 16 or 20 years' service after the Navy is reduced to the number of enlisted men appropriated for in this act, and in no event after January 1, 1923: *Provided further*, That the enlisted men who have served less than 12 years found to be in excess of the total number herein appropriated for, after all other deductions have been made by way of retirement or transfer, shall be discharged or furloughed without pay for the convenience of the Government, and all recruiting shall be discontinued until the total number of enlisted men has been reduced to the number herein appropriated for: *Provided further*, That enlisted men of the Navy who may be separated from the service by furlough or discharge under the requirements of this act shall receive travel allowance now authorized by law for men honorably discharged, and shall, upon reenlistment in the Navy at any time hereafter, receive the then current pay of the rating held at the time of discharge plus all permanent additions to such pay authorized by law at time of reenlistment for service equal to that which they had at time of discharge, and, if allowed to reenlist, shall be required to serve under such reenlistment only for a period equal to the unexpired term of the enlistment in which serving when furloughed or discharged: *Provided further*, That additional commissioned, warranted, appointed, enlisted, and civilian personnel of the medical department of the Navy, required for the care of patients of the United States Veterans' Bureau in naval hospitals, may be employed in addition to the numbers authorized or appropriated for in this act.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. ROGERS. It is understood here also that all points of order are reserved on the whole paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] reserves all points of order on the paragraph.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. No amendment can be offered for consideration while the point of order is reserved to the paragraph.

Mr. ROGERS. This is being done by unanimous consent for the convenience of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the point of order will not be insisted upon.

Mr. STAFFORD. When is the point of order going to be pressed?

Mr. ROGERS. After the consideration of the main question.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think, Mr. Chairman, in behalf of regular parliamentary procedure we should have the regular order.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Was not that a part of the unanimous-consent agreement?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understood it, it was not modified by the committee.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand the gentleman intends to have a vote on the motion before the point of order is decided?

Mr. ROGERS. On the main question.

Mr. MONDELL. On that theory, if the gentleman is defeated on the vote, he may be able to brush it all out on the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS. That is not worthy of the gentleman. My point is to wholly leave it over and let these questions with the points of order go into the details of the paragraph, awaiting the decision on the main question.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] will kindly leave it to me to say what is worthy of the "gentleman from Wyoming," I will appreciate it.

Mr. ROGERS. I have an opinion and I assert it.

Mr. MONDELL. This House can not vote under the rules with a point of order reserved.

Mr. ROGERS. We have already done it twice within a minute.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is not correct. I raise the point of order that no amendment can be considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks after the reservation is made the reservation lies.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Chair will permit me, then if the Chair would ask the gentleman reserving the point of order whether he withdraws it or insists on it—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts did not insist on it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman from Massachusetts has made no point of order. He has not stated what his point of order was. He simply reserves the right to make a point of order to the paragraph after this matter is determined.

Mr. STAFFORD. The regular order demands that he shall make his point of order or not make it. He has not made it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed to report the amendment.

Mr. TREADWAY. As I understand the last remark made, it was that the gentleman must make his point of order or withdraw it at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, if regular order is demanded.

Mr. TREADWAY. The regular order having been demanded by the gentleman from Wisconsin, it seems to me the point should be made or withdrawn. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] seems very touchy about it, and we had best have it out.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the "gentleman from Wyoming" is not touchy about anything, but it is absurd beyond words to insist that this House shall debate for four hours and then vote, solidly or otherwise, on a proposition that may thereafter go out on a point of order. If anything of that sort has ever been heard of heretofore in a parliamentary body, it has escaped my notice. It can not be done. There is no rule under which it can be done.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, if there is no rule by which an agreement can be entered into of that nature, there is no reason why the point should not be made. The gentleman from Wyoming offered a very unfortunate insinuation, it seems to me, against my colleague from Massachusetts, that if he was beaten he would take some other method of reaching the end he is seeking.

Mr. MONDELL. If that was not the gentleman's purpose, what had he in mind?

Mr. TREADWAY. It was not his purpose. He had no such purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What is the point of order?

Mr. TREADWAY. That on page 34, after the proviso, you are putting legislation in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to understand the point of order made by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts please state his point of order?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that beginning on page 34, line 9, and from there on through the paragraph, the various provisos carry with them legislation which is not proper on an appropriation bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the point of order made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, of course, is not good, because the whole paragraph is designed to reduce the strength of the Navy from 96,500, its present strength, to 67,000. Of course, the machinery set up in the paragraph for effecting that reduction is only collateral to the main proposition of the reduction, and the whole paragraph comes squarely under the Holman rule, making a provision in order which effects a reduction in numbers or salaries of officers or men.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Michigan a question?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Even if these paragraphs were thrown out on a point of order, if the point of order was upheld and these paragraphs did not appear in the bill, would we not then still be reducing the Navy under either circumstance, whether the number we agree upon here is 67,000 or 86,000? Consequently, to my mind, the Holman rule applies before we reach the provisos at all. These are the provisions that you are endeavoring to insert here, of a legislative character, that will qualify the reduction you are to make under the vote we are to take, either for 86,000 or 67,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No. I will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the other provisions to which he has made a point of order simply provide the methods and machinery by which the reduction is to be effected. If the machinery were not provided, probably the reduction could not be made.

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

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Take the first proviso, for example:

*Provided*, That enlisted men who have served not less than 25 years shall, unless sooner discharged by sentence of court-martial, be permitted to reenlist and continue serving until they are eligible for retirement after 30 years' service, as now provided by law.

Wherein does that come under the Holman rule?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Those men are entitled to remain in the Navy and subject to retirement privileges. If that retirement is to be effected prior to the time when they ordinarily could retire, you transfer them from a salary higher to a salary lower, so that it comes under the Holman rule under another theory.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. You reduce the Navy to 67,000 men.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In one case we reduce the number, and then of those who are reduced by reason of the reduc-

tion of the number you also reduce the pay, so that you make a reduction both ways.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. You do not reduce their pay, but you transfer them to the inactive list. They are a charge on the Treasury.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. But they get less pay.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. They draw pay, but do not perform any service. That is the point. Here you have men who do not perform service who draw pay. Where is the saving on the Treasury?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It has been held many times that the transfer from the active to the retired list comes under the Holman rule.

Mr. STAFFORD. This identical question was submitted to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union when the War Department appropriation bill was under consideration, and there the Chair ruled that the collateral matters to carry out the main provision of reductions were in order.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman has had great confidence in the Chair heretofore.

Mr. STAFFORD. I not only have great confidence in the Chair, but I feel sure he is upholding the position taken by the chairman at that time.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say further, Mr. Chairman, that the enlisted force of the Navy is divided into classes. This reduction can not be made all out of one class, but must come out of the classes proportionately all along the line. These paragraphs are intended to bring about that reduction in each case of enlisted men in the Navy, and the various provisions are for the purpose of effecting that transfer, the change from the active to the inactive list, or whatever the case may be; and the whole matter is predicated primarily on the reduction of the number of men, and, second, on the reduction of pay. They do render service when on the inactive list when called upon to do so. They are at the command of the Government in any time of need.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. But it will prevent their reenlistment and continuance in the service. It seems to me that is simply particular legislation not necessarily collateral to the reduction of the Navy referred to.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Michigan one more question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes, indeed.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will these provisions be applicable whether the final vote on 67,000 or 86,000 applies?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They will be not only applicable but necessary.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VARE: Amend, on page 34, line 7, by striking out the figures "2,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "6,000," and on page 34, line 8, by striking out the figures "67,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "86,000," making the paragraph read: "Immediately upon the approval of this act the Secretary of the Navy shall begin to reduce the enlisted strength of the Navy by furlough without pay (and no refunds shall be required of men so furloughed), discharge, or otherwise, under such regulations as he may prescribe, without regard to provisions of existing law governing discharges, so that the average number of enlisted men, including 6,000 apprentice seamen, shall not exceed 86,000 during the fiscal year 1923"—

And so forth.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I understand that the gentleman's amendment is intended only to change the figures "2,000" to "6,000" and the figures "67,000" to "86,000," and that all the other language connected with the paragraph is untouched.

Mr. VARE. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into a while ago I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE] one hour, and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE].

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my personal views as a member of the committee that reported this bill, and I trust that in my limited time I may be permitted to do this without interruption.

I very much regret to differ with the majority of my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations in reference to the naval strength provided for in the pending bill. This bill was drafted by a subcommittee of five, consisting of one Member from

Michigan, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, one from Minnesota, one from Idaho, one from South Carolina, and one from Alabama. These five States have an aggregate membership in the House of 42. Great States like Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Virginia, each an empire in itself, have had no voice in the preparation of this bill, which presumes to determine the naval policy of this country.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, is he not?

Mr. MAGEE. I decline to yield, Mr. Chairman.

The members of the subcommittee contend that they desire to give to the country a Navy in numbers and efficiency authorized by the naval treaty recently ratified by the Senate, and that they have done so in this bill. On the other hand, the Secretary of the Navy, Assistant Secretary Roosevelt, and other high officials of the Navy, and prominent members on the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, contend that this bill does not do so. [Applause.] The crucial question is one of fact. We must determine who is right in the contention. All the Members of the House, excepting the five Members comprising this subcommittee, can be regarded as jurors. The country will look to us to give a correct verdict.

I do not consider that I am competent to determine the naval policy of the country, and yet I consider that I am just as competent to determine such policy as the other 30 members of the Committee on Appropriations who had no part in the drafting of this bill. However, I do consider myself entirely competent to act as a juror in this case, and to render a true verdict in the public interest upon all the facts presented for our consideration.

It is conceded that we are entitled to 18 capital ships under the naval treaty. The question at issue is the number of enlisted men required on shore and to man those ships and the necessary auxiliary vessels thereto for action in defense of our country upon reasonable notice. The Secretary of the Navy says that it will require materially more men than this bill provides for. The members of the subcommittee say that 67,000 will be sufficient. What is the basis upon which the subcommittee fixes this number? They say in their report that they have accepted the figures given to the Naval Committee by the Navy Department as of February 1, 1922. This statement is a confession of the abject weakness of their case, because those ships and the necessary auxiliary vessels were not ready and equipped for action on February 1.

The Secretary of the Navy, as I understand, contends that on February 1 there were only sufficient men on those ships to man and equip for action 13 capital ships. It is apparent that if we are to have 18 capital ships and maintain them ready for action additional men must be provided for in the pending bill.

The Committee on Appropriations, under the rules of the House, is an appropriating committee. It is not a legislating committee. This committee makes appropriations when appropriations have been duly authorized by the various committees of the House vested with legislative power. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I feel it my duty to protest against the Committee on Appropriations attempting to determine the naval policy of the country through limitation in appropriations. There is a fundamental principle involved here that can not be ignored. Such an attempt is, in my judgment, a direct assault upon the Budget system and, if persisted in, will ultimately end in the House taking away the great powers now vested in the committee [applause] which, when properly exercised, make this great committee the watchdog of the Treasury and the foundation rock of the present budgetary system that means the saving annually of hundreds of millions of dollars to the taxpayers of the country.

Further, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I can not bring myself to the point of striking a blow at the American Navy, which is the pride of the Republic. It is, in my judgment, the greatest asset that the Nation possesses. It is our first line of defense, and, if properly provided for, will prove to be our secure line of defense. The traditions of the Navy are marvelous. It has never failed the country in any crisis that has ever arisen. Its officers and men have exhibited the greatest daring and courage on every occasion when called upon to defend their country. It has never been whipped upon any lake nor upon any sea [applause], and I hope that in the years to come, upon the seven seas, in peace and in war, wherever an American warship may be, the flag will still wave. [Applause.]

I think that a Republican President is entitled to the support of a Republican House. [Applause.] The President was responsible for the International Conference on Limitation of Armaments, and I assume that he knows what he wants. He is the greatest asset that the Republican Party has. [Applause.]

The country is overwhelmingly with him and will not tolerate an attempt to nullify his great work. [Applause.] Some of my Republican friends may refuse to sustain the President on a matter arising out of one of the greatest conferences in the history of the world, but I predict that such refusal will not bring you any glory nor enhance your political prestige. Don't fool yourselves. The public will know that a vote for the enlisted personnel provided for in this bill is a vote against the President, a vote against the prestige and security of this country, a vote to make America probably a third-rate naval power. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROACH].

The CHAIRMAN. In order that the procedure may be understood, the Chair will recognize the supporters of the amendment of the Republican side and the opposers of the amendment on the Republican side, the supporters of the amendment on the Democratic side and the opposers of the amendment on the Democratic side.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I think it will be better if the Chair will simply recognize whomsoever is yielded to. We have control of the time on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the right of recognition.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I know; but nobody gets the floor except by having time yielded to him by one of four men. The Chair can not determine in what order the speeches shall be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the right to determine and should determine the proper order of debate.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. How could the Chair determine the order of debate? He does not know what the order of the debate is to be, except as it is suggested by those who have control of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The issue in this case is a simple one. There are some gentlemen on one side that have one hour and some on the other that have one hour.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Can not the Chair trust the men who have charge of the time as to the order in which the opponents and proponents shall proceed? I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROACH], and why should the Chair fail to recognize him?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is recognizing the gentleman. But the Chair announces that he will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] next.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Suppose the gentleman from Massachusetts does not want to yield to anybody?

The CHAIRMAN. That is at the option of the gentleman from Massachusetts. After that the Chair will recognize the gentleman from South Carolina. The Chair makes that announcement in fairness to all.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I want to be in perfect harmony with the Chair, but when the time is in the control of four men who have among themselves reached an agreement as to the order in which the speeches shall be made, I can not understand how the Chair can arrogate the right of determining the order in which the speeches shall be made.

The CHAIRMAN. If gentlemen desire any other arrangement, the Chair will carry it out.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I do. I desire to have the Chair recognize the men who are given time by the Members having charge of the time.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think there is no trouble about it. What the gentleman from Michigan means is that if the gentlemen on the floor arrange among themselves the order, the Chair will recognize them as they are yielded time.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly; the Chair simply made the announcement as to what he would do without any other arrangement.

Mr. ROACH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROACH. Mr. Chairman, it can not be disputed that this bill just as it is written calls for an expenditure of a million dollars a day on the Navy alone for the next fiscal year. If we adopt the amendment proposed, we will add to this amount \$60,000,000 annually to be paid by a tax-paying public that is already staggering and groaning beneath a weight of taxation never before known. These figures are not mere conjectures but are established beyond dispute. When the people of this

country learn these facts they will not say that we have been niggardly with the Navy. The expenditure of a million dollars a day on the Navy during times of peace, following on the heels of the disarmament conference, is not a small thing, and we should stop to consider well before adding to this amount.

We should not permit ourselves to be swept off our feet or lose our own poise and power of reasoning on account of the powerful influences at work here in Washington and elsewhere to save men of high places jobs that were scrapped by the disarmament conference. I sympathize with them, of course, but my duty to the people lies plain before me.

Throughout this entire debate the question has been repeatedly asked as to whom we should follow in the many conflicting recommendations which have been made to us upon this subject. Answering for myself, I have, at the cost of days of hard labor delving into brain-racking figures and statistics which have caused me sleepless nights, carefully investigated the facts for myself. I have weighed all that has been said by the Secretary of the Navy, Navy experts, committee in charge of the bill, the 1,086 pages of testimony contained in the hearings, the debates on the floor, and what everyone has had to say upon the subject, and I now expect to keep faith with my conscience by following my own judgment thus formed, which brings me to the inevitable conclusion that I should vote against the amendment proposing to add \$60,000,000 annual expense to this bill, and which I will attempt to show you is wholly unnecessary. [Applause.]

Some people fail to realize that we are to-day confronted with a new condition of affairs, so far as relates to our Navy. The disarmament conference has just been concluded, the treaties ratified by our Senate, and for the first time in our history we have a fixed standard or yardstick by which the size of our Navy is to be measured. The people of this country praised God when it was heralded to the world what the disarmament conference had accomplished. Fathers and mothers' hearts were gladdened when it became known that the five great powers of the earth had entered into a compact which made war next to impossible during the life of the compact—a period of 10 years. The struggling taxpayer lifted his head with a wan smile in the thought that at last a means had been found to lessen the awful burden he was carrying. Our own beloved President electrified the world with his now historic statement, which I repeat verbatim:

Out of the cataclysm of the World War came new fellowships, new convictions, new aspirations. It is ours to make the most of them. A world staggering with debt needs its burden lifted. Humanity, which has been shocked by wanton destruction, would minimize the agencies of that destruction. Contemplating the measureless cost of war and the continuing burden of armament, all thoughtful peoples wish for real limitation of armament and would like war outlawed. In soberest reflection the world's hundreds of millions who pay in peace and die in war wish their statesmen to turn the expenditures for destruction into means of construction, aimed at a higher state for those who live and follow after.

I plead with you that we keep faith with the country, or else this declaration by the President will become mere empty words of mockery. [Applause.]

I stand for an adequate Navy under the peace treaty, but not for a single man or a single dollar more. In my opinion, the future peace of the world depends largely upon the good faith shown in our observance of the treaties and can best be obtained if the United States and the other powers will faithfully stay within the boundaries established by the 5-5-3 ratio of naval strength. If the United States violates the spirit and intent of this ratio—if we fudge over the line and attempt to build up our Navy to a greater strength than that laid down by the plain terms of the treaty, such an act would be an evidence of bad faith upon our part and calculated to cause the other nations to take similar action, and it would soon again become a mad race of the world for naval supremacy.

The question of the correct size of our Navy is no longer an open one or difficult of determination if we will but take the time to go into the facts, and we are not required to rely upon expert testimony from naval officers, but merely to exercise our own good common sense and apply sober judgment to the facts with which we have to deal to reach an intelligent conclusion. I have tried many lawsuits, and when I was compelled to rely upon expert testimony that run counter and contrary to the physical facts of a case the expert testimony had to give way to the established facts, and here are the established facts with reference to the size that our Navy should and must be.

The disarmament conference in fixing the relative naval strength of the three great naval powers of the world at the ratio of 5-5-3 left no room for doubt or uncertainty. They said in plain terms that the size of the navies of Great Britain and the United States as compared with that of Japan should be at the ratio of what five is to three. They did not gauge this ratio or relative strength by numbers of men or by dollars and cents,

but, leaving no room for doubt, declared that the navies of Great Britain and the United States were to consist of 18 capital battleships each, with all necessary auxiliary warcraft to accompany that number of capital battleships, while that of Japan was fixed at 10 capital battleships, with like necessary auxiliaries. The conference by this action declared the strength of the Navy to consist of the fighting ships afloat and not the number of men in the offices or on the streets of Washington. This bill proposes to make our Navy exactly what the disarmament conference said that it should be—no more, no less. Figures prove themselves, and here they are: The bill provides that the fleet of the Navy of the United States and its necessary auxiliaries and complement of men shall be made up by 18 capital battleships, with a total complement of men on board of 18,259; 11 cruisers, with 4,248 men on board; 103 destroyers, with 9,579 men; 84 submarines, 2,520 men; 6 destroyer tenders, 2,551 men; 7 submarine tenders, 1,833 men; 2 aircraft carriers, 502 men; 12 mine layers, 1,574 men; 10 mine sweepers, 498 men; 2 repair ships, 727 men; 3 storeships, 612 men; 14 fuel ships, 1,568 men; 2 ammunition ships, 354 men; 2 hospital ships, 629 men; 7 cargo ships, 612 men; 3 transports, 822 men; 9 gunboats, 759 men; 6 yachts and patrol vessels, 545 men; 8 fleet tugs, 338 men; 10 fleet towing vessels, 450 men; 1 survey ship, 137 men; miscellaneous, 7 with 375 men; total number of craft, 327; of men aboard, 49,492. The Secretary of the Navy nor anyone else does not contend that a single additional man is required on board either of these ships.

Mr. MILLSAUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROACH. I yield for a question.

Mr. MILLSAUGH. The argument which the gentleman is making is very convincing. How does the gentleman arrive at the number of auxiliary craft and men necessary to accompany the 18 capital battleships prescribed by the disarmament conference?

Mr. ROACH. From the testimony of the Secretary of the Navy and Navy experts given before the committee in charge of the bill and contained in the printed hearings. I will furthermore say to the gentleman that the number of auxiliary craft, both as to men aboard and ships necessary, which I have just given has been fixed by the Navy Department itself as being the necessary craft and men to accompany the 18 capital battleships prescribed by the treaty. I also wish to emphasize the fact right here that the number of men on board these same ships on February 1, 1922, was 2,000 men less than the numbers which I have given, but the experts were not willing to accept the actual number of men on these ships on that date, so the committee allowed the number of men on each ship that the Navy Department said was necessary, and as a result of their liberality this bill actually provides 2,000 more men than was on board these selfsame ships on February 1 last. There is no dispute and can be no dispute about that. Good measure has been given in every instance where the least doubt existed. I also have here the names of the battleships, submarines, destroyers, gunboats, and other warcraft that I have just mentioned, which will make our future treaty Navy, including the President's yacht, *Mayflower*, with 160 men on board, and a half dozen other yachts that do not add any strength to the Navy. I will not take the time to read the list. They are thrown in for good measure.

Now, then, these undisputed facts show that the floating Navy of the United States, which is really the test of the naval strength, can be maintained exactly up to the standard called for by the peace conference—with 49,492 men, ship for ship, with every man on board asked for by the Navy Department.

#### NAVY ON SHORE.

Remember that this bill provides for 67,000 men, which, after placing 49,492 on ships, gives us 17,508 men on shore. It should not be difficult to determine whether this is sufficient number or not. We certainly do not want more on shore since the ratification of the treaties than we had before, and the hearings before the committee show that on February 1, 1922, 12,633 men were on shore, distributed as follows:

Receiving ships and barracks	1,945
Navy yards and stations	1,359
Training stations and trade schools	2,032
Hospitals	1,978
Prisons	23
Communications	1,228
Aviation	2,754
Ammunition depots	605
Recruiting	709
Total	12,633

Using that number as a basis—without reducing a single man—you can see by deducting this number from the 17,508 would leave a surplus of 4,875 men on shore. The evidence before the committee shows most conclusive that there are only

jobs for 9,965 of these men on shore, which number would be sufficient to fill every shore station, so that the 17,508 men which we allow in this bill for shore duty fills every post on shore and gives a surplus of 7,543 men to draw from. In addition to these actual figures, which no one dares to dispute, it should be remembered that we have thousands upon thousands of efficient Navy men and seamen throughout the United States and hundreds of young men graduating out of the Naval Academy every year who could on a moment's notice be called into the service of the Navy in the event of war. Where are we going to put an extra 20,000 more? What are they for? Where is the proof of the necessity for them? This is no time to accept the opinion of anyone unless they back up their opinion with facts to prove the wisdom of their judgment.

Are we so rich that we wish to add 20,000 men to this shore list who will have absolutely nothing to do but parade the streets of the city of Washington at the expense of the taxpayers of this country? That is exactly what we do if we increase the number of men in this bill a single man. We are giving the Navy every single man that they say is necessary on the battleships and warcraft constituting the treaty Navy, and if the Secretary of the Navy lays up some of the fighting craft and places the men in offices to ornament the mahogany furniture who is to blame? The Secretary of the Navy is now operating this same number of warcraft with 2,000 men less than we are giving him in this bill. No one has yet pointed out a single reason why he can not continue to do so.

Oh, I will tell you the trouble. The peace conference scrapped a large number of battleships, 200 destroyers, and hundreds of other smaller warcraft, many of which added no real strength to our Navy. Each one of these battleships carried an average complement of 1,014 officers and men, the destroyers an average of 87 officers and men, with a less number on each of the smaller craft, but all of whom will be out of jobs when the treaty Navy is established, and this proposed amendment is simply an effort to put 20,000 of these unemployed on the pay roll with nothing for them to do. Are we going to vote to do it? I stand for an efficient Navy, second to none in the world; for the treaty Navy—this bill gives us all of that. Why should we increase it? If we increase the number of men 20,000, we must increase ships, fuel, and every other expensive item in proportion. Do you know what this means? Let me right here give you exact figures. The fuel bill for destroyers alone during the first three months of the present fiscal year was approximately 980,882 barrels of fuel oil, costing an average of \$2.56 per barrel, a total cost in this item alone for three months of \$2,511,822, which is at the rate of \$10,047,288 per annum, and it should be remembered that prior to the war the entire Navy fuel bill never exceeded \$5,631,000 per annum. It is high time to stop some of this expense. If we carry out the intent of the peace conference, 200 of our 300 destroyers must be scrapped. Only a few days ago some of you gentlemen vigorously objected to expending \$42,000,000 for improvement of all the great rivers and harbors of the country, others recently said we were so poor that we could not grant a bonus to the ex-service men, while yet others are unwilling even now to pay a pension to men who fought in the Civil War because you say we have not the money, yet you would now add \$60,000,000 annually to this bill without batting an eye when the proof shows such expenditure to be unnecessary. [Applause.]

I would do violence to my own judgment and betray the confidence of the people that sent me here if I voted for this proposed increase. Were I not sure of my ground I would yield to the pressure of the almost irresistible and powerful influences at work to secure this increase. It is all right to follow some one else if you do not know the facts, but I have not quit thinking for myself, and I conceive it to be my duty as a Member of the greatest legislative body in the world to inform myself of the facts, which I have attempted to do, and I intend to vote to sustain Governor KELLEY and the majority of the committee, who have taken no one's word but gone into the facts for themselves. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there have been some splendid arguments made during this week in favor of both contentions. Some one—I believe it was the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE]—said a few moments ago that many of us would have to act as jurors and decide upon these arguments which have been made. That is true. A great many of us came into the discussion with minds perfectly impartial on the issues involved and with determination to do that which is best for the Nation and best for the Navy. It is for those of us to decide what we shall do and how we shall vote. If we make a mistake and vote for too large a

Navy and too large a personnel, then we have made a mistake in voting only for an expenditure of too much money. And yet that money will not be wasted, because it will be spent for the training of young men, it will be spent for equipping the Navy up to a standard which would be valuable in any war that may come; but suppose we made a mistake on the other side; suppose we make a mistake and vote for too small a personnel. Then we do not make a mistake only in the expenditure of money but we make a mistake against our Government, we make a mistake which means inefficiency, we make a mistake which means our Navy is not the Navy it should be under the treaty recently made at the disarmament conference.

For my part, I am going to cast my vote in favor of the larger personnel. [Applause.] Why do I do that? I do it because the Department of the Navy says we need the larger personnel. The President says so; every naval expert says this; every man who is very familiar with naval affairs says that we need the larger number. And gentlemen, I am quite sure that if we had some of the witnesses that are dead and gone they would likewise say we need the larger personnel. What would Schley say, what would Sampson say, what would Dewey say if he were alive, what would the other naval heroes of the past say? What would Theodore Roosevelt say if he was still living and was asked on which side he would cast his vote? [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, how are those of us who expected to get information from this debate to vote? On one side are men true and tried producing powerful argument in favor of the bill as written. On the other side are men equally as good showing almost, if not conclusively, that the increase is absolutely necessary. On one side is a majority of the subcommittee charged with the responsibility of bringing out a proper bill and giving it to the House along with sufficient reasons for the faith that is within them. On the other hand is a minority of that committee, many, if not all, of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, as well as the Secretary of State, Hon. Charles E. Hughes, one of the commission on the part of the United States to the disarmament conference; and that splendid gentleman, the Secretary of the Navy, and the President of the United States.

I again repeat, How are those of us who have not had the opportunity to study the problem in detail and who are now with all earnestness seeking information to vote? Shall we heed here and now the plea of economy and vote for the lesser number of men, or shall we support a larger personnel, as sought by the Navy Department, and vote for the larger number?

Mr. Chairman, I know there is a chance to make a mistake in this matter, as there is in all measures which come up for consideration here. I feel this way about the matter: If we make a mistake and vote for too large a personnel for the Navy, we make a harmless error, except that we cause an expenditure of too much money. If we vote for too small a personnel for the Navy, we make an error that would give us a Navy less than authorized by the conference, a Navy inferior to that of England and almost, if not, inferior to that of Japan, and a Navy not adequate for our protection. On one hand we may lose money, on the other we may lose a Navy which would probably keep us out of war and which would win for us if war should come. On one hand we may lose a few million dollars, on the other hand we strongly chance to lose all. How shall we vote? It is far better to vote for millions for the Navy when those millions are not needed than to fail to appropriate one dollar when that dollar is needed to make our Navy of sufficient strength to insure peace to our Nation, whether that peace be a continuation of the peace we now enjoy or the result of victory in a war thrust upon us.

Ah, Mr. Chairman, it would be infinitely better for us to appropriate every dollar it is possible for this Nation to raise rather than fail in the provision of any amount needed to make our Navy of sufficient strength to absolutely guarantee that "this Government of the people, for the people, and by the people" shall not perish from the earth.

For my part, Mr. Chairman, I am going to resolve my doubts in favor of safety and of the larger personnel. [Applause.]

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER].

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this bill has been more exhaustively debated than any other piece of legislation which has come before the House since I became a Member, and there is little that I can add, but I think that by asking ourselves two fundamental underlying questions we can arrive at a very definite decision as to what our action should be in the matter. Since we are the elected Representatives of the people, the first question that the Members of this House should ask themselves, because it is the first question which these same people of the United



States will ask themselves, is whether or not the other two parties to this agreement, Great Britain and Japan, will maintain under this treaty arrangement any navy other than one which is fully efficient. To my mind the answer of the American people and the answer of the Representatives in this House will be that they will not; the other question is, Can we afford to maintain a Navy under the 5-5-3 agreement that is any less efficient, under the agreement, than any other of the powers involved? The answer is a categorical "No."

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], in a query which he made on the floor the other day, submitted, to my mind, another question which the proponents of this lame-duck treaty Navy have failed to answer satisfactorily. In the debate he asked the Member who was then speaking, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], I think, what the American people would have said to the American conferees if at any time they had attempted to place our ratio lower than the ratio of any other one of the conferees engaged in the conference. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] replied that they would undoubtedly have been swept from power, but that question has remained unanswered by the opposition, however. We know and they know that the answer would have been, as Mr. ROGERS stated, "We know what they have done." Public opinion would have risen up in its might and would have swept the conferees from out of the conference hall by a wave of protest which would have rocked the Nation. [Applause.]

My distinguished comrade and colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who was good enough to admit to the House that he is not a candidate for the Senate, as are many others of the leading proponents of this bill—Mr. KELLEY, Mr. MONDELL, and Mr. ARENTZ—yesterday made a statement on the floor of this House to the effect that he could offset the 50,000 legionnaires in California who have, through their department commander, telegraphed requesting the California delegation to stand for a personnel of 86,000, with something like 100,000 legionnaires from Mississippi. Now, my friend, from Mississippi is frank and always sincere, and I am sure he believes what he stated yesterday on the floor of the House, but to show you how inaccurate these proponents are, even when they are not avowed candidates for the Senate [laughter], I want to read a few statistics relating to Mississippi. Mississippi in the World War furnished for the Army 62,859 men, and for the Navy 4,898, and the Marine Corps 553, making a total of 68,310. She had 4,443 members of the American Legion on October 15, 1921. Where does the gentleman from Mississippi propose to get his 100,000 legionnaires, which is nearly 32,000 men more than she had in uniform during the World War? By what gift of imagination or fancy does the gentleman conjure up 100,000 legionnaires where only 4,443 grew before? [Laughter and applause.]

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

Mr. LINEBERGER. I am sorry, but I have not the time. I hope that gentlemen of the House will bear in mind that the statements which have been made on this floor by the 67,000 personnel proponents are just as generally inaccurate on this question. Now, if the gentleman from Mississippi had been a candidate for the Senate—and I hope he will be some day—after this bill is passed he would probably have said 200,000 instead of 100,000. [Laughter.] That is the way it seems to affect them.

There is no question where we should stand on this bill. We should stand with the Secretary of the Navy, with the Secretary of State, with the President, if you please, and the naval experts who advised the American conferees at the Limitation of Armament Conference. With all due respect to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], the chairman of the subcommittee reporting out this bill, I say that for my part I shall take my stand with the great leaders in this great movement for the limitation of armament, and shall vote for a personnel of 86,000, as proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE] [applause], and as recommended by that greatest of all living Americans, Warren G. Harding, President of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. In reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] I desire to say that when I stated on yesterday that I might offset his 50,000 ex-service men in California who, he says, are in favor of the larger personnel for the Navy with something like 100,000 from Mississippi who are in favor of economy in naval and military expenditures I did not state that all those men from Mississippi were members of the American Legion. An ex-service man has the same right

and the same voice in public affairs, whether he is a member of the American Legion or not. [Applause.]

He tells you that Mississippi furnished only about 68,000 men during the war and that therefore my figures were exaggerated; but he overlooks the fact that thousands of ex-service men have moved to Mississippi since the war closed.

We had two training camps in that great State—Camp Shelby, at Hattiesburg, and Payne Field, at West Point—and when those boys from other sections of the country came there and saw what a wonderful country we have, what great prospects are there for the future, and what good-looking girls Mississippi affords, they were simply charmed [laughter], and when the war closed those boys flocked back to Mississippi by the thousands. [Laughter.]

And if my distinguished friend from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] had had the privilege, the pleasure, and the honor of training in Mississippi for the gallant services which he rendered overseas, especially if he had been a single man, no doubt to-day, instead of wasting his time trying to convince this House on the proposition for which he stands or of tantalizing himself with the prospects of going to the Senate, he would be down there in Mississippi cultivating his cotton fields or mowing his alfalfa and singing "Praise God, from whom all blessings flow." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY].

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROACH] I have yet failed to hear an argument on this floor that to my mind satisfactorily refutes the figures and arguments given us in the majority report of the committee. Gentlemen insist still that we must accept the views of the naval experts, of the admirals, and of the heads of the Navy Department. I commend the suggestion rather of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE]. We are the jury; it is our duty to hear the evidence from both sides and judge seriously whether we really can afford to cut down our Navy personnel and naval expenses as proposed in this bill. I submit that other men have spoken besides the naval officers, and have spoken with reason more cogent and authority more firmly established by facts, figures, and precedent. Again I am irresistibly impelled to tell a story. A gentleman sat in a railway train and held on his lap a tightly closed little wooden box perforated with small air holes, as if it contained something alive. A gentleman sitting by looked curiously at the box, and the conversation ran somewhat thusly:

"What is that in your box?"

"Why, it is a kill-o-ma-dee."

"A kill-o-ma-dee? What is that?"

"Oh, it's a little animal about as big as a rabbit."

"How does it live?"

"It burrows in the ground, like a prairie dog."

"What does it eat?"

"It eats snakes; nothing but snakes."

"That's funny. How do you get enough snakes to feed it?"

"Why, I am a hard-drinking man and I have no trouble finding snakes. I find them all around almost every day."

"But they are imaginary snakes."

"Yes; but that makes no difference. This is an imaginary kill-o-ma-dee."

It seems to me that the advocates of a large Army and Navy are seeing snakes. They are backing their demands with shrieks of fear inspired by imaginary dangers to our national and domestic safety. Especially do some of our friends quake at the name of Japan, which they wave as a red danger signal, and seem surprised that any of us should fail to stop and tremble.

I frankly believe that is all bunk. Japan, struggling under her crushing debt and scarcely able to feed her congested population on her small area of productive soil, Japan who needs our friendship ten times more than we need hers—can it be that she wants to pick a fight with America? No, gentlemen, war with America is about the last thing the real Japan wants. Of course, that nation has its militaristic clique, supported by their jingo press. What nation has not? But these do not represent the true spirit of Japan. This is not only the conclusion of reason; it is the testimony of intelligent and patriotic Americans who have opportunity to know, both of those who have visited Japan to study this question and those who have lived in Japan for years.

I feel an American pride in our Navy. I appreciate its importance, as long as we need it, and I am not yet ready to do away with it entirely. I realize the necessity of maintaining it at a reasonable strength. The question is simply as to what constitutes a reasonable strength. That can not be answered off-hand. It requires investigation, the production and consideration of evidence. Our committee have given weeks and even

months to such an investigation, considering evidence on all sides of the question, and have brought before us the facts as they have found them, with their recommendations based thereon. These facts which they have brought do not seem to me to have been successfully contested, and hence I believe that the recommendation of the majority of the committee for a Navy of 67,000 men should stand, and that this House would not be doing a consistent thing, but would be doing an unwise and an extravagant thing, to increase the figure to 86,000.

I differ from the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] when he says that our Navy is our greatest asset. The greatest asset of any Government, in time of war even more than in time of peace, is a loyal, patriotic, satisfied, thrifty, and intelligent people.

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,  
When 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, a country's pride,  
When once destroyed, can never be supplied.

The wisest thing, the most righteous thing, and the most vital thing for us to do as the legislative body of a great nation is to pass such laws and to so direct public affairs as to help the interests, encourage the hearts, and inspire the confidence of the plain people. Notice, please, I do not say the common people—certainly I do not say the lower classes of the people—they are the higher classes if measured by their common sense, their fundamental principles of righteousness, or their importance in our economic, social, or political systems. The foundation of a building may be its lower part, but it is also its most solid part. And the great population that forms the basal part of our civilization is also its most constructive and productive part.

These are the people who work in the shops and the stores, on the farms, on the railroads, in the mines and the factories, on the roads and the bridges—everywhere that honest bread is to be won by honest toil. They far surpass the rest of our population in numbers. "God must have loved them, or he would not have made so many of them." It is not improper to refer to them as the "working class." That they are, and in that is their pride and their strength. If our democracy stands for anything it stands for the principle that no honest labor is menial and for the fact that the man who is poor enough to have to work is, after all, deserving of the most consideration.

The larger part of this great working class, which forms the solid foundation of our institutions, and I venture to say the more virile and the more virtuous part, live on the farms and in the "old home towns." They furnish the strongest and most effective recruits to the great business and professional ranks of our cities. So much is this true and so generally is it recognized that these two phrases, "the old home town" and "down on the farm," have come to be universally associated with our concept of successful men.

A great man in Chicago said to me:

LOWREY, I will tell you, if it were not for the good, pure, red blood that flows into our cities from the country districts, our cities would rot.

To me some gentlemen seem to consider our Army and Navy as an end sufficient unto itself. Such argument can readily be reduced to an absurdity. They are not an end but a means. They are valuable only as they are really needed for defense. Every cent expended on them beyond that is pure waste. Not only is it waste but the very existence of armaments greater than necessary is a menace and an evil, social, political, and economic. It is a dissipation of man power and money power that should be turned into production and is an encouragement of dangerous autocracy.

Understand again, please, this is not an attack on adequate defense. But gentlemen seem to me to have established clearly that a Navy of 67,000 men is all that is necessary and proper under the terms arrived at by the arms conference. The addition of 19,000 men above that at a cost of \$40,000,000 is the thing that seems to me wrong and dangerous. For the people who will feel this burden most are at the very basis of our political and economic system. They are the large majority of our population, and they are the element of our population which most need financial protection and relief. When we legislate for the improvement of the condition of the plain people we are discharging our highest official duty; when we needlessly increase their burdens, we descend to the depths of official iniquity. When we so legislate as to win their confidence and loyal support to the Federal Government, we are building the strongest possible wall of protection around the Republic; when we shake their confidence and shock their loyalty, we are battering the walls which we already have.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have followed the course of this debate from the beginning, and I am thoroughly convinced that the bill provides a sufficient personnel, and I believe, without qualification, knowing the valor of American seamen, that with that personnel we will have the most efficient navy in the world.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. McARTHUR] says he wants a navy equal or superior to that of any other country in the world. Well, we can not have a navy in ships and tonnage superior to that of any other country. The treaty forbids it, and I am thoroughly convinced from the statements of the chairman and the majority report that the personnel provided for in the bill gives us a navy fully equal and, I believe, superior to any navy in the world. I believe also that a large majority of the House believe as I do upon this subject. It may be that on account of the letter of the President addressed to Mr. LONGWORTH, of Ohio, that Members may vote for the larger number. I know the power of the President is great, his influence is great, but I believe his best friends are those who shall seek by their vote to carry out the spirit of the Conference for the Limitation of Armament; and, further, since I believe that the number of personnel provided in the bill is sufficient, I could not for any reason justify my course in adding \$40,000,000 unnecessary tax to the burdens of an already overburdened public. Will not the American Congress, if it shall vote for the larger Navy, place ourselves in a position of discrediting the sincerity of the other signatories to the four-power treaty? Will we not place ourselves in a position of those who take counsel of their fear rather than of their confidence? Is it becoming and appropriate that at this particular juncture, when all progressive nations in the world are longing for the guaranties of peace, that this Nation, which has inspired and initiated the great world conference, shall now by our action proclaim our distrust for its final results?

Much of the argument for a larger personnel revolves around the contingency of war, the imminence of war, not the possibility but the probability of war, and yet no portentous cloud is seen, and unless the nations with whom we are treating and the only nations who are in position to do us harm are utterly recreant to all the instincts of honor and faith there is no danger of war. Further, if there is any one thing that has been more strongly impressed upon my mind than any other since I have been in Congress it is that each and every head of a department of government is religiously impregnated with the idea that his particular department of the Government is paramount, superior, and more important than all others. And that this is true of the Navy Department there is no doubt in my mind, nor do I think in the mind of any Member of Congress. The Congress should act dispassionately, free from the extravagant views of the Secretary of the Navy. We should not lose sight of the enormous pressure brought to bear upon committees and who seek to influence Members of Congress to protect the interests of great Government establishments, such as navy yards, ordnance manufactories, and especially the interests of naval officers, who are naturally loath to relinquish their jobs; but my duty is to the taxpayer of the Nation upon whose shoulders now rest heavy burdens and grievous to be borne.

Closing as I began, I know the valor of American seamen, and with ships of equal tonnage and equal gun power, whether we shall have a few dozen more or less upon a ship, we have yet the greatest Navy in the world, and believing this I would feel that I were guilty of dereliction to the best interests of the people of this great Nation, and especially the people of my own district, whom it is my highest ambition to represent faithfully, if I should cast my vote to add 19,000 men to an already sufficient Navy and thereby add \$40,000,000 to their taxes.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I can not consistently, with my conception of my duty, consider the argument of those who have flaunted the specter of war, cast my vote for this increase, but I shall cheerfully and conscientiously cast it to sustain the report of the committee. [Applause.]

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, when I vote on the bill now before Congress proposing the drastic cut in the enlisted strength of the Navy from the present figure of approximately 96,000 men to 67,000, I propose to follow the leadership of our great President, Warren G. Harding, the Commander in Chief of the naval and military forces of the United States, who personally informed the members of the Naval Affairs Committee that he thought the present strength of the Navy should be fixed at 86,000.

Since the President has confirmed this in his letter to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], I do not

fear that I am violating any confidence reposed in that committee by making such a statement.

President Harding is backed up in his view of the situation by Secretary Hughes and Secretary Denby, and while some Members of the House of Representatives do not consider those gentlemen as being naval experts, I can fortunately furnish some information on the subject which you will all agree comes from a man competent to judge the situation.

I refer to Admiral Henry B. Wilson, of Camden, N. J., affectionately known to the "gobs" in the service as "Tug" Wilson. Admiral Wilson comes from my home town and I have known him from boyhood. He grew up with the Navy from midshipman to admiral, and during the great World War was stationed at Brest in charge of the transportation of our millions of soldiers to the battle fields of France. How well he accomplished that great feat is now a matter of history, and his native town and State are exceedingly proud of the renown that he has brought them. Later he commanded the great Atlantic Fleet, and while serving in that capacity did me the great honor of making a special trip to Camden to vote for my election to Congress, the first ballot he had been able to cast in 20 years, owing to his continuous service on the sea for his country. At present he is spending the evening of his life in command of the Naval Academy at Annapolis, training future captains and admirals to take his place and the places of others when their time comes for retirement. Surely my colleagues will not claim that Admiral Wilson is not an expert, fully qualified in every way to express the needs of the Navy.

This is what he has to say in a recent letter to me, in which he gave me permission to publish his views on the question now pending:

MY DEAR MR. PATTERSON: As you well know, these are parlous times for the Navy, to which service I have been attached all my life. Naturally, I am much distressed over the way things appear to be going, and as a friend of mine and my Congressman I appeal to you to help the service of which I am so proud, to keep the drastic legislation which has been proposed from being enacted.

I can assure you, PATTERSON, as a friend, that it will be disastrous, in my opinion, to reduce the number of officers we have at the present time. There are not too many as conditions are to-day. If later other nations honestly reduce, or are willing to reduce, then, of course, I would be in no way against meeting their move. It takes time to make officers. As for the men, I can understand that some reduction can be made without much harm. If you can stand by the commissioned personnel, as I hope you will, I know that you will be doing good work as an American, and you will be more than pleasing one of your constituents, who holds you in high esteem.

I appreciate your stand in voting for a decrease in the Navy to not less than 86,000. All of us who know the Navy feel that it would be a national disaster to reduce the Navy without regard to its efficiency. I can not say more than the press has been saying this week and I agree with much, practically all, in fact, that they have said. The press understands, much as we do, that an efficient Navy is vital. No doubt you have read Mahan's "Influence of Sea Power on History." If you have not, it makes interesting reading. Mahan shows conclusively that there never has been a successful power—that is, successful for any length of time—without control of the sea.

I am glad that the New Jersey delegation is standing behind the Navy. I am sure they are making no mistake so far as the good of the country is concerned, and I feel equally sure that their constituents will agree with them. It is too bad that Mr. HUTCHINSON is holding out, but nine for and one against is a pretty good average for the old State. (Since then Mr. HUTCHINSON has informed me he stands for an enlisted personnel of 86,000.)

As a matter of fact, there is a greater menace in the Butler bill than the 67,000 men proposed by the Appropriations Committee. That menace is the provision for reducing the authorized strength. A reduction in the authorized strength will cause a corresponding reduction in officers, as provided by the bill, and will unfortunately prevent any increase in the Navy in view of any impending trouble without legislative action. When the situation is internationally delicate, legislation for increasing the armed forces is always looked upon with disfavor, as it is possible that such legislation will be looked upon by a prospective enemy as an overt act. To my mind it would be so much better to let the authorized strength stand and reduce the Navy through the Appropriations Committee to 96,000, in order that the President's hands may not be tied in case it is necessary to fill up to capacity suddenly.

The unfortunate part of the whole situation is the unrest in the service, which is inevitable when none of the personnel know just where they stand. A commission in either the Army or the Navy has always been considered more or less of a permanent proposition so long as efficient service was given. With the sword constantly hanging over their heads, officers and prospective officers will look with hesitancy upon a naval career. As you know, the pay is low compared to what a man of Naval Academy education ought to be able to earn in civil life. This low pay has been compensated by the assurance of a permanent position and by the honor and pride of service. Public harping against the naval personnel can not but make the younger officers wonder if it is really worth while, and, of course, when they get in this state of mind it is not unreasonable to expect that they will not give their best. All that we ask is an adequately paid Navy, as good as any navy in the world. The arms conference was a success largely because we had something tangible to give, and we gave it willingly. Were there to be another conference, where we had nothing to give, you would find our position not unlike that of China in the last conference. Look at Japan for a moment. Less than half a century ago they were virtually an unknown, unimportant people, comparatively. They spent huge sums on their national defense. What was the result? In a period of a few years they have reached the top. The last conference has, in fact, made them one of the three great powers. They had might on their side—

China had right. Who got the most out of the conference? Japan has in recent years acquired control of many acres of land and they acquired this because they had power. I am not arguing that we ought to be a military Nation. I do not believe in that, but I do believe that if we are to be heard in the councils of the world we must have adequate national defense.

You may quote me as much as you like. I have spent my whole life in the Navy. I know the Navy inside and out. I know that what I am saying is right and I know that any student of world's history will admit that this is right. I appreciate the need for economy and I am heartily in accord with any plan for reasonable economy, but I can not concede that it is economy to place our country in an insecure condition, a condition which may cost us billions in the future. Preparedness never costs as much as unpreparedness. The last war is an exemplification of that. This is a fact and not a theory.

With kindest regards and my thanks for the stand you are taking in regard to the national defense, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY B. WILSON.

Admiral Wilson has won his renown. He has reached a safe anchorage. His only hope and thought is to maintain the glory, the prestige, and the traditions of the American Navy made immortal by John Paul Jones, Barry, Stewart, Perry, Lawrence, Decatur, Farragut, Sampson, Schley, and Dewey.

The proposed reduction in the pending bill to 67,000 men has its economic side. Where are the 30,000 men to be thrown out of the Navy to secure work when there are already several million American workmen seeking jobs because we have failed to enact a permanent protective tariff based on American valuation?

Stoppage of the construction program under the terms of the bill under discussion is costing my district millions of dollars annually in wages. I have no navy yard in my district, but located there is one of the largest shipbuilding plants in the world. Before and during the great World War the New York Shipbuilding Co. built some of the biggest and best ships in the United States Navy, and the same company has constructed some of the finest passenger and cargo carriers of our merchant marine. Now it is building huge caissons for the new Delaware River bridge that will link the great States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey and make Camden a city of half a million people. But in the meantime our workmen and merchants are suffering. One great battleship building is to be scrapped and a mammoth battle cruiser—the *Saratoga*—we hope is to be converted into an airplane carrier. During the war 18,000 workmen were busy in that hive of industry and the pay roll was \$1,000,000 a week. Now there is a skeleton organization of 5,000 of the most skilled men left, with a pay roll of but one-quarter its previous size. Naturally, the business men and merchants are affected as well as the idle workmen, who can not find jobs on account of the depression in all other lines.

Cheeseparing is not always economy. To paraphrase a famous saying, I believe in "millions for defense but not one cent for graft." We are saving \$200,000,000 a year under this bill. That will pay our national debt, outside of what is owing to us from our allies, in 50 years. Eighty-six thousand men in our Navy as against 67,000 would increase the expense approximately \$20,000,000 for a few years. That is a small premium to pay on a marine insurance policy that will probably prevent our being plunged into another war that would cost us untold billions.

Mr. Chairman, we have all enjoyed the heavy artillery and broadsides fired in the big battle of the general debate of the last few days. We have even enjoyed the smoke screen of false economy thrown up by the opponents of the larger Navy. The decks are now cleared for action, and under the five-minute rule the auxiliaries and smaller guns can be used. Ordinarily I would agree with the hard-working members of the great Appropriations Committee and would gladly follow the lead of such intellectual giants as Chairman MARTIN MADDEN, JAMES R. MANN, FRANK MONDELL, and GOVERNOR KELLEY, but under the circumstances I am compelled to forego that privilege and enroll under the banner inscribed "Safety first." [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER].

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much disgusted by the constant insinuations that gentlemen who favor the policy of the administration on the question of an adequate "treaty" Navy are actuated by selfish motives. Such an insinuation comes with bad grace from this Subcommittee on Appropriations which in bringing in this bill admits, through its chairman, that it has included appropriations for naval training stations in spite of the fact that the new policy of the Navy Department is in favor of training these boys on the vessels and not on shore. And yet they have included these items in the bill, one of them being located on the Great Lakes. A navy yard is just as important a part of a Naval Establishment as any other part, but there is not a man in this House who believes that any navy yard should be maintained unless

it is absolutely necessary for the maintenance of an adequate Naval Establishment. This matter, however, is more important than the question of any particular phase of this appropriation. It is a question of whether this country shall maintain such a Navy as is provided for in the naval treaty which has just been ratified by the Senate of the United States.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] is a clever debater, and, as has well been said, he could make a jury believe that black is white or that white is black, and he could have made just as good a speech if he had advocated a Navy with 25,000 personnel. But he can not get away from the fact that Great Britain and Japan are proposing under this new treaty arrangement to have a personnel of 98,000 and 68,000, respectively.

A Navy does not consist of battleships or of guns alone. It depends upon the men behind the guns, and I do not believe that the American people, when they understand the facts, will ever consent that this Nation shall have a Navy in the ratio of two and one-half compared with five for Great Britain and three for Japan. They expect that the American Republic is going to have a Navy as provided for in that treaty, and in order to have such a Navy we must have a personnel corresponding, at least approximately, to the personnel of the British Navy.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] attempted to show that the marines—20,000 of them—should be added to the 67,000 he provides for, and therefore, he says, we will really have a Navy of 87,000. He knows perfectly well that the marines, taken as a whole, are not part of the enlisted personnel of the Navy, although they are provided for in this bill. They are essentially land troops, and there is no valid reason for including them in the Naval Establishment. On the other hand, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTON] pointed out, the Royal Marines of England are sailors. They are trained to fight battleships. Our marines are not. It is not expected that any considerable number of them shall be upon these vessels. As has been pointed out, at the present time less than 2,000 of them are on the vessels. The greater part of them are only on the vessels on which they are carried from one particular post of duty to another. So when he says that this bill virtually provides for a Navy of 87,000 men, he is not telling the exact facts and to that extent is misleading the House.

I therefore hope that the amendment providing for a personnel of 86,000 will be adopted. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DEAL].

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

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

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

Mr. DEAL. Mr. Speaker, I favor the amendment for a Navy minimum of 86,000 men. There are two classes of individuals who, for the time being at least, are subject to the shafts of oratorical irony and criticism of the distinguished gentlemen composing the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee having charge of H. R. 11228. These gentlemen, representing districts far removed from the seaboard, where naval ships, yards, docks, and bases are supposed to function, are peculiarly fitted for the duties to which they have been assigned, but seem to have discarded as unworthy of consideration information supplied upon request by our naval authorities. Not only has there been a seeming disposition to spurn such information but to laymen, such as myself, it appears that there has been a decided effort to discredit the testimony submitted by the Department of the Navy, and yet this is the only source from which such information can be obtained unless, perchance, one has passed through the various grades of the service and is in close touch with its records, as has been the Secretary and his aids. From the suggestions which, I think, that I have heard upon this floor a novice might infer that those in charge of our Navy are either very ignorant or else are perjurers. To those of us who have associated and have acquaintance with its personnel either suggestion is absurd, and it is my conviction that the public will be equally as loath to accept these views. The conviction has obtained that the standard of honor in the Navy has been of the highest. From the day that a recruit enters the service he is taught that he must be truthful and honest—in short, a gentleman. Those in command having passed through the academy, and all ranks of the service from ensign to admiral having served on ships large and small, in yards, at the bases, and in the offices, having for a lifetime devoted their entire thought to the work of building a defensive organization for a country of which they are citizens,

must know that of which they speak. Surely I should not be censured for inclining to follow their advice. Nor can we forget the White Fleet which sailed without a hitch around the world, advising all nations that we actually had a Navy. The daring and successful entrance into Manila Bay, the sinking and capture of the Spanish fleet and the island without the loss of a ship. The Battle of Santiago can never be forgotten, and finally when the order was given to take part in the World War these men were ready to the minutest detail. Under their guidance not a troop ship was molested, not a duty left undone. These men have never failed. It is a long, long trail to undo in the eyes of the public or of this body their capacity or their veracity.

The second class to which I refer are those Representatives who happen to hail from districts in which there are navy yards, bases, and so forth. I happen to be one of those Representatives. Indeed, it may be that no district in the Union is so honeycombed with naval activities as the second district of Virginia, which I have the honor to represent, comprising 312,000 people, nearly 100,000 above a congressional quota. We have one of the best, if not the best, equipped navy yards in America. Three large dry docks, one of which is over 1,000 feet in length with 40 feet of water over the mud sill; a machine shop second to none in equipment; storage space and warehouses unequalled. A naval base with accommodations for 25,000 recruits, located immediately upon the anchorage of our largest battleships, supply houses and docks at which these ships may enter, load, and discharge; a fuel storage for millions of tons of coal; an Army base and terminal, the magnitude of which is appalling; a fort at Cape Henry armed with the heaviest rifle guns, capable of dropping shells upon ships 20 miles off the coast; a marine hospital; a Navy hospital; and, finally, a magazine depot. With all of these Government activities in my district, according to the formula, my views are the very last entitled to the consideration of my colleagues, and yet having lived in the midst of them, having seen them come one by one, develop and grow beyond the conception of a great majority of my colleagues, knowing the hundreds of millions of dollars that they have cost the taxpayers of all the States of the Union. I venture to warn this body of the danger and loss of permitting them to deteriorate, even though I invoke the witticisms and sarcasm and ridicule of the distinguished committee, who have sailed the seas of the great Middle West, who have gained their knowledge of battleships and dry docks and naval bases where the tall corn grows, and to some extent from the naval personnel.

I have the greatest confidence and respect for the committee, for their views and for those who agree with them. Indeed, there have been times during this debate when their evident sincerity of conviction has tempted me to believe there was justification for their view, but when weighed in the balance they seem to me to be wanting.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should practice the utmost economy in all branches of our Government, but there is such a thing as false economy. Under this head I would place the enormous reduction proposed by a majority of the Appropriations Committee in H. R. 11228, both in personnel and appropriation. I have listened with profound interest to many of the debates upon this floor for and against the committee recommendations.

Arguments have been presented by Members of this body who have devoted years of time and thought to the subject. There has been such a divergence of opinion and disparity of figures, even where it is claimed they have been obtained from the same source, that I have been unable to reconcile them. I frankly admit that I have little first-hand information upon the subject; therefore, I accept the Navy estimates as the safest to follow. There are some facts, however, which have not been contradicted and upon which all seem to agree, the first of which is that we are in need of a Navy, that it should be adequate as a first line of defense in event of war. England for a hundred years has maintained a navy superior to that of any other nation, her policy being to keep it at a standard of strength equal to that of any two of the leading naval powers. Under this policy her commerce has extended to the farthest parts of the earth; she has grown in wealth and power. London was until the recent war the financial center of the world, and the day came when her navy saved not only the British Empire and her allies but possibly America from German domination. It requires a generation to train designers of warships, big guns, and submarines, engineers and mechanics to construct them, to build and maintain our yards and docks, and tools that must be kept in constant repair. Turn these men adrift, let our equipment deteriorate, and we will unquestionably see history repeat itself. The eyes of the world are turned with avarice upon the wealth of America, even as were those of the

Goths and Visigoths upon the wealth of Rome. Only yesterday there stood upon the floor of the Genoa conference delegates from the most powerful nation of the world in population and natural resources demanding a redistribution of the world's gold supply. America is said to have about half of this supply. These people well know that they have not that with which to buy this gold. Then, how is it to be redistributed? Let us not "destroy our battleships and other impedimenta of war in order to release funds for maternity and child hygiene," War Finance Corporation schemes for private interests, seeds for farmers whose average wheat yields have been above normal, bonuses for the strongest, most healthy, and most virile of American manhood, millions given to foreign countries in direct violation of the mandates of the Constitution that we have all taken a solemn oath to uphold, maintain, and keep inviolate.

It ill becomes gentlemen in this body to chide with extravagance those of us who wish to maintain our Navy at the highest degree of efficiency, when, notwithstanding a bonded debt of \$23,000,000,000 as the result of a war which came like a bolt from a blue sky, plus a floating debt of \$4,000,000,000, when they have themselves voted during this Congress, in cash and credits directly and through subsidiary organizations belonging to the Government, nearly and probably more than \$6,000,000,000. We have been 30 years in the building of a Navy of which the American people are justly proud, a branch of the service that is deservedly popular among the masses, an insurance against invasion, a guaranty of American prestige upon the seven seas, the strong arm that commands the respect of all nations of the world. European statesmen are to-day exerting themselves to draw America into its troubles, to secure our guaranty in some form or other of its war gains and its war losses. It will continue this policy until it succeeds or is convinced of failure. Let our Navy deteriorate and Europe will become convinced of its failure far more quickly. Its attitude of friendship may be, and probably will be, reversed. The murder at Serajevo was the excuse for an explosion of the smoldering lust to take that which thy neighbor hath. Can anyone believe that this characteristic sin, inherent in man since the days of Cain, has changed? Can anyone be so guileless as to believe that the Washington Disarmament Conference has recast human nature? If so, reduce the Navy and watch the result. Let us not find ourselves in the position of the foolish virgins. We may not, as in the last war, find friends who are willing to "lend us their oil." I can not sympathize with a policy of opening wide the doors to the vaults of our Treasury and inviting the theorists and idealists who may organize a few thoughtless people, come to Congress claiming to represent millions, and with demands and threats secure millions and billions of dollars from the pockets of the taxpayers, while we pretend to the people at home that we are responding to their demand for a lightening of the tax burden by deleting the necessary maintenance of our Navy, of our yards, machine shops, docks and bases, our harbor and river activities, our public buildings, and our national highways. We can not deceive the people. There was a time perhaps when this might have been done, but our splendid educational system has taught the great majority of our people to read and to think, and with an increasing acquirement of knowledge Congress, the most important branch of our Government, is being held more and more in contempt by the public, because it turns from the highway of statesmanship to follow the narrow trail of petty politics.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HIMES].

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chairman, I represent a district having no direct contact with navigable waters and so far removed from the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards as to be entirely safe from invasion unless, indeed, this entire land were overrun by foreign hordes. Accordingly, if the people in my district were narrowly selfish or selfishly narrow, it would behoove me to support the Committee on Appropriations in its laudable but nearsighted proposition to reduce the personnel of our Navy to 67,000 men.

But the people of my district, Mr. Chairman, are both broad-minded and patriotic. They have not forgotten that they gave to this Nation one of its greatest Presidents nor that they belong to the State that has become known as the Mother of Presidents. They have obtained and retain a national viewpoint, and I am confident that they would have me insist that we maintain the ratio as fixed by the Conference on the Limitation of Armament and not through false economy lose our prestige among the world powers.

Gentlemen may say that the world is tired of war or that we have no international enemies or that we are too remote to be subject to attack. They may be right, but are those good

reasons for our inviting attack and deliberately laying ourselves open to insults that necessarily lead to retaliation and war?

It would be presumptuous, indeed, for me, a new Member of this honorable body, to disagree with its distinguished leaders, were it not that in so doing it was possible for me to agree with leaders just as distinguished. Gentlemen say that the Navy can be properly manned with 67,000 men and others say that 86,000 men is the irreducible minimum. It is with no disrespect to the members of the Committee on Appropriations when I say that I choose to rely upon the judgment of the business men of the Navy Department, my colleagues of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Secretary of State, and our President.

From the inception of this Nation we have believed that international matters should be handled by the executive branch of the Government, subject to the approval of the legislative. This administration, in cooperation with leaders of the Senate, with the approval of the great majority of this House, and inspired by the prayers of a Nation, completed an international agreement whereby the United States might join with sister nations in reducing armaments in perfect safety. A ratio, intended to preserve a balance and not only make remote danger of war but to serve as a basis for negotiations looking toward future economies was worked out. I am in complete accord with my colleague [Mr. LONGWORTH] in the belief that our efforts toward international peace depend as much upon maintaining the 5-5-3 ratio as a minimum as upon our fulfilling our solemn pledge that it be our maximum. I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. FROTHINGHAM].

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, this has been a very enlightening debate. It comes down to the question of how many men we need on these ships to keep them up under the treaty. Advocates of the committee report for a Navy personnel of 67,000 and those advocating an increase to 86,000 both say their number will be sufficient. But it seems to me that if there is any doubt on the question the way to solve it is to take the greater number, and then you will know you have not made any mistake.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield? That being the case, 120,000 would be the number.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. The greater number that is before the House. If we had not had a large and potential Navy there would not have been a successful conference here in Washington. We would not have been in a position to call one and we would not have had anything to give up, to trade with, or to persuade other countries of our good faith. Besides, at the end of 10 years, when the treaty ends, we shall be in a weak position if we fail to keep our enlisted personnel to a proper standard. If we had not had a Navy second to only one in the world, that conference would not have come to a successful conclusion; and do you suppose for a minute that Great Britain would not have continued to maintain that she must have the largest navy in the world if we had not had the potentiality here, second to her, and still growing? Do you suppose that otherwise she would have conceded that this country could have a Navy equal to hers?

No, gentlemen; there is only one question, and that is whether you will be on the sure side and vote to have an adequate personnel for these ships, or whether you will let them go down hill.

Now, I would like to say one serious word to this House, if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] will give me his attention. I would like to point out one thing that has not been touched on by anyone here yet, and that is what happened at the time of the Spanish War in 1898.

The ship on which I served did not participate in the battle of Santiago, but I went over a short time afterwards with Admiral Sampson and others and visited those Spanish ships. Now, on paper before that war the Spanish Navy was held by some foreign experts to be the equivalent in ships and armament of the American Navy. Those ships were driven on the beach by our gunfire. They would have been driven on that beach anyway, no matter how they had been manned, because the men of the American Navy, their traditions, their ability, and quality were superior to those of any navy in the world.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman know how many men we had then?

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. I know how many we had then, and I know more or less the number in the Spanish Navy, and those were the competitors then. But I have only a few minutes, and I want to talk on the bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am sorry I interrupted the gentleman.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. It was discovered that those Spanish ships were not in proper condition. Why were they not kept in condition? Because they had not kept up the personnel of the Spanish Navy. They had not been kept up numerically, and it was currently reported that when Admiral Cervera came over here with those ships they had to empty the prisons in Spain to get the necessary number of men to put on them. The *Colon*, which was supposed to have a speed of 22 knots, was allowed to run down, so that she was overtaken by the *Oregon*, of 16 knots.

In those days the complement of a battleship was 500 men. Some of you may recall the couplet sent to Captain Evans, as he was then, by Rudyard Kipling. They ran something like this:

Zogbaum draws with a pencil, and I do things with a pen, while you sit up in a conning tower bossing 500 men.

On a battleship now some twelve hundred men are required. It is a city. Submarine defense, radio, wireless, airplanes, anti-aircraft defense, and a change in the method of gunfire have all come in, the guns are bigger, the ships are bigger, and all this requires more men.

Does anyone imagine that England and Japan will not keep theirs up to the limit? Of course they will.

I am for the policy which will keep the personnel of the American Navy first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of its countrymen. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER], and I would ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] if he has anybody left to plead his cause that he will use some of his time then. I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to my friend from Massachusetts that I have a very retiring disposition and do not want to crowd in. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak on the bill be permitted to extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FESS). That can not be done in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLSPAUGH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for one minute.

Mr. MILLSPAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I feel sure that I voice the sentiment of the people of my district in supporting the committee on this bill.

Living as I do in the midst of the great agricultural belt of the Nation which has been so sorely stricken by the financial stringency which came as an aftermath of the war; being fully cognizant of the difficulty which farmers and stockmen have encountered in securing funds with which to pay their taxes, caused by the enormous war expenditures, and realizing that the funds which must be raised to maintain our Army and Navy must eventually be produced from the soil, I am constrained to support the committee in its endeavor to reduce the Navy to the smallest number of men and ships which in their sound judgment they consider commensurate with our position in world affairs.

The people of my district, regardless of party affiliations, were keenly interested in the Washington peace conference and followed its deliberations with unflagging interest. They have manifested their satisfaction at the wonderful results obtained from the conference and feel that our country should go to the limit in disarmament for the dual purpose of demonstrating to the world that we regard our obligations seriously and are willing to take the lead in abolishing war and the war spirit and also to lift the war debt which hangs over us as the sword of Damocles.

When I made the pledge to do all in my power to reduce needless Government expenditures I meant what I said, and in looking over the legislation of the past year and considering the untrifling labors of the Appropriations Committee I can candidly say that we have kept the faith. The Army and Navy have been reduced, useless Government clerks have been dropped from the pay rolls, the Budget system has held a check on the department heads both as to employees and as to purchases for their several departments.

But, Mr. Chairman, while giving the Members my views on this bill I want to present to them another matter which I think is of interest to them.

Mr. Chairman, being a member of the District Committee and my attention having been called to the housing shortage in Washington, which condition seems to become more acute each week, I determined to seek the cause.

Starting with a well-founded suspicion that the Rent Commission was responsible for a goodly portion of the trouble, I deemed it wise to make an examination of its activities or inactivities, as you may choose to call it, and upon merely a cursory investigation I am convinced that this Utopian scheme is the cause of the distress of the wage earner as well as the man of moderate means in the District.

Although the commission is more than a thousand cases behind its docket, it has recently partially abandoned the docket where the rights of wage earners are involved and has upon its own initiative taken up the matter of fixing rents for the Chastleton and other apartments which are occupied principally by millionaires, Senators, and Representatives, in the meantime allowing the wage earners to be mulcted.

The commission is now more than seven months behind in its hearings, and a reference to its docket reveals the fact that there were 800 complaints filed from September 12, 1921, to November 28, 1921, of which number 48 have been acted upon.

In an official statement of the commission for the month of March, 1922, it is shown that 196 rent cases were determined by the commission, resulting in an increase in rents of \$311.50 per month and a decrease of \$1,277 per month, making a net decrease in rents for the entire month of \$965.50.

Assuming that this is a fair average of the results of the deliberations and determinations of the commission it will readily appear that the total net reduction of rents for one year will be less than \$12,000, while the expenses of the commission to produce this result will equal, if not exceed, \$45,000 per annum.

This means that the taxpayers of the District must pay \$27,000 per year, and the taxpayers of the country, your constituents and mine, must pay \$18,000 per year to maintain this pernicious system. In plain language it costs the taxpayers of the United States \$45,000 per year to secure a rent reduction of \$12,000 per year for a few people in the District of Columbia, and the millionaires seem to be given the preference in the functioning of the commission.

Referring again to statistics, it will readily be seen that the average rent reduction is less than \$5 per month.

The intimation is given that in partially abandoning the docket to take up the Chastleton hearings on its own initiative the commission is yielding to pressure from the Hill, which I hope is not true, for I do not believe there is a Member of this House who can justify himself in expending \$45,000 of the taxpayers' money in such a futile cause.

The Rent Commission renders a report to no one, so far as I can ascertain; is responsible to no one, and functions as it pleases without being examined or supervised at all.

The commission is asking for an enlargement of its personnel that it may catch up with its docket, but I am confident the taxpayers of the country will not look with favor on an extension of this pernicious legislation.

There are hundreds of new houses being built in Washington, and of these hundreds I have been unable to find a single one with a for rent sign upon it, as each house on being completed is readily sold, the result of the Ball Rent Act being to drive wage earners and people of moderate means to buy property on the installment plan at exorbitant prices. The Ball Rent Act has certainly been a godsend to the real-estate promoter.

I sincerely trust that although this measure has been jammed through the body at the other end of the Capitol as a result of propaganda, that the membership of this House, pledged as they are to economy in Government expenditures, may defeat it and remain true to their constituents.

I have made these remarks at this time in order that the Members may have time to consider the evil effects of this measure so that if the attempt is again made to force it through the House under gag rule the Members may act with full knowledge of the facts.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, of course I am for an adequate Navy, and I intend, of course, to vote for it.

If the committee, the House Committee on Appropriations, can convince me that this bill—H. R. 11228—as it stands, gives our country an adequate Navy, then I will vote for it.

But until then I am for the minority report, and if I could get a chance I would vote for a Navy of 100,000.

Professing no familiarity with professional figures, having no expert knowledge and no technical experience, I must do

the best thing possible—seek the best advice to be secured. [Applause.]

I have been, of course, impressed and swayed by the genial and generous, resourceful and wonderful subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, ex-Governor KELLEY. I am really afraid I have been too much affected by his impetuous oratory and advocacy of this bill. If ever there was an "imperial wizard" with naval figures it is Governor KELLEY. I would like to vote with him. But his name and fame are secure, anyhow.

However, I find that the minority report appears to embody nearly the views of the Secretaries of the Navy and of State—the trusted heads of the Navy Department and the State Department. We must trust somebody. The people trust Harding, he is trusting Denby and Hughes; both are, in my judgment, worthy of trust. And Secretary Hughes says "To alter the 5-5-3 relation would be a very serious matter for the United States, both impairing its prestige and putting its security in jeopardy." [Applause.]

My people are for an adequate Navy. I may have my doubts as to what is adequate. My people have no doubts. They are positive. They favor taking no chances.

If they ever were ignorant of the Navy they are not now; they know what an adequate Navy is.

They have been informed by those 2,000,000 men who returned from abroad after seeing great sacrifice, great service, and great seas, and the great value of a real Navy.

I am very, very sure that if there is one thing—one thing above all others—that is absolutely demanded by Illinois, it is an adequate Navy. [Applause.]

With this profound conviction and assurance as to my people, and confronted with a radical disagreement between men and officials who ought to know but who radically differ, I face the alternative of voting, on the one hand, for 67,000 men—67,000—as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, or voting, on the other hand, for 86,000 men—86,000—as recommended by the House Committee on Naval Affairs and by the minority of this subcommittee. What shall I do? What would my people do? I feel now that I will vote for the 86,000—"and if this be treason, make the most of it." I will take no chances. [Applause.]

It has been said here—well said—that there is nothing in the history of England or Japan to cause us to trust them blindly or to assume they will not prepare fully.

Be not deceived.

On the contrary, the entire history of both England and Japan warns us that both England and Japan will surely arm—right square up to the highest and last notch of efficiency allowed in the 5-5-3 treaty—and England, by the way, will do it with our money, money she owes us. Be not deceived. This is no time for "weasel words."

It is true that gentlemen arguing for the little Navy—the 67,000 men—67,000—exclaim, "Oh, the country is not rich enough to pay for 20,000—20,000—more men"; and they repeat over and over again, "Is the country so rich?"

The downright answer, stripped of all mental reservation and all equivocation and all evasion, is, "Yes; the country is rich; too rich to be pacifist; too rich to risk again the awful danger of 1917 and 1918; it is rich enough to defend itself, and do it right."

Then why, why, in the name of common sense and in the name of love of country, and why, in the name of our oaths, yours and mine, registered in heaven, should we, we alone, disarm, making the ratio no longer 5-5-3, but 5-3-2½—yes, 5-3-2½—5 for England and 3 for Japan and 2½ for us? To do that would be dangerously near indulging in pacifism.

Theodore Roosevelt, whose name will always be inseparably linked with the American Navy, in a speech to 20,000 cheering people, his last at Springfield, Ill.—the last speech I heard him deliver, said:

And now comes the pacifist, and he says, says the pacifist, "Come, now, let us be harmless; because the more harmless we are the less harm other people will do to us; so come, now, let us be harmless."

This puncturing of pacifism was greeted with cheers, uproarious and tumultuous.

I believe I know how this lover of liberty and of his country would vote on this question. He would vote for an adequate Navy and take no chances, and would thus insure the peace of the world and thus lessen, at least for a time, the horrors of war, which will always threaten this old world until God sees fit to change the natures of men. [Applause.]

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

Mr. YATES. May I have one minute more?

Mr. VARE. I am very sorry I have not the time.

Mr. YATES. I had the promise of one more minute.

Mr. VARE. I yield the gentleman one more minute.

Mr. YATES. I want, in that one minute, to answer, with another question, the question asked by the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GARRETT, the Democratic leader. Another gentleman had the floor—the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GOODYKOONTZ]—and he was interrupted by the gentleman from Tennessee, who, with urbanity and suavity asked the childlike and bland question: "Against whom are we arming? Who can possibly be our foe?" I answer that question by asking, Who will be our friend? Will it be Japan or will it be old England? No; there is not a nation in the world to-day that is our friend. They are all suspicious and unfriendly, and I am in favor of arming on that theory and not disarming on the theory of the gentleman that we have no foe. When he asks, "Who is our foe?" I reply, "We waked up one day 30 years after the Revolution and found ourselves again at war with England. Then, 30 years later, we had to go to war with Mexico. Then, 17 years later, we were on the verge of war again with England over the Trent incident. Then, 35 years later, our foe was Spain. And only 20 years later we were at war with Germany and Austria. Just before all of these wars there were men who asked, "Who will be our foe?"

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and nineteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. VARE. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHANDLER].

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, love for the Republic and patriotic devotion to its highest interests should prompt all our actions here, especially in the matter of providing for adequate national defense.

Every Member of this House and of the Senate, every officer of the Government, State and Federal, and, indeed, every American everywhere, should love America as Macaulay says Pitt loved England, as an Athenian loved Athens, as a Roman loved the "City of Seven Hills."

No cowardly impulse, no sectional selfishness, no narrow view of patriotism, no partisan prejudice, no sordid stinginess, should ever remotely influence our legislative conduct in providing for the common defense and promoting the general welfare of our country. Rather let us invoke the lofty and patriotic spirit of the Revolutionary fathers and of the saviors of the later Republic, who held no cost too heavy and no sacrifice too great when the sacred rights of humanity were to be proclaimed and the great cause of liberty and of union was to be defended and maintained.

The people of my district, like those of yours, my colleagues, are God-fearing and peace loving. They pray for peace perpetual with national honor unimpaired. But they are red-blooded Americans all, who love their country, believe in it, adore its flag, and are ready, if need be, to fight and die for both. They believe in both preparedness and peace—peace, if possible, with honor and self-respect; preparedness as a guaranty of victory if war must come.

During the last few weeks my office has been flooded with letters from the people of my district protesting against the destruction of the American Army and the American Navy. Hundreds upon hundreds have conveyed to me the double message of preparedness and peace. These letters are instructions from those whom I have the honor to represent to use my best endeavors to promote and maintain an honorable peace between America and all the other nations of the earth, but to neglect no act and leave no stone unturned to create and maintain a state of national preparedness that would enable the Republic to defend grandly and successfully its territory and its flag if war should come. These instructions are sacredly binding upon me, and by my vote and voice in Congress I shall obey them. In other words, I shall stand and do stand for the strongest possible Navy personnel that the circumstances of this day and time will allow. I shall vote for 86,000, as provided by the Vare amendment, instead of 67,000 as provided by the bill. I should like to vote for 96,000 asked by the Navy Department, if it were possible. I will not consent to the scrapping of the American Navy by the American Congress.

I am in favor of strong national preparedness, but I am opposed to militarism. I want my country to be and to remain forever the great advocate of peace among all the countries of the world. I want our glorious flag to represent forever the force and justice of democracy and military discipline, and not the tyranny and oppression of autocracy and military despotism.

The founders of the Republic designed it to be a perpetual asylum of liberty and of peace. They intended that the civil should remain forever above the military authority. They emphasized this design when they made the President of the Republic, a civilian officer, the head of both the Army and the Navy. I sincerely trust that their beneficent intentions will prevail to the end of time.

But the builders of our Government were not pacifists, "peace at any price" men, who prefer humiliation to battle and the ease and quiet of a voluptuous existence to the fierce struggle of life in which courage and strength are born. They were men of blood and iron who preferred death and annihilation to dishonor and disgrace. They knew that the infant Republic had been created in the throes of revolution—in seven years and eight months of arduous toil and bitter struggle. Their vision was prophetic, and they foresaw that insurrection from within and invasion from without would necessitate military and naval preparedness if America was to remain united and free and if the safety and dignity of the country were to be successfully defended and maintained.

No wonder then that Washington, in his fifth annual address, gave to his countrymen this sage advice:

I can not recommend to your notice measures for the fulfillment of our duties to the rest of the world without again pressing upon you the necessity of placing ourselves in a position of complete defense. The United States ought not to indulge a persuasion that, contrary to the order of human events, they will forever keep at a distance those painful appeals to arms with which the history of every other nation abounds. There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld if not absolutely lost by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

No wonder that John Adams, in his second annual message, dealing with our relations with France, should have used this language:

But in demonstrating by our conduct that we do not fear war in the necessary protection of our rights and honor, we should give no room to infer that we abandon the desire of peace. An efficient preparation for war can alone secure peace.

No wonder that Thomas Jefferson, in his fifth annual message, advocated—

The organization of 300,000 able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 26 for offense or defense at any time or at any place where they may be wanted.

It is interesting at this point to note that Thomas Jefferson advocated a larger Army for the defense of a small Republic of fewer than 20 States, populated by fewer than 5,000,000 people, than some of his Democratic descendants are willing to provide for the defense of a giant Republic of 48 States and several colonies, with a population of more than 100,000,000 people. It would be more interesting still if the virile, pugnacious, red-headed author of the Declaration of Independence, founder of the University of Virginia, and third President of the United States could appear again upon the earth and express himself after hearing members of his own party as well as Republicans advocate the gradual disbanding of the Army and destruction of the Navy at the very moment that a justly alarmed people demand that their Representatives in Congress provide them with means of adequate national defense.

The greatest obstacles in the way of maintaining adequate military and naval preparedness are the theories and objections of professional pacifists, who are to be found both in and out of Congress. The convictions of these men should not be derided or denounced. Their aims are high, their motives are pure, and their impulses are generous and fine. Their hopes and aspirations for permanent and universal peace are honorable to human nature and are a splendid tribute to the higher and better qualities of the minds and hearts of men. But they are dangerous nevertheless, for they are nothing more than plain idealists and deluded dreamers. In making forecasts of the future they take no account of the past. The teachings of history mean nothing to them. The inherent savagery in man and the inevitable experiences of human life do not seem to impress them seriously. They refuse to ground their convictions in what men have done as the best assurance of what men may do, but insist on coloring their arguments with all the tints of the rainbow and on weaving them from the warp and woof of mere fancy and conjecture.

It is a ghastly and sickening thought, but if human history teaches anything, it is that man is a savage animal and that recurring wars are as inevitable as the certain return of the tides of the sea.

In 1908, at Chicago, the late brilliant and gifted ex-Governor Black, of New York, nominated Mr. Roosevelt for the Presidency. The following is an extract from that perfectly polished gem of oratory:

The fate of nations is still decided by their wars. You may talk of orderly tribunals and learned referees; you may sing in your schools the gentle praises of the quiet life; you may strike from your books the last note of every martial anthem, and yet out in the smoke and thunder will always be the tramp of horses and the silent, rigid, up-turned face. Men may prophesy and women pray, but peace will come here to abide forever upon this earth only when the dreams of childhood are the accepted charts to guide the destinies of men.

This sentiment may seem pessimistic and be painfully disappointing and distressing, but the teaching is sound in the light of human history and experience, and we should never forget that the only safe guide for our footsteps upon the highway of the future is the light of the past.

A state of warfare seems to be the normal condition of human life and the bloody pastime of the nations. For thousands of years the peoples of the earth have been at each other's throats in terrific struggles. The gates of Janus, in Rome, were closed for short periods only three times in 700 years. Within the memory of men now living every important nation on the globe has fought three important wars, and many of them four or five. Our own dear country is no exception to the rule. The brief span of the life of our Republic has been marked by six great conflicts—the War of the Revolution, the War of 1812 with England, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the War with Spain, and the War with the Central Powers. This does not take into account the Florida wars, the wars with the Barbary States, nor the various Indian wars that have marked the progress of our history.

For ages it has been the dream of philanthropy and the hope of religion that the perfection of Christian life and the advance of civilization would do away with all wars by illuminating the reason, softening the heart, and taming the savage qualities of men. But has this been realized? Let the terrible world struggle that has just ended answer.

The Sermon on the Mount is the chart of the soul on the sea of life, and its beatitudes are the glorification of the virtues of gentleness, mercy, love, and peace. Nearly 2,000 years have passed since the Prophet of Nazareth delivered this sublime and solemn message to mankind, and yet within the last six years the appalling and pathetic spectacle has been presented of the Christian nations of the world employing all the devilish ingenuity and the hellish methods that fertile brains and scientific aids could furnish to devise yet more fiendish means and to invent still greater guns to blow other Christian brains into seething froth.

No; let us not be deceived by the thought nor be beguiled by the hope that civilization as we now understand it will ever bring lasting peace. History and experience have taught us that civilization at best is but a veneer, and that the slightest scratch will reveal beneath the surface the savage in the man. A pastoral commonwealth with justice and peace forever seated at the confines of the Nation is a Utopian dream.

Let the pacifists indulge their visions of a millennium of peace. But let practical patriotic men pay no attention to them. Let us not forget that the bitter experiences of our race teach us that wars are inevitable and that they come seemingly in obedience to a law as pitiless and inexorable as that which dooms us to the dust. Let us not forget that a solemn obligation rests upon us, under our constitutional oaths as Congressmen, to provide for the "common defense" as well as to promote the "general welfare." Let us then meet the great issue of national preparedness intelligently and fearlessly in the light rather of human history and experience than in the shadow of the fears of theorists and dreamers.

I do not hesitate to tell you, my colleagues, that I have more confidence in the teachings of history than I have in the deliberations and proclamations of international disarmament conferences. Furthermore, I do not hesitate to say to you that I prefer to guide my political conduct in this body by history and human experience rather than by the resolutions of any handful of men however grandly gifted and endowed.

In closing, then, I wish to state my preparedness creed: I believe that a Republic of 100,000,000 people, with several thousand miles of coast line to protect, with important insular possessions to defend, with the Panama Canal to fortify and guard, and with the Monroe doctrine to maintain should have a standing Army of at least 200,000 men, with adequate militia and volunteer reserves, together with a Navy at least second among the navies of the world.

This belief represents my personal conviction and reflects, I am convinced, the sentiments and wishes of a very large majority of my constituents, and I shall act upon this belief in my vote to-day.

Repeating a single sentence from the fifth annual address of Washington, heretofore referred to, that "there is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld if not absolutely lost by the reputation of weakness," I wish to



say. Mr. Chairman, in closing, that I have an abiding and unbounded faith in the great destiny and in the undying glory of my country. I believe that the time is not far distant when American genius and American influence will dominate the nations and overshadow the earth; when our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence will be the mold and model of free institutions among all the tribes of men; when the torch of freedom which was lit at the flame of the American Revolution will be a beacon light to the oppressed of all mankind; when our soldiers and our sailors will be feared and respected on every land and on every sea; when the drumbeat of our country will be heard around the world; when freedom's flag will illumine all the skies; and, whether proceeding from the mouth of an ambassador or from the hot throats of Federal guns, when the mandate of the great Republic will be heard and obeyed throughout the earth. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER]. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, certainly there exists no rational ground now for apprehending war troubles in the near future. We have just concluded very far-reaching treaties with all the great naval powers of the world, and the President has spoken in a most assuring vein to the people of the Nation as to what these treaties promise in the way of peace for the future. Since the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHANDLER], notwithstanding these treaties and the 10-year naval holiday which they promise, seem still to see dark clouds of war hovering over us, I respectfully invite their attention to some excerpts from a speech delivered by the President at the concluding session of the peace conference. Among other things, he said:

But the whole achievement has so cleared the atmosphere that it will seem like breathing the refreshing air of a new morn of promise.

When you first met I told you of our America's thought to seek less of armament and none of war; that we sought nothing which is another's, and we were unafraid, but that we wished to join you in doing that finer and nobler thing which no nation can do alone. We rejoice in the accomplishment.

How sane and simple and satisfying to seek the relationship of peace and security.

I once believed in armed preparedness. I advocated it. But I have come now to believe there is a better preparedness in a public mind and a world opinion made ready to grant justice precisely as it exacts it. And justice is better served in conferences of peace than in conflicts at arms.

Again, gentlemen of the conference, congratulations and the gratitude of the United States! To Belgium, to the British Empire, to China, to France, to Italy, to Japan, to the Netherlands, and to Portugal I can wish no more than the same feeling which we experience, of honorable and honored contribution to happy human advancement, and a new sense of security in the righteous pursuits of peace and all attending good fortune.

It might be well for the President also to read again his own speech, since in a recent letter to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] he expresses doubt as to whether we have advanced sufficiently along the paths of peace to adopt what the Appropriations Committee of the House now recommend as an adequate and sane naval program for the year 1923. This speech certainly shows that the President, when the conference adjourned, and the Senate's ratification of the treaties was urged, strongly felt that we had advanced far along the paths of peace, and that our country was reasonably safe for the next 10 years at least from all dangers and misunderstandings that might lead to war. The people of our country accepted the action of the conference in that fine spirit and belief that bespoke an international cooperation and understanding, so hearty and sincere as to dispel all thought of impending war, and so great was their faith in the agreements made that very general public approval has been given the Senate's ratification of the treaties. As a result, our country is now preparing to scrap not only 15 of the older battleships but also 13 of the most powerful war vessels ever designed, all of which are nearing completion, and on which millions have been spent. These 13 great warships would have been finished within the next two years, and on their completion America's supremacy of the seas could not have been challenged by any power.

In August, 1916, Congress authorized the building of 10 battleships, 4 of which, when finished, would have been the speediest, the most destructive, the most powerful ever designed by the mind of man. The same act also provided for six battle cruisers, the speediest, the most effective for offensive and defensive warfare ever authorized for any Navy. No nation had any ships like these, built or building, and it is doubtful whether any other nation has the financial ability to construct now or in the near future such giant weapons of destruction.

Yet under the treaty all of these great battle cruisers and seven of the battleships are to be scrapped, and included in the seven battleships to be scrapped are our four greatest, with a displacement of 42,000 tons each, a speed of 23 knots, each carrying twelve 16-inch guns, capable of throwing with accuracy steel projectiles weighing 2,100 pounds more than 25 miles. No one questioned on the completion of this great building program, already far advanced, that the United States would possess the most powerful naval vessels of these two types afloat.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. Not just now. Certainly America's willingness to scrap her greatest weapons of destruction was the highest evidence of her faith in the treaty promises of peace for the future. [Applause.]

We will now have no battleships of more than 21 knots speed and none with the gun power or tonnage displacement of those we have agreed to destroy; we will have no great battle cruisers in our Navy; and yet so great was our faith in the agreements entered into with our former allies that we have permitted Great Britain to retain many capital ships, with a speed of 23, 25, and 32 knots, carrying great modern 15-inch guns, and to build two additional battleships of 35,200 tons displacement—larger than any we have retained, with no limit as to speed. Mark my prediction, she will build these two with light side armor, with decks well protected, each carrying not exceeding two or four 16-inch guns, and of great speed, with the greatest possible space for aircraft. No navy will have any vessels in point of effectiveness like unto them.

Japan has been allowed to retain battleships faster than ours, and she will also have more than five battle cruisers, armed with great modern guns, having a speed of more than 32 knots.

If, then, there are in fact substantial grounds, as some wildly imagine, for the fears expressed by a few as to our country's security, then the conferees, the President, the Senate, and the people who indorse their action have shown a degree of reckless, thoughtless carelessness, little short of treason, in agreeing to scrap six great battle cruisers and seven great battleships now nearing early completion. These 13 ships, from the standpoint of naval value, measured by speed, gun power, tonnage, and effectiveness, possess more than double the value of the 18 capital ships which the treaty permits us to retain, and which must constitute the entire capital-ship strength of our Navy until long after 1932, because the treaty forbids any further construction of capital ships by the United States until after 1932.

In this connection it may be well to take a passing inventory as to the military value of these 18 capital ships of our Navy. Eleven have a tonnage displacement ranging from 24,000 to 27,000 tons, with a speed of about 20 knots, each carrying from eight to ten 14-inch guns, capable of throwing a projectile weighing 1,400 pounds about 20 miles; three will have a tonnage displacement of 33,000, a speed of 21 knots, each carrying 16-inch guns, capable of throwing a projectile of 2,100 pounds about 24 miles. We at present only have one of this last type; the other two are now in course of construction and will be completed probably by 1925. The remaining 6 of our 18 capital ships are less than 21,000 tons displacement, with a speed of 18 or 19 knots, each ship carrying 12-inch guns only, with a range of about 15 miles and capable of throwing a projectile of 870 pounds only. Two of the 12-inch-gun ships are to be scrapped when the two battleships now building are completed.

The six 12-inch-gun ships have no real naval value; any one of the seven great battleships or battle cruisers which we are to scrap could have successfully met and destroyed all of the six in an hour's time, without even subjecting itself to gunfire from the ships so destroyed. A battleship is like a woman's hat—only good in its season.

So for the next two years our capital fleet will consist of only 12 battleships of real military value, which last number will be increased to 14 about 1925, and this 14 will constitute our Navy's real capital-ship strength until long after 1932. Great Britain in speed, tonnage, gun power, and number of ships is now unquestionably superior, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] has well pointed out.

The point that I wish to impress on the House is this: That out of the 18 capital ships we are allowed to retain under the treaty, we will have but 14 of any real military value, and yet we are not complaining. And why? Simply because we have faith in the agreements we have made with the great naval powers of the world, and we believe that for the next 10 years all danger of war has been reduced to a minimum, if not made impossible. [Applause.]

Naval experts know, and our people should be informed, however, that at present we have neither a balanced fleet nor one on a 5-5 basis with Great Britain. We have more destroyers,

more submarines, but Great Britain has more and faster battleships and at least seven battle cruisers, whereas we have none; she has five or six aero-carrying ships, and we have only one of very doubtful value. The treaty, however, permits the United States to build five aero-carrying ships, aggregating 135,000 tonnage, and authorizes two of our modern battle cruisers, now in course of building, to be converted into aero-carrying ships of 33,000 tons displacement each, with no limit as to speed, but carrying only 8-inch guns.

It is important, then, that this Congress appropriate sufficient money to build not less than two modern aero-carrying ships of great speed, because only on the completion of the five aero-carrying ships authorized by the treaty can we feel that we have a balanced and really effective Navy. In future the first line of offense and the best line of defense, so far-advanced naval experts advise, will be our Air Service. [Applause.]

Let me again repeat that until you have built great aero-carrying ships and perfected your Air Service organization our Navy will not be equal to Great Britain's, and this fact is frankly admitted by every naval authority; yet, notwithstanding this, I submit America feels unafraid. [Applause.] Not only are we unalarmed but we are even now looking forward to the time when another conference can be called which will place further limitations on capital ships, and limitations also on submarines and other weapons of destruction. [Applause.]

Then why, may I ask, under these conditions should we listen to the insistent demands of the Navy Department to provide at great expense war complements for our capital ships and a great surplus of men for shore stations?

I wish to discuss this matter from a business standpoint with the Members of the House, because I feel that if the House is acquainted with the facts, as we know them, they will not vote millions of dollars for needless expense. We all love the American Navy. [Applause.] No man here knowingly would do it hurt. It is our country's best security, and far be it from me to detract from or say aught in criticism of its wonderful past achievements, both in war and in peace. [Applause.]

Neither the Navy Department nor naval officers, however, are immune to mistakes, and this Congress well knows how extravagant indeed are the estimates they often submit. I have previously called the attention of the House to the fact that it is not unusual for naval officers to widely disagree as to the number of enlisted men required to efficiently man the Navy. In 1919 the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy was 181,000. The following year, over the strong protest of the Navy Department, the committee reduced the enlisted personnel to 120,000. Naval officers then strenuously insisted that the Navy could not efficiently function with less than 160,000 enlisted men, yet Congress wisely and against the advice of high naval officers at the head of the bureaus of the Navy Department cut the enlisted strength to 120,000. Who will undertake to say now that we hurt the Navy by this action? Yet we saved a large sum of money to the Federal Treasury by refusing to follow the advice of naval officers.

Last year these same naval officers insisted that they must have 120,000 men for the present fiscal year, 1922; yet Congress, over their protest, cut it to 106,000; and who, again may I ask, will deny that our action was wise? You will recall that the heads of the bureaus fooled our good friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] last year to the extent that in a speech before the House he stated that he was advised by the Navy Department that if the enlisted personnel of the Navy was cut to 106,000 that only 13 battleships could be kept in commission. We to-day find him again in a speech to the House on last Monday stating that the Navy Department now advises that if the enlisted personnel is cut to 67,000 they can only retain in active commission 13 battleships. Rather a remarkable coincidence that they should have fixed on 13 as being the number of battleships that could be retained in active commission, whether you have 106,000 or 67,000 men. The pending amendment to fix the enlisted personnel at 86,000 will be over the protest of naval officers, because they are now demanding 106,000. In other words, it would seem that we always find them willing to take for the next year what you gave them this year, especially when the question is raised as to whether they are entitled to the number they now have. Congress has not blindly followed in the past the advice either of the General Board, the Navy Department, or any combination of high naval officers, and in failing to do so I submit that we have done no hurt to our Navy.

A careful, judicial, and unbiased study of the facts will now disclose to the Members of the House that the committee in reporting the pending bill have provided sufficient men and sufficient money for the fiscal year 1923 to efficiently man and oper-

ate all of the ships which the Navy Department states is its desire or purpose to keep in active commission during 1923.

I respectfully submit that an examination of the table furnished by the Secretary of the Navy to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], appearing on page 5551 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will disclose that with 86,000 men the Navy Department proposes to keep in commission the same number of ships, and no more, than the pending bill seeks to provide shall be kept in commission with 67,000 men. The essential differences, then, between the Navy Department in its use of the enlisted personnel of 86,000 men, provided for in the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE], and in its use of the 67,000 provided for in the pending bill are simply these: The Navy Department desires to place on 18 capital ships, as shown by the table on page 5551 of the RECORD, 23,369 men, including flagship complements and fleet aviation detachments, whereas the pending bill provides for these same capital ships only 19,591 men, including flagship complements and fleet aviation detachments. The Navy Department further desires, as shown by the table on page 5551, to keep at shore stations, including shore base submarine tenders, 28,732 men, whereas the pending bill provides for these same shore stations only 16,176 men. Certainly this Congress, if the Members will only read the hearings, are not willing to provide 28,732 men for shore station duties in the Navy during 1923. A careful reading of the hearings will show that the committee has made generous provision for these activities.

Now, as to the complements for the capital ships, the pending bill provides not only for all capital ships but also for the other ships which the Navy Department proposes to keep in commission during 1923 more men than were actually carried on these same ships during January of the present year, when the Navy had 100,000 men or more to draw from.

The real item of difference between the table submitted by the Secretary on page 5551 of the RECORD and the pending bill, as the same relates to the enlisted personnel on our ships, is in fact reduced to the size of the complements on our 18 battleships. The pending bill provides not only more men than were carried on these ships in January of this year, but it provides, as complements for each of these 18 battleships, more men than the General Board of the Navy and the Bureau of Navigation fixed as the number to be carried on these ships when the ships were originally designed.

We may even apply a further test to show that an adequate complement for each of our capital ships has been provided for in the pending bill, namely, for 1923 we have given to each of these capital ships more officers and enlisted men than were carried on any 18 battleships of Great Britain's during September, 1918, at a time when Great Britain was carrying on all of her battleships full war complements.

In proof of these claims I submit, first, that a report from the Navy Department itself, as set out in the hearings, shows that we have provided, with the 67,000, more men for the ships to be kept in commission in 1923 than were actually carried on these same ships in January of this year.

As to the claim that we have provided an excess number over the complements fixed by the General Board and the Bureau of Navigation when the ships were originally designed, I respectfully refer the Members of the House to a full discussion of this subject before the House Naval Affairs Committee on December 31, 1918, where Secretary Daniels supplied to the committee a table showing the original complements fixed by the General Board and the Bureau of Navigation for eight of our present battle fleet. I quote from page 916 of the hearings as follows:

*Designed complement of ships.*

New York	902
Arkansas	916
Wyoming	915
Texas	902
Delaware	830
North Dakota	830
Utah	828
Florida	837

Secretary Daniels, in discussing this table in connection with the increased number of men that some naval officers were then recommending as peace complements for our capital ships, made the following statement to the committee:

In my judgment, there is not a ship in the American Navy that is not overmanned and the number of men should be reduced; but there are officers in the Navy, able and very splendid men, who believe that we should now make a permanent complement on the ships equal to our war complement which, in my judgment, is the greatest waste of men and the greatest waste of money that could possibly be permitted.

If the Members of the House, in connection with the table giving the complements fixed by the General Board for the ships,

as they were designed, will read the interesting speech made by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] and add to the designed complements the numbers which Mr. FRENCH points out may be added on account of fire control and other changes made after the ships were designed, you will find that the pending bill provides for this additional number of men on every capital ship in a most generous way. [Applause.]

Now, in support of the claim that the pending bill provides for our 18 capital ships more men and officers than were carried on any like number of Great Britain's greatest capital ships during the war, I beg to submit a table, accepted by the House Naval Affairs Committee in December, 1918, as officially correct, and which table clearly shows that the total number of officers and enlisted men carried on British battleships during the war was less than the number which the pending bill provides for our battleships in 1923. The list I have just referred to was furnished by Secretary Daniels and can be found on page 917 of the hearings, and the following taken therefrom gives the names of 18 of Great Britain's best battleships, with the dates of their completion, their tonnage displacement, and the number of officers and men carried on each ship as of September 30, 1918, which was long after the Battle of Jutland and shortly before the war closed:

Battleships.	Completion.	Displacement.	Officers and men.
		Tons.	
Royal Sovereign.....	Apr. 29, 1915	25,750	942
Royal Oak.....	Nov. 17, 1914	25,750	977
Revenge.....	May 29, 1915	25,750	1970
Resolution.....	Jan. 14, 1915	25,750	937
Ramillies.....	Sept. 12, 1916	25,750	937
Malaya.....	Mar. 18, 1915	27,500	955
Valiant.....	Nov. 4, 1914	27,500	957
Barham.....	Dec. 31, 1914	27,500	1985
Queen Elizabeth.....	Oct. 16, 1913	27,500	11,016
Warsprite.....	Nov. 26, 1913	27,500	957
Erin (late Reshadieh).....	Sept. 3, 1913	23,000	1,130
Benbow.....	Nov. 12, 1913	25,000	1,995
Emperor of India.....	Oct. 24, 1912	25,000	1,995
Marlborough.....	Oct. 12, 1912	25,000	995
Iron Duke.....	Mar. 21, 1912	23,000	915
Ajax.....	Nov. 18, 1911	23,000	812
Centurion.....	Oct. 9, 1911	23,000	1,849
King George V.....			

<sup>1</sup> Flagship.

The above table shows the British war complements on 18 of her great battleships, as carried in September, 1918—6 of the ships included in the list being flagships. The total number of officers and men carried on these 18 British ships during the war was 17,409, and the total number which the pending bill provides for our 18 capital ships during 1923 is 19,591. In other words, the pending bill provides for our 18 battleships as peace complements in 1923, 2,182 more enlisted men than the total number of officers and enlisted men carried on 18 British battleships during the war. [Applause.]

And in this connection, it is proper to say that the statement has been invariably made that the British war complement was at least 10 per cent greater than her peace complement.

Who will now deny that the pending bill provides for all of our 18 battleships, first, a complement in excess of the actual number carried on these same ships in January of this year; second, a complement largely in excess of the number fixed by the General Board and the Bureau of Navigation, when the ships were originally designed; and, third, 2,182 more men than were carried on 18 of Great Britain's largest and best battleships in September, 1918, during war. If these claims be conceded, then what reason can there be for providing 23,369 men—the number which the Navy Department now insists should be carried on these 18 capital ships? The mere statement of the question, it seems to me, carries its own answer.

Now, if it is the desire of the House to provide this large peace complement for 18 battleships, 6 of which have no real military value, and to provide more than 28,000 men for shore stations, then, of course, you should vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE]. It is well to remember, however, when you add useless personnel increases to the Navy for 1923, that the hope of the people of our country that the peace conference would result in substantial reductions in naval appropriations can not be realized.

Already we are told by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that if the enlisted personnel is increased to 86,000, and the amount necessary for scrapping the 28 ships provided for in the treaty is appropriated, that the total amount expended on the Navy for 1923 will total about the same as was appropriated for in

1922. With 28 capital ships to be scrapped, with a large number of submarine chasers, Eagle boats, and other small craft of no military value to be either sold or put out of commission, with a large number of destroyers and other auxiliary craft to be put in reserve, surely the House must know that the Navy enlisted personnel can and should be greatly reduced, and the pending bill undertakes to do this.

I respectfully submit that we have provided an adequate number of men to man our ships and care for all naval activities during 1923, and out of the savings thus effected we should provide for the immediate construction of two aero-carrying ships, which I have attempted to show are now urgently needed in the fleet and the building of which should not be longer delayed.

In conclusion, since strong opposition has now developed in the House, in the administration, and in the Navy and War Departments against any reduction in either the officer or enlisted personnel of these services, it may be well here to set out some facts showing a comparison between our Military Establishment prior to the war and at the present time. In 1916 we had approximately 8,694 officers in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps and the other allied services. We now have in these same services 21,558 officers. The enlisted personnel of the Army is now twice what it was in 1916, that of the Navy is about double the size of what it was in 1916, and the Marine Corps is more than one-half as large again. We have at our universities and colleges 95,000 young men in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps units and a large number under the War Department in training at high schools and other institutions in addition to this 95,000.

The abnormal increase in the number of generals, colonels, lieutenant colonels, and captains of the Army, of admirals, captains, commanders, lieutenant commanders, and lieutenants of the Navy will later furnish interesting information to the people of our country, especially to our farmers, when they study the cost of maintaining the Army and Navy for 1923.

It is evident now that strong pressure is being brought to bear by the administration to maintain the Army at 150,000, notwithstanding the House by a large vote favored its reduction to 115,000, and we have seen and felt in the House during the week the hand of the administration in the increase now proposed for the Navy. Well may we ask: When will the time come that our Military Establishment is to be placed on a peace-time basis?

It would seem that with a strong federalized National Guard, now numbering about 150,000 in its enlisted personnel, and with about 8,000 officers, this country can well afford to materially reduce its regular standing Army, and the recent peace conference certainly gave promise of large reductions in the Navy.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Under leave to extend I wish to insert a further statement read to the House Naval Affairs Committee by Secretary Daniels on December 30, 1918, as set out on page 912 of the hearings. The statement is as follows:

It seemed to be universally agreed by all naval experts that in passing from the predreadnought class of battleship to the dreadnought a reduction in the cost of maintenance would result because of two factors: (a) That the small ship with a great number of small-caliber guns required more men and officers than a larger ship with large-caliber guns only, therefore the complement of a dreadnought would be less than the complement of the predreadnought; (b) the change from the coal-burning to the fuel-oil burning battleship would reduce the complement of the dreadnought as compared with the predreadnought. While only the latest battleships have been oil burners exclusively, and although a reduction in the engineers' forces has resulted, nevertheless the complements of the ships of the Navy have been constantly increasing and have been increased far beyond the designed complement at the time the ships were laid down.

On January 11, 1907, President Roosevelt, in advocating the authorization of the "11 big-gun ship" in his message to Congress, stated as follows upon recommendations of the experts of the Navy Department: "Moreover, though a large ship consumes more coal, a small ship having a large number of small guns—6-inch, etc.—actually requires more men and officers than a large one having heavy guns only, and consequently each small ship costs at least as much to maintain and repair. For example, the complement of a dreadnought of 18,000 tons is 690 officers and men, while that of the *Louisiana* of 16,000 tons is about 850."

In 1910 the war complement of the *Louisiana* was stated as 954 men and the peace complement as 834 men, while in 1915 a report from the fleet itself placed the peace complement of the *Louisiana* at 1,137 men. The *Louisiana* is cited because in 1907 the experts in advising President Roosevelt placed the complement at 850 officers and men.

For instance, the *New York*; the designed complement is 902 enlisted men. In 1915 the complement was stated at 1,094 as a flagship, and to-day she has on board 1,444 men as a flagship, and the peace comple-

ment, as determined by a board now in session in the fleet, will be probably 1,410 men. Another instance is the *Delaware*, whose designed complement was 830 men; in 1915, 981; to-day, 1,094; and the board in session in the fleet will probably recommend a peace complement of 1,247 men. When the plans for the modern dreadnoughts were laid down such ships as the *Pennsylvania* and *Arizona* were designed to carry 937 men, but the number of enlisted men actually on board to-day is 1,440 for the *Pennsylvania* and 1,540 for the *Arizona*. While it is true that the battleship force has been used for training purposes during the war, there is, nevertheless, a board in the fleet now in session to recommend the complement of the battleships, and it is probable they will recommend a complement of about 1,420 men for the *Pennsylvania* and 1,490 men for the *Arizona*. This is an increase of 556 and 626 men, respectively, over the designed complements in time of peace.

The complement of enlisted men of the ships of the Navy has increased to such an extent that the crowded condition becomes a matter of concern as regards efficiency and sanitation. The division commander of the American forces operating with the British Grand Fleet, Rear Admiral Hugh Rodman, has forwarded a criticism to the department relating to offices, compartments, and sleeping space, stating that the men are crowded and are "packed in like sardines in a tin, two and three deep at times, in close, poorly ventilated berth deck compartments," and recommends that no more changes be made in the ship where the change will encroach upon the space for the crew, as it tends to cause more men to find sleeping billets on the "already crowded berth deck."

The number of men on the ships to which Admiral Rodman made reference in his letter to the Secretary were war complements carried on the ships, consisting of about 1,400 men to the ship. This, strange to say, is the peace complement now recommended by naval officers for many of our capital ships. The admonition of Admiral Rodman should be sufficient to warn Congress against placing large peace complements on these ships.

Secretary Daniels, continuing to read from the prepared statement, said:

While it is conceded that the complement of the ship might be necessarily increased in time of war to care for casualties, additional look-outs, and fire-control stations, and even in time of peace, because of additional stations that may become necessary from time to time in the development of modern naval warfare, yet, after careful investigation, I am of the opinion that the complements of the battleships of to-day can be operated efficiently with smaller complements. In December, 1914, a memorandum was filed with this committee setting forth a comparative statement of the commissioned line personnel and of the enlisted personnel of Great Britain and the United States. The statement showed as follows:

Enlisted personnel:	
Great Britain, per thousand tons	55
United States, per thousand tons	69
Commissioned line personnel:	
Great Britain, per thousand tons	2.21
United States, per thousand tons	2.51

It is therefore submitted that as far as the manning of the fleet is concerned efficient work can be done with smaller complements.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I must ask not to be interrupted during the brief 10 minutes that I shall have. There are a few questions that I want to take up in rapid fashion by way of summary. In the first place, much has been said on both sides of this question upon which there is no difference. We all love our country, we all love our flag, we all love the greatest Navy in the world, and I can join in that wonderful encomium paid our Navy a little while ago by the gentleman from New York, Mr. MAGEE. I agree with everything that he said in tribute about what it has been, what it is, and what its officers and men always will be. What, then, is the question? The question is whether or not under the pending bill we are protecting the 5-5-3 program. Three factors enter into that program in large degree—ships, officers, and enlisted personnel. As for ships, your committee stand for 18 capital ships, 103 destroyers, and enough auxiliary craft to meet the situation under the agreement. Second, we stand for officers to man these ships, and no one challenges our conclusions. Third, with regard to the men, after the most careful analysis that your subcommittee could make, we believe we have taken care of the situation in comparison with that which will be provided for the navies of Great Britain and Japan. We fixed the enlisted personnel as that upon our ships upon the 1st of February last. We provided for shore stations and we added some seven thousand to take the place of men in transit, in hospitals, and away from posts of duty. So figured, we have shown that the enlisted personnel will be approximately 67,000 men.

Then we have cross checked on our figures. We took the complements that were prescribed for the ships eight years ago and increased these complements by men required by reason of new devices and new services and it gave us slightly less than 67,000 men. We went further than that. We subtracted the men now assigned to ships that are to be scrapped and to stations and duties that are to be abandoned from our present enlisted personnel of 96,000 and it gave us 66,000. Further than that, compared by the number of men on the ships making up the capital ships and other craft of Great Britain and Japan to-day, our figures are wholly adequate and comparable.

Why should we provide more? Those who oppose, who want to raise the number up to 87,000, say that we need more men. For what purpose? They do not say. What is the purpose? As has been said by the gentleman who preceded me, there is a certain very definite minimum for men during peace times to be upon the different battle craft. Upon the capital ships it is something like 900 or 1,000. We have gone beyond that. You would have something like thirteen or fourteen hundred, if you please, in time of war. Between that upper line and this lower line you will find something like three or four hundred men. Why should we have a war-time complement upon our ships or anything that would approach it?

What are these men? They are electricians, some of them; some of them machinists, mechanics, laborers. The electrician that is working in the electrical plant to-day in any city in this country is ready, for the most part, with experience necessary to which will be added a short preliminary training as he goes upon shipboard to care for the electrical work upon the battle craft. The man who is at the lathe, the man who is the engineer, the man who is the laborer performing work for which he will receive pay in civil life in any of the industrial concerns of this country is doing that which gives him the experience necessary with a very little adaptation to the work upon the ship that will make him capable of carrying on as a member of the American Navy in war or in the event of an emergency. That is all there is to the proposition. You have that great reservoir of men who are electricians, machinists, mechanics throughout this country and you can draw upon them, and in a few months they can be trained fully to meet the work upon shipboard.

Aside from the quotas we have provided, these men had better be employed in private industry.

You can not do that with officers. It takes time and years to train officers. Therefore, as to them, we have given the high number. You can not do that with regard to ships; it takes years to build them.

#### ADDED COST.

Several men have spoken to me in respect to the cost of the additional men under the proposed amendment. Figure it up any way you please, and the very minimum cost for the additional men in my judgment, and I think that rests upon estimates of the Navy Department, will fall somewhere near \$57,000,000. That assumes that they will be placed in much the order that the personnel we have allowed are placed at this time. But if you intend to bring more of the destroyers into the service—add another 200, say, of the destroyers and put the men on those ships—you will immediately add to the cost, and instead of its being \$57,000,000, it may be \$60,000,000, \$75,000,000, or even more, because vast quantities of money will have to be expended for fuel, for repairs, and for other purposes, to maintain these added craft.

#### THE RATIO OF UNITED STATES AND JAPAN.

There is another criticism I must mention. We are told that the enlisted personnel for Japan will be from 68,000 to 71,000 men. We are told that if we provide an enlisted personnel of 67,000 we will fall in ratio below the ratio of Japan. But gentlemen who so urge are proclaiming the 5-5-3 ratio and themselves apparently contend that 86,000 enlisted personnel for our Navy will maintain the ratio indicated as against the enlisted personnel of Japan.

Is it not apparent that there is sophistry in the contention of these gentlemen? They make the ratio depend entirely upon enlisted personnel when they consider the figures of 67,000 provided by the committee, while, on the other hand, when they consider the proposed figures of 86,000 they evidently include in measuring their ratio the number of ships and the number of officers that will be provided by the United States and that will be maintained by Japan. If gentlemen would be consistent, instead of supporting an amendment for 86,000 enlisted personnel, they would support an amendment that would bear a ratio of 5 to 3 to the Japanese alleged enlisted figure of 71,000, and they would be asking in their amendment that the enlisted personnel for the United States be 118,330.

#### OPPOSITION TO THE COMMITTEE FIGURES.

The most vigorous opponents of the proposed enlisted personnel offered by the committee of 67,000 are the officers of the Navy Department, on the one hand, and groups that represent navy yard and navy station activities upon the other. These latter groups are not limited to the Representatives upon this floor from the States where are located navy yard and other activities, but the opposition is reflected through chambers of commerce, commercial clubs, newspapers, and groups of workmen from cities where navy activities are found. During the last few days Representatives from States have come to me

and asked me frankly whether or not, in my judgment, a reduction of the enlisted personnel to 67,000 men would reduce the activities of the navy yards. I have been compelled to tell these men that I believed it would; that the navy yard activities would necessarily shrink with the removal of naval craft as provided in the treaties, and with the abandonment, as we propose, of battle craft of various kinds that can serve no useful purpose. These men are between what they conceive to be two duties; they want to serve their country, they want to serve the districts they represent, where men are employed in navy yards; they hope that their two duties will not conflict, and, like the faithful Achates of old, they feel that they must serve those who have sent them here and whose Representatives they feel themselves to be. More than this, the members of your subcommittee have been appealed to by these workmen; they have been appealed to by business men and civic organizations to maintain their navy yards.

A year ago, when your subcommittee refused to appropriate \$670,000,000, approximately, asked for by the department, and scaled the appropriation down in the House to approximately \$390,000,000, the same fight was waged by people within the navy-yard districts. And not only did the groups to which I have referred urge upon the committee the carrying forward of projects that could not be defended except in war, but the wives of employees of navy yards themselves appealed to the committee. They urged the committee to permit the construction of naval craft for which we had no use in order, as they said, that their husbands might not be thrown out of work and the bread taken from the mouths of their children.

Gentlemen, the American people support the Limitation of Armament Conference and its results. The agreements we are entering into for the limitation of naval craft must necessarily decrease the building of ships as units of our Navy. Do gentlemen believe we should continue to build ships in order to sink them, or in order to salvage them? The agreements of the Limitation of Armament Conference will mean the discontinuance of guns in such quantities as had been anticipated; it will mean that guns of the largest caliber plan will not be built. Do gentlemen believe that notwithstanding all this we should vote the people's money for the building of guns, for the con-

struction of naval materials, in order that employees of the navy yards may be continued in their employment? The appeal that was made to me not to throw these men out of work touches my deepest sympathy, but better a thousand times that we adhere to the plan of limiting our armament and permit these machinists and skilled employees to enter into profitable and productive activities in private life.

Mr. Chairman, those who urge these larger appropriations are sincere in their purpose, but as I see it, they are as incapable of getting the true and entire perspective of the situation as would be a man in the jury box if asked to deliberate upon a case in which he was involved, and so I say of the officers of the Navy. They are honest, they are sincere, but they are enthusiasts, and with that enthusiasm they want to see the Navy Department magnified beyond that which appears to be sustained by sound reason. The enthusiasm on the part of the Navy officers for their work is the same enthusiasm possessed by the successful officers of every bureau in every department of our Government, who somehow feel that their own particular work is after all the reason almost for the existence of government. If your Appropriations Committee were to accept the estimates of the heads of bureaus of the Navy Department and of all the other departments of our Government, the Budget for next year for the United States would be not less than \$10,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, the other day when I discussed this bill, and again to-day, I referred to the conditions confronting us six and eight years ago and at this time. I have called attention to the financial, the military, the economic wealth, if you please, of Europe and the countries of Europe, and the same factors pertaining to the United States. I think you should have before you a chart that will indicate to you more graphically than words can tell it the ratio of economic strength, the ratio of burdens borne by the several nations, the ratio of the factors that will enter into just comparison between nations as you consider what should be the policy of the United States in the maintenance of a Navy. Therefore I want to place at this point in my remarks a table that will show the essential factors touching the leading nations of the world approximately eight years ago and touching them to-day:

	United States.		Great Britain.		France.		Japan.	
Population.....	(1913) 195,000,000	(1920) 105,710,620	(1911) 45,370,530	(1920) 150,000,000	(1911) 39,601,509	(1920) 140,000,000	(1913) 52,985,423	(1918) 57,070,935
Debts.....	(1913) \$1,028,564,000	(1920) \$24,062,510,000	(1913) \$3,485,818,000	(1920) \$37,910,000,000	(1913) \$6,346,249,000	(1920) \$46,025,000,000	(1913) \$1,241,997,000	(1920) \$1,300,000,000
Army.....	(1914) 105,032	(1922-23) 126,000	(1914-15) 181,000	(1922)	(1914) 1790,000	(1922)	(1914) 1250,000	(1922) 1250,000
Navy:								
Tons built.....	(1914) 765,133		(1914) 2,157,850		(1914) 688,840		(1914) 519,640	
Do.....	(1922) 1,285,343		(1922) 1,787,932		(1922) 538,442		(1922) 584,255	
Tons built and building program	(1922) 2,063,173		(1922) 1,984,252		(1922) 606,842		(1922) 1,398,642	
	Italy.		Russia.		Germany.		Austria.	
Population.....	(1914) 35,238,997	(1918) 36,740,000	(1912) 1171,059,900	(1920)	(1910) 64,925,993	(1920)	(1914) 150,000,000	(1920)
Debts.....	(1913) \$2,921,153,000	(1920) \$18,330,000,000	(1913) \$4,537,861,000	(1920)	(1913) \$1,194,052,000	(1920)	(1913) \$2,152,490,000	(1920)
Army.....	(1914) 304,672	(1922)	(1913) 1,200,000 to 1,800,000	(1922) 1,000,000	(1913) 1,790,985	(1922)	(1913) 424,258	(1922)
Navy:								
Tons built.....	(1914) 283,460		(1914) 270,861		(1914) 951,713		(1914)	
Do.....	(1922) 340,660							
Tons built and building program	(1922) 383,219							

<sup>1</sup> Estimated.

<sup>2</sup> Approximately as carried in House military appropriation bill.

<sup>3</sup> Including colonials.

<sup>4</sup> Peace Army.

WHOM DO YOU FEAR?

Now, I have only a couple of minutes more. Gentlemen, the question has been asked before, of whom are you afraid as a Nation? I pointed out the other day the different nations of the world, their condition eight years ago, and their condition to-day. Let me ask the question again, Of whom are you

afraid? Are you afraid as you look across the water to Great Britain, the only country that has a navy comparable to ours? There is a country where every individual, man, woman, and child, is under an indebtedness to-day, owing, by their Government, of from three to four times per capita the indebtedness of the United States. Are you afraid of France? France,

poor, stricken France! As you walk down the streets of her villages or go through the country and see her thousands of wounded men, with the country under a load to-day that is five or six times per capita the indebtedness of the United States, do you fear her? Go to Italy and you find another country similar to France. Go to Germany and Austria, with no navies; countries that are practically on the verge of bankruptcy. Or is it Russia that you fear, a country that was a powerful nation eight years ago, and yet to-day a country that is financially bankrupt; a country, if you please, of splendid people, dominated and impoverished to-day through a cruel and tyrannical minority. Gentlemen, do you fear that country to which we are sending from our abundance the bread and butter that her people may not stave? [Applause.] Whom do you fear?

In the other direction, is it China, a better friend of the United States to-day than ever in times past? Is it Japan that you fear—a country with half the population of the United States, a country with a navy that is about 3 to 5 compared with ours; a country that does not have the material wealth that can be found in some of the great American States of our Republic? Now, gentlemen, whom do you fear?

One word in conclusion. If the Limitation of Armament Conference is to bear the fruit we fondly hope, we must show the world that we respect the letter and the spirit of the agreement. There is no prohibition in the agreement touching various kinds of battle craft, yet for us to engage in building such craft would be to proclaim that though we may keep the letter of the treaty we shall forget the spirit. There is no limitation against submarines, so far as their construction may be concerned, and yet in my judgment we would blight the fruit of the conference were we to compete in submarine construction. The agreement of the conference carries dual responsibility; it carries responsibility to the nations of the world besides our own, and it carries responsibility to our people. We must keep faith with foreign countries by refusing to go above the 5-5-3 agreement. We must keep faith with the people of the United States by refusing to go below, except as we may do so through the concert of supplemental agreements. This I hope we may be able to do.

Gentlemen, I believe we have given you a bill that respects the treaty and that will challenge the admiration not only of our own people but of foreign countries as well.

I heard the address of Premier Briand at the second, I believe, of the Limitation of Armament Conferences. He said, in substance, that peace between nations is not insured by destroying arms and tearing down forts, it is not insured by scrapping ships; there must be more than that, said this eminent statesman; there must be the will for peace.

We have given you a bill, in my judgment, that maintains at once the dignity of our country, the dignity of our Navy, the dignity of our place in the ratio of navies, but that must be calculated to let the nations of the world know that with the American people there is the will for peace. [Applause.]

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, as I understood the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], in the very eloquent address that he has just delivered, and which he is so capable of always making, he said that one man's guess at the present time is as good as another's in the distribution of the men to be used by the Navy. On the one hand, then, we find the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] are doing part of the guessing, and, on the other hand, we find that the department itself, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of State, and the President of the United States, the ones which you are to put in the scales, are also guessing. Now, if that is in the form of a guess, I for one want to be on the side of the President of the United States. [Applause.]

It seemed to me that this debate was over yesterday when a letter was read from the President of the United States stating that anything less than 86,000 men in the personnel of the Navy would not be sufficient to keep up what we have agreed to as a 5-5-3 limitation among nations. So it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, we not only have it as our duty toward the administration itself but, further than that, and far above that, we are under obligations to the administration as part of the agreement among the great powers. We can not afford in any sense to have this question settled on other than the basis which the Government itself desires. And when one speaks of using any financial consideration, it seems to me that we can almost, from the way in which money has been spent, not only in this Congress but in preceding Congresses, regard this difference of

\$14,000,000 between the two figures as presented to us as in the light of practically nothing more than a financial bagatelle. It is true that \$14,000,000 is a lot of money, but in proportion to the amount that Congress has been spending for other purposes it is very little with which to maintain the integrity among nations. [Applause.]

Why should we speak of "being afraid" of some other nation? For my part, this additional number is not required in anticipation of any trouble with other nations, but rather that we may continue to maintain an equality with them in line with the recent limitation agreement.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE].

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, many of the arguments made here to-day and advanced to the Members of this House are followed by the questions: Of whom are you afraid? Who are we going to fight? In answer to that, Mr. Chairman, let me say that it does not make any difference who we are going to fight. We are not afraid of any nation in the world. We never were afraid of any nation in the world, because heretofore we have had a Navy provided by former Congresses of the United States made up of red-blooded men who never measured the American dollar with the lives of the young men who make up our Navy and who would not be swayed from their duty. [Applause.]

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Can the gentleman tell me whom England and Japan are afraid of? They are keeping up their navies.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, the only one that England or Japan will ever be afraid of is the American Navy. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I venture to say, coming as I do from one of the districts which has been referred to as having in it a navy yard, that I will be charged with selfish motives and trespassing on the rights of this House when I advance in a humble way my reasons for advocating a larger Navy. I want to say that our motives are just as honest and just as clean as the motives of those who are advocating the other side of the question. We are not looking upon it from a selfish point of view, because we in those districts have seen the Navies of the United States grow to the size that they were during the late war. We have seen the boys from your districts in the Middle West, we have seen them from the far West, come to the eastern coast, there to make up the red-blooded men of the American Navy, and there they were received by men who had been trained in the service, men who were a credit to the Nation. They were experts, Mr. Chairman; yes, experts of the Navy. I am willing to follow in the wake of those men who have given their lives to the building up of the American Navy.

I am willing to follow men like Admiral Coontz rather than my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], and I am willing to follow Admiral Taylor rather than the distinguished leader from Wyoming, as to what I think should constitute the Navy of the United States.

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

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BURROUGHS].

Mr. VARE. And I yield him the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. BURROUGHS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURROUGHS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote my own honest convictions on this bill and I am going to vote for 86,000 men. [Applause.] In doing this I am very glad that I am supporting the recommendations of the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, and every single naval official who has voiced an opinion concerning the matter. I am not ashamed to be found in this company.

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to vote for every dollar of appropriation that is necessary in order to maintain our Navy on an exact equality, both in ships and personnel, with the navy of the British Empire and in the ratio of 5 to 3 in comparison with the navy of Japan. I understand the Congress of the United States is entirely within its rights under the treaties adopted at the recent conference in Washington in providing exactly that kind of a Navy. From all the information I can get—and I have sought information wherever it was available—I do not believe the present bill, which is being so ably defended by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, will give us that kind of a Navy. I understand that this bill gives us not more than 13 battleships with

full complement, when we are entitled under the treaty to have 18, and the British Empire is going to have 18. I understand that this bill will give us not more than 10 cruisers, when we are entitled to have 13. I understand that this bill will give us not more than 65 destroyers in full commission, when we now have more than 300, and the very least number that the Secretary of the Navy has recommended is 103 in full commission and 23 in half commission. I understand that this bill will give us a total enlisted personnel of only 67,000, when the British Empire will have not less than 104,000 and Japan will have not less than 68,000. These figures are obtained through the Navy direct from our naval attachés at London and Tokyo. If any other or different figures are given, they seem to be based on nothing more dependable than common rumor or newspaper report. It is therefore my belief that this bill, if enacted into law, will inevitably reduce our Navy in point of efficiency and strength far below the British Navy and probably somewhat below the navy of Japan. It is because of this belief that I shall vote for the motion to increase the enlisted personnel to 86,000 men.

The gentleman from Wyoming, the distinguished leader of the majority, asks with much dramatic effect why it is necessary to accept as gospel truth the recommendation of the naval experts. I think there is no necessity for it. I know of nobody who has suggested doing so. What I do say, however, is this: I see no sense whatever in spending weeks in the examination of experts before the committee if these experts are all to be regarded as prejudiced witnesses, whose testimony in the end is not to be relied upon at all, and whose recommendations and conclusions are to be summarily thrown on the ash heap. Doctors, of course, sometimes make mistakes. But, after all, in time of sickness most of us go to a doctor rather than to a blacksmith. I want to call attention to the fact that these naval experts, whose recommendations seem to be regarded with so much distrust and suspicion, and whose testimony is thought to be so wholly unreliable, are the very same men upon whom our delegates to the arms conference relied entirely in all matters involving expert opinion or advice in framing the treaties. Our brilliant Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, and Senator Lodge and Senator Underwood and Mr. Root found them to be entirely trustworthy. I wonder what has happened in the short space of a few weeks that the chairman of this committee now finds himself unable to trust these same men to advise him as to the proper number of men to serve as the complement of a battleship. I confess I do not exactly understand.

The distinguished leader of the minority, the gentleman from Tennessee, has just told us that he sees no obligation upon us growing out of the treaty to maintain a Navy in accordance with the so-called 5-5-3 ratio. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman on that proposition. But, Mr. Chairman, I say that we do have an obligation to maintain our relative position in exact accord with the terms of the treaty. That obligation arises out of the oath which each one of us took in front of this desk. Our duty, as I look at it with reference to this matter, has a twofold aspect. We owe a duty to the rest of the world with whom we have entered into treaty relations to keep at all times within the limitations prescribed by the treaties. But in addition to that we owe a duty to our own people not to allow the fighting strength of the American Navy to fall below the position accorded us in the treaty. I have a very firm conviction that the American people expect this Congress to do its full duty in both aspects as I have described them.

There is not a man in this House who does not know that if our delegates at the arms conference had been willing to accept a position of inferiority to any other nation in the world in respect to naval strength, the treaties they formulated would never have been ratified by the Senate or by the people, and they themselves would have been quickly swept into oblivion by a thoroughly aroused and offended public opinion. If that is so, it seems to me equally clear that the same public opinion, when it understands the true situation, will condemn any man or any party that is responsible for the weak, timid, pusillanimous policy now for the first time proposed in a great naval bill in the American Congress that would put our Navy into a permanent position of inferiority among the naval powers of the world. I said "permanent," Mr. Chairman, and I use the word advisedly, because it must be plain to everybody that if once we accept a second or third rate position it is going to be most difficult, if not, indeed, impossible, at a later time to take our rightful place. Any subsequent action by Congress looking in that direction will at once excite among the other powers the greatest suspicion, if, indeed, it be not regarded as a hostile act.

Mr. Chairman, I was a strong believer in the so-called Limitation of Arms Conference. I saw in it a real effort along what seemed to be perfectly sane and practical lines to put a stop to

the race for naval supremacy among the nations, that was bound to be an ever increasing burden upon every people and nation that participated in it. I believed then and I believe now that the only practical, sensible way for the nations to disarm is by agreement. I most assuredly do not believe in disarmament by example. I am unwilling to see my country disarm either on land or sea as long as all the other nations of the world remain armed to the teeth.

I was proud to see my country take the first step toward disarmament. How was she able to do it? It was only because she had at the moment a Naval Establishment potentially, at least, the most powerful in the world. When the right time comes I want to see her take another step in the same direction, but her success then, as before, will depend upon her having a strong, efficient Navy, the equal of any that sails the seas. If we are to expect others to follow, we must see to it that we maintain our position of leadership. Any other policy spells inevitable failure.

I would go very far indeed to bring about a condition in the world wherein war would no longer be tolerated and when any nation that engaged in it would be considered an outlaw nation. But, Mr. Chairman, while that is true, it is also true that I will never, if I know it, favor or vote for any measure the effect of which is to put the control of American naval policy into the hands of the little group of extreme pacifists that seem to follow the leadership of that other son of Michigan whose chief title to distinction lies in the fact that he has put the "tin Lizzie" into thousands of American homes. So far as I am concerned, I will never vote for any policy or any measure the inevitable effect of which is to cripple and hamstring and dismantle our Navy in order to meet the views of men who, however noble and fine may be their ideals for their country, fail utterly to grasp the fundamental truth that such ideals amount to nothing in the present state of civilization unless we possess the will and power to make them effective.

I appeal to you, my colleagues, not to cripple and destroy our splendid Navy. Its noble traditions are the pride and glory of America. It is and must always remain our first line of defense. It is both our right and our duty to keep it on a basis of equality with the best. In the name of John Paul Jones and Perry and Decatur and Farragut and Dewey I ask you to-day to maintain that right and perform that duty. [Applause.]

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that any event of the past half century has met with such universal approval as the achievement of Secretary Hughes and our American representatives at the disarmament conference called by President Harding, which convened in Washington on the 12th day of November last. I believe that 95 per cent of the American people are in favor of some kind of an international understanding to prevent a race in armaments and to minimize the dangers of war. Many Americans were in favor of the League of Nations for this reason. The last election, however, demonstrated that a vast majority of the American people were afraid that the covenant of the League of Nations went too far and threatened to involve this country in European conflicts. I am persuaded that the overwhelming sentiment among those who opposed the League of Nations is in favor of an understanding, such as President Harding and the American peace delegates brought about through the disarmament conference.

Prior to the World War Great Britain stood first in naval strength among the nations of the earth. Great Britain was the mistress of the seas, and under the protection of her navy her commerce entered with security into every port around the world. Next to England came the navy of Germany, and under its protection the commerce of Germany became a strong rival to the commerce of Great Britain, while the commerce of the United States, lacking the protection of an adequate Navy, was greatly retarded in its development.

Our representatives at the Disarmament Conference succeeded in getting an amicable arrangement whereby the navies of the three great naval powers should be limited, and providing that the navy of Great Britain at the end of 10 years should be no greater than that of the United States, while the size of the navy of Japan, as compared with that of the United States, should bear the ratio of 3 to 5.

What was it that made this achievement possible? What was it which made England willing to surrender her proud position as mistress of the seas and to consent to a limitation of her armaments which made it possible for the United States, without excessive expenditures, to have a Navy equal to that

of any nation upon the globe? What was it that made Japan, proud as she is, with an extensive navy building program, submit to a naval ratio of 5 to 3?

It was the fact that America had undertaken with determination to carry out a program which by 1926 would give America the greatest Navy afloat, coupled with the further fact that both England and Japan knew that the resources of the United States were such as to insure victory for America in an international race in armaments. I believe that every patriotic American feels that the establishment of this naval ratio by amicable agreement—a ratio which makes the naval strength of the United States at a moderate cost equal to that of Great Britain and vastly superior to Japan—was the greatest achievement of this age. What would the American people have said of the work of our delegates at the arms conference if they had consented to a naval strength between Great Britain and the United States upon a ratio of 5 to 3 and a naval strength of the United States less than that of Japan? And yet that is the thing which the bill now under consideration proposes to do.

Why do I make this statement? What evidence have I to sustain it? The chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, and our leader, Mr. MONDELL, declare that the provision of the bill providing for an enlisted naval personnel of 67,000 men is fully adequate to take care of our Navy's needs. But what are the facts? Great Britain has provided in her naval budget for enlisted personnel, exclusive of marines, amounting at the end of the next fiscal year to 98,000 men. Japan has provided in her naval budget for next year for a personnel of 68,252 men, and yet this committee tells us that an enlisted personnel of 67,000 men for the American Navy will maintain our ratio equal to that of Great Britain and as 5 to 3 when compared with the navy of Japan. The fallacy of such a contention is obvious. To begin with, the training of England's naval personnel is far superior to that of ours, because her enlistment is for a period of 12 years. The training of Japan's naval personnel is superior to ours, because her enlistment is for a period of six years, while the enlistment of the personnel in our Navy is for an average period of three years.

On June 3, 1921, out of 119,000 men in the American Navy, 98,000 had less than 4 years' experience and 87,000 of them were less than 24 years of age. Experience shows that it takes at least one year to make any sort of a sailor out of enlisted men and that it takes at least three years' training to prepare men for efficient service in operating a battleship. Furthermore, our naval records for the last year show that we had 55,000 new enlistments of young men who had never seen naval service, while we had only 16,000 reenlistments.

Thus it will be observed that at least one-third of our enlisted men must necessarily be in training all the time and thus incapable of active naval service, while a considerable percentage of the remaining two-thirds must be engaged in training the one-third raw material. This handicap does not apply to the British and Japanese Navies under their long enlistments.

Thus it is evident to any reasonable man that the contentions of the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. KELLEY of Michigan] and the floor leader [Mr. MONDELL] that this bill provides for our complement under the terms of the treaty is totally without foundation. Battleships do not make navies, and the finest battleship in the world is of no value as a fighting force unless it is manned by trained, intelligent, and skillful seamen. You can not have a 5-3 ratio between the United States and Japan so long as Japan has 68,252 men, seasoned and trained under long enlistment, while the United States has only 67,000 men, one-third of whom are not trained at all. And you can not maintain a 5-5 ratio between Great Britain and the United States so long as Great Britain has 98,000 enlisted men, seasoned and trained under 12-year enlistments, while the United States has only 67,000 enlisted seamen, one-third of whom are not trained at all.

If we are to keep up our complement and help to insure peace by maintaining our ratio with England and Japan, as provided in the treaty, we can not do so with a personnel of enlisted men such as that which is provided in the bill now under consideration. If we are going to disarm alone and ignore the splendid ratio which caused the American people to hail the achievements of our delegates at the arms conference as a great success, then what did the accomplishments of the conference amount to? If we do not maintain the strength allotted to us, in order that America's views and ideals might be respected over the world, then what advantage was there in having a conference? No other nation is going to interfere with us in disarming alone. We had a right to do that without a conference. But the American people know that to do this means to invite trouble, and I do not believe that they will approve of any such program.

The American people have learned by experience in recent years that unpreparedness invites conflict. They have learned that such a condition of our Army and Navy, coupled with an election in this country, strongly declaring in favor of peace, regardless of the insults which we endured, resulted in our being hurled into a world conflict which cost this country \$40,000,000,000 and 70,000 lives, and placed a responsibility upon this Government to care for sick and wounded soldiers amounting to more than \$500,000,000 a year.

I do not believe the American people want this mistake repeated. I believe that they approve of the achievements of President Harding and Secretary Hughes. I believe that they feel that a great step has been made toward permanent international peace by agreement, and I believe they want us to keep our complement up to its full strength, as Great Britain and Japan are doing, until the time comes when further declarations by agreement can be made. If we ignore the provisions of the treaty and take our place in naval strength in the rear of Great Britain and Japan, it is reasonable to assume that at the end of the 10-year period the agreement for the limitation of arms will not be renewed and we will again be off on another international race in the construction of machines for war.

I am convinced not only from the facts which I have presented to you that the provisions of this bill are totally inadequate to provide for our complement under the arms conference, but even if I did not have these facts I would vote to increase the enlisted personnel of the Navy to 86,000 men. Why do I say this? The chairman of the subcommittee, who served for some years upon the Naval Committee of the House, has declared that the enlisted strength of 67,000 men is adequate. The Republican floor leader [Mr. MONDELL] has declared the same thing. Why should I not follow them? I will tell you why. Because the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, consisting of Members of this Congress who have devoted years of study to the naval problems of this country, say that we can not keep up our complement and maintain the ratio provided by the treaty with less than 86,000 enlisted men; because the Secretary of the Navy and the naval experts who have devoted their lives to the study of naval problems and who so successfully advised our delegates to the peace conference tell us that we ought to have at least 96,000 enlisted men and that we can not maintain the 18 first-line battleships allotted to us by the treaty, together with the necessary auxiliary equipment, with less than 86,000 men; and because the Secretary of State, who so successfully led our delegation at the peace conference in the greatest achievement of world peace yet known, and who, as the head of the State Department, together with the Secretary of the Navy, is in a position to have in his possession information upon international questions which are not and can not be available to Members of Congress, urges that we must not provide for less than 86,000 men; and because the President of the United States, who is acclaimed by the nations of the earth as the great leader for international peace, and who is in a position to have information and to understand far better than we the complicated angles of this great international problem, said to us in a letter yesterday:

I shall be greatly disappointed, and I believe the country will be greatly disappointed, if the appropriation, to which the Navy must and will adhere, is reduced to a point where the limitation of enlisted men and apprentices is below 86,000.

Ultimately, perhaps, the lower figures proposed may be reached, and I hope it will be possible through later international concert, but the trend toward peace and security ought to be more firmly established before going beyond the limitation to which we were gladly committed at the international conference.

There is no official of this Government more insistent upon national economy than President Harding; no one more determined that the tax burdens of the people shall be reduced. It was under his leadership that this great achievement for peace was accomplished; it was under his guiding hand that this international race in armaments was stopped. He is in a position to understand better than we the purposes and inclinations of the other nations of the earth. No man in this Government carries greater responsibility than he; no man in this country is more patriotic than he; no man in the Government is more concerned about the welfare of the Nation and its future than he. He is the commander in chief of the Navy, and when he tells me, as he did upon yesterday, that he will be greatly disappointed if we fail to provide for an enlisted naval personnel of 86,000 men, I, for one, will not cast my vote to hamper him in his fight for world peace. He is the head of our Nation, the leader of my party, and when he appeals to me, as he did upon yesterday, you may depend upon me to respond. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to recognize any gentleman.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, how much time has the gentleman from Pennsylvania?



Mr. VARE. Twenty-three minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. How much time has the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN]?

Mr. GALLIVAN. A little over 30 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I suggest that the gentleman use some of his time.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I would prefer to have a vote, but I yield myself three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts for such time as he desires to use.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I approach once more the consideration of this tremendously important bill with some fear and trembling. In the general debate we progressed as one happy family until the closing hour; then almost in the closing minute the motives of the men who come from the big cities on the Atlantic coast and the Pacific coast who advocate a larger number of enlisted men in this bill were questioned. I come from a city which has within its limits the oldest and the finest navy yard in all the land. It has helped to make the history of this Republic, and we in Boston are proud of its achievements and glory in its record. But do you men believe that the three Congressmen from Boston who favor the larger number of men proposed in the amendment are interested solely because of that navy yard? Does any man within the sound of my voice believe that we are made of that kind of stuff? Yet our motives were attacked openly, and, as I say, it is with fear and trembling that I dare return to make another appeal for the flag. [Applause.] The other day I told the House of the newest navy in our land, the prohibition navy. I see, by the way, that it got into operation yesterday and it fired its first shot, and it was a wet shot. [Laughter.] I said then that this Congress was at all times ready to vote millions for prohibition, but in this hour pennies for the flag. What of it if it is going to cost \$47,000,000 more to put this amendment on the bill? What of it? Is it the cost of your Navy that you are sitting here to estimate? Is it the cost or is it the character of your Navy and the kind of a Navy you are going to have? Oh, let me say to my friend King KELLEY of Michigan, whom I love [laughter and applause], I want to read to him some lines from Rudyard Kipling. I should have opened my brief speech with these lines. I know he will applaud.

No doubt but ye are the people—your throne is above the king's,  
Whose speaks in your presence must say acceptable things:  
Bowing the head in worship, bending the knee in fear—  
Bringing the word well smoothen—such as a king should hear.

Such as a king should hear!

I do not want to take up any more time of this House, but this is going to be my last word on this proposition. I was ready at noon to submit the question to a vote without any further debate, and I appeal to the men of Congress to realize that at no time in their career, in my judgment, have they had a more important question handed to them; and I appeal to them to go slow before they follow the recommendation of a committee of five men, coming from the States so well pictured as my colleague from New York [Mr. MAGEE] pictured them. In closing again I go back to Rudyard Kipling, and this is for the whole House:

No doubt but ye are the people—absolute, strong, and wise;  
Whatever your heart has desired ye have not withheld from your eyes.  
On your own heads, in your own hands, the sin and the saving lies!

[Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, our genial and distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] in the speech which he has just concluded, made one of those striking statements for which he is talented when he said, "Congress is willing to vote millions for the enforcement of prohibition but pennies for the support of the Navy." In the first place, the genial gentleman from Massachusetts might as well recognize that prohibition is now a part of the Constitution of the United States, and Congress, which is sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution, is going to appropriate whatever money is necessary to enforce the prohibition laws. All gentlemen who are advocating light wines and beer and who would like to see an abandonment of efforts to enforce prohibition might as well recognize the eighteenth amendment as part of the law of the land and join hands to bring about its effective enforcement. In the second place, the gentleman from Massachusetts is entirely mistaken when he says Congress is only "spending pennies for the Navy." He should recall that if this pending naval appropriation bill is passed without any additions, coupled with the amount already appropriated for the support of the Army, the Government of the United States will be appropriating for the fiscal year 1923 upwards of \$500,000,000 for the support of the Army and the Navy. And yet the gentleman from Massa-

chusetts says, "What does it matter if you add \$47,000,000 more?" Well, gentlemen of the Congress, what does it matter? Is it no matter if you add fifty million more dollars tax burden to the already bended back of the taxpayer? I believe I recall that some one has said that there is one thing that is stronger and more powerful than armies, and that is an idea when its hour has come. The hour for the relief of struggling humanity from the crushing burdens of military and naval armaments has come, and happily it has fallen to the lot of America to lead the way. [Applause.]

It is not the first time that the forces of destiny have bestowed upon us the power of a great opportunity. Our Revolutionary fathers of 1776, when they declared by the pen of Thomas Jefferson that all men are created equal and endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, set in motion forces which have crumbled thrones and empires and have scattered the emblems of despotism and tyranny like as a sand storm scatters before it the dust of the desert. Those who have visited Washington's home at Mount Vernon will remember that hanging on the wall of one of the halls is the key to the Bastille which was sent by Lafayette to Washington through Thomas Paine. In the glass case where the key rests is the note which Paine wrote to Washington upon delivery of the key. It reads thus:

Our very good friend, the Marquis de Lafayette, has intrusted to my care the key of the Bastille and a drawing handsomely framed representing the demolitions of that detestable prison as a present to Your Excellency, of which his letter will more particularly inform. I feel myself happy in being the person through whom the marquis has conveyed the only trophy of the spoils of despotism and the first ripe fruits of American principles translated into Europe to his great master and patron. When he mentioned to me the present he intended you my heart leaped with joy. It is something so truly in character that no remarks can illustrate it and is more happily expressive of his remembrance of his American friends than any letters can convey. That the principles of America opened the Bastille is not to be doubted and therefore the key comes to the right place.

When the news reached England of the fall of the Bastille the great statesman Fox, perceiving its significance for liberty, exclaimed:

How much is this the greatest event that ever happened in the struggle for liberty and how much the best.

And now, at another epoch in the world's history, America is again privileged to lead the way, and by her own unselfish example at the recent Limitation of Armament Conference has laid out a path for other nations to follow which they can not afford to ignore. The American people heartily approve and support the work of that conference and expect Congress to give effect to its program by real reductions in expenditures. If Congress votes the increase in naval personnel, as proposed by the pending amendment, from 67,000 enlisted men to 86,000 men, and follows it up by increases in other items of appropriation made necessary by the increase in personnel, will we be giving to the American people any substantial reduction in naval expenditures? I say no. Gentlemen, we must avoid that sort of a situation. The people are entitled to have some of the burdens lifted.

NATIONS SHOULD PAY AS MUCH ATTENTION TO TRAINING FOR PEACE AS IS PAID TO TRAINING FOR WAR.

Now, I am not laboring under any delusions as to the effect and benefits of limitation of armaments. I realize that it is not a sure and certain guarantee of peace. Causes of war run deeper than armaments. Men went to war long before gun-powder and firearms were invented, and when there were only clubs and sticks and crude spears for weapons. There must be a moral reformation, a universal will and purpose for peace among the nations of the world before we may expect permanent peace. I would hardly be optimistic enough to say that we have reached that millennium yet. But while I realize that humanity is yet very far from the perfect ideal, I would hate to see its shortcomings and imperfections made the basis for a do-nothing policy.

A policy of just sit back and say human nature is selfish and men are grasping, and therefore nothing can be done except to let things drift along until another crash comes and the world is plunged into another war more horrible than the one through which we have just passed. No; civilization has never made any progress that way.

We rise by things that are under our feet;  
By what we have mastered of good and gain;  
By the pride deposed and the passion slain  
And the vanquished ills that we hourly meet.

A nation should pay as much attention to training for peace as it does in training for war. If the Neitches and Bernhards and Kaiser Wilhelms of Germany had devoted their attention to developing a spirit of peace and good will among their people

instead of a harsh and intolerant military spirit, in all probability the world would have been spared the horrible holocaust of the recent war.

One of the best ways to train for peace is to lay aside some of the burdens of military and naval armaments and enter into treaties of arbitration and understandings with other nations to which we can resort when the war clouds do threaten, instead of resorting to an appeal to the sword. Men who take time to think and nations who take time to think, usually find that they have acted the part of wisdom. The man who is always thinking about achieving his rights and nothing about fulfilling his obligations is likely to come to grief, and the rule is not different among nations. So while I want to see the United States protected in all of its rights, I am equally anxious that it recognize and fulfill all of its obligations.

The agreements entered into at the recent Limitation of Armament Conference are distinctly forward steps in training the world for peace, therefore I favor observing these agreements in letter and in spirit, and it is for this reason that I will vote against the amendment to make the proposed increase in naval personnel.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, how does the time stand now?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has 40 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, it is my unalterable determination to uphold the hands of the President of the United States, of his great Secretary, and of the American delegates to the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments, by voting for that reduction in naval personnel and naval cost contemplated by the treaty they negotiated, and faithfully reflected in the provisions of this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it is true that the Washington conference does not bind us in the matter of personnel or cost of the Navy. It does bind us in the number of effective fighting ships. It is true that we could maintain our present personnel of 96,000 enlisted men; we could increase that to the 120,000 which the naval board recommends; we could maintain our present expenditures, we could increase them, as the Naval Establishment desires, without violating the letter of the treaty. But is there anyone so dull, so insensible to national obligations as to believe that we could do that or anything approaching it without violating the treaty in every phase and factor of its essential principles, without making it a mere scrap of paper begrudgingly adhered to in the letter, flagrantly violated in the spirit? [Applause.]

Gentlemen express a desire to follow the naval experts. How far do they expect to follow them? The officials of the Naval Establishment, civil and military, have never budged from their insistence upon a Navy of from 94,000 to 120,000 enlisted men, or qualified their demand for naval expenditures as great or greater than those of the days before the ratification of the treaty. Is this to be wondered at? Not at all. I challenge anyone to find in all the history of the world a time or place when a professional fighting establishment ever voluntarily or willingly reduced its costs or forces by a single man or a single dollar. [Applause.]

We have heard much of the importance of maintaining a treaty fleet, 18 battleships in full commission and their necessary auxiliaries. With that thought and purpose I am in complete accord, and it is accomplished by the provisions of this bill. There was no other thought or purpose in drafting it; but, Mr. Chairman, there is a wide difference between the reasonable and proper maintenance of a treaty fleet and the continuation of the unhappy and unholy competitive naval race for supremacy which it was hoped the Washington treaty had brought to an end. [Applause.]

If it were true—which, in my opinion, it is not—that Great Britain was, with her wide-flung empire, maintaining under arms a few more men than we, must our sole effort and endeavor be to hunt out and count the last man she has in order that we may match him with another? If that is the theory on which we are to carry out the treaty, then it were just as well that the treaty had never been negotiated. Save for the fact that we have surrendered and propose to sink our finest fighting ships, we have come out of the conference just where the nations went in—suspicious and determined to outrace and outclass each other. If it be true that Japan, following the usual oriental custom of having two men do the work of one, is maintaining in training or otherwise a few more than the forty or fifty thousand men which might properly man her fleet, would that fact alone justify us in maintaining a larger establishment than is necessary to keep our treaty Navy in fighting trim?

Mr. Chairman, this committee undertook in good faith the task of preparing a bill which, while making sufficient provisions for our Navy under the treaty, does at the same time—and what is equally important—translate into legislation and in the figures of appropriations the spirit and purpose of the treaty in the reduction of naval costs and naval establishments. Notwithstanding the committee's best efforts, this bill, without any increases, with the necessary additions which must be made to it in pay and in provision for aircraft and for continuing construction, will involve a cost of upward of \$300,000,000, as compared with a naval cost of less than \$150,000,000 for the years immediately preceding the Great War. No one knows how much more must be added to this cost through the cancellation of contracts on ships now building and to be abandoned. Some have placed it as high as \$50,000,000. I trust that figure is excessive, and yet it is possible and would result in an outlay of approximately \$350,000,000 for the Navy the first full year after the treaty and within a few millions of the cost of the Navy before the ratification of the treaty.

That is the bill as it is now before us. Add the 19,000 men proposed and the cost increases by from \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000, or to at least \$400,000,000; or about the cost of the Navy this year. Add another \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000, as your naval experts will all demand when this bill goes to the Senate, and your naval costs and your naval personnel will be greater after the treaty is ratified than it was before. This is no fanciful suggestion; this is what I know to be not only in the minds of naval men but, unhappily, I regret to say, in the minds of men on this floor. I am for a treaty Navy but I am also for the spirit of the treaty. [Applause.]

The crowning achievement of our great President and of our great Secretary of State, the crowning glory of this administration is the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments and the treaties resulting from it—if they be adhered to in their spirit and their purpose. It is our duty, regretful as we are, that we may seem to differ from the view of those in high places, here and now to sustain the President and his administration, to meet the expectations of the people of the country by crystallizing into law and appropriations the purpose and triumphant accomplishment of the conference through the reduction in the Navy and naval expenditures proposed by this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if we make the increases that are now asked of us we shall raise the cost of the Navy and the Naval Establishment higher after the ratification of the treaty than before it, and shall in so doing violate the spirit of the treaty we profess to desire to observe. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON].

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, ordinarily I have great respect for the judgment and opinion of the gentleman from Wyoming. Generally I follow his judgment as the floor leader of my party, but I can not follow him to-day. He has just told us that if we pass this amendment and provide for 86,000 enlisted men in our Navy that we will thereby scrap the naval treaty which was but recently entered into at the Washington conference. He has so informed us notwithstanding the fact that the President of the United States has requested this number of men. Does the gentleman contend that the President, who has so successfully negotiated this treaty, now intends to scrap it? I wish to say to the gentleman from Wyoming that, so far as I am concerned, as to the effect of this amendment upon that treaty I prefer the judgment of the Secretary of State and the President of the United States. [Applause.]

The people of the great Middle West who furnished some two millions to our Army and Navy during the late war believe in the treaties negotiated at the Washington conference. They believe in the naval treaty and in maintaining the strength of our own Navy at the 5-5-3 ratio agreed upon. That ratio places our Navy as second to none in the world, and they want no Congress to change that position.

A navy is made up of ships, guns, and men, and one might almost say that the greatest of these is men. This treaty authorizes us to maintain a Navy based on 18 capital ships, placing us on a par with Great Britain and making us second to none among the naval powers of the world. In negotiating the treaty and providing for the necessary capital ships the question of the guns upon the ships was fully considered. The treaty therefore considered the first two elements—ships and guns—and it is up to this Congress to provide the necessary men to maintain that Navy and to keep it up to a high state of efficiency.

The bill before us does not provide a sufficient number of men. I have great confidence in the gentlemen in charge of

this bill, but their statements are disputed by the naval officers, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of State, and the President of the United States. It seems to me that the preponderance of the evidence submitted before us is on the side of those in favor of this amendment for 86,000 men. [Applause.]

I want to make this further observation: If this Congress should adopt this bill as it is and fix the Navy enlisted personnel at 67,000, we would, in effect and for all practical purposes, fix that figure as a maximum for the full 10-year treaty period. For all practical purposes it would be impossible in the future to come in with a bill increasing that number, for the very moment that we did so it would be charged, and with some reason, that we were violating the spirit of the naval treaty by increasing its strength. To-day we are just commencing upon the first year of this treaty period. No such situation can now confront us in fixing the number of men for this year. With a Navy of 18 capital ships properly balanced we require some additional ships, such as two airplane carriers of 27,000 tons each. There is a bill before us authorizing the conversion of two battle cruisers now under construction—which construction is to be abandoned under the treaty—into two airplane carriers.

The construction of these and two more additional carriers is contemplated under the treaty. Furthermore, we should complete the 10 scout cruisers that are under construction. The Committee on Naval Affairs has recommended to the House the completion of these auxiliary ships, and their completion is necessary if we are to have a properly balanced Navy and to maintain our position as a coequal naval power of Great Britain.

Now, then, those ships have not yet been completed. No provision has been made in this bill for manning those ships with the proper number of men. When the ships are completed those ships will, of course, have to be manned with the proper complement of both officers and men. If, therefore, we now limit our Navy to 67,000 enlisted men, where are we going to get the men to man these additional and most necessary units to our Navy? If after fixing the Navy at 67,000 enlisted men we then seek to raise that number, it would be claimed at once that we were violating the spirit of the naval agreement. It seems to me, therefore, with this conflict of opinion and conflict of figures, and the necessary additions to the Navy that must be provided for, that we had better play safe and adopt the amendment fixing the Navy at 86,000 men, for if that proves to be more than sufficient in the future it will be easy for us to reduce that figure, whereas if 67,000 men proves to be too few it will be embarrassing and exceedingly difficult to raise that figure.

Mr. Chairman, to me there is but one thing to do, and that is to support the amendment for a Navy in accordance with the desires of the President, backed up by his able Secretary of State. [Applause.]

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OSBORNE].

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, one who has not participated with the committee in the formation of this bill can only give impressions rather than produce any very solid information on the proposition. My own impression is, Mr. Chairman, that in framing this bill, with a purpose of cutting expenses, a very worthy purpose, the committee have cut too deep—they have cut the Army too fine and the Navy too fine. The questions have been asked on the floor, Where are we expecting trouble? Who will make war on us? We can not tell where trouble is coming from. In 1912 nobody would have believed that it was possible to have a war with Germany in 1917. We are in this position: That this country is a very rich country. Human nature is the same all over the world. We have the accumulation of the gold of the world. We have lots of property, lots of riches, and lots of prosperity as compared with other countries. Undoubtedly we excite the envy of other powers, as wealth and success always excite envy. The possibility always exists that we may find ourselves in trouble from unexpected sources. So far as I am concerned, I am going to vote for a Navy that I think is as near as possible to the limit of what we are permitted to maintain under the treaty of the Conference on Limitation of Armament. We ought not to fall behind the naval strength of any other power. [Applause.]

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOLA].

Mr. MONTOLA. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of an efficient Navy. It happened that during the war I had three of my boys in the service. One of them was in the Navy. He was shifted from training in California to Hampton Roads. He wrote to me from there and said, "Father, I have been here two days and I have looked all around, and I see over in the bay 12 or 15 American warships and cruisers. I shall be on one of them

in a few days, and I assure you that I know that we will lick the whole world." [Laughter and applause.]

I want to keep faith with my boy and I want to keep faith with the American people. I shall vote for a bigger Navy. [Applause.]

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLINE].

Mr. KLINE of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from Massachusetts have most ably stated to you their reasons why we should not pass the naval bill carrying 67,000 enlisted personnel as reported by the Committee on Appropriations. I heartily agree in all that they have said. There are, however, certain aspects which they have not covered. They have dealt with the Navy afloat, but to keep the Navy afloat there is necessary a large and highly developed force ashore. We have at this time throughout the United States navy yards and stations where there are employed about 53,000 civilians. We have an investment in these navy yards exceeding one-half a billion dollars. The corps of navy yard workmen is not a mushroom growth. It has been built up through years. It is composed of men of training and skill, many of whom have given the better part of a lifetime to this Government work. Should this bill carrying 67,000 personnel prevail, this shore organization will of necessity have to be in large measure discontinued. For example, I am reliably informed that with a 67,000-men Navy a great majority of the yards on the east coast would have to be closed. The business of yards is repairing the ships. If the ships are put out of commission, there is no work for the yards. Under these circumstances they could not be continued. The discontinuance of the yards will not only involve a great hardship upon the employees, who would thus be left without work, but would also destroy at a blow the very specialized organization which has been built up through so many years and which is an absolutely necessary integral part of the Nation's defense. Such an organization can not be assembled overnight. It is of necessity the product of long years of work. I therefore bespeak your consideration for this very important aspect of the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield four minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRENNAN].

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Chairman, one day about six years ago I sat in the balcony of this House as a spectator and listened to a portion of a debate on what was then known as one of the preparedness bills. One of the Members who opposed that measure made the argument: "With whom are we going to fight? Is it with England, our friend of a century? Is it with Japan, an island smaller than many of our States? Can it be with Germany, with an ocean lying between us?" Within a year from that time we were plunged into the World War.

Yesterday I sat in the same balcony with some visitors and heard the identical argument delivered against the amendment now before us, and delivered with the same vehemence and eloquence: "Whom are we going to fight, England, Japan, Russia?" It is as unthinkable to-day as it was in 1916 that this country should ever again engage in armed conflict. But the inconceivable happened once. It can happen again. We fervently hope and pray that it will not, but no one can issue a guaranty.

But we are asked: "How about the treaties that you have ratified? Do they not guarantee this country against war?" No one has claimed for them that extravagant virtue. No country to-day, in the present state of civilization, is war proof any more than the most skillful engineers or builders have been able to construct with all their ability a building which is fire-proof. We hear occasionally of some new marvel of engineering construction which is heralded as fireproof, but we have never yet heard the architect or the builder tell the owner of the building not to carry any insurance on it because it could not burn. In this instance our architect and engineer is the Commander in Chief of the Military Establishment of the United States [applause], and he has given us a solemn warning that the bill as proposed by the subcommittee does not furnish adequate insurance and protection for the building of which we are the custodians, and which houses 110,000,000 of American men, women, and children. [Applause.]

My genial colleague and neighbor from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] on Monday last said that the President is a man who has upon his shoulders the weight of the world, and that he had something else to do besides going out and counting up the number of men required for the operation of the Navy. Mr. Chairman, by his letter of yesterday the President has given us to know that with all of his multitudinous cares, responsibilities, and obligations he deems it essential to give his attention to the size of the Navy personnel, and that there is no

responsibility weighing upon him which is greater than that which has to do with the security and the safety of the people who look to him for guidance. [Applause.]

It has been said that this amendment is sponsored by those who live upon the coasts. I come from the Middle West, and I intend to vote for the amendment. It has been said that the amendment is backed by only those who have navy yards in their district. There is not a navy yard within 500 miles of Michigan, so far as I know. It is with reluctance that I find myself unconvinced by the able and plausible argument of my colleague, but I take solace in the thought that I am in accord with another gentleman from Michigan, a man who in the earliest days of the war, at the age of 49, enlisted as a private in the Marine Corps, and who served throughout the war with distinction, and who sits to-day as Secretary of the Navy, not with a smile upon his lips, but fearful, and yet hopeful, that the American Navy will not be destroyed by the American Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I have no letter to read from any man in high official position, and I have none to read from naval experts and none to read from navy-yard employees. But if I were to read a letter I would read one of many I have received from persons of position in my district, in humble station and in high, the one letter expressing the sentiment of the many, and the many expressing the sentiment which I feel prevails in my district, in my State, and in this Nation—the sentiment that this Congress should give to the Nation a Navy worthy of the flag it bears. [Applause.] A natural corollary of the Washington conference, so happily and so successfully terminated, prompts us to curtail the human as well as the material forces of the Navy if we are to keep abreast of the advanced thought of the hour and are to meet fairly and squarely the spirit of that conference. To make effective this curtailment the Naval Affairs Committee, after very exhaustive hearings, determined to recommend to Congress that the authorized strength of the Navy be reduced to 86,000 men, believing that while this number would represent a substantial reduction in personnel it would not render the Navy impotent nor ineffectual. I am glad to say that the prevailing opinion of the Naval Affairs Committee was and is that the actual strength shall approximate the authorized strength, and therefore it is with a clear conscience and a firm conviction that I am willing to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. [Applause.]

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

Mr. HICKS. I regret I can not yield. My colleagues, as we approach the subject and as we vote upon it, let us remember that the American people feel kindly toward the Navy; they appreciate its value for defense; they appreciate its value for protection to our commerce; they appreciate its value in maintaining our national policies, and I believe they are willing to pay the cost of keeping it well equipped, well maintained, and well manned. [Applause.]

As the nations of the world, in the arms conference, followed President Harding, a man of sympathy, a man of world vision, a man whose heart is attuned to the aspirations and the hopes of humanity, let us, his fellow citizens, follow him to-day in his patriotism and in his statesmanship as he has interpreted that conference by pointing the way to a Navy worthy of a mighty people. [Applause.] Colleagues, let us vote for the amendment [applause], let us have a Navy worthy of the name, worthy of the glory, worthy of the deeds of that Navy which throughout the years has been the pride and the bulwark of the Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, how much time is there remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. There are 39½ minutes remaining between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE] and the gentleman from Michigan. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] has 23 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] 25 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the chairman of the committee, Mr. MADDEN. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the Appropriations Committee recognizes itself as the servant of the House, and we recognize the House as the servant of the people, and we believe the American people are in favor of decent economy in the conduct of the Government. [Applause.] We give as conscientious study to every problem that comes before us as it is possible for disinterested minds to give. We have no preconceived notions about anything. We have no special interests to serve. We serve only the American people, and we believe

when we come to you with a recommendation seeking to preserve the integrity of the economic side of the American Government we have a right to expect reasonable and decent consideration at your hands. [Applause.]

There has much been said to-day about the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY]. I think he has no peer anywhere. [Applause.] For integrity of purpose, useful, unselfish devotion to duty, industry, knowledge, and experience no man of my acquaintance surpasses the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. [Applause.] As chairman of the subcommittee which prepared the pending bill, he has shown that he possesses an amazing fund of naval knowledge, more knowledge of naval affairs than any naval officer that came before us. [Applause.]

It has been said that we have acquired no information. Well, if we acquired no information, it was because there was no one in the Navy who had it [applause], for we had every man presumed to have any knowledge before us, and we made up our minds we were going to acquire the knowledge if it could be obtained.

Why, the distinguished Secretary of the Navy was before the Committee on Appropriations for three weeks every day; so was the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and they learned more about the Navy during their sessions with the Committee on Appropriations than they would have learned if they had been in these positions for a thousand years. [Laughter and applause.] Why, that is the place where we compel men from the departments to expose their ignorance or their knowledge or experience, as the case may be. Oh, we frequently have been compelled to send them back to learn their lesson. You talk about the Navy and about the expert knowledge which the men in the Navy possess. Everybody else has been telling tales out of school, and I presume it is no crime for the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to tell his tale, and I propose to tell it. Why, it is not long since, as you all know, that the Navy was before us for \$12,500,000 of a deficit for fuel for the ships. They withdrew. They came again. We had further hearings. They reduced from \$12,500,000, as the hearings went on, to \$10,900,000, and, as the hearings proceeded, from \$10,900,000 to \$9,900,000. We gave them \$6,283,000 for the rest of the fiscal year. They said that the Navy would be tied to the docks.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman remember that the floor leader, yielding to the importunity of the experts, begged the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to give them this sum which they said they must have?

Mr. MADDEN. I do, very well indeed.

Mr. MONDELL. I believed in them for the moment.

Mr. MADDEN. But I did not. [Applause.] And we gave them \$6,283,000. It may be of interest to the House to know that only a few days ago I received a letter from the Secretary of the Navy saying that in the original instance they made a mistake; that they only should have asked for \$7,700,000 instead of \$12,500,000. [Laughter and applause.]

There is your expert knowledge taken from the Navy books by the Secretary of the Navy. Why is their expert knowledge more valuable as to the men on the ships? No two men in the Navy will tell you the same thing about the number of men on the ships. We have agreed on every ship except 23 destroyers, which they wanted in half commission. Twenty-three destroyers in half commission would mean 50 men to a destroyer. Fifty men to 23 destroyers would mean 1,150 men. They have 18 battleships. They had on board on the 1st of February, 1922, 18,258 men. They said they wanted 21,158 men as the extreme maximum. That would be only 2,900 men more; 2,900 and 1,150 would be 4,050 men. If there is any difference at all between the Committee on Appropriations and the Navy, it is 4,050 men. That is all there is to it. They said they would be able to function these ships if they had these men.

We had 301 destroyers built during the war. Everybody knows we do not need 301 destroyers in time of peace. Even the Navy says they do not need them. They say they are going to lay up 198 of them. They have laid them up. Why, the destroyers cost \$75,896,000 last year, within \$4,500,000 of the total cost of the Navy before the war, except for repairs and construction.

Do you want to maintain this sort of a Navy forever? The American people, I believe, are waiting, anxiously waiting, to see whether we are in earnest in the promise we made of economy in the conduct of the Government. Why, the total cost of the Navy and of the Army in 1916 was only \$280,000,000. The total cost of the Army and Navy for the current fiscal year is \$800,000,000. The total cost of the Army and Navy for the

year 1923, if the House and the Senate will concur in the recommendations made by the Committee on Appropriations, will be \$500,000,000. [Applause.]

That is 100 per cent more than before the war. Why, the Navy had in 1916, 51,000 men. They had then as many battleships as we have now. If they could conduct the affairs of the Navy with an equal number of battleships then on an expenditure of \$147,000,000, in God's name is there any reason why they can not conduct it now on the basis of \$233,000,000? [Applause.]

Do you know, gentlemen, that if your amendment is adopted it will add \$60,000,000 to the recommendations of the committee? That is not all; oh, no; that is not all. There is a bill pending here to-day for increased pay for the Navy which will mean, when passed, \$15,000,000 more. There is a bill pending for \$8,000,000 for the Navy for Air Service construction. That will have to be added to this bill. There is a bill pending, or one that will be pending, for the cancellation of the contracts due to the conference limitation, which requires the cessation of construction on several battleships now under way. That will cost \$75,000,000 more. This program, then, would read like this: The bill instead of \$233,000,000 would mean \$391,000,000.

Are you ready, gentlemen, to go before the American people and say that you are willing to keep this load upon their backs forever? We supposed when the Conference for the Limitation of Armaments was called that that would mean economy. But does it? Not if this program goes through.

What we maintain is this: That we give the Navy every man and every ship except the 23 destroyers in half commission that they ask for, and we maintain that what we have given them is compliance with every line of the naval treaty. [Applause.]

Now, we are your servants. You will do what you please. We come here to recommend. You have the power to act. Whatever your action may be, it will be our action when it is over.

But we plead with you on behalf of an overburdened taxpaying public to stop, to think, to listen, to wait for the verdict; for the verdict if it does not come to-day, gentlemen, will come in November. [Applause.] And I would like to know how any Republican can go back home and make any claim for the support of his constituents on the ground that he has voted for economy when he must make that claim in view of extreme extravagance; and that is what your proposal with respect to this bill means.

The Budget submitted to the Congress was \$167,000,000 more than the revenues, and since that time we have \$85,000,000 more of estimates. That makes the Budget to-day \$252,000,000 more than the revenue. The Budget did not contain any estimate for carrying out the pending reclassification act, which will cost several million dollars more, and likewise it did not contain the probable action that will be taken by the House under the so-called \$240 bonus, which will cost you \$35,000,000; and it did not provide for the \$17,000,000 bill that you passed a few days ago for the veterans' hospital fund; and it did not provide for the \$65,000,000 road bill, which is pending, and which undoubtedly will be passed. And it did not provide for the pending river and harbor act amounting to more than \$31,000,000. The items for which the Budget did not provide amount to \$163,000,000, and \$163,000,000 added to the \$252,000,000 to which I have called your attention will make a deficit on the face of the case of \$415,000,000. If you add the figures which it is proposed to be added to this bill you will not only eat up all the revenues but you will leave the Government with many hundred millions of deficit, and we shall be compelled to go to the American people with a new tax bill. Do you want to do it? Do not do it. I plead with you.

There is no man living who loves the President of the United States more than I. I am his friend; I am unselfishly devoted to him. I love him with a love that knows no turning. I would go further for him than any man I know. I was one of the first seven or eight men in the United States who declared for Mr. Harding for President. There is nothing in the world that he could ask me to do—and I know he would not ask me to do anything that his conscience would not tell him was right—that I would not do.

He has asked me for nothing in this. He has asked no one for anything in this. He has expressed an opinion as to what he thinks, but the expression of that opinion does not disclose the facts as they exist. We have obtained the facts from a close, earnest, untiring, unselfish devotion to and study of the case. I come to you, gentlemen, pleading with you to sustain the Committee on Appropriations and to let the party go to

the country with a fulfillment of its promises for decent economy in government. [Applause, the Members rising.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. VARE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] two minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, a sentence spoken by a very great American:

But there is something we need even more than ships, and this is officers and men. To provide battleships and cruisers and then lay them up with the expectation of leaving them unmanned until they are needed in actual war would be worse than folly. It would be a crime against the Nation.

Those are the words of Theodore Roosevelt. [Applause.] They were expressed to this Congress of the United States on December 3, 1901. Roosevelt had the gift of vision; we should follow him to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to a real expert, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT]. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, on last Tuesday it was my pleasure and privilege to submit to the House some remarks on this bill. So deeply impressed am I with the gravity of the situation, so serious are the conditions that are threatened, not alone to the Navy but to the country, by the provisions of the pending bill that I feel justified in appearing before you again.

Before the armistice was called we had built and building the finest and best Navy in the world. In military and naval efficiency and value it stood number one. With a generous response the people of the United States said through the conference, "We are willing to yield our first position and come down and put ourselves upon an equality with another country," when we had a position of superiority over that country in the military value of our Navy.

The other day I called your attention to the fact that this agreement for a 5-5-3 ratio was based alone upon tonnage of battleships. It ignored every other consideration. It left out gun power and it left out speed; and I submitted to you facts showing that in speed England had many ships faster than our battleships that we retain, because in our generous response, in the overflowing generosity of our country and our people we scrapped 13 of the finest, greatest, strongest, and best ships that were ever planned and put in the course of construction in all the history of the world. That is what we did. We surrendered gun power, we surrendered speed, and took ships with inferior gun power and with inferior speed, and put ourselves upon an equal basis of tonnage alone.

My friends, I call your attention to that to emphasize the fact that it does not behoove us, it does not become the American Congress further to sacrifice the efficiency and the ability of the American Navy. [Applause.] The responsibility rests upon us to see to it that the proper standing, the proper ratio, of the United States is maintained. [Applause.]

A moment ago the distinguished leader of the majority, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], came before the House and said that it was always his proud pleasure to support the President of the United States. When I heard him say that I could not withhold the reflection that if the President heard that expression he would say, "From such friends and supporters, good Lord deliver us." [Laughter and applause.] Again, the gentleman said that he was maintaining the treaty, that he wanted to save the treaty that had been agreed upon, that the treaty should not be sacrificed, that the treaty should not be salvaged; and I thought to myself, "Does he think that the President of whom he is so proud has not good sense enough to know whether or not he is sacrificing and salvaging the treaty?" [Applause.] But, my friends, do not forget that the President of the United States has not only a personal but he has a historical interest in this transaction. The President of the United States is interested in preserving this treaty, and he understands it, and I dare say that the President is as proud and is as jealous and is as deeply interested in the preservation of the treaty as is the gentleman from Wyoming, and I dare say that he understands our international relationships, that he understands the purposes of the treaty and its intertwining relationships with all the countries of the world as well as does the gentleman from Wyoming. I want to say also that I think the Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, understands the details and the particulars and the circumference and the center and the whole of that treaty as well as does the gentleman from Wyoming. [Applause.]

I think he is as deeply interested in it. I think in the history of these days that is to be written hereafter his name will be coupled with it as proudly and as intimately as that of the gentleman from Wyoming, and he will be accredited in history

as having as deep and abiding an interest in its preservation, and he would as deeply protest against its salvage and its sacrifice, as would the gentleman from Wyoming. [Applause.] And yet, my friends, we find the President of the United States so deeply impressed, so thoroughly aroused, over the tremendous consequences of this pending bill, so aroused over the disastrous results that will come to the American people, that he has not been content to have the purported interviews that have come out in the press of the country to give his views and his ideas of this matter, but in answer to a letter from a Member of this body he comes out and in specific terms warns this House and warns the people of this country of the disaster threatened by this legislation. And more than that, my friends, if you will read that letter in the spirit and the motives in which it was written, you can not escape the conviction that the President was coming and even pleading and begging the membership of this House in the name of the history of this country and the preservation of its standing and its relationship with all the countries of the world to maintain and preserve the standards and the integrity and the relationship of the American Navy. [Applause.]

My friends, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MADDEN] said that the people of this country were in favor of economy. Exactly so. We are all in favor of it. But what is economy? I want to say to you and to say to him that withholding money is not always economy. Economy is the judicious and rightful use of money for a necessary and a proper purpose. [Applause.] I called your attention the other day to the fact that as the result of the Hughes conference that just closed we had 812 ships, and under the provisions of this bill we will have in operation 277, and we will have in ordinary and reserve 535. I called your attention to the fact that the initial cost of these 535 ships that it is proposed to put out of commission and allow to go to waste and ruin was \$541,000,000. I ask you, my friends, is that economy?

I want to say more. The people of the United States are not only in favor of economy, but I want to say to you what you know and what everybody in this country knows, and that is that the American people are in favor of and honor the American Navy. [Applause.] They do not want the American Navy scrapped. I have noticed as I have gone among the people and have met the plain man that he says, "I want a good Navy. It is our first line of defense. It keeps our enemies from our shores. They can not set foot upon our soil to molest us and to attack us. We want a great and a capable and an efficient Navy."

Now, my friends, these gentlemen say that they are providing for that; that is their ipse dixit. But on what do they base it? It is simply just that, for if they had put in any other figure they could say the same thing, "We have provided for all the necessities of the Navy." But what do you say? The President of the United States says it is inadequate, that it is insufficient and not providing the proper personnel for the Navy. As Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, as President of the United States, as an interested, honorable, upright citizen, is not his judgment and his word entitled to some consideration and weight? Charged with the duty and responsibility as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy in this country, shall we give no weight, no credence, no credit to the statement of the President of the United States? And, more than that, my friends, the Secretary of the Navy, who is charged with the duty and responsibility of executing the laws and maintaining a Navy and distributing the personnel that goes into details, he has submitted figures and details in the hearings and says that if you provide for 67,000 men he will have to put out of commission in ordinary and reserve 535 of our ships, and can equip only 277 of them; and of those ships, the 18 battleships constituting the basis of the tonnage agreement, we have got to scrap 5 of them and put them in ordinary with only one-sixth of the personnel, barely enough to look after them and keep them cleaned up.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. No, I can not; I have but little time. Then comes the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, who has given the matter close personal investigation, and he corroborates the others. Then comes every responsible naval officer in the Navy, every single one without exception; they have not a single man on whose statement they can predicate their assertion. They say to you that if you only give us 67,000 men, here is the distribution that we will have to make of them; here are the ships that will have to go into ordinary and into reserve; and here are the only ones we can equip in commission and operate.

Now, when you come to think of the vast investment that is in this, when you come to think of the morale, when you come

to think of the fact that it has taken generation after generation to build up the American Navy, that it represents struggle, that it represents contest, that it represents the education of the masses of the people in which they can build up a great and honorable history; history the tradition of achievement in results that you have built up, and now they come and say it will be economy to starve it to death.

My friends, I do not believe in that sort of economy. I believe that the American people want a navy that is provided for of 5-5-3, and they want it 5-5-3. I stand before you today to say that if that conference had agreed or submitted a proposition that the English Navy should be 5, and the American Navy should be 4 or 3, and Japan's Navy should be 3, every man in this House, every man in this country that has one drop of patriotic blood in his veins would rise up and damn them beyond recognition. [Applause.]

Our people would not have stood for it one minute. These gentlemen are proposing to put us on a basis of Japan, and Japan has 1,252 men more than we are providing for our Navy. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, if a Member of the House reaches the conclusion expressed by my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] that he must follow the advice of the experts in fixing the number of the enlisted men, and he has the courage of his convictions, then he owes it to himself to vote either for 120,000 men, recommended by the General Board, or for 95,000 men, recommended by the Secretary of the Navy, upon the advice of his expert advisers. [Applause.] If he refuses to do that, then he must admit that he is casting a vote in defiance of the advice of all of the experts. If gentlemen reach the conclusion expressed by the gentleman from Nebraska, that this bill does not provide for a 5-5-3 Navy, they may well suffer some disturbance of mind; but the members of the committee who listened to the testimony of the experts of the Navy Department, of the Secretary of the Navy, and the Assistant Secretary know that this bill provides sufficient men to man a fleet that will provide us with our part of the 5-5-3 ratio. [Applause.]

Regardless of the statements that have been made, no intimation was given to representatives of the department of the men that would be allowed to them when they were asked to outline the ships which under the treaty they would put in commission next year. We simply asked them to indicate the ships they would retain and they outlined that list. I checked them off one by one, as did other members of the committee. Then we asked them to give us the number of men on those ships. They said they did not have that number as of that date, but would furnish the list reported as of January 1, and it amounted to 49,492 men. We said, then, that we would allow for the ships 49,492 men, but they said that they wanted more than 49,492 men for next year; that for the same ships they wanted 61,000—after the peace pact had been signed and after the naval holiday had been agreed to. Mr. Chairman, I wish the newspapers would state to the country that for the next year the Navy Department wants 12,000 more men than they had on the same ships this year on January 1. [Applause.]

Oh, but they say it does not provide a 5-5-3 Navy. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] thinks that for us it means a two and a half Navy. Does the gentleman mean what he says? My friend from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] said the same thing yesterday. Then, if 67,000 men means a two and one-half Navy, in order to be five you would have to vote for 134,000. If you do not, then you sacrifice the ratio of 5-5-3. Sacrificing the ratio of 5-5-3 is what they charge us with, but they advocate the sacrifice themselves when they vote for 86,000. I say that we do not sacrifice it, and all of the correspondence school that we have had thrust upon us in the last few days—the letter from the President, the letter from the Secretary of the Navy, the letter from the Secretary of State, from the chamber of commerce, and from all of the other inhabitants of the correspondence school—every last one has been based upon the statement of the Navy Department that under the personnel provided we will have a Navy less than that of Great Britain and only equal to Japan. I deny it, because the figures do not support it.

Gentlemen say that this committee did not ask the Navy Department for a statement as to the personnel figures of other navies. That statement, too, is untrue. When the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and others were charging the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] with that fact I knew that one week before the gentleman from Michigan made a report to this House I went to the office of the Chief of Operations to ask him to authorize the intelligence office to give me the latest

figures they had on the British and Japanese personnel. His aid, Commander Hill, very courteously stated that he would present the figures to me there, and he gave them to me, and I hold in my hand a statement signed by the aid to Admiral Coontz, the Chief of Operations, which is based on the March report, but yet differs from the statement furnished by the Navy Department, and which has been placed in the RECORD.

In this statement placed in the RECORD the figures as to total personnel exclude marines and officers. Why did he not exclude the Coast Guard? I have a statement here in which they do that. Did he exclude the midshipmen? No. He says here in the statement which has been put in the RECORD that the total enlisted force on March 31, 1923, will be 94,500 men; and in a statement furnished me, based on the same report, on March 25 it is 97,450. And then in order to secure the figure of 104,000 he adds 111,000 of last year to the 97,000 for this year and divides it in two. No two figures furnished us being the same, we determined to check up these figures. I have here the debates of the House of Commons on the naval estimates, the statement of the parliamentary secretary of the Admiralty of Great Britain. I have read every available service paper of Great Britain, and I find that the figures furnished by the department are inaccurate and misleading. I charge nothing venal.

I do charge that the statements upon which the President and the Secretary of State and others have reached the conclusion that Great Britain would have in its personnel next year a much greater number of men than we have is wrong. I can not go into all the details. Here is one glaring misstatement. They told you that next year Great Britain would have in the Royal Air Force 30,000 men and that one-third of them would be devoted to naval aviation. Knowing how inaccurate their statements were, we determined to investigate. We learned that Brig. Gen. William Mitchell, Assistant Chief of Operations of the American Army, as splendid an officer as ever wore the uniform, had just returned from Great Britain, where he had been studying aviation. We summoned him before the committee. Here is the transcript of his testimony. He says while the authorized strength of the Royal Air Force is 30,000 that they have not recruited more than 23,000. Instead of one-third of that force, or 10,000, being assigned to the naval service that only 2,500 men are assigned to the naval service. [Applause.] And he did not make any general statement. Here is his testimony. Because of his service during the war he is very intimate with the English aviation officers, and he had excellent opportunity to acquire information, not from newspapers but by personal visits to their headquarters and to practically every important aviation station, and he sets forth here station by station the number of men and the number of officers. He says that assigned to the fleet there are only 850 men—that there are located at training stations only 1,197 men, making 2,047 men. To be liberal he allows 500 mechanics, giving every doubt to the naval service, making the total number of men of the Royal Air Force assigned to the navy only 2,547 men in time of peace. In time of war one-third would be assigned to the fleet and coast defenses, only one-sixth going to the fleet.

Now, let me ask you, if the Navy Department can send through this entire country, sticking in every newspaper this chart which is based upon the statement that there are 30,000 men in the Royal Air Force and one-third assigned to the naval service, when there are only 2,500 assigned to it, how can you depend on any figures that they give you on this subject?

Now, you have been told that the English complement on battleships is going to be greater next year. Have they not told you that every day here? Here is the statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty, explaining the naval estimates, that because of the improved international situation, they will this year reduce the complements on their battleships by 15.7 per cent.

Instead of increasing it, they are going to reduce their complement 15 per cent because of the improvement in the international situation. If the international situation has improved for Great Britain, what has occurred to so menace the security of this country that the Navy of the United States wants 12,000 more men on the same ships than they had on January 1 of this year? The militarists of one country act very much like the militarists of another country. Here are the debates of the House of Commons. It may remind you of what you have heard here this week:

The parliamentary secretary of the Admiralty, Mr. Amery: The American Navy, following the same policy as ourselves in reducing strength, proposes to reduce from 139,000 to 115,000; that is to say, to a strength slightly above ours. The position of the Japanese Navy is that their figure stood at 82,000. The latest figure stood at 80,000. I am not aware of any suggestion for still further reduction.

This statement was made as late as 24th of March, 1922. We could have told him better than that. But Great Britain is told that we contemplate keeping 115,000, a force greater than theirs, and Japan is to keep 80,000. In Japan doubtless the people are being told that Great Britain and America are increasing their enlisted men, and here we are told that Great Britain is to retain a superior force and Japan an equal force.

Can not you imagine a scene similar to this in London, a debate along the same lines? But the secretary to the Admiralty did make one statement which should be interesting to the gentlemen who claim that we are providing so small a force compared to that of Great Britain. He said of us:

The committee of their lower House has made suggestions which, when you include all the different items comparable with the items which come under our vote A, would reduce the total to something over 99,000 men, or a figure very slightly in excess of our own.

Now, remember, that while the Navy Department asserts that the British intend to keep in the service 104,000 men, the secretary of the Admiralty time after time in this debate states that they intend to reduce the total force to 98,000 at the earliest possible date in this fiscal year. Now, let us see how he figures that with comparable figures our total will exceed that number. Their 98,000 will include marines, officers and men, officers of the navy, and officers and men of the coast guard. This is admitted by the statement I have from the office of Chief of Operations. It appears from the English statements. It does not indicate whether midshipmen, numbering approximately 2,500, should be included. But take our 67,000 and add 19,500 marines, 6,156 officers of the line and staff, 1,244 warrant officers, 1,000 marine officers, approximately 4,000 Coast Guard men and officers, and 2,500 naval cadets, and you have a total of 101,400. This evidently is how the secretary to the Admiralty figures our force in excess of theirs. Does it impress gentlemen at all that while they are charging that we have reduced the force so much below Great Britain's that the British Admiralty is asserting that the force proposed in this bill when properly compared with theirs is greater?

One very pertinent remark was made by Lieutenant Commander Kenworthy. As gentlemen argued for increased appropriations for the navy yards of Great Britain, he said:

The navy does not exist for the dockyards but the dockyards for the navy.

Let me call attention to this statement by the Secretary of the Admiralty:

I omitted to answer the question put by the right honorable gentleman the member for the city of London as to the numbers in the Navy in 1914. The figure is 150,300, which we are now reducing to 98,000.

So that while Great Britain can reduce its force from 150,300 to 98,000, including marines, officers, coast guard, and all, which would really bring the net down to 70,326, including aviation, this peace-loving country of ours must increase its force from 54,000 in 1916, after the sinking of the *Lusitania*, up to 67,000, and if some of you have your way to 86,000. And remember that under the treaty Great Britain is allowed for the next year 580,450 tonnage as against our 500,650, and manifestly if they are to keep in commission their treaty navy it would require a few thousand more men than it will require to keep ours.

But the gentlemen who have not studied this question assert that the force provided could not keep the 18 battleships in commission. If, with 54,000 men in 1916, they could find 18,000 men to keep battleships in commission, why can not they find 18,000 men for the battleships out of the 67,000 men provided by this bill? They say it can not be done. Before the committee the Secretary stated that with 67,000 men he could keep in commission only 12, and the table on page 232 so shows. But the table, when prepared by the Secretary and inserted in the RECORD yesterday, shows that with the same number he now says he can keep in commission 13 battleships.

And my good friend from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] says that if you provide 67,000 men you can keep in commission but 12 battleships. I love him, but he is not always the best prophet. Last year when we had the appropriation bill up the Navy swore if we gave them 100,000 men we were going to scrap the whole shooting match, and on February 10, 1921, Mr. PADGETT said:

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] stated that it would keep all of our dreadnoughts in commission. I must disagree with him. I have a statement, received this morning, to the effect that if the personnel were reduced to 100,000 men the ships of the Navy will be in the following status: Battleships, first line, in commission, 13.

[Laughter.]

That is the high-water mark. They can not exceed 13. Last year they could not. This year they say they can not. When we passed the 100,000 provision, instead of putting in commission 13, as Mr. PADGETT predicted, they put in 18, and they

have 18 to-day. So what becomes of the prophecy of my good friend from Tennessee?

Oh, they say, "We ought to follow the experts on the question of personnel for battleships." Well, the General Board says you ought to put 22,000 on them. The Chief of Operations says you ought to put 21,000 on them. And they have to-day 18,000. They ought to have 18,000. And when we give them that 18,000, when we give them the exact number they have on the ships they want to keep in commission, then if they do not keep them in commission it is not your fault, but the fault of the naval officers, and the President ought to remove some of them. [Applause.]

Now, let me say a word to this side of the House. We have heard much of the Limitation of Armament Conference. We Democrats believed in limiting armament. During the World War we told the people that we fought that war in order that war might be no more. Then, under the leadership of our President, we endeavored to provide for a limitation of armament on land and sea through the League of Nations. When the last naval bill was considered Members on this side fought for an amendment providing for a limitation of armaments, among them being the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

When the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], against the wishes of the Republican leaders of the Senate, placed his amendment on the naval bill, this side of the House with only one or two exceptions stood for it and fought for it.

Now, after this conference has been held up to the world as a success, shall we vote for an amendment here that will mean increased naval appropriations instead of decreased appropriations in the next fiscal year? If I wanted to play politics with you gentlemen on the Republican side, I would advocate it; I would help pile up appropriations, so that when you went before the people we could say the Limitation of Armament Conference was a fraud. But a man's duty is not to his party but to the people of America. In every hamlet they prayed for the success of this conference, and they thought they were getting something. Shall we tell them before the ink is dry upon the peace treaty that we have only distrust for the signers and that the people, instead of getting reduced taxation, will get a gold brick at the hands of the American Congress? [Applause.]

We have heard from all the lobbies, the naval lobby, the steel lobby, the newspapers in communities where naval activities exist, some unselfish and some selfish. But back home there are people from whom you have not heard, people who do not write you letters, but who stay upon the farms and in the factories of America and place their trust in you. Among these people who sent you here there is unemployment and distress. The people are sorely oppressed by taxation. Will you listen to the plea of the special interests, or will you consider the interests of the people who sent you here, and vote to reduce to some extent the taxation which now threatens to exhaust the rich and beggar the poor? [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, has the time all been consumed except what I have reserved for myself?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] has five minutes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the great old patriarch of national defense, the real hero here of the World War [JULIUS KAHN]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Lord that I have learned and remembered some lessons of the World War. On the 6th day of April it was only five years since we got into that war. We were absolutely unprepared for the war. In 1916 the national defense bill was up before this House, before this committee; I had the pleasure of supporting that measure. I repeatedly called the attention of the House to the fact that we were not prepared for war.

Unfortunately the House was not willing to vote for all the amendments that I had proposed at that time. Gentlemen then asked me on this floor the very questions or, rather, questions similar to the ones that have been asked here to-day. Repeatedly I heard men on this floor say, "Whom are you going to fight? Whom are you going to prepare for? What is the need of getting ready? There is no enemy in sight." I told the House frankly that I did not know who would be our enemy; I did not know when war would come; but I believed in keeping this country of ours measurably ready to meet any country in the world. [Applause.] And after an interim of six years I still feel that way regarding the United States of America. [Applause.]

Now, the Members in charge of this bill speak of the economies that should be practiced at this time because of the great

burden of taxation. I agree that the taxes are terrific, but what brought them upon the shoulders of the people of this country? The war, for which you would not get ready in 1916. [Applause.] Practically \$1,000,000,000 a year is the amount that the people of the United States are called upon these days to meet in the Treasury of the United States our annual war expenses. That is a terrific amount; that is what our unpreparedness in 1917 cost us. Yet the people are paying the indebtedness cheerfully. But they expect this House to do those things that will prevent the possibility of any future war.

The Democratic President was elected in 1916 on the score that "he kept us out of war." It was at that time a pacifist country. A few months later, when we took up those very questions of preparedness on this floor, we could not induce the Members of the House to make appropriations for necessary preparation. And yet in less than seven months afterwards we were in the war up to the very hilt. We had to pour out \$24,000,000,000 to meet the expenses of the war. Our interest charges alone cost us a billion dollars a year. It took us 13 months to get ready for that war. Fortunately for us, England and France and Belgium were able to hold the lines while the Americans were being trained and put in a condition to help win the war.

That kept on for some little time; in those days we were not prepared to fight. But our Navy was able to help the bringing of 2,000,000 American soldiers to the war areas of Europe. Finally, in May, 1918, we were able for the first time to send our forces to fight. America needs make no apology for the work of our soldiers. But no loyal patriotic citizen wants our boys to go through such another experience. That is why I support the amendment for 86,000 men. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from South Carolina yields one minute, his unexpired time, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], so that the gentleman has 21 minutes. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, we have debated this bill now for an entire week, and we have at last reached the point where we are to make a decision. The bill is important in the highest degree, both because it directly relates to the national security, which must always be our first concern, and also because it carries an appropriation of nearly a quarter of a billion of dollars. It has been asserted that the amounts carried in the bill are insufficient and that the number of men provided will not properly man the ships which we are to retain under the agreements reached at the Conference on Limitation of Armament. If I believed that this were true I would not vote for the bill myself. The amounts carried are based entirely upon the theory that they are adequate to meet all the requirements of the treaty navy. I do not believe that the position of the committee as to this has been shaken in the slightest degree during the entire week of debate. The propositions laid down at the beginning of the debate have not been successfully met. The most serious criticism of the work of the committee, apparently, has been that we were not willing to accept without challenge the views of the Navy Department, particularly with regard to the size of the enlisted personnel necessary to operate a navy based upon the 5-5-3 ratio.

I need not say in this connection that the committee has at all times been eager to obtain the viewpoint and the opinion of the Navy Department, but we have been just as eager to ascertain the reasons as we have been to learn their conclusions. An opinion, no matter from what source it may come, is of little value unless the reasons lying at the bottom of such opinion appeals to the judgment. I am frank to say that we have not accepted statements and opinions without question, and I may say we have scrutinized every demand for money with more than usual severity. We believed that the conditions of business in the country and the state of the finances of the Government demanded such a course. We proceeded upon the theory that no person under the Government, high or low, was entitled to a single dollar for his department unless he could sit on the opposite side of the table and show with a reasonable degree of certainty where that dollar was to be spent and why it was necessary to spend it. [Applause.] We assumed that you wanted us to pursue this course. If we were to accept without question whatever was laid before us in the form of demands for money, the labor of the committee might as well have been eliminated and the estimates brought directly to the House. We regarded ourselves as the agents of the House, to inquire into all the facts, and felt ourselves charged with the duty of making a most searching inquiry and examination into the needs of the Navy in the light of the Conference on the Limitation of Armament before bringing for your consideration this great bill, carrying more than \$230,000,000. We have kept the faith to the very best of our ability. [Applause.]



I will admit at the outset that the committee and the Navy Department have not always been in accord, and that we have not accepted in every instance the views of the advisers of the Navy Department. There is in the Navy the same difference of opinion with reference to naval matters as exists in the professions of medicine or the law as to legal and medical affairs. The committee did not, therefore, expect to find that every naval officer agreed with every other naval officer. If it were merely a matter of disagreement between two officers of equal rank and experience, the committee could choose between them or disregard either or both. But the thing that has disturbed the committee more than anything else has not been the varying opinions of different men but the widely differing statements of fact made by the same naval officer under exactly the same conditions and within a comparatively short period of time. [Applause.] The committee has been obliged to adopt a most searching attitude because of this fact. The military head of the Navy under the Secretary is the Chief of Naval Operations. The same officer who held that position a year ago holds it now. During the course of the hearings last year the Chief of Naval Operations was asked to state to the committee of the House the number of capital ships and necessary auxiliaries which could be maintained in full commission with an enlisted force of 100,000 men. He put into the hearings a table on January 10, 1921, which appears on page 65 of last year's hearings. In this table it appears that he could keep in commission 17 battleships and the necessary auxiliaries with an enlisted force of 100,000 men. The bill passed the House carrying approximately \$400,000,000.

The Senate added approximately \$100,000,000 more. During the consideration of the Senate increases this same officer testified before the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, on the 18th of February, 1921, with the same bill under consideration and with no change in world conditions, that he could keep in commission only 15 battleships and necessary auxiliaries with 120,000 men. [Applause.] At the same time, and while before the same committee, he put in another table showing that with 110,000 men he could keep in commission only 13 battleships. [Applause.] We gave him 106,000 men and he has kept in commission 18 battleships. [Applause.]

I am going to make a statement which I fear may sound somewhat harsh, but I believe that it should be said. No executive department of the Government should permit its officers to juggle with facts in the manner above stated. [Applause.] I do not believe that any officer ought to be continued as the military head of the American Navy who appears before two different committees of Congress within a month and makes such varying and contradictory statements as a basis for increased appropriations. [Applause.] I have always been glad to be guided by the counsel of the officers of the Navy Department whenever such counsel has been consistent and appeals to the judgment and can be defended in reason. The experience of our committee, however, last year made it necessary to adopt more searching methods of inquiry this year than heretofore in determining the requirements for the Navy. We did not believe that the House would be satisfied with the mere statement of the Chief of Naval Operations that any particular number of ships could be kept in commission with any particular number of men.

We therefore decided to determine the needs of the Navy in a more detailed and thorough manner. Instead of inquiring as to the number and type of ships that could be kept in commission with a particular number of men, we decided, first, to require the Navy Department to furnish us a complete list of all ships of every type, by name, which in the judgment of the department would be necessary to a properly balanced 18-battleship fleet. This list the committee has printed in its report. We then assigned to each ship the number of men now carried on that particular ship, as furnished us by the Navy Department itself, as of February 1, 1922. The bill, therefore, provides for all the ships of the treaty Navy, with as large a personnel carried thereon as was on board on the date above mentioned. I do not see how a fairer or more accurate method could be devised. [Applause.] But they say we took advantage of them. I suppose that what they really mean is that had they known that we intended to base our appropriation upon the number of men upon the ships on a certain day the results might have been quite different. [Applause and laughter.] Be that as it may, it is claimed the number was not normal. This debate has been going on now for a full week. Officers from the Navy Department have been in constant consultation with Members of Congress, supplying information and making suggestions relative to the various proposals carried in this bill.

I have no criticism whatever on account of their doing this, but I am sorry that some of them thought it necessary to ex-

change their uniforms during the past week for civilian clothes, whenever they came to the Capitol. [Laughter.] If the number of men carried on the ships, as of February 1, 1922, was abnormally low, if there had been an hour during the last 12 months when the records would show a larger number carried on the ships than were carried on that date, have you any idea that my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] would not at least have had a letter from the Navy Department advising him on this fact? [Laughter and applause.] But we go through the whole debate for an entire week, the department claiming that the number of men on the ships was below normal on February 1 last, with all the records in their office to show this fact if it were true, but we come to the very hour of voting and no such proof has been furnished. [Applause.] No other proof is necessary, in my judgment, to convince the House that the number of men carried on the ships on February 1, 1922, represented a fair average of personnel afloat on these particular ships for the year. The number of men we have, therefore, allowed for the treaty navy stands upon as solid a ground as to accuracy and sufficiency as when printed in the report and laid before Congress. So much, then, for the Navy afloat. They have not shown that they need another man. We have provided for 50,000 men for the treaty Navy afloat—2,000 more than were carried upon these identical ships before the great nations of the earth entered into a solemn compact to keep the peace of the world and to maintain friendly relations with one another. [Applause.]

No one has yet given any reason why a larger number of men should be supplied than the ships actually carry at this time. The only other question, therefore, is, did we give them men enough on shore? My answer is that it gave them a man on shore for every job on shore, and 7,000 men besides. [Applause.] But it did not seem to be sufficient. They had on February 1, last, only 12,600 places on shore where they could legitimately put men, and yet they are asking this Congress for 32,000 men on shore to fill 12,600 jobs at a time when farmers, merchants, and manufacturers are borrowing money to pay their taxes. [Applause.] If the Committee on Appropriations had actually followed any such advice as that, then, indeed, the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGEE] that the Appropriations Committee might well be abolished would be timely. [Laughter.]

Why do they desire this large number of excess men on shore? I am sure that question has been running through your mind constantly during this week of debate. I asked the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] the other day if he, as a business man, was willing to say that we ought to appropriate for 32,000 men to fill 12,000 jobs, and he said that he thought so if the Navy Department wanted them. [Laughter.] But the other gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN], with a mind as sharp as a razor's edge, was not so easily satisfied, and he pressed me for an answer as to what the department could do with all these extra unassigned men. And the question is still unanswered by any proponent of this increase of 20,000 men above the amount provided in the bill.

In my judgment there is only one possible reason for asking for these 20,000 extra men. It can not be because they are to be added to the ships of the treaty Navy. Those ships already carry enough, as has been shown by Mr. OLIVER, Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, and other gentlemen on this floor. They are not needed on shore because we have given them a man for every job and 7,000 unassigned men for training or to take the place of men who are sick, on leave, or in transit in the service. But that was not enough. They come here and want 20,000 more. What for? The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] on yesterday asked to have the navy yard items passed over until the number of enlisted men were agreed upon. In answer to a question by me as to the theory upon which his request was based he replied that an increase in the number of men, of course, would mean an increase in the number of ships and a consequent increase in the item of repairs. Inasmuch as the committee had provided for the treaty navy, it becomes apparent that those who demand the increased number of personnel expect a larger Navy to be kept in commission than that required under the treaty. The other gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] also let the cat out of the bag a while ago when he condemned as unwise the policy of not keeping all our fighting ships in full commission. And the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER], more frank than all the rest, urged that all our destroyers should be kept in full commission. And at last we have the reason why the 20,000 extra men are demanded. It proves out with almost mathematical precision. We have 200 surplus destroyers and it takes 100 men for each destroyer. So that if we keep them all in commission it will require exactly 20,000 men to man them. This is the only

logical reason which has been given by anyone for increasing the personnel provided in this bill from 87,000 men to 86,000 men. But what does this proposal mean?

Are we ready to send this challenge out to the world, that we intend to keep in commission 200 warships over and above the number required to maintain the treaty Navy? How does such a performance on the part of Congress harmonize with the lofty ideals enunciated by America at the time of the assembling of the Conference on the Limitation of Armament? What will the world say to-morrow morning as the Christian people of the earth assemble for worship on the Sabbath day if they are told from the pulpit that the American Congress has just appropriated \$54,000,000 to keep in full commission and ready for instant war 200 ships of war in addition to those permitted under the treaty? [Applause.] Such a proposal as that would strike at the heart of civilization everywhere throughout the world. [Applause.] The mischief that such a course on the part of Congress might do can not be calculated. But it is said that the President and the Secretary of State have advised this. If they have been misled as to the effect and the purpose of this increase in personnel, the responsibility upon Congress to prevent the mischief is only thereby increased. [Applause.]

Why have our naval officers taken this position? Why do they desire all these surplus warcraft to be kept in commission? They have simply fallen into a panic. The 200 surplus destroyers require 1,600 officers, and if we lay up the 200 destroyers the officers are lying awake nights wondering what will be done with the officers thus released. I think the officers have made a mistake.

Personally, I have not been in favor of greatly reducing the number of officers. In fact, I am willing that we should have a surplus of officers. I believe that should be the policy of the Government. If we have the officers and the ships, the enlisted personnel is not so serious a problem and could be quickly supplied. There is no provision, therefore, in this bill for any reduction in the number of officers, although it is possible that some reduction may be necessary at an early date. Thus through fear of losing promotion or perhaps through fear of being severed entirely from the service, I fear the officers of the Navy have made common cause with the various localities of the country whose business interests have been adversely affected by the agreements reached at the Conference on Limitation of Armament. We therefore find arrayed against this bill all the local influences from Maine to New Orleans on the Atlantic and from San Diego to Seattle on the Pacific. I do not say that this is not a natural attitude for these various navy-yard communities to take. They naturally feel the loss of business as a result of smaller naval activities. I can well sympathize with the employees here in the Washington Navy Yard. Some of them have been employed by the Government for 20 years. They have been manufacturing the great 16-inch guns that were to be placed on ships that are never to be built. These guns will never even fire a salute.

When the agreement was reached at the conference the major portion of the work in the Washington Navy Yard came to an end, and the thousands of employees had to look for employment elsewhere. There is a great navy yard in Boston. I do not censure Representatives from that locality who reflect the opinion of the city which they represent. There is a great navy yard in Philadelphia, and I do not censure Mr. VARE for looking after the interests of his constituents who will suffer financial loss because of reduced naval activities at that point. But the fact that new adjustments will be necessary, and that temporary losses must be sustained in certain localities, must not be permitted to retard the work so gloriously begun at the Washington conference.

Gentlemen of the House, it is very well to sympathize with those who may be financially or professionally affected by the great world movement having for its object a reduction and a limitation of armament. Where it is possible and proper, no doubt some temporary adjustments should be made until employment in civil lines can be obtained. I want to say, however, in conclusion, that the American Congress must not permit any group of individuals or any combination of localities anywhere under the flag to throw themselves across the path of the world's progress in its onward march toward the goal of international understanding and good will. [Prolonged applause, the Members rising.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, let the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the VARE amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair stated that he was in doubt.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. VARE and Mr. KELLEY of Michigan were appointed to act as tellers.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 177, noes 130.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], who is present in a wheel chair, be permitted to be counted in the negative.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11228, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11228, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. McARTHUR].

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Oregon please state where the figures which he has in his amendment came from?

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, the figures in my amendment were prepared at my request by the Paymaster General of the Navy.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Do they provide for taking 10,000 men out of the lower grades of the Navy and keeping all of the high ones in, or are they proportional?

Mr. McARTHUR. They are proportional. That is my understanding.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman say so of his own knowledge?

Mr. McARTHUR. I can not say so of my own knowledge. That is my understanding.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Are the amounts carried based upon present law or the law of 1916 and prior to that?

Mr. McARTHUR. They are based upon the same law that the bill is drawn upon. They are presented to the House upon the theory that the increase would be made which the House has just voted to make in Committee of the Whole.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11228, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

By BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that gentlemen who have spoken upon the bill have permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD for five legislative days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, availing myself of the privilege to extend my remarks on the Navy appropriation bill, I desire to submit a telegram from Myer C. Rubin, adjutant of the San Francisco chapter of the Military Order of the World War:

Resolution adopted by San Francisco chapter, Military Order of the World War, Wednesday, April 19, 1922, at San Francisco, Calif.

Whereas it has come to the attention of the San Francisco chapter of the Military Order of the World War that certain Senators and Congressmen intend to legislate for the further reduction of the personnel

of the Army and the Navy and to curtail the Navy building program; and

Whereas the excuse given for the proposed legislation is for economy of administration funds and a consequent lessening of the burden of taxation now being carried by our people: Be it

*Resolved*, That it is the opinion of the San Francisco chapter of the Military Order of the World War that the sum so saved would be so small as to be insignificant in proportion to the danger involved in reducing the already inadequate number of the armed forces of this country; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this order is most emphatically opposed to any reduction in the numerical strength of our Army and Navy as now proposed and insisted upon by the departments of the Army and Navy; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this chapter of the Military Order of the World War use every endeavor to prevent the ill-advised legislation mentioned in the first paragraph of this resolution and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the representatives in Congress from California, and that they be requested to reply by formal letter setting forth their attitude in this matter.

(Please transmit copies to chairmen Senate and House Committees of Army and Navy Affairs and Members of Congress from California.)

#### LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. DUNBAR, for six days, on account of important business.

Mr. HAMMER, for four days, on account of business.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Wyoming if it is the intention to call up the naval bill for consideration on Monday?

Mr. MONDELL. The Unanimous Consent Calendar will, I assume, be considered on Monday, unless the House determines otherwise by vote. Later in the afternoon, if it is desired, if we get through with the Calendar for Unanimous Consent early, we might take up the naval bill, but I should think it would be doubtful.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman not think it would be well to have it thoroughly understood to-night when the final vote will come on the bill—that it will not be on Monday?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlemen ought to know, and I doubt if under the circumstances we ought to take up the naval bill at all on Monday. I think we should adjourn after consideration of the Unanimous Consent Calendar is concluded. I make that suggestion, because there are gentlemen who desire to go home who would not return Monday if the naval bill is not to be taken up at that time.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, April 17, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

590. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination and survey of Lake Washington Ship Canal, Wash., was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

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

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. ELLIS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9615. A bill for the relief of Sarah Green, Virginia Green, and Henry Green, next of kin of Lydia Rivers; with an amendment (Rept. No. 906). 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. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 11322) to amend paragraph (11) of section 6 of the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WARD of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 11323) to provide for a post-office building at Williamston, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 11324) to amend the Federal farm loan act so that branch banks shall be established in the capital of each State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 11325) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Kirkpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 11326) granting a pension to Judson B. Luckhurst; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 11327) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay a certain claim as the result of damage sustained to Leslie J. Kennedy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 11328) granting a pension to Lucy E. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 11329) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Waddell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11330) granting a pension to Deliaette Bruno; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A bill (H. R. 11331) for the relief of Rudolph Ponevac; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 11332) granting an increase of pension to Amanda E. Pollard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 11333) for the relief of Francis Leo Shea; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 11334) granting a pension to Sarah Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11335) for the relief of the widows of certain officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 11336) for the relief of Joseph L. Galle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 11337) for the relief of Anna Volker; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

5128. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Union League Club of Chicago, opposing the proposed reduction of the Army and Navy as provided in bills now pending and indorsing the President's stand on same; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5129. Also (by request), petition of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Massachusetts, opposing the reduction of the Army and Navy as proposed in bills now before Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5130. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, supporting the conclusions reached by the disarmament conference and later embodied in the four-power naval treaty and the President's recommendations regarding the Navy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5131. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of more than 200 members of Trinity Presbyterian Church, of Philadelphia, urging the passage of House bill 2193, regulating the export of opiates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5132. By Mr. FAVROT: Petition of sundry citizens of Baton Rouge, La., opposing the passage of the Fitzgerald Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5133. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Resolution adopted by the United Veterans of the Republic, Unit No. 12, of Charlestown, Mass., relative to the Navy personnel and the Boston Navy Yard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5134. Also, petition of Charles A. Waterman, of 18 Ethel Street, Boston, Mass., urging the passage of House bill 2894, calling for a 25 per cent reduction in interchangeable mileage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5135. Also, petition of the New England Confectionery Co., of Boston, Mass., urging passage of House bill 10159, known as the "commercial bribery bill"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5136. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of sundry citizens from the State of Washington opposing the Sunday blue law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5137. By Mr. KEARNS: Petition of Mrs. Burt L. Knotts and others of Lewistown, Ohio, opposing the passage of House bill 9753, or any Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5138. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Leon Dickinson, Esq., of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the reduction of the Navy from 86,000 to 85,000 men; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5139. By Mr. MANN: Petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., opposing the passage of pending compulsory Sunday observance bills (S. 1948 and H. R. 4388 and 9753); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5140. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the First Baptist Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., Rev. James K. Kirtley, acting pastor, urging immediate action on the Miller bill (H. R. 2193), as it will prevent all improper exportation of opium and other harmful drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5141. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of F. W. Delventhal, secretary of Lodge No. 1246, United Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees and Railroad Switchmen's League, indorsing House bill 10798 and urging its passage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5142. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, indorsing The Hague rules regarding ocean bills of lading and urging legislation looking toward its adoption; also petition of the Dried Fruit Association of California, of San Francisco, Calif., indorsing the McKellar amendment to the Harter Act, permitting ocean carriers to make contracts in accordance with The Hague rules, 1921; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5143. Also, petition of John R. Quinn, department commander, American Legion of California, of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the reduction of the naval forces of the United States below 90,000 men; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5144. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, relative to Federal taxation; also, petition of Ray Hays, of Nevada City, Calif., protesting against a tax of \$2.35 a pound on imported wrapper tobacco; also, petition of the Foreign Mission Society of Vincent Methodist Episcopal Church, of Los Angeles, protesting against the proposal to tax wine and beer to raise revenue for the soldiers' bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5145. Also, petition of J. J. Borree, brigadier general, National Guard of California, indorsing Senate bill 3325 and House bill 10972, the Army pay bill, as amended; also, petition of Snow Shed Lodge, No. 743, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Roseville, Calif., indorsing House bill-6432, for the relief of the Russian Railway Corps; also, petition of George M. Krone, of Los Angeles, urging action on the Bursum bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5146. By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions of J. T. Smith, William Zeiter, Frank E. Marshall, Morris Rosenthal, and J. W. Shott-hafer, of Utica, N. Y.; W. J. Doyle and Parker L. Scripture, of Rome, N. Y.; and Alvie Carlstran, of Oriskany, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Chandler bill (H. R. 9198) providing for an increase in pension for veterans of the War with Spain; to the Committee on Pensions.

5147. Also, petitions of granges at Lee, Columbia, and Steuben, N. Y., favoring equal privileges in granges and land banks which other American banks enjoy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5148. By Mr. WILLIAMSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Hot Springs, S. Dak., opposing the passage of the bill to secure Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, April 17, 1922.

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

Our Father, we thank Thee for yesterday and all that it means, for the hopes stimulated, the desires realized in the fact that there was an open tomb emptied, and that through the life of Him who lived and wrought so wondrously and died, was buried and rose again, life and immortality have been brought to light.

We bless Thee this day for all its associations and ask that our lives may be ennobled by the thought that the Risen One lives and loves to-day as ever. Grant Thy blessing upon the work of the day and glorify Thyself in every act and word. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, April 14, 1923, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

## CALL OF THE ROLL.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gooding	McCormick	Sheppard
Broussard	Hale	McKinley	Simmons
Bursum	Harrel	McNary	Smoot
Calder	Harris	Moses	Spencer
Capper	Harrison	Myers	Stanley
Caraway	Heflin	Nelson	Sterling
Colt	Hitchcock	Newberry	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Norbeck	Swanson
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Townsend
Dial	Kellogg	Oddie	Walsh, Mont.
du Pont	Kendrick	Overman	Warren
Edge	Keyes	Owen	Watson, Ga.
Fernald	King	Phipps	Weller
Fletcher	Ladd	Pittman	Willis
France	La Follette	Poindexter	
Gerry	Lenroot	Pomerene	
Glass	Lodge	Rawson	

Mr. HEFLIN. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is absent on account of illness in his family. I ask that the announcement stand for the day.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced his signature to the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House:

H. R. 2556. An act to advance Maj. Benjamin S. Berry to the permanent rank of major; and

H. R. 7589. An act for the relief of Maj. Ellis B. Miller.

## SPECIAL CANCELING STAMPS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10740) authorizing the use of special canceling stamps in certain post offices, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. TOWNSEND, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts conferees on the part of the Senate.

## SOUTHERN TARIFF ASSOCIATION.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week a committee known as the schedule-committee of the Southern Tariff Association met in this city for the purpose of urging increased protection for southern industries. They asked for a meeting with a number of Republican Senators who have been urging proper recognition and protection for the agricultural industries of the country. A very interesting communication addressed to those Senators at that meeting was read by Mr. Woodall, of Texas. I ask that the communication may be read.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator desire to have it read?

Mr. GOODING. Yes; I desire to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the communication.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, may I ask from whom this communication comes?

Mr. GOODING. I ask that the names attached may be read so that Senators from the South may understand from whom the communication comes.

The reading clerk read the signatures attached to the communication.

Mr. GOODING. I ask that the reading of the communication may be proceeded with and concluded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the reading.

The reading clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the communication, which, entire, is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 13, 1922.

To the Republican Senators representing agriculture and affiliated industries:

The schedule committee of the Southern Tariff Association appreciates the opportunity to appear before you and present its case. It is conscious of the deep solicitude of all of you for the well-being of the Nation as a whole, and is grateful that the vital interests of a great