

Also, a bill (H. R. 11852) granting an increase of pension to Susan R. Vittoe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 11853) for the relief of John F. Cassidy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 11854) granting a pension to Hannah E. Cahay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11855) for the relief of Jacob S. Steloff; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 11856) granting an increase of pension to William McCloud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 11857) granting a pension to Elizabeth Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 11858) granting a pension to Carrie Howell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 11859) granting a pension to Laura V. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 11860) granting a pension to Tabitha E. Isbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLSPAUGH: A bill (H. R. 11861) granting a pension to Catherine Crow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11862) granting a pension to Anna R. Little; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROACH: A bill (H. R. 11863) for the relief of Chancey F. Bartholomew; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 11864) granting a pension to Sarah A. Byam; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11865) granting a pension to Mary E. Gates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAW: A bill (H. R. 11866) providing for preliminary examination and survey to be made of the Illinois River, Ill., and its tributaries; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 11867) for the relief of Walter P. Crowley; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 11868) for the relief of the widow of John Curtis Staton; 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:

5844. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Grand Parlor, Native Sons of the Golden West, California, relative to Japanese immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5845. Also, petition of Grand Parlor, Native Sons of the Golden West, California, urging that all regulations permitting concessions to be granted for educational, religious, or charitable purposes, also include patriotic purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5846. Also, petition of the Tulare Fish and Game League, California, and the Tulare County Board of Trade, California, relative to the protection of game in the area which it is proposed to eliminate from the Sequoia National Park; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5847. Also, petition of residents of El Nido, Merced County, Calif., protesting against House bills 9753 and 4388 or Senate bill 1948, the so-called Sunday laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5848. By Mr. BECK: Petition of Mr. William F. Diven and others, of the town of Pine Valley, Clark County, Wis., urging legislation to protect the farmers against filled milk and butter frauds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5849. Also, petition of Mr. H. R. Burgdorff, of Oxford, Wis., and others, favoring legislation for the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of filled milk or any other substitute for milk or butter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5850. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of Grand Parlor, Native Sons of the Golden West, at its forty-fifth session, held at Oakland, Calif., April 17-21, 1922, advocating exclusion of Asiatic immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5851. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Idaho, protesting against the enactment of House bill 9753, and other Sunday bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5852. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of International Motor Co., New York City, N. Y., regarding tariff on graphite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5853. Also, petition of E. Clemons Horst Co., San Francisco, Calif., regarding foreign trade and finance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5854. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of C. C. Thomas Post, No. 244, Navy Post of the American Legion, San Francisco, Calif., urging support of the Secretary of the Navy's recommendation that \$1,000,000 be appropriated to provide for the Naval Reserve Force; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5855. Also, petition of G. R. Milford, of Redding, Calif., indorsing House bill 5823, known as the public shooting ground and game refuge bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5856. Also, petition of Mrs. Helen Hatch, master counselor, and others, of Los Angeles Council of Sadol, International Magian Society, urging immediate action by Congress in behalf of Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5857. Also, petition of Viall & Co., of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against paragraph 1116 of House bill 7456; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5858. By Mr. ROGERS: Evidence in support of House bill 11864, granting a pension to Sarah A. Byam; to the Committee on Pensions.

5859. By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of 17 citizens of Grant County, Ky., protesting against the schedule of freight rates issued for live stock in the territory south of the Ohio River effective June 1, 1922; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5860. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Belus Calkins, jr., Kate Zehler, Mary A. Reiber, and Daniel W. Bump, of Varysburg, N. Y., urging the passage of the so-called Bursum-Morgan bill increasing pensions to Civil War pensioners; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5861. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of Saranac Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring the passage of the Sterling-Towner education bill; to the Committee on Education.

5862. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition of numerous voters of College Place, Wash., protesting against the passage of House bills 4388 and 9753 and Senate bill 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5863. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Columbus Republican Club of Massachusetts, Revere, Mass., favoring the modification of the naturalization laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5864. Also, petition of Boston Central Labor Union, favoring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving Congress the power to enact legislation to make uniform child-labor laws in the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

5865. By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of F. H. Gray, of Wiscasset, Me., and 18 other citizens of Maine, all employees of the Maine Central Railroad Co., urging the passage of the Towner-Sterling educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

5866. Also, petition of Mr. H. C. Johnson and 37 other citizens of Osnabrock, N. Dak., asking for the passage of the Towner-Sterling educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

5867. Also, petition of Mr. Emil Spiellinger, of Louisville, Ky., and 14 other citizens of the State of Kentucky, asking for the passage of the Towner-Sterling educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, June 2, 1922.

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 20, 1922.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the 30th day of June will soon arrive, and new appropriation bills, of course, will have to go into effect by the 1st day of July. It is quite apparent that we shall have to yield from time to time in the tariff discussion for the purpose of taking up the several appropriation bills. So I am going to move that the tariff bill be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that he ask unanimous consent that the pending tariff bill be laid aside, and that the Army appropriation bill be taken up.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well; I ask unanimous consent.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection to that course, but I think there ought to be a quorum present, and I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

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

Ball	Harris	McLean	Smoot
Borah	Harrison	McNary	Spencer
Brandegee	Heflin	Nelson	Stanley
Bursum	Hitchcock	New	Sterling
Calder	Johnson	Newberry	Sutherland
Cameron	Jones, N. Mex.	Nicholson	Underwood
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Oddie	Wadsworth
Cummins	Kellogg	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Kendrick	Pepper	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Keyes	Poindexter	Warren
Dillingham	Ladd	Ransdell	Watson, Ga.
du Pont	La Follette	Rawson	Watson, Ind.
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Robinson	Willis
Glass	Lodge	Sheppard	
Gooding	McCumber	Simmons	
Hale	McKinley	Smith	

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

The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that the tariff bill be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 10871, the Army appropriation bill. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to ask if it is the policy of those in charge of the bill to continue the consideration of the Army appropriation bill until its conclusion?

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the question is addressed to me, I will say that so far as I am concerned I hope we can keep the Army appropriation bill before the Senate until it is disposed of.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The reason why I asked the question is because I merely wish to know, for the benefit of those on this side of the Chamber, what the business before the Senate will be; not that I suppose there will be any delay in the consideration of the appropriation bill, but it will probably take some little time.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to object to laying aside the tariff bill. At the same time I would like to have, if those in charge of the Army appropriation bill see fit to do so, a postponement of the measure for an hour or two, until we can have time to read the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will say to the Senator that it will take a great deal longer than an hour or two to read the bill. It is a bill of one hundred and fifty odd pages.

Mr. BORAH. I presume it is the intention to waive the formal reading of the bill for the purpose of considering committee amendments.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope that may be done.

Mr. BORAH. That is what I assumed, and that is the reason why I asked that we may have an opportunity to read the bill. Otherwise it puts those of us who have not had an opportunity to read the report and the bill in a position where we can not make progress in determining what we want to discuss, if anything. I think, however, I shall not object, but I hope that if we need a little time later we may have it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me say to the Senator from Idaho that if an item is encountered in the bill on which Senators desire more time for consideration, for one I shall be entirely willing to postpone the consideration of that item and proceed with others.

Mr. WARREN. I hope the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs will follow that course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and House bill 10871 is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WADSWORTH. A number of Senators have routine business to present, and I yield for that purpose.

PETITIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions adopted by the American Chamber of Commerce of the Philippine Islands, urging Congress to decide the permanent status of the Philippine Islands, and further requesting that Congress authorize the appointment of a committee of three American citizens to represent in Washington American interests in the Philippine Islands. The resolutions will be referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

Mr. CURTIS presented a resolution adopted by the Twenty-fourth Annual Congress, Kansas Daughters of the American Revolution, at Pittsburg, Kans., favoring the creation of a national military park and monument at Yorktown, Va., covering the Revolutionary fortifications at that place, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the National Conference of Mothers' Congress, at Tacoma, Wash., favoring

the passage of the so-called Capper-Fess physical education bill, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WILLIS presented the petition of Lawrence W. Kutsch and sundry other citizens of Curtice, Ohio, praying for the imposition in the pending tariff bill of a duty of \$2 per 100 pounds on Cuban sugar, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., praying that only a moderate duty on kid gloves be imposed in the pending tariff bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ashley and Ithaca, in the State of Michigan, praying for inclusion in the pending tariff bill of a duty of \$2 per 100 pounds on Cuban sugar, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WILLIS, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 3611) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to abrogate a contract lease of land and water power on the Muskingum River, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 732) thereon.

Mr. ROBINSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3048) for the relief of L. D. Riddell and George W. Hardin, trustees of Milligan College, Tennessee, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 733) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1764) for the relief of J. A. Leslie, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 734) thereon.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 3570) for the relief of the United Dredging Co. (Rept. No. 735);

A bill (H. R. 7052) for the relief of G. C. Caldwell (Rept. No. 736); and

A bill (H. R. 8374) for the relief of the estate of Frank W. Knight (Rept. No. 737).

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2960) for the relief of Arthur A. Padmore, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 738) thereon.

Mr. NEW, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3424) to provide for the reclamation of the United States Military Reservation, Fort De Russey, Honolulu, Hawaii, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 739) thereon.

REPORT ON PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I report back from the Committee on Printing House Concurrent Resolution No. 47, providing for the printing of 100,000 copies of the report of the special mission to investigate the Philippine Islands, and I submit a report (No. 731) thereon. The Secretary of War is very anxious that we have the report printed at once, and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask that the concurrent resolution may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the concurrent resolution for the information of the Senate.

The reading clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That 100,000 copies of the report of the special mission on investigation to the Philippine Islands to the Secretary of War, without the map but with the data on the Philippines preceding and accompanying such report, be, and the same is hereby, ordered printed as a public document, to be distributed as follows: Sixty-five thousand through the document room of the House, 25,000 through the document room of the Senate, 5,000 through the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House, and 5,000 through the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the receipt of the report or to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. ROBINSON. Pending that question I desire to ask the Senator from Kansas if this is a report from the Committee on Printing?

Mr. CAPPER. It is.

Mr. ROBINSON. A favorable report?

Mr. CAPPER. It is.

Mr. ROBINSON. A unanimous report?

Mr. CAPPER. A unanimous report.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection to the adoption of the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

CONFIRMATION OF ENSIGNS IN THE NAVY.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may confirm in open executive session the following nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBINSON. Let the nominations be reported.

Mr. HALE. These are nominations of four members of the graduating class at Annapolis. These men had intended to retire on graduation, but have now decided to stay in the service, and the naval authorities have approved the action.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This is confirming them the same as we confirmed the other members of the class?

Mr. HALE. Exactly the same.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be reported for the information of the Senate.

The reading clerk read as follows:

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1922:

Harold L. Fudge.
William H. Egan, jr.
Carl R. Brown.
Beverly M. Coleman.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nominations will be confirmed.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the President be notified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President will be notified. The Senate resumes its legislative session.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. LENROOT:

A bill (S. 3670) granting an increase of pension to Arabella Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HITCHCOCK:

A bill (S. 3671) for the relief of James A. O'Dell and certain other former privates and noncommissioned officers in the military service of the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 3672) to amend sections 34 and 40 of the organic act of the Territory of Hawaii; and

A bill (S. 3673) to provide for the transfer of the lands and buildings of the Federal leprosy investigation station at Kalawao, on the island of Molokai, in the Territory of Hawaii, to the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. SHEPPARD (for Mr. FLETCHER) submitted amendments providing for improvement works on the inland waterway from Pensacola Bay, Fla., and Mobile Bay, Ala., in accordance with report submitted in House Document No. 610, Sixty-third Congress, second session, a channel 5 feet deep and 40 feet wide, route to be the most practicable and the most economical in final cost; St. Johns River, Fla., from Jacksonville to Palatka, with a view of giving a 20-foot channel to Palatka; St. Johns River, Fla., from Palatka to Lake Monroe, with a view of making cut-offs and improving navigation; Blackwater Bay and River, Fla., and Bayou Chico, Fla., intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10766) authorizing appropriations for the prosecution and maintenance of public works on canals, rivers, and harbors, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

IMPERIAL VALLEY AND VICINITY.

Mr. ASHURST submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25), which was read, referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed 5,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 142, Sixty-seventh Congress, presented by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] entitled "Problems of Imperial Valley and Vicinity," of which 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room and 2,000 copies for the use of the House document room.

ADDRESS BY HON. D. R. CRISSINGER.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the very able and instructive address by Hon. D. R. Crissinger, Comptroller of the Currency, before the Pennsylvania Bankers' Association at Pittsburgh on May 26, on the maintenance of the gold standard, be printed in the RECORD in the usual RECORD type.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type, as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY, HON. D. R. CRISSINGER, BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA BANKERS' ASSOCIATION, PITTSBURGH, PA., MAY 26, 1922.

Almost the last among great financial communities to commit ourselves definitely to the gold standard, we find ourselves now summoned to determine, I may say, for all the world whether that standard shall be maintained or whether we shall abandon it and allow the economic craft to struggle without chart or rudder.

I remember very well the years of the heated controversy over the gold standard. In those times we were constantly being assured that our country was the victim of the gold standard because we were a debtor nation and others controlled the world's gold. We were told that the tendency was for gold constantly to increase in value, compelling the debtor always to pay in a dearer money than that in which he had borrowed.

It was not always easy to answer, for effective answer required the consideration of economic fundamentals concerning production, exchange, and consumption. But in 1896, after a campaign of education in these fundamentals, the verdict was in favor of maintaining a gold standard. I am very sure that if to-day the verdict had to be sought again on those issues the gold standard would win again by a far greater majority.

In the quarter century since 1896 we have seen that this standard does not mean the economic enslavement of a debtor country; rather, it means the assurance of equal opportunity to develop resources and the chance to transform the debtor community into a creditor state. In 1896 we were the greatest borrowing community in the world; in 1922 we find ourselves the greatest lending community, the mainstay and reliance of business, of bankers, of nations, of civilization itself, in the effort to weather the greatest storm that ever burst over mankind.

If the gold standard meant so much of opportunity to us as the great debtor State, how much more must its maintenance mean to us, now that we have become the great creditor Nation. Every argument that could be made in 1896, with however much plausibility, against maintaining the gold standard, now applies with a thousandfold more force in favor of rigidly adhering to it.

We know how absolutely necessary is a uniform monetary standard throughout the world. We know that without it our problems of exchange and of international commerce can not be solved. We realize that the debts which are owing to us, the balances which must be paid to us or by us, must somehow be adjusted to a single, common, universal standard; and that, as these obligations have all been thus far related to or measured by gold, we can not safely depart now from that standard.

Yet with our own interest absolutely bound up in the maintenance of this system we find that our very wealth and good fortune are fast becoming a menace to this system. The security of the gold standard depends on the maintenance of a free gold market, on the comparatively unrestricted flow of gold. If the movements of commodities shall too long continue in a particular direction they must inevitably create a vacuum which can only be filled by a movement in the opposite direction.

In the last eight years the movement of commodities has been away from our shores and the movement of gold has been toward us. The result is, as has been pointed out with possibly firesome iteration, that our side of the world tends to gather to itself more than it needs of the gold, while the other side, burdened with debts, finds its store of gold constantly reduced and its powers to maintain a gold standard correspondingly weakened. The gold standard can not be maintained by piling up all the gold in one place.

Yet there is every sign that the movement of gold to us will have to continue, unless there shall be some settlement of international debts and such adjustments in governmental finances, international fiscal relations, and the producing and consuming opportunities of the nations as will restore something like equilibrium. At the basis of the trouble we find the huge domestic and international debts of the world—the fundamental disturbance that is destroying trade and commerce and our own industrial prosperity.

Domestic debts impose enormous burdens of taxation, while the international debts interpose well-nigh insurmountable obstacles to the adjustment of exchange relations. With financial exchange in this chaos, commercial transactions are rendered well-nigh impossible, because they tend to become mere speculation in exchange fluctuations.

There must be, first, some determination of policy toward the international debts, and, second, an adjustment of government budgets that will give confidence in the power of States to pay the debts and maintain the gold basis of money,

I do not believe it is possible at this time to reach a final settlement of all the international obligations. But there is absolute necessity that some general policy shall be agreed upon among the nations with reference to these obligations. A beginning must be made, an understanding reached, for balancing budgets and adjusting international debts, so that there may be a start toward international liquidation and stabilization. In the final analysis, we shall see plainly that the preservation of the gold standard depends on bringing all these obligations into a relationship with gold and then placing money on a gold basis and setting out toward ultimate payment in gold.

This is absolutely necessary, lest the stream of gold shall continue to flow toward American shores, until other nations find it impossible to go farther with the pretense of maintaining a gold monetary standard.

I recall, at one critical epoch during the war, reading a letter from London which said—this being a considerable time before America's entry into the war—that unless American financiers should extend credit to the allied nations, then the allies would buy from us, pay in gold, send us their last resources of the yellow metal, and then abandon the gold standard—leaving us with the gold, but depriving it of its monetary value.

I recall the shiver with which I contemplated the consequence of such a policy. We would be left with a vast stock of gold, which, repudiated by other nations, would become well-nigh valueless to us.

Fortunately that crisis was not precipitated. But conditions now, despite that peace has been restored, confront us with a grave danger that this same crisis may be brought before us again. We can not go on indefinitely compelling our creditors to settle with gold, which, once it reaches us, flows inevitably into vaults and there remains, comparatively useless to business either at home or abroad.

There must be adjustments among the nations that will enable them to reckon with confidence upon their financial futures. It is not necessary, as I view it, that Europe shall forthwith begin to pay interest upon its obligations to us. Indeed, to-day that would mean that Europe must drain itself of its remaining gold and break down the gold standard. The only alternative would be for Europe to furnish us with goods, which we could only accept at the price of substituting them for goods produced by our own industries. In either case our last state would be worse than our first.

The most that can be undertaken at this time—and it must be undertaken soon if we are to avoid disaster—is to reach a workable understanding and settlement as to the future of the international debts due us and existing between other countries, and along with this there must be a serious effort to balance budgets and bring costs of government within the capacities of the nations to pay.

It has been proposed that a conference of the various national financial establishments be held to devise measures to restore and maintain the gold standard. In every such discussion it must be kept in mind that the permanency of the gold standard depends fundamentally upon some adjustment or settlement, not cancellation, of all international debts, in terms of gold, so that they can be paid by the contracting parties without sorely impoverishing the people through unbearable burdens of taxes. It is well to remember that the economic possibilities of reconstruction must be measured in units of human energy, and an overload or a lack of such units means default and disaster. In every such effort our country must obviously take a part, for we are not only the leading creditor nation but we have become custodian of the greater share of the world's gold.

Nothing short of complete frankness, understanding, confidence, can serve the purposes of such an international adjustment. There must be perfect candor about policies and programs; complete understanding as to the end sought. There must be a recognition of the fact that the alternative, if we fail to stabilize the old order, is bound to be a cataclysm. In that cataclysm the present social and economic system of the world will face the tremendous question of whether, incapable of protecting itself against its own weakness, it deserves to survive.

Always a firm advocate of the gold standard, I have never been so convinced as I am now of its absolute necessity. We must maintain it and we must bear our part in making the rest of the world maintain it, or else we must be prepared to deal with new standards in the whole field of international intercourse. No man can guess what those standards might be. But, just as faith, honor, and square dealings constitute the only standard to which human conduct can ever be universally related, so in the present state of society one feels that the gold

standard of money is the only one to which we can hope to relate the money systems of the world.

I speak of these things with great earnestness, because lately there have been evidences of a revival, in unexpected places, or sentiment altogether too hospitable toward the old fallacies of cheap and unsound money. Sometimes they have been dressed up in attractive disguises. Some of them, indeed, have been so thoroughly camouflaged that it is hard to recognize them as merely the refurbished and modernized doctrines of "Coin" Harvey, Gen. James B. Weaver, and "Brick" Pomeroy.

But on examination they will be found just that; and we will be wise to stamp them out now, with the inexorable logic of truth and experience. Our country must stand for the policies that are sound and lasting. Others may be tempted into dangerous experiments. We have seen the disastrous consequences of some of these, and we must hold firm for the things we know to be deserving of our confidence.

By such unswerving adherence we will strengthen the faith of others more sorely tempted than ourselves. If we stand firm, we will make a great contribution to the rehabilitation of the world and to the establishment of the new order of things. And I believe we will do this. I believe we will, by wisdom and caution, add much to the contribution we have already made for the salvation of civilized institutions.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE—QUORUM CALLS.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

I understand that a new rule has been inaugurated to the effect that Senators arriving in the Chamber in response to a quorum call after the roll call has been concluded and a quorum of Senators have answered to their names are not permitted to be included as having been present. The Senators who are located in the far corner of the Senate Office Building, among whom I happen to be, find it absolutely impossible 50 per cent of the time at least to reach the Senate Chamber before the conclusion of such a call when a quorum is ascertained to be present. Even though they leave their offices on the sounding of the bell, being obliged to make use of various elevator services and the subway trolley, unless they happen to catch a car at the moment they arrive and an elevator as well, they find it practically impossible to reach the Chamber. This morning, although I left my office immediately when the bell rang and reached the Chamber as expeditiously as possible, the roll call had been completed, an I was unable to respond to my name. I find that one or two other Senators are in precisely the same position as am I. If the rule to which I refer is to be invoked it will mean, of course, that the RECORD will show that we were not present on the quorum call.

In these days there is so much adverse criticism of absenteeism and failure to obtain quorums in the Senate that it seems to me there should be some liberality in the application of the rule. Of course, when a second roll call is ordered it is quite possible for a Senator to get on the roll, but when a quorum is secured on the first call, as I have stated, 50 per cent of the time it is impossible for Senators situated as I am to be recorded as present.

BITUMINOUS COAL PRODUCTION.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and I ask for immediate action on it. The resolution ought not to provoke debate, for it merely asks for information upon a subject of great interest to the American people at the present time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WADSWORTH. May we have the resolution reported for the information of the Senate, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Reading Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 293), as follows:

Whereas it has been reported that as a result of the strike of the bituminous coal miners the consumption of bituminous coal is exceeding the production and that the available surface reserve is being rapidly exhausted; and

Whereas an adequate supply of bituminous coal at reasonable prices is vital to the domestic and industrial welfare of the Nation; and

Whereas it is of utmost importance that the consuming public possess all information possible relating to the present and probable supply and prices of bituminous coal; and

Whereas it has been represented that the Secretary of Commerce has been negotiating with certain coal operators for a voluntary agreement to fix prices during the pending emergency: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he hereby is, directed to obtain and to report to the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interests, as expeditiously as possible all available facts relating to—

- (1) The present supply of mined bituminous coal;
- (2) The average weekly production and consumption of such coal since April 1, 1922;
- (3) The amount of bituminous coal estimated to be necessary for all uses in the United States until May 1, 1923;
- (4) The effect of such strike upon present coal prices and the probable effect upon such prices if a settlement of that strike is not reached before September 1, 1922;
- (5) What action, if any, has been taken by the United States through its governmental agencies to terminate the strike; and
- (6) What action, if any, has been taken by the United States to protect the consumers of coal from paying exorbitant prices by reason of curtailment of production.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I do not intend to object to the consideration of the resolution, but I simply wish to refer to the fact that there has been upon the calendar since May 16, 1921, Order of Business 54, being Senate bill 1807, to aid in stabilizing the coal industry. That bill simply calls upon the Secretary of Commerce to procure the very facts which are asked for in the resolution now submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts. If Senators had not three different times objected to the consideration of that bill, possibly by this time it would have been passed and the Senate would have been in possession of the very valuable information which is so necessary to enable the Senate to determine what policy they shall pursue in regard to the coal strike.

I hope before Congress shall finally adjourn that Senators will change their attitude respecting the measure to which I refer and will give the power to the Secretary of Commerce to enable him to procure and report to Congress the true facts concerning the coal industry.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

AFFAIRS IN SANTO DOMINGO.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I received on yesterday a letter from a prominent American residing in the Dominican Republic inclosing an extract from an address delivered by the Governor of La Vega Province at the opening of the central highway from the capital to the north of the island, and also a translation of an editorial which appeared in *Pluma y Espada*, a paper published in the island. These two extracts will give the viewpoint of some gentlemen in the island who are not disposed to find fault with everything the American occupation is doing. I commend them to the attention of a few Americans who are disposed to befool the American name and occupation in that island. I ask that, without reading, these two extracts may be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Translation of a paragraph of the address of the Governor of La Vega Province at the opening of the central highway from the capital to the north.]

You are the representative of the most democratic and most powerful Nation in the world, and you are also chief of the small Dominican State; in your first position, with a true sense of that American grandeur, you can well afford to be benevolent toward those influenced by love of their flag; in your second position as chief of the central government you can well carry out works of moral and political benefit, and this to you would be easy, dealing personally with a naturally calm Dominican people, and by common accord a solution will be found for this important national problem; with the assurance that if you do this the pages of Dominican history that record the acts of your administration will also class you as a member of the family of human benefactors—Jesus Christ, Lee, Jefferson Davis, Lincoln.

[Editorial from *Pluma y Espada*, Velasquez Party organ.]

The point of attack for the "patriots" these days is the Duarte Highway—that the work is no good; that there has not been spent on this work what they said has been spent; that the road will soon be impassable from the fact that it has been so badly constructed; and a whole lot of other things which the "dogs in the manger" are shouting about. Perhaps there is something in the fact of the money invested on the work, but with all the evils of the "carretera" it is undoubtedly a great benefit to the country. Would to God that all the money which the government of occupation spends could be spent on "carreteras." The Carretera Duarte has in reality cost many millions. But we can not complain when we compare that sum with the millions thrown away by native governments on useless works. How much have the Dominicans spent in arsenals, in generals under orders, in revolutionary expenses? How were the loans invested made under the government of Liliis? What was done with the money received in the concessions to Haiti of grand parcels of Dominican land? All these operations and others just as shameful have left a blot on our history upon which we can only look with shame. These loans were only used to buy men, to corrupt men, and to throw our nation's honor in the mud. If all the millions spent by the Dominicans in shameless works had been spent on something like the Carretera Duarte, we would have obtained advantages which result from works of that magnitude. We have nothing to complain of. All the evils from which we are suffering we have bought at an enormous price. If Liliis had not been permitted to negotiate the loans the country would not have had to celebrate later on a convention with the Government of the United States, which convention was the first thing that compromised our independence. But in the madness of the orgies of that time nothing was thought of except filling the pockets, and with no thought for the future of the

Republic. And in the course of years we all suffer, particularly those whose hands are clean of those crimes against the country, from the terrible consequences of all those economical disorders. With all that has been said, we do not pretend to justify the fact that \$5,000,000 has been spent on the Carretera Duarte, it appearing to us that with that amount of money and better administration the work could have been finished better. What we do wish to say, assuming all responsibility, is that for all the evils from which we are suffering we have no one to blame but ourselves. In the management of funds of the nation we have almost always been unscrupulous, not to say bandits, and, of course, we are all now suffering from this. Consequently, I repeat, that it is to be hoped that the government which succeeds the occupation will be composed of honest men, never of those dishonest ones who have placed us where we are now, which leads us to sometimes think that the only method of solution would be suicide.

ADDRESS OF HON. W. G. M'ADOO.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, on the 24th day of May Hon. W. G. McAdoo delivered at Hutchinson, Kans., a very illuminating address dealing with economic and financial questions, and to some extent with political conditions. I have read it carefully, and I think it is entitled to a place in the RECORD. I ask, without reading, unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD in the regular RECORD type.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY W. G. M'ADOO BEFORE THE KANSAS STATE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION AT HUTCHINSON, KANS., MAY 24, 1922.

The question which most immediately concerns the American people is prosperity. The business man is weary of restricted trade and high taxes. The farmer is worn to a frazzle by heavy losses inflicted upon him through the merciless processes of so-called deflation or "normalcy." Labor is tired of unemployment and would like something else to do than hunting for a job or fighting wage reductions. The vast army of men and women of moderate salaries or small means who are dependent on good business for the opportunity to work are anxious for better times and sufficient pay to meet the cost of living. Everybody is tired of excessive railroad rates, of bad government, and, above all, of bad politics. The recent days of Democratic prosperity shine happily by contrast with these unhappy days of Republican "normalcy." How to regain prosperity persistently demands an answer. Among the most important essentials to its restoration are not alone the preservation but the increase of our foreign trade; and along with that, reduction of taxation, a more equitable distribution of the tax burden, and a tariff law that will not destroy our foreign markets.

Under our system of Government it is difficult to accomplish these ends except through political action. We are in the habit of relying in large part on political action for solution of economic problems and, so long as this continues, wise and well-administered government becomes more and more necessary to the life and prosperity of the people. Therefore, unless we are prepared to accept the evil consequences of the economic mistakes and absurdities that may follow upon the election of the wrong party or the advice of unwise leaders we should not vote blindly on political issues. We should study and understand them. When we apply the same brains to voting on political issues that we do to our business affairs we shall have better government and more prosperity.

An instance of what I mean by solving economic problems through political action is the Federal reserve system. For generations we had suffered financial panics and colossal losses because of a financial system which was both unsound and insufficient for the needs of the Nation. It could be remedied only through political action. The Republican Party, despite its claim that it alone possessed the "best minds" of the Nation, had proven itself during 50 years of power wholly incompetent to solve this problem, and was consistent in its solid opposition to this great reform. But the bill was passed and the Federal reserve system was established under a Democratic administration. The great economic problem involved in our financial system was thus solved through political action.

Why is the preservation and expansion of our foreign trade necessary to our prosperity? Because we produce, under normal conditions, more than we can consume. If this surplus is forced upon our home markets, when they are incapable of absorbing it, our producers are forced to accept ruinous prices, which affect not alone the surplus but the entire product. If the surplus can be marketed abroad at remunerative prices the value of the entire product is favorably affected and losses are turned into profits. Foreign markets are therefore of first importance to our farmers, our workingmen, and our producers generally. How are we to preserve and expand our foreign markets? Primarily through political action. If the political action of our Government is such as to close or restrict these markets business depressions are inevitable, with all of their attendant evils of unemployment, stagnation, and general distress.

Republican leaders at Washington seem to be obsessed with the idea that it is to our advantage to isolate ourselves from Europe politically and economically. They have not only refused to cooperate with other nations in establishing peace and order in Europe, but they are now engaged in passing a tariff law which will render still more difficult, if not impossible, the maintenance of our foreign trade.

From the materialistic point of view, and without dismissing the idealistic, which is of great importance, we are deeply concerned in the peace and stability of Europe and the preservation of those great markets for our surplus products. Europe has always been our best customer. Oriental and Latin-American trade, important as they are, do not compare with our interests in Europe. Not alone is European trade larger and more profitable to us than any other trade but European nations owe the United States about \$12,000,000,000, which it is very much to our interest to collect some day. By cooperating, therefore, to the extent of our power in the maintenance of peace and the restoration of stable and prosperous conditions in Europe, we help ourselves in every direction.

The Democratic Party presented a plan for the preservation of European peace, the reestablishment of order, and the reduction of the vast land and naval armaments which are crushing the life out of peoples everywhere. This was embodied in the League of Nations. It would, in my judgment, have been successful had it been adopted. But the Republican Party defeated it and promised the American people, in lieu of that, some sort of organization of nations which would accomplish the same result. They have failed to organize such an association and have done nothing to preserve the peace of Europe or to lift the grinding burden of taxation through a reduction of military armaments. The only step they have taken is to make an alliance with Great Britain, France, and Japan which provides that "if any other power should threaten, by aggressive action, the rights of any of the four nations involved, they will confer with each other for the purpose of determining on the most efficient measures to be taken, jointly or separately" to meet the situation. This is the kind of an alliance which usually leads to war instead of peace, because, when any set of powers enters into such covenants they say, in effect, "We propose to maintain the policies outlined in this agreement against the rest of the world." This means that they must fight if those policies are challenged by other powers who may make a counteralliance against them or run away when the issue is presented.

But this is not its only vice. Under the exaggerated claims Republican leaders make for it, there is danger that the American people may be lulled into the belief that this is all that is required of America to preserve the peace of the world. As evidence of this, Senator Lodge, in a recent speech before the Republican members of the Massachusetts Legislature, claimed that this treaty has done more in "12 weeks for the world's peace than has been done anywhere else" in 24 years. This is, of course, a silly and preposterous claim. Was not the successful ending in 1918 of the goriest war in all history a greater immediate achievement for peace than the four-power Pacific pact of which Senator Lodge boasts? A Democratic administration did that. And could the four-power pact have been made if the war had not first been ended and if Woodrow Wilson's work at Paris had not laid the foundation for the Washington conference? It is the last Democratic administration that did more for world peace in the two years of 1918 and 1919 than had ever been done before by human effort. It is the Republican administration that has not contributed materially to world peace; it has merely postponed the realization of that boon until 1925.

The chief virtue of the four-power pact is the extent to which it may lead the administration into a genuine effort to cooperate with the rest of the world to secure peace. At best the four-power pact is a feeble step in that direction. Senator Lodge admits this in the speech to which I have referred, when he says: "The only obligation we assume is that of consultation, and when the consultation has been held, each nation that was in it is as free to do what she thinks right as she was when she entered the doors."

How can a mere agreement to hold a consultation be reasonably claimed as "more done in 12 weeks for the world's peace than has been done anywhere else in 24 years"? The disagreeable fact is that the four-power pact is no guaranty of the peaceful settlement of international disputes, even between the four powers involved, and that the United States surrenders its freedom of action in other important ways to such an extent that the advantages of consultation may be outweighed. Had the four-power pact provided for arbitra-

tion of disputes between the signatories, a method of peaceful settlement might have been provided, but it specifically leaves the settlement to force if disagreement results from the consultation. The pact, as a peace preserver, was further seriously weakened by the rejection of Senator Robinson's really constructive amendment, which provided that any outside power—such, for instance, as Russia and Germany—which became engaged in a controversy between any one or more of the signatories, should be invited to the conference.

The four-power pact is an alliance. It is the very kind of entangling alliance that Washington reprehended; the very kind of an alliance which, throughout all human history, has been the fruitful cause of wars between nations. It is the very kind of an alliance which America thought she had made forever impossible when we defeated Germany and her allies during the World War. That it is such an alliance is conclusively shown by the fact that it binds the United States to act with a limited group of powers from which other powers interested in the same subject matter are excluded. For instance, it excludes Russia and Germany, each of which has important interests in the Pacific. This alliance has already provoked the inevitable counteralliance, that recently consummated at Genoa between Germany and Russia. That these powers will challenge our alliance when their national interests demand it is beyond reasonable doubt. What else could we expect Germany and Russia to do but come together when our policy and that of the other nations of the world have forced them into a position where, for mutual protection, no other course was open to them? Self-preservation among nations, as among individuals, is the first law of nature.

The peace of the world and restoration of order are of transcendent importance. To say that war can not be destroyed is to say that civilization can not be saved. War can be destroyed if the nations of the world, in good faith, organize to destroy it. The United States can take the lead and do this noble thing for mankind. The League of Nations having been defeated, the responsibility rests upon the Republican Party of providing some other effective means of securing the great boon of peace. Republican leadership is confronted with the alternative of standing on the ineffectual four-power pact and doing nothing more to preserve the peace of the world or of calling, in good faith, a meeting of the nations for the purpose of organizing some association or society of nations for the preservation of world peace. Our security as well as the restoration of the stable economic conditions which make for permanent prosperity depend upon the wisdom with which the administration meets this situation.

When we contemplate the flabby and timid diplomacy of the administration we wish for the inspiring days of "shirt-sleeve diplomacy," which made America distinctive and respected everywhere. "Shirt-sleeve diplomacy" meant that we were not afraid to take our place in the councils of the world, to define and assert American opinion and American rights, to vigorously present America's case in the style of diplomacy which the rolled up shirt sleeve implies. Instead of this heartening picture, we now have the spectacle of our ambassadors and representatives slinking about the courts of Europe, using the back stairs of international assemblages, sitting in the galleries of world conferences, looking on, spying about, observing, but accepting no responsibility. The administration has abandoned "shirt-sleeve diplomacy" for "shirt-tail diplomacy," because our envoys now sit meekly on their shirt tails and take no manly part instead of representing America with the vigor and directness which distinguished our diplomacy in more honorable days. No wonder we have gained the contempt and distrust of all the world.

As the fit mate to the Republican policy of political isolation, Republican leaders are now trying to effect our economic isolation by jamming through the Senate the most iniquitous and indefensible tariff bill ever presented to the American people. With a reckless disregard of the great economic forces which should be permitted to operate, if our own prosperity is to be restored and preserved, these leaders have determined to destroy our foreign markets and to confine American trade and intercourse within the boundaries of the United States. Nothing will do this so effectively as the pending tariff bill. That the farmers, the laboring men, and all classes of our people will pay a heavy price for this stupid policy is certain. The farmer will find inadequate markets for his products, the workingman will find insufficient employment for his labor, business men will find trade restricted and profits reduced, and all of the people, the great consuming public, will find the cost of living increased, whereas the only beneficiaries of this extraordinary piece of economic ineptitude will be the greedy monopolists and selfish interests, which will be given the

power by this bill to collect taxes in disguised form from the American people for their private benefit. The power of taxation should never be exercised by the Government except for the benefit of the Public Treasury, but under this bill the Government transfers its right of taxation to selfish interests and monopolists. It is the frankly declared purpose of the Republican leaders, as stated in the debates in Congress, to prevent, as far as possible, any foreign trade, and to confine American commercial activities to the boundaries of the United States. This bill can not help the farmer, because it will narrow the market for his products with resulting loss in values; and even where he is able to break through the tariff barriers and sell his products in foreign markets, he must meet the competition of Argentina, Canada, Australia, and other agricultural countries against which he can have no protection, whereas on every article he uses he must pay the increased prices which this new tariff bill will certainly impose. The consuming public will be forced to submit to heavier exactions than ever before from greedy profiteers and tariff barons.

And here we may draw a fundamental distinction between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. The Republican Party is the tool of special privilege—trusts and monopolies and big business. The Democratic Party is the foe of special privilege—the foe of the trusts and greedy monopolists who are forever seeking, through control of the Government, legislation that gives them an advantage over the rest of the people.

What a curious idea it is that we can produce prosperity by imposing higher taxes on everybody and making every necessary of life more costly. That is exactly what this tariff bill will do. It puts a tax on the mouth of every baby and every adult in the land, and in like manner it puts a tax upon the body of every citizen—man, woman, and child—who wears clothes or consumes commodities. The taxes are on consumption, and nothing escapes. These taxes are skillfully concealed in the prices of the commodities, and go not into the Public Treasury for the benefit of the people but into the capacious pockets of the entrenched interests. It is impossible for the consumer to know how much he is paying in the form of concealed taxes. It is a part of the game to prevent him from knowing how much tribute he is paying for the enrichment of some already overrich but conscienceless protected-tariff baron; and when these barons get new fortunes by this illegitimate use of government they are made stronger to buy elections, to put their tools in control of the Government, and to make new raids of rapacity on a hoodwinked people.

A worse time than now for passing a tariff bill, so far as the interests of the people are concerned, could not be selected. The uncertain economic state of the world, the rapid fluctuations in exchange, and the generally unsettled conditions everywhere, make the enactment of a tariff law a wild revel of guesswork, so far as the consumer is concerned. The imposition of excessive duties on our imports is designed to destroy our import trade. If we destroy our import trade we destroy our export trade except as to those things which Europe can not buy elsewhere. That will reduce our export trade to very small proportions, and it is our farmers who will suffer most, because in normal times approximately 50 per cent of all of our exports is represented by the products of agriculture. This will reduce the farmer's buying power, and when he can not buy business suffers, factories shut down, labor is thrown out of employment, and general depression seizes the country. When labor is thrown out of employment or forced to accept less than a living wage, its buying power, like that of the farmer, is reduced; and when the farmer and the laborer are unprosperous the country is unprosperous. We never have real prosperity except when the farmer is able to sell his products at a profit and labor is employed at good wages. The margin between prosperity and depression is represented by a profitable foreign trade. It has been well said that the margin between prosperity and depression is not more than 15 to 20 per cent. It is frequently the pressure of that 15 to 20 per cent of surplus products that brings prices below the cost of production, causing great losses, whereas the absorption of that surplus at good prices establishes the value of the whole and brings prosperity to the country.

I am not so dogmatic about the tariff that I would not be willing to admit that economic conditions might arise where reasonable protection to certain home products may be justified, but in all such cases the schedule in the bill should be written upon the findings of an impartial tariff commission and not by the beneficiary himself. The creation of a nonpartisan Tariff Commission composed of the ablest economists in the country was one of the achievements of the Wilson administration, and

the purpose was to secure through the investigations of that commission accurate information upon which just and scientific tariff laws could from time to time be enacted. Nothing could be fairer to those seeking protection and to the great consuming public, which must foot the bill, than a well-functioning, impartial, and nonpartisan tariff commission. Public opinion must be educated to the necessity of having our tariff bills based upon the reports and findings of this Tariff Commission. It has been thrown into the scrap heap by the Republican majority and the tariff beneficiaries have been permitted to write their own bill.

This tariff bill contains a provision which is so revolutionary and extraordinary, so pregnant with evil, that it is a new menace to the integrity and purity of our form of government. It gives the President the power, solely in his discretion, to raise rates 50 per cent, to change classifications and to embargo importations into this country. That such a law is wholly unconstitutional, I have no doubt, but until the courts so declare it will be the law of the land. It may take years before the Supreme Court can pass on this question. Meanwhile we shall have a congressional election in 1922 and a presidential election in 1924.

I do not wish to be understood as doubting the President's integrity, because I do not; but such power in his hands or in any President's hands is unwise and dangerous. That power if used for partisan ends could control elections and determine the destiny of the Nation. It is a vastly greater power than that possessed by the Congress because, under the Constitution a majority of both houses and the approval of the President are required before a change of duties or classifications can be made or an embargo can be laid. But under this bill the President alone is granted these powers—powers greater and more despotic than any autocrat of modern times has ever possessed—except the late Czar of Russia, where corruption in government, from the dispensation of tariff benefits, was one of the gravest scandals and abuses of that unhappy régime.

No matter how well meaning and honest a President may be, he can be imposed upon by selfish and designing men in the exercise of the wide discretion the proposed bill gives him. Classifications are so technical that the difference between great bounties and no bounties hangs sometimes on a word, or a punctuation mark, or a skillful phrase, and it is the predatory and selfish beneficiary who knows where to put that word or to place that punctuation mark or to phrase the skillful sentence that will give him wealth and advantage. A President, unversed in these technicalities, or careless, or unalert, or swayed unconsciously by partisan influence, may easily be imposed upon to the grave injury of the people. This law if passed makes the President a czar. It subverts our Constitution and alters our form of government, because it transfers legislative powers to the executive. It is one of the most audacious and sinister proposals yet brought forward by the predatory interests and their subservient tools.

The possession of the proposed power and discretion by the President will keep business in a state of constant uncertainty and apprehension. None of those engaged in foreign trade will be able to enter into contracts with the assurance that they can be performed. The President can at any time place an embargo on imports, or he can raise duties, or he can change classifications to the grave injury of business. Through these powers the President can put into effect the discredited and despised and unsound American valuation plan which has aroused strong opposition among business men all over the country. These things will revolutionize business as well as our customs laws. A long line of court decisions which have come down through the century establishing the principles of customs law and appraisals and forming a definite basis for the interpretation of an infinite number of scientific and technical questions of the greatest importance to trade and industry will be thrown out of gear. Business will be thrown into a state of confusion for years while awaiting decisions of the courts and claims running into millions of dollars will have to be paid by the Treasury if the courts fail to sustain the law.

What a preposterous idea this tariff bill is! Its frankly declared purpose is to destroy or restrict our foreign trade. If we destroy it, or reduce it to small proportions, what possible use is there for an American merchant marine? There will be no ocean-going trade for it to carry, and yet our "best mind" Republican leaders are gravely proposing a ship subsidy bill which will take \$40,000,000 or more each year out of the already over-raided pockets of the American people to keep the American flag on the high seas! Why spend this great sum to float our flag around on ships which have no commerce to carry. It would be far more sensible to keep the flag at home along with

our goods which the new tariff bill will prevent us from shipping than to waste \$40,000,000 per annum of the taxpayers' money to float it at sea on empty bottoms.

Internal taxation, like the tariff bill, is another thing that seriously affects our prosperity. The Republican platform of 1920 promised that the tax laws put upon the statute books for both war and peace purposes would be quickly repealed and a beneficent tax law, that would make everybody happy, would be put in its place. The platform said:

But sound policy equally demands the early accomplishment of that real reduction of the tax burden, which may be achieved by substituting simple for complex laws and procedure; prompt and certain determination of the tax liability for delay and uncertainty; tax laws which do not, for tax laws which do, excessively mulct the consumer or needlessly repress enterprise and thrift.

The Republican House and Senate has been in almost continuous session at Washington since March 4, 1921, and it was not until late in that year that the Congress, laboring like the proverbial mountain, brought forth one of the most diminutive of mice in the shape of what the Republicans themselves have admitted is a fizzle and a failure as a revenue measure. It did not reduce the tax burden. Everybody is still suffering because of it. It did not substitute "simple" for "complex" tax laws and procedure. It made them more complex and difficult. It did not provide prompt and certain determination of the tax liability for delay and uncertainty. It aggravated the delays and uncertainties. The Republican "best minds" did not give us tax laws as promised which do not excessively mulct the consumer or needlessly repress enterprise and thrift. They gave us tax laws that do.

The late Senator Penrose, chairman of the Finance Committee which reported the bill, characterized it as a "temporary measure, which does not place the tax system on a suitable or scientific basis." Senator Smoot, Republican, said it would be "condemned by the American people." The newspapers of the country denounced it, almost without exception, as a poor piece of legislation. The New York Globe, a Republican organ, said, "It is not satisfactory, even to the men who voted for it." The Journal of Commerce, organ of business, said:

The pity of the whole situation is that, instead of giving relief to the average man, as it was expected, no doubt, by politicians that the new plan would do, the bill as drafted will hurt him. * * * Altogether it will be a sorry day for the employed man who depends upon his labor when this bill takes effect. His soi-disant friends have stabbed him in a vital spot while pretending, and perhaps really thinking, that they were helping him.

And it is a temporary measure, so they tell us, and admittedly inadequate and full of faults. The Republicans were able, after seven months of effort, in times of perfect peace, and with all the "best minds" of which they boast, to pass only a temporary measure which gives no satisfaction whatever to anybody; they promise a permanent bill later.

One of the most iniquitous features of this tax measure is that it throws into the courts a great number of new questions which must be decided before the taxpayer can know what the law really means, and it imposes upon the Treasury Department a vast number of new and complex regulations which must also stand the fire of court contests, and involves the department in an infinite amount of new and tedious administrative work which adds to the uncertainties of business transactions and keeps the taxpayer in doubt for many years as to where he stands with respect to his tax liability. The same things will be repeated when the Republicans give us the permanent tax bill they have promised.

This tax bill does, however, reduce the taxes of one class; for instance, it reduces the maximum surtax rates on very large incomes from 65 per cent to 50 per cent. President Harding and the Republican House of Representatives favored reducing the taxes on these very large incomes from 65 per cent to 32 per cent, but the violent outcry from the country at this palpable favoritism to the plutocrats forced the Senate, temporarily and reluctantly, to put the tax at 50 per cent, thus reducing the surtaxes on large incomes 15 per cent, but leaving the surtaxes on small and moderate incomes without relief. Those unfortunate taxpayers whose incomes are only \$1,000,000 to \$50,000,000 per annum were presented with a reduction of 15 per cent. They had to have a wider margin for contributions to the Republican war chest. But taxpayers with small and moderate incomes received little or no reduction. The Republican doctrine is to give to those who have and take everything possible from those who have not.

The administration's foreign policy—noncooperation; its tariff bill, designed to destroy or make negligible our foreign trade and raise the cost of living; its internal-revenue tax bill, which lifted no burdens from the backs of the people and favored only the wealthy classes, who needed no relief, show clearly that the

administration has no sympathy with the needs of the masses of the people and has no sound conception of the vast political and economic problems which face this Nation and the world. Those policies, if maintained, can not bring permanent prosperity to the American people. The heavy speculations in the New York stock market and the slight symptoms of improved business conditions in some trades and in some localities must not be accepted as the certain indications of settled conditions or of returning prosperity. We can not expect permanent prosperity until we have entered upon an enlightened policy of international cooperation with other nations to preserve the peace of the world; until we, by wise action, secure our share of foreign markets; and until we reduce taxes upon business and upon the masses of the American people to the point where their savings will not be appropriated by the Government but left in their hands for the development of enterprise and industry.

The Democratic policy seeks international cooperation to destroy war and to permanently secure peace throughout the world; to preserve and enlarge our foreign markets, so that the farmer and the laboring man and the great masses of our people may get the largest rewards for their thrift and industry; to reduce taxes and redistribute them so that the rich shall not be favored at the expense of the poor, but that the rich and the poor shall bear their just shares of the burdens of government in proportion to their ability to pay. The Democratic Party must stand firmly for these policies. It must continue to be the party of liberalism and of progress. It must continue to be the defender of the rights of the people against the assaults of special privilege. It must never cease to fight for social justice and for equal opportunity for all.

EXTENSION OF CHARTERS OF NATIONAL BANKS.

Mr. KING. I am advised that yesterday during my absence House bill 9527 was passed, extending the charters of national banks for 99 years. I had opposed that bill and regret very much that it was brought up in my absence. I wish to enter a motion to reconsider.

Mr. ROBINSON. I desire to inquire whether the Senator has ascertained that the bill is still in possession of the Senate, or has it gone to the House?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the bill has gone to the House.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest that the Senator accompany his motion to reconsider with a motion to request the House of Representatives to return the bill to the Senate.

Mr. KING. I thank the Senator. I move that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered, and the motion to reconsider will be entered.

LETTER FROM DAVID LAWRENCE.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from a gentleman who says I was mistaken about a fact, and I want to do him the courtesy of putting it in the RECORD.

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

520 EVENING STAR BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1922.

DEAR SENATOR CARAWAY: I noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning an extended comment by you on a story I wrote on Wednesday, May 31, about the Daugherty case. You were under the impression that this story was inspired by the Attorney General himself. This is not so. I have not talked with the Attorney General in several weeks and have never discussed the Morse case with him.

I do not mind telling you that the source of the story was as stated in the article, namely, "friends of Mr. Daugherty," who, I have reason to believe, are familiar with his side of the question. Let me add also that there was no effort on the part of Mr. Daugherty's friends to draw these matters to my attention, but that, following my usual course in controversial matters, I voluntarily sought the views of those who would know the Daugherty side. So the story was not inspired in any sense, but it was the natural result of a reporter's effort to get at both sides of a moot question.

I thank you for your statement in the RECORD that you were confident I was trying to be fair in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID LAWRENCE.

Senator T. H. CARAWAY,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

VIEWS OF SENATOR CULBERSON.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in 8-point type a letter by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] to Major Fisher in respect to the Ku-Klux organization, and what, if any, legislation is required with respect to it; also, another letter, which has to do with the attitude of the Senator from Texas upon the Cummins-Esch bill. It is very brief.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1922.

Major H. V. FISHER,
Commercial Bank Building, Houston, Texas.

DEAR MAJOR: Your recent letter asking my position with reference to the order known as the Ku Klux Klan which is now in operation in our State was duly received and I answer at the earliest opportunity.

I have no affiliation directly or indirectly with this organization and I am unqualifiedly opposed to its operations. If not curbed, it will usurp the functions of the State and be destructive of government itself. It will indeed overthrow our Anglo-Saxon civilization in its relation to government.

Steps should be taken, therefore, at once to arrest its progress and finally to destroy it.

Appeal can not be made to the Federal Government for this purpose for it is without jurisdiction unless application is made by Texas to the United States in the manner provided by the Constitution for protection against domestic violence, and this is unthinkable.

Fortunately, however, the power of the State is ample, and if no law now exists adequate to the occasion the Legislature may be called in extra session to supply this deficiency.

Truly your friend,

C. A. CULBERSON.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1922.

Hon. ALLISON MAYFIELD, *Chairman*;
Hon. CLARENCE E. GILMORE, *Commissioner*,
Railroad Commission of Texas, Austin, Texas.

GENTLEMEN: Replying at the earliest opportunity to your recent letter regarding the Transportation Act of 1920, known as the Esch-Cummins law, I beg to say that, as you know, I voted against this legislation when it passed the Senate originally and will be very glad to support the bill to which you refer to repeal it in its entirety.

I was one of the early advocates of the establishment of a State railroad commission in Texas and have always vigorously defended the right of the State to control the rates on shipments which are wholly within its boundaries.

Very sincerely yours,

C. A. CULBERSON.

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. 9527) to amend section 5136, Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to corporate powers of associations, so as to provide succession thereof until dissolved, and to apply said section as so amended to all national banking associations; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McFADDEN, Mr. DALE, and Mr. WINEO were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and a joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7299: An act to incorporate the Women's Overseas Service League;

H. R. 10159: An act to further protect interstate and foreign commerce against bribery and other corrupt trade practices;

H. R. 10768: An act to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the unlawful breaking of seals of railroad cars containing interstate or foreign shipments, the unlawful entering of such cars, the stealing of freight and express packages or baggage or articles in process of transportation in interstate shipment, and the felonious asportation of such freight or express packages or baggage or articles therefrom into another district of the United States, and the felonious possession or reception of the same," approved February 13, 1913 (37 Stats., p. 670); and

H. J. Res. 337: Joint resolution granting consent of Congress and authority to the Port of New York Authority to execute the comprehensive plan approved by the States of New York and New Jersey by chapter 43, Laws of New York, 1922, and chapter 9, Laws of New Jersey, 1922.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 53) to create a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to determine what employment can be furnished Federal prisoners, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

S. 745: An act to amend section 24 and section 256 of the Judicial Code;

H. R. 241: An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant a perpetual easement for railroad right of way and a right of way for a public highway over and upon a portion of the military reservation of Fort Sheridan, in the State of Illinois;

H. R. 10925: An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell real property known as the Pittsburgh Storage Supply Depot, at Pittsburgh, Pa.;

H. R. 11408: An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Winnebago and the town of Rockton, in said county, in the State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Rock River, in said town of Rockton; and

H. R. 11409: An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Ottawa and the county of La Salle, in the State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Fox River.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by title and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 10159: An act to further protect interstate and foreign commerce against bribery and other corrupt trade practices; and

H. R. 10768: An act to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the unlawful breaking of seals of railroad cars containing interstate or foreign shipments, the unlawful entering of such cars, the stealing of freight and express packages or baggage or articles in process of transportation in interstate shipment, and the felonious asportation of such freight or express packages or baggage or articles therefrom into another district of the United States, and the felonious possession or reception of the same," approved February 13, 1913 (37 Stat. p. 670); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 7299: An act to incorporate the Women's Overseas Service League; and

H. J. Res. 337: Joint resolution granting consent of Congress and authority to the Port of New York Authority to execute the comprehensive plan approved by the States of New York and New Jersey by chapter 43, Laws of New York, 1922, and chapter 9, Laws of New Jersey, 1922; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EMPLOYMENT OF FEDERAL PRISONERS.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 53) to create a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to determine what employment can be furnished Federal prisoners, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10871) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, as preliminary to the reading of the bill, I desire to present a comparative statement of the appropriations for the Army as recommended by the Budget, as contained in the bill as passed by the House, as reported to the Senate, and of last year's appropriation for similar purposes. I ask that it may be printed in the Record at this point.

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

The statement referred to is as follows:

Amount of bill as passed House	\$287,897,731.67
Amount added by Senate (net)	45,985,120.00
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	333,882,851.67
Amount of estimates for 1923 (includes \$15,180,401 added in House for rivers and harbors and not officially estimated)	374,541,318.47
Amount of appropriations, 1922	356,824,212.41
The bill as reported to the Senate is—	
Under the estimates for 1923	40,658,466.80
Under the appropriations for 1922	52,941,360.74

The President pro tempore. The Secretary will proceed to read the bill.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 1, line 6, after the figures "1923," to insert "and for other purposes," so as to make the first clause of the bill read:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "Title I—Military activities and other expenses of the War Department incident thereto, Office of Secretary of War," on page 2, line 20, after the word "each," to strike out "7" and to insert "6"; in line 21, before the word "assistant," to strike out "5" and to insert "4"; and in page 3, line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$208,640" and to insert "\$207,080," so as to make the paragraph read:

Salaries: Secretary of War, \$12,000; Assistant Secretary, \$10,000; Assistant and Chief Clerk, who shall sign such official papers and documents as the Secretary may direct, \$4,000; private secretary to the Secretary, \$2,500; clerk to the Secretary, \$2,000; stenographer to the Secretary, \$2,000; clerk to the Assistant Secretary, \$2,400; assistant chief clerk, \$2,400; disbursing clerk, \$2,750; principal clerks—1 \$2,500, 1 \$2,250, 1 \$2,000; chiefs of divisions—2 at \$2,500 each, 2 at \$2,200 each, 1 \$2,000; deputy disbursing clerk, \$2,000; chief telegrapher, \$1,800; clerks—10 of class 4, 10 of class 3, 2 at \$1,500 each, 19 of class 2, 2 at \$1,300 each, 27 of class 1, 1 \$1,100, 5 at \$1,000 each; foreman, \$1,400; carpenter, \$1,200; engineer, \$1,200; assistant engineer, \$720; skilled laborer, \$1,080; chief messenger, \$1,000; messengers—2 at \$1,000 each, 6 at \$840 each; 4 assistant messengers at \$720 each; telephone supervisor, \$1,020; 13 telephone switchboard operators at \$840 each; 5 laborers at \$660 each; chauffeurs—1 \$1,000, 2 at \$840 each; skilled laborer, \$900; 6 watchmen at \$720 each; messenger boy, \$480; charwoman, \$240; in all, \$207,080.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingencies of the Army," on page 4, line 19, before the word "authority," to strike out "and" and insert "or," so as to read:

For all contingent expenses of the Army not otherwise provided for and embracing all branches of the military service, including the office of the Chief of Staff; for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, including the employment of translators and exclusive of all other personal services in the War Department or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices at Washington, D. C., or in the Army at large, but impossible to be anticipated or classified; to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of War, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, including the payment of a per diem allowance not to exceed \$4, in lieu of subsistence, to employees of the War Department traveling on official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts, \$95,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Staff Corps, Contingencies, Military Intelligence Division," on page 6, line 15, after the word "information," to strike out "\$100,000" and to insert "\$225,000," so as to read:

For contingent expenses of the Military Intelligence Division, General Staff Corps, including the purchase of law books, professional books of reference; subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals; drafting, clerical, and messenger services in the Military Intelligence Division in Washington, D. C.; and of the military attachés at the United States embassies and legations abroad and rental of offices for such military attachés; the cost of special instruction at home and abroad, and in maintenance of students and attachés; for the hire of interpreters, special agents, and guides, and for such other purposes as the Secretary of War may deem proper, including \$10,000 for the actual and necessary expenses of officers of the Army on duty abroad for the purpose of observing operations of armies of foreign States at war to be paid upon certificates of the Secretary of War that the expenditures were necessary for obtaining military information, \$225,000; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 23, before the words "at \$1,400 each," to strike out "18" and to insert "20"; in the same line, before the words "at \$1,200 each," to strike out "20" and to insert "21"; in line 25, before the words "at \$840 each," to strike out "3" and to insert "2"; in the same line, before the words "at \$720 each," to strike out "9" and to insert "6"; and in line 26, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$119,470" and to insert "\$120,470," so as to make the paragraph read:

Clerks, messengers, and laborers, office of the Chief of Staff: Chief clerk, \$2,500; clerks—1 \$2,250, 4 at \$2,000 each, 6 at \$1,800 each, 10 at \$1,600 each, 20 at \$1,400 each, 21 at \$1,200 each, 20 at \$1,000 each; chief messenger, \$1,000; messengers—2 at \$840 each, 6 at \$720 each; laborer, \$720; in all, \$120,470.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from New York for a moment. I am not disposed to make objection to any of the amendments now being considered, but it has occurred to me that later on in the consideration of the bill there will be amendments which will be debated with a view to changing them. For instance, I have in mind the provisions in regard to the size of the Army. It has occurred to me that possibly the number of clerks might depend

to some extent upon the size of the Army. Can we have an understanding that when we come to the consideration of the question of the size of the Army, if the committee amendment is rejected or modified, and it becomes necessary to modify any of the other amendments, there will be no objection to their reconsideration?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There will be no objection to their reconsideration. I may say to the Senate, however, that I think I can say with absolute accuracy that the number of clerks and messengers has been so severely slashed that proportionately they are far below the number which would ordinarily have been employed for an Army of 150,000 men or even for an Army of 133,000 men, which this bill provides for.

Mr. NORRIS. From the slight examination I have been able to make of the bill I think the Senator is absolutely right in that respect; but some Senators who expect to take an active part in the debate on the question of the size of the Army are not in the Chamber at the present time, and I assume, of course, that if there should be any change in the provisions respecting the size of the Army the Senator from New York would not object to reconsidering such amendments as it may be necessary to reconsider.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment last stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead, "General service schools, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.," on page 8, line 17, before the word "services," to strike out "or special," and to insert "special and clerical," so as to make the paragraph read:

For the purchase of textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, instruments, and material for instruction; employment of temporary, technical, special and clerical services, including the services of one translator at the rate of \$150 per month; and for other necessary expenses of instruction, at the School of the Line and the General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., \$35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Military post exchanges," on page 9, line 8, after the word "established," to strike out "\$75,000," and to insert "\$200,000," so as to read:

For continuing the construction, equipment, and maintenance of suitable buildings at military posts and stations, for the conduct of the post exchange, school, library, reading, lunch, amusement rooms; for the conduct and maintenance of hostess houses, chapels, and gymnasiums, including repairs to buildings erected at private cost, in the operation of the act approved May 31, 1902; for the rental of films, purchase of slides, supplies for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits, and for similar and other recreational purposes at training and mobilization camps now established, or which may be hereafter established, \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 9, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$15,000" and to insert "\$60,000," and in line 11, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$35,000" and to insert "\$90,000," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That not to exceed \$60,000 from this appropriation may be expended for the conduct and maintenance of libraries and not to exceed \$90,000 may be expended for the conduct and maintenance of hostess houses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster supplies, equipment, etc., Reserve Officers' Training Corps," on page 10, at the end of line 24, to strike out "\$2,750,000" and to insert "\$3,600,000," so as to read:

For the procurement and issue, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, to institutions at which one or more units of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps are maintained, of such public animals, means of transportation, supplies, tentage, equipment, and uniforms as he may deem necessary, and to forage at the expense of the United States public animals so issued, and to pay commutation in lieu of uniforms at a rate to be fixed annually by the Secretary of War; for transporting said animals and other authorized supplies and equipment from place of issue to the several institutions and training camps and return of same to place of issue when necessary; for the establishment and maintenance of camps for the further practical instruction of the members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for transporting members of such corps to and from such camps, and to subsist therein while traveling to and from such camps and while remaining therein so far as appropriations will permit; or in lieu of transporting them to and from such camps and subsisting therein while en route, to pay them travel allowance at the rate of 5 cents per mile for the distance by the shortest usually traveled route from the places from which they are authorized to proceed to the camp and for the return travel thereto, and to pay the return travel pay in advance of the actual performance of the travel; for pay for students attending advanced camps at the rate prescribed for soldiers of the seventh grade of the Regular Army; for the payment of commutation of subsistence to members of the senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, at a rate not exceeding the cost of the garrison ration prescribed for the Army, as authorized in the act approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act approved June 4, 1920, \$3,600,000, to remain available until December 31, 1923.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Military supplies and equipment for schools and colleges," on page 12, at the end of line 12, to strike out "\$804" and to insert "\$500," so as to read:

For the procurement and issue as provided in section 55-c of the act approved June 4, 1920, and in section 1225, Revised Statutes, as amended, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, to schools and colleges, other than those provided for in section 40 of the act above referred to, of such arms, tentage, and equipment, including the transporting of same, and the overhauling and repair of personal equipments, machine-gun outfits, and horse equipments, as the Secretary of War shall deem necessary for proper military training in said schools and colleges, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civilian military training camps," on page 12, line 24, after the words "section 47-d" to insert "; for such expenditures as are authorized by said section 47-d as may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of said camps," so as to read:

For furnishing, at the expense of the United States, to warrant officers, enlisted men, and civilians attending training camps maintained under the provisions of section 47-d of the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920, uniforms, including altering, fitting, washing, and cleaning when necessary, subsistence, and transportation, or in lieu of such transportation and of subsistence for travel to and from camps, travel allowances at 5 cents per mile as prescribed in said section 47-d; for such expenditures as are authorized by said section 47-d as may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of said camps, \$1,800,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 2, after "\$1,800,000," to insert: "and no other funds appropriated in this act shall be available for the purposes of this paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 5, after the word "over," to strike out "35" and to insert "27," and on line 6, after the word "age," to insert "except those who received training within the fiscal year 1922 and except veterans of the war with Germany, who may be accepted if not over 30 years of age," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That the funds herein appropriated shall not be used for the training of any person who is over 27 years of age except those who received training within the fiscal year 1922 and except veterans of the war with Germany who may be accepted if not over 30 years of age.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Adjutant General's Office," on page 14, line 5, before the word "messengers," to strike out "21" and to insert "18"; at the end of the same line, to strike out "43" and to insert "35"; and at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "\$1,156,770" and to insert "\$1,148,490," so as to make the paragraph read:

Salaries: Chief clerk, \$2,750; assistant chief clerk, \$2,400; 5 chiefs of divisions at \$2,400 each; 12 principal clerks at \$2,000 each; clerks—89 of class 4, 90 of class 3, 154 of class 2, 388 of class 1, 48 at \$1,000 each; engineer, \$1,400; firemen—one \$1,000, one \$720; skilled mechanic, \$1,200; typewriter repairer, \$1,100; 18 messengers at \$840 each; 35 assistant messengers at \$720 each; 4 watchmen at \$720 each; 5 skilled laborers at \$840 each; 20 laborers at \$660 each; 11 messenger boys at \$480 each; 11 charwomen at \$240 each; in all, \$1,148,490; all employees provided for by this paragraph for The Adjutant General's Office of the War Department shall be exclusively engaged on the work of this office for the fiscal year 1923.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 15, after the word "States," to insert "and the District of Columbia"; in line 17, after the word "States," to insert "and the District of Columbia"; and in line 20, after the word "Army," to strike out "\$202,000" and to insert "\$250,000"; so as to make the paragraph read:

For expenses incident to completion of the work of furnishing to adjutants general of States and the District of Columbia statements of service of all persons from those States and the District of Columbia who entered the military service during the war with Germany, including the employment of clerical and other help in the office of The Adjutant General of the Army, \$250,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Inspector General," on page 14, line 23, after the word "clerks," to strike out "one" and to insert "two"; in line 25, after the figures "\$840," to strike out "assistant messenger, \$720"; and at the end of line 26; to strike out "\$18,500" and to insert "\$19,640"; so as to make the paragraph read:

Salaries: Chief clerk, \$2,000; clerks—2 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 3 of class 2, 4 of class 1, 1 \$1,000; messenger, \$840; in all, \$19,640.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Judge Advocate General," on page 15, line 4, before the words "of class 2," to strike out "five" and to insert "seven"; in line 5, after the figures "\$840," to strike out "three assistant messengers at \$720 each" and to insert "assistant messenger, \$720"; and at the end of line 7 to strike out "\$53,060" and to insert "\$54,420"; so as to make the paragraph read:

Salaries: Chief clerk and solicitor, \$2,500; patent expert, \$3,000; clerks—2 of class 4, 4 of class 3, 7 of class 2, 20 of class 1, 2 at \$1,000 each; messenger, \$840; assistant messenger, \$720; 4 charwomen at \$240 each; in all, \$54,420.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 16 it is proposed to strike out lines 10 to 26, both inclusive—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from New York if he will not pass over that amendment for the present.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am perfectly willing to do that, Mr. President. If we pass it over, it will involve passing over from page 15 to the bottom of page 21.

I desire to ask just exactly how much the Senator from Nebraska wants passed over. The items which follow the bottom of page 21 have to do with the size of the Army. The portion to which the Senator has called attention affects only the commissioned officers. The pay of the enlisted men commences on page 24.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to have the Senator pass over temporarily everything that pertains to the size of the Army.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, before that is done I want to ask the Senator a question about the pending amendment for information. Is this amendment so worded as to conform to the new Army pay act?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is.

Mr. ROBINSON. It conforms to it in every particular?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is all I desired to understand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment beginning on page 15, line 10, will be passed over.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, if it is the desire of the Senator from Nebraska to pass over all amendments or portions of the bill which affect directly or indirectly the size of the Army, the commissioned and enlisted strength, it will be necessary to pass over that portion of the bill commencing on line 9, page 15, to and including line 12 on page 28.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York suggest that all the amendments prior to line 13 on page 28 be passed over?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. That, I understand, is the desire of the Senator from Nebraska, and I consent to that.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All the amendments within those limits will be passed over. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 28, line 15, after the figures "\$1,500," to insert a comma and the words "and for each fiscal year hereafter a like amount during her life is permanently appropriated," so as to make the paragraph read:

For amount required to make monthly payments to Jennie Carroll, widow of James Carroll, late major, United States Army, \$1,500, and for each fiscal year hereafter a like amount during her life is permanently appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 19, after the figures "\$1,500," to insert a comma and the words "and for each fiscal year hereafter a like amount during her life is permanently appropriated," so as to make the paragraph read:

For amount required to make monthly payments to Mabel H. Lazear, widow of Jesse W. Lazear, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, \$1,500, and for each fiscal year hereafter a like amount during her life is permanently appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 25, after the figures "\$1,200," to insert a comma and the words "and for each fiscal year hereafter a like amount during his life is permanently appropriated," so as to make the paragraph read:

For the amount required to make monthly payments to John R. Kissinger, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-seventh Indiana Volunteer Infantry, also late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, \$1,200, and for each fiscal year hereafter a like amount during his life is permanently appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 2, to strike out:

For compensation of clerks and other employees of the Finance Department, \$1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 4, to insert:

For compensation of clerks and other employees of the Finance Department, \$1,617,000: *Provided*, That \$500,000 of this amount shall be available only for the compensation and traveling expenses of clerks and other employees engaged on work pertaining to the audit of World War contracts, and of this amount not to exceed \$25,000 shall be available for personal services, at salaries not in excess of \$3,000 per annum, in the Office of the Chief of Finance, War Department.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, that amendment appears to carry a very large increase over the House item, the latter appropriating only \$1,000,000, whereas the Senate amendment provides for \$1,617,000, with certain express limitations upon the use. I inquire of the Senator from New York the occasion for that very large increase in the House item?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, this amendment suggested by the committee has to do with an exceedingly important activity in the War Department—an activity which the committee believes will in all probability mean the saving of millions and millions of dollars to the Government.

The Finance Department is charged not only with the keeping of the fiscal accounts of the Army itself and the pay of officers and men, but also with the duty of auditing contracts heretofore entered into, as well as examining and approving fiscal operations upon which the War Department is about to embark.

Since the termination of the World War the finance department of the War Department has been auditing the contracts into which the War Department entered during the war. There are 150,000 of those contracts. With a very limited force of accountants in the finance department, 15,000 of those contracts have been audited, and I may say that these are contracts which have been already in a sense closed. The money has been paid. As a result of the work of the finance department audit, going back over this contract history, there has been recovered from contractors who have sent in their checks voluntarily upon being notified and convinced of errors in the way of overpayment \$1,894,000. In addition to that, the finance department has turned over to the Department of Justice audits as the result of which the Department of Justice is in process of collecting from contractors by legal procedure \$4,370,000. In addition to that, there is now in process of investigation by this same small auditing force of the finance department a number of contracts; and that investigation up to date, although not complete in every respect and ready to be turned over to the Attorney General, indicates the very clear possibility of recovering \$26,645,000 for the Government.

Only 15,000 of these contracts have been audited thus far. There are 135,000 more of them. The Chief of Finance, General Lord—and we heard indirectly, but none the less emphatically, from the Attorney General himself—believes that this work should be expedited. At the present rate of procedure it will take 15 years or more to go over these war-time contracts with this expert audit. The committee, therefore, was thoroughly persuaded that it was the part of wise economy to give them \$600,000 over the appropriation made by the House, in order to enable them to go out and cover this field with greater rapidity. They believe that with an appropriation running annually, such as the committee suggests, they can clean up this work in four or five years. If it is allowed to go beyond four or five years' time, it is the general consensus of opinion that the whole thing will get out of the hands of the Government; witnesses will disappear; papers will disappear and be destroyed; it will be impossible to make an effective audit after three or four years have gone by. We believe that this means millions of dollars recovered to the Government.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, it is undoubtedly both necessary and advisable that the work of auditing these contracts proceed as speedily as may be, with due consideration to accuracy in results. The statement of the Senator from New York has, in my judgment, justified the increase in the appropriation beyond question. The results which are being obtained and the prospective accomplishments which it is hoped will be brought about through this department support very strongly the very large increase in this item. I am curious to know whether the request for this additional amount was submitted to the House committee, and whether it passed upon the question and then refused it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. My impression is that it was not, but I would not say for certain. A supplemental budget estimate of this increase was sent in, according to my recollection. But I desire to have it understood that my recollection is not entirely clear as to whether the House committee considered it.

Mr. ROBINSON. In view of the statement which the Senator from New York has made, I do not think that would be a controlling consideration with me when I vote, anyway. I merely desired as full information respecting the subject as could possibly be obtained within a brief time. I am satisfied that the Senator from New York has fully justified the increase.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It may be permissible for me to say, just to round out the story, that this work is the foundation and the basis for all the work in the way of prosecution which the Department of Justice may carry on.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 24, to strike out "\$1,100,000" and insert "\$1,689,450," so as to make the paragraph read:

MILEAGE OF THE ARMY.

For mileage to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks and field clerks of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, \$1,689,450.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations to ask unanimous consent to present an amendment to be attached to this paragraph, which, frankly, is in the nature of legislation, but it is a provision which will save the Government a good deal of money.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 29, line 24, add at the end of the paragraph the following proviso:

Provided, That hereafter the mileage allowance to members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when called into active service for training for 15 days or less shall not exceed 4 cents per mile.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is contrasted with 8 cents per mile, which is the standing law. The committee believes that for this kind of transportation, for these short trips, for only 15-day periods, 4 cents a mile is ample compensation for the officers thus traveling. Otherwise they would receive 8 cents.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Claims for damages to and loss of private property," on page 30, line 2, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$500" and insert "\$1,000," and in line 6 to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$80,000," so as to read:

For payment of claims of not to exceed \$1,000 in amount for damages to and loss of private property incident to the training, practice, operation, or maintenance of the Army that have accrued, or may hereafter accrue, from time to time, \$80,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 11, to insert:

CLAIMS OF OFFICERS, ENLISTED MEN, AND NURSES OF THE ARMY FOR DESTRUCTION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY.

For the payment of claims of officers, enlisted men, and nurses of the Army for private property lost, destroyed, captured, abandoned, or damaged in the military service of the United States, under the provisions of an act approved March 4, 1921, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 18, to insert:

CLAIMS OF OFFICERS, MEMBERS OF THE NURSE CORPS, AND ENLISTED MEN FOR PAY AND ALLOWANCES, WORLD WAR.

Not exceeding \$500,000 of the unexpended amount of the appropriations for pay, etc., of the Army for the fiscal years 1919 and 1920 is hereby made available for payment for the adjustment and settlement of claims of officers, members of the Nurse Corps, and enlisted men for pay and allowances growing out of service in the World War from April 6, 1917, to June 30, 1919, and from July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, and shall remain upon the books of the Treasury to the credit of those appropriations until June 30, 1923.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 6, to strike out:

TRANSPORTATION OF WOUNDED AND OTHERWISE DISABLED SOLDIERS, SAILORS, OR MARINES WHEN TRAVELING ON FURLOUGH.

For payment to railroad and steamship companies of the amount required to pay the difference between 1 cent per mile and the scheduled rate for tickets furnished to wounded or otherwise disabled soldiers, sailors, or marines under treatment at any Army, Navy, or other hospital, who are given furloughs in accordance with the provisions of the Army appropriation act of June 5, 1920, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Chief of Finance," on page 32, line 13, before the words "of class 4," to strike out "28" and to insert "32"; in line 14, before the words "of class 3," to strike out "24" and to insert "20"; in the same line, before the words "of class 2," to strike out "40" and to insert "44"; in line 16, before the word "assistant," to strike out "4" and to insert "2"; at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "four" and to insert "two"; and at the end of line 18, to strike out "\$285,810" and insert "\$285,270"; so as to make the paragraph read:

Salaries: Assistant to Chief of Finance, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,750; chiefs of divisions—1 \$3,000, 1 \$2,750; principal clerks—1 \$2,400, 1 \$2,250, 4 at \$2,000 each; clerks—32 of class 4, 20 of class 3, 4 of class 2, 16 at \$1,300 each; 60 of class 1; 2 messengers, at \$840 each; 2 assistant messengers, at \$720 each; auditors for Red Cross accounts—1 \$3,500, 1 \$3,000, 2 at \$2,750 each; in all, \$285,270.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps," on page 33, line 21, after the word "ration," to strike out the comma and the words "at the rate of \$0.75 per ration";

in line 22, after the word "allowances," to strike out "of commutation in lieu of rations" and to insert "for quarters and subsistence"; in line 24, after the word "men," to strike out "and male and female nurses"; on page 34, line 1, after the word "including," to strike out "warrant officers of the Mine Planter Service"; in line 7, after the word "contest," to strike out "male and female nurses on leave of absence"; in line 11, after the word "rations," to strike out "for members of the Army Nurse Corps while on duty in hospital, and"; and at the end of line 22, to strike out "\$16,550,000" and to insert "\$17,000,000"; so as to read:

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Subsistence of the Army: Purchase of subsistence supplies: For issue as rations to troops, including warrant officers of the Mine Planter Service, enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, civil employees when entitled thereto, hospital matrons, nurses, applicants for enlistment while held under observation, general prisoners of war (including Indians held by the Army as prisoners, but for whose subsistence appropriation is not otherwise made), Indians employed with the Army as guides and scouts, and general prisoners at posts; for the subsistence of the masters, officers, crews, and employees of the vessels of the Army Transport Service; hot coffee for troops traveling when supplied with cooked or travel rations; meals for recruiting parties and applicants for enlistment while under observation; for sales to officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps while on active duty, and enlisted men of the Army: *Provided*, That the sum of \$12,000 is authorized to be expended for supplying meals or furnishing commutation of rations to enlisted men of the Regular Army and the National Guard who may be competitors in the national rifle match: *Provided further*, That no competitor shall be entitled to commutation of rations in excess of \$1.50 per day, and when meals are furnished no greater expense than that sum per man per day for the period the contest is in progress shall be incurred. For payments: Of commutation of rations to the cadets of the United States Military Academy in lieu of the regular established ration of the regulation allowances for quarters and subsistence to enlisted men on furlough, enlisted men when stationed at places where rations in kind can not be economically issued, including enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, and when traveling on detached duty where it is impracticable to carry rations of any kind, enlisted men selected to contest for places or prizes in department and Army rifle competitions while traveling to and from places of contest, applicants for enlistment, and general prisoners while traveling under orders. For payment of the regulation allowances of commutation in lieu of rations for enlisted men, applicants for enlistment while held under observation, civilian employees who are entitled to subsistence at public expense, and general prisoners sick therein, to be paid to the surgeon in charge; advertising; for providing prizes to be established by the Secretary of War for enlisted men of the Army who graduate from the Army schools for bakers and cooks, the total amount of such prizes at the various schools not to exceed \$900 per annum; and for other necessary expenses incident to the purchase, testing, care, preservation, issue, sale, and accounting for subsistence supplies for the Army; in all, \$17,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, at the beginning of line 1, to insert "other than in Alaska"; and in the same line, after the word "charged," to strike out "do not" and insert "are not estimated to," so as to make the paragraph read:

None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the payment of expenses of operating sales commissaries other than in Alaska at which the prices charged are not estimated to include the customary overhead costs of freight, handling, storage, and delivery, notwithstanding the provisions of the act of July 5, 1884.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 8, after the word "sold," to strike out "does not" and to insert "is not estimated to," so as to make the paragraph read:

None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for payment of expenses of operating any utility of the War Department selling services or supplies at which the cost of the services or supplies so sold is not estimated to include all customary overhead costs of labor, rent, light, heat, and other expenses properly chargeable to the conduct of such utility.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 18, after the word "stores," to insert "except at establishments under the direct control of the Chief of Ordnance," so as to read:

Regular supplies of the Army: Regular supplies of the Quartermaster Corps, including their care and protection; construction and repair of military reservation fences; stoves and heating apparatus required for the use of the Army for heating offices, hospitals, barracks and quarters, and recruiting stations, and United States disciplinary barracks; also ranges, stoves, coffee roasters, and appliances for cooking and serving food at posts in the field and when traveling, and repair and maintenance of such heating and cooking appliances; and the necessary power for the operation of moving-picture machines; authorized issues of candles and matches; for furnishing heat and light for the authorized allowance of quarters for officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, and enlisted men, warrant officers, and field clerks, including enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty; contract surgeons when stationed at and occupying public quarters at military posts; for officers of the National Guard attending service and garrison schools, and for recruits, guards, hospitals, storehouses, offices, the buildings erected at private cost, in the operation of the act approved May 31, 1902, and buildings for a similar purpose on military reservations authorized by War Department regulations; for sale to officers, and including also fuel and engine supplies required in the operation of modern batteries at established posts; for post bakeries, including bake ovens and apparatus pertaining thereto and the repair thereof;

for ice machines and their maintenance where required for the health and comfort of the troops and for ice for issue to organizations of enlisted men and offices at such places as the Secretary of War may determine, and for preservation of stores; materials for cleaning and preserving ordnance and ordnance stores, except at establishments under the direct control of the Chief of Ordnance; for cold storage; for the construction and maintenance of laundries at military posts in the United States and its island possessions; authorized issues of soap, toilet paper, and towels; for the necessary furniture, textbooks, paper, and equipment for the post schools and libraries, and for schools for noncommissioned officers; for the purchase and issue of instruments, office furniture, stationery, and other authorized articles for the use of officers' schools at the several military posts; for purchase of relief maps for issue to organizations, commercial newspapers, market reports, etc.; for the tableware and mess furniture for kitchens and mess halls, each and all for the enlisted men, including recruits; for forage, salt, and vinegar for the horses, mules, oxen, and other draft and riding animals of the Quartermaster Corps at the several posts and stations and with the armies in the field, and for the horses of the several regiments of Cavalry and batteries of Artillery, and such companies of Infantry and Scouts as may be mounted; for remounts and for the authorized number of officers' horses, including bedding for the animals; for seeds and implements required for the raising of forage at remount depots and on military reservations in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands, and for labor, and expenses incident thereto, including, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of War, the cost of irrigation; for straw for soldiers' bedding, stationery, typewriters and exchange of same, including blank books and blank forms for the Army, certificates for discharged soldiers, and for printing department orders and reports, \$10,932,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 23, to increase the appropriation for regular supplies of the Quartermaster Corps from "\$10,932,000" to "\$12,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 9, before the words "for fuel," to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$3,500,000"; in the same line, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000"; and in line 12, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$175,000" and insert "\$200,000," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That from this appropriation, not to exceed \$350,000 shall be expended for the pay of civilian employees; not to exceed \$1,250,000 shall be expended for power, heat, and electric current; not to exceed \$57,000 shall be expended for maintenance and repair of buildings (including repair of machinery) for laundries; not to exceed \$225,000 shall be expended for the maintenance and repair of heating apparatus (other than stoves); not to exceed \$175,000 for maintenance and repair of electric wiring and fixtures; not to exceed \$15,000 for the repair and exchange of typewriters; not to exceed \$3,500,000 for fuel; not to exceed \$5,000,000 for forage; including salt and vinegar and bedding for animals and straw for soldiers' bedding; not to exceed \$200,000 for ice; and not to exceed \$125,000 shall be expended for stationery.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, beginning in line 13, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to sell as soon as possible after the approval of this act, upon such terms and under such conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the best interests of the Government, such horses and mules now being held at remount stations and posts or with organizations of the National Guard or units of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps as are not in actual use.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 3, after the word "hereafter," to strike out "the issue and," and at the beginning of line 5 to strike out "including" and insert "plus," so as to read:

Clothing and equipage: For cloth, woollens, materials, and for the purchase and manufacture of clothing for the Army, including enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, for issue and for sale; for payment of commutation of clothing due to warrant officers of the Mine Planter Service and to enlisted men; for altering and fitting clothing and washing and cleaning when necessary; for operation of laundries; for the authorized issues of laundry materials for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances, and for applicants for enlistment while held under observation; for equipment and repair of equipment of dry-cleaning plants, salvage and sorting storehouses, hat-repairing shops, shoe-repair shops, clothing-repair shops, and garbage-reduction works; for equipage, including authorized issues of toilet articles, barbers' and tailors' materials, for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances, and applicants for enlistment while held under observation; issue of toilet kits to recruits upon their first enlistment, and issue of housewives to the Army; for expenses of packing and handling and similar necessities; for a suit of citizen's outer clothing, to cost not exceeding \$30, to be issued when necessary to each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably; to each enlisted man convicted by civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a penitentiary or other civil prison; and to each enlisted man ordered interned by reason of the fact that he is an alien enemy, or, for the same reason, discharged without interment; for indemnity to officers and men of the Army for clothing and bedding, etc., destroyed since April 22, 1898, by order of medical officers of the Army for sanitary reasons, \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That hereafter authorized sales of clothing and other quartermaster supplies shall be at the average current prices, plus all overhead costs, to be determined and fixed by the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation of the Army and its supplies," on page 42, line 2, after the word

"allowance," to insert "for payment of transportation costs for dependents of officers and enlisted men," so as to read:

For transportation of the Army and its supplies, including transportation of the troops when moving either by land or water, and of their baggage, including warrant officers, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, including the cost of packing and crating; for transportation of recruits and recruiting parties, of applicants for enlistment between recruiting stations and recruiting depots; for travel allowance to officers and enlisted men on discharge; for payment of travel allowance as provided in section 3 of the act approved February 28, 1919, to enlist men of the National Guard on their discharge from the service of the United States, and to members of the National Guard who have been mustered into the service of the United States, and discharged on account of physical disability; for payment of travel pay to officers of the National Guard on their discharge from the service of the United States, as prescribed in the act approved March 2, 1901; for travel allowance to discharged prisoners and persons discharged from the Government Hospital for the Insane after transfer thereto from such barracks or place to their homes (or elsewhere, as they may elect), provided the cost in each case shall not be greater than to the place of last enlistment; of the necessary agents and other employees, including per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$4 for those authorized to receive the per diem allowance; for payment of transportation costs for dependents of officers and enlisted men; of clothing and equipage and other quartermaster stores from Army depots or places of purchase or delivery to the several posts and Army depots and from those depots to the troops in the field; of horse equipment; of ordnance and ordnance stores, and small arms from the foundries and armories to the arsenals, fortifications, frontier posts, and Army depots; for payment of wharfage, tolls, and ferrages; for transportation of funds of the Army; for the payment of Army transportation lawfully due such land-grant railroads as have not received aid in Government bonds (to be adjusted in accordance with the decisions of the Supreme Court in cases decided under such land-grant acts), but in no case shall more than 50 per cent of full amount of service be paid.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, at the end of line 12, to increase the appropriation for the transportation of the Army and its supplies from "\$16,000,000" to "\$18,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 14, to increase the appropriation for water and sewers at military posts from "\$1,750,000" to "\$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 15, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$25,000," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That not to exceed \$25,000 of this appropriation shall be expended for new construction work.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Military posts," on page 47, line 16, before the name "Benning," to strike out "Camp" and insert "Fort"; and, in line 19, after the word "at," to strike out "Camp Dix, Meade, and Lewis" and insert "Edgewood Arsenal and Camp Lewis," so as to make the paragraph read:

For the construction and enlargement at military posts of such buildings as in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be necessary, including all appurtenances thereto, \$916,000, including \$400,000 for continuing construction of post at Fort Benning, Ga.; \$55,000 for construction of one hospital ward at Letterman General Hospital, San Francisco, Calif.; \$262,000 for general construction at Edgewood Arsenal and Camp Lewis; and \$198,000 for continuing construction and enlargement of barracks for guards at the United States Disciplinary Barracks, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations to propose an amendment, which is in the nature of legislation, at this point, and to ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 47, line 16, after the word "Georgia," insert the following proviso:

Provided, That apartment buildings may be constructed out of this appropriation at a cost not to exceed \$150,000 each, and to provide for not less than 18 families each.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator explain what that is? I did not catch its full import.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The appropriation of \$400,000 for continuing construction at Fort Benning, which comes from the House, impelled the committee to inquire of the officers of the War Department what sort of structures they were building at Fort Benning. We were informed that some of the buildings are to be used as quarters for officers and some for noncommissioned officers. Upon further inquiry we found that it is their plan to build apartment houses for some of the personnel, a plan with which we did not agree, but we ascertained that the apartment houses are going to cost at the rate of \$10,000 per apartment. The committee thought that was a little expensive. The object of the amendment which I have offered is to limit

that cost, in effect, to \$8,000 per apartment. The committee thinks that is enough money to be expended for such a purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Military posts, Hawaiian Islands," on page 48, after line 2, to insert:

For construction of six standard storehouses, including all appurtenances thereto, at not exceeding \$9,000 each, \$54,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 49, line 17, after the name "United States," to strike out "\$2,982,638" and to insert "\$4,000,000"; so as to read:

For barracks, quarters, stables, storehouses, magazines, administration and office buildings, sheds, shops, and other buildings necessary for the shelter of troops, public animals, and stores, and for administration purposes, except those pertaining to the Coast Artillery; for construction of reclamation plants; for constructing and repairing public buildings at military posts; for hire of employees; for rental of the authorized allowance of quarters for offices, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, on duty with the troops at posts and stations where no public quarters are available; of barracks or authorized allowance of quarters for noncommissioned officers and enlisted men, men on duty, where public quarters are not available, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve, retired enlisted men, and members of the enlisted Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty; for grounds for cantonments, camp sites, and other military purposes, and for buildings or portions of buildings for occupation by troops, for use as stables, storehouses, and offices, and for other military purposes; for the hire of recruiting stations and lodgings for recruits; for wall lockers in permanent barracks and refrigerators in barracks and quarters; for screen doors, window screens, storm doors and sash, and window shades for barracks and officers' quarters, and for flooring and framing for tents, and for the National Guard when called or drafted into the service of the United States, \$4,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10972) to readjust the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 339) making available funds for repairing and restoring levees on the Mississippi River above Cairo, Ill., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ATTORNEY GENERAL DAUGHERTY—THE TARIFF.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Public Ledger is one of the great independent Republican papers of the country. Mr. Edward G. Lowry is one of the most reputable newspaper correspondents in America. He wrote an article that appeared in yesterday morning's Public Ledger, and it is copyrighted by the Public Ledger Co. With one exception, the article has so much good advice and embodies so much wisdom that I desire to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LENROOT in the chair). If there be no objection it will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

MR. HARDING'S CHANCE—HE COULD PROFIT BY MR. TAFT'S EXPERIENCES THAT HURT HIM AND PARTY.

(By Edward G. Lowry. Copyright, 1922, by Public Ledger Co.)

President Harding could spend a useful and informative evening if he would invite Mr. Taft to come to the White House and tell him the real inside story of the Winona speech and the Ballinger-Pinchot case. The narrative, frankly and fully recounted, might save Mr. Harding and his party associates a hard fall. The President is facing almost the identical situation that confronted Mr. Taft. He has a Cabinet officer under fire in the person of Mr. Daugherty, and presently he will be asked to sign a tariff bill even more extortionate and oppressive in some of its rates than the short-lived Payne-Aldrich Act that proved so destructive to its makers and sponsors.

To this juncture the cases of Mr. Harding and Mr. Taft are strikingly parallel. It is for Mr. Harding to decide whether the analogy and similarity are to continue. Mr. Taft hadn't a political enemy in the world in his first year. All men spoke well of him. After the Winona speech no one spoke well. It was in that speech that he gave his blessing and praise to the Payne-Aldrich bill, which he had just signed. It did for him what "too proud to fight" did for Mr. Wilson. Mr. Taft never recovered his prestige or his popularity while he remained in the White House.

The cases of Ballinger and Daugherty as they first came up to the Executive for consideration and decision are strikingly alike, too. And they were presented to Presidents with many characteristics and qualities in common. Both Mr. Harding and Mr. Taft are essentially kindly men, with a strongly developed sense of personal loyalty to friends and associates. When the associate is also a personal friend the sense of loyalty tends to outweigh and overbalance the sense of public duty.

When the Ballinger case came up to Mr. Taft he waited too long before acting, as he, perhaps, would tell Mr. Harding if asked. Mr. Ballinger was allowed to ripen on the tree, and when he fell he spattered. Neither the public nor any party political interest was served by the delay in removing him. Out of his experience Mr. Taft could advise Mr. Harding that these things are best done quickly, and that the charges, questionings, and suspicions about Mr. Daugherty should

be promptly, thoroughly, and impartially investigated or the Attorney General permitted to "resume the practice of law," as they all say when they quit or are forced out.

The Daugherty matter can not be hushed up. It will go on day by day, assuming larger and larger proportions, if it is not taken firmly in hand now. So it was with Ballinger. When public accusation and public questioning has gone as far as it has in the present instance concerning Mr. Daugherty's fitness for office it becomes a matter for definite settlement. The public welfare is not served by inaction or by allowing the qualifications of a Cabinet member to become a "campaign issue." There are enough real problems and real issues to be settled in this country without bringing a controversy over personalities into the coming campaign.

Senator LENROO was quite right when he said the other day while visiting Gifford Pinchot at Milford:

"There has been a feeling, whether justified or not, that the reactionaries of the party have felt that the overwhelming majority for the Republican Party made it entirely safe for them to insist upon the old methods of government."

By one of the curious recurrences in our politics the group that went out of power with Cannon in 1910 when the revolt within the Republican ranks began is now in power again. A great many shrewd persons at Washington agree with Mr. LENROO that this "old crowd" interpreted the Harding victory as a charter to resume "the old methods of government"—the only methods they know.

Pinchot in Pennsylvania was one public denial and contradiction of this interpretation and Beveridge in Indiana was another. Will the response to inaction in the Daugherty case be a third?

The political men all agree that the country was never less radical than it is now, but that does not mean reactionary. The men who conduct and give the tone and color of policy to this Congress are reactionary, and it is known to even the dullest politician that the country does not hold the Federal Legislature in esteem. Mr. Harding does not share in this disesteem. People still speak well of him. Mr. Taft had his opportunity and did not take it. Mr. Harding can profit by his predecessor's experience if he will.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 339) making available funds for repairing and restoring levees on the Mississippi River above Cairo, Ill., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10871) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 49, after line 19, to insert:

All the money hereinbefore designated under the titles "Regular supplies of the Army," "Water and sewers at military posts," and "Barracks and quarters," shall be disbursed and accounted for as "General appropriations, Quartermaster Corps," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

Mr. ROBINSON. That appears to be a legislative provision, and I take it the committee found some urgent necessity for its adoption. I wish the Senator from New York would explain why the committee propose that amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Prior to two years ago, all the appropriations under the head of Quartermaster Corps were considered as of one fund, and were handled in that way. Each appropriation bill carried a provision similar to this, but including all the items.

Two years ago that provision was dropped from the bill for the first time, and last year it was also dropped from the bill, thereby compelling the Quartermaster General to follow the appropriations actually made for the several items. The War Department has always begged us to reinsert a provision of this kind covering all the items, saying that it saved them a lot of bookkeeping and the keeping of extra accounts, but Congress thus far has failed to insert the general provision.

However, the Senate committee in considering the matter at this session made up its mind that it might be well to allow these three accounts, regular supplies, water and sewers at military posts, and barracks and quarters, to be lumped together as one fund, for this reason.

For example, it is necessary to repair a barracks. We find that the money with which the plumbing is to be repaired comes out of "waters and sewers at military posts." The money with which the painting in the bathroom where the plumbing needs repair must be taken out of "barracks and quarters" or from "regular supplies." To do an ordinary repair job at any Army barracks anywhere which would include painting and papering and mending of broken plumbing, the War Department would have to go to three separate accounts. The result is a vast amount of bookkeeping which means nothing to the taxpayer one way or the other. The committee thought these three accounts, which are so closely interwoven, might well be allowed to be lumped together.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suppose the purpose of Congress in insisting upon a separate accounting as to those three items was to maintain a closer supervision over the administration of the fund. I can readily see that the War Department would

experience inconvenience under the system and that it would be much more convenient both in administering and in accounting to do so under the provision which the committee has reported. I shall make no objection to the item.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Barracks and quarters, Philippine Islands," on page 50, line 5, after the word "rents," to insert "and rentals for United States troops in China," so as to read:

Continuing the work of providing for the proper shelter and protection of officers and enlisted men of the Army of the United States lawfully on duty in the Philippine Islands, including repairs and payment of rents and rentals for United States troops in China, the acquisition of title to building sites, and such additions to existing military reservations as may be necessary, and including also shelter for the animals and supplies, and all other buildings necessary for post administration purposes, and for shelter and repair thereof, \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, before the next matter is taken up I desire* to say that I am compelled to be out of the Chamber for a little while, and I want to ask the chairman of the committee a few questions with respect to the appropriations for the United States Military Academy. I shall preface the question which I am about to ask by making a very brief statement.

About a year ago some question came up here about the failure of certain midshipmen to pass the examinations at the Naval Academy, and after a good deal of discussion upon the floor an arrangement was made whereby nearly all those young men who had failed to pass their examinations were readmitted in the lower class. I am happy to say that my information is that most of those midshipmen stand high in their classes now and that they are going to prove a credit to the institution.

At that same time I had information, coming not only from instructors at the academy but from at least one of the Board of Visitors at the academy, which demonstrated conclusively to me that the methods of instruction in the Naval Academy are not up to date; that so far as the naval officers are concerned who were assigned to give instruction in the academy, they were not qualified to perform the duties as they should have been; and that the best qualified instructors—I am speaking generally—in the academy are civilian instructors.

Now there is a movement afoot to dispense with the services of civilian instructors and to place in the Naval Academy a lot of naval officers who have had little or no experience in teaching. As a result, I am satisfied that so far as some of the instructors at the academy are concerned the young men would do just as well and become just as proficient in their studies if they were at home "sitting under a sour-apple tree."

In discussing this subject with a major general in the Army, who is a man who keeps in touch with conditions at the Military Academy, I was told that the same condition prevails at the Military Academy, and that there has been no advance in teaching over methods that prevailed 50 years ago.

The question I want to ask is this: Is there a movement afoot in the Military Academy to do away with civilian instructors there?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have heard of no such movement. This is the first time the question has ever been directed to me.

Mr. POMERENE. I am convinced that the condition is such at the Military Academy that the Board of Visitors ought to inquire into conditions there to the end that the methods of instruction in the two academies may be equal to those which prevail in the great universities of the country. Anything short of that character of instruction is a discredit to the Nation itself.

I notice there have been some changes made in the appropriations as they appear in the bill as it passed the House. I have not had an opportunity to study them, and I felt that it might not be inopportune to call attention to the situation. I have not any desire to stir up any undue controversy or anything of that kind, but I am intensely interested in the proper training of these young men.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Ohio that, as was stated by the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, we have heard of no disposition to make changes at West Point Academy along the line the Senator indicates. There happens to have been some presentations made before the subcommittee in charge of the naval appropriation bill as to Annapolis, but I do not understand that any actual movement has been made that would decide otherwise than as heretofore for civilian as well as naval instructors.

Mr. POMERENE. Does the Senator mean that to be true so far as the Naval Academy is concerned?

Mr. WARREN. So far as the Naval Academy is concerned, I happened to hear witnesses before the subcommittee discussing the subject and questions propounded by members of the subcommittee, but I have no information that there has been any decision yet to carry out the idea of substituting commissioned officers in the place of civilian instructors.

Mr. POMERENE. My information comes pretty direct that the admiral in charge of the academy has already made the recommendation that a large number of the civilian instructors at the Naval Academy be dismissed. I know that the matter has been called to the attention of the Secretary of the Navy. I do not know whether he has come to a final decision about it, but I suspect that one of the reasons is to furnish places for naval officers, and so forth, a large number of whom are not qualified to teach. They may be good men in command of a ship, but it does not necessarily follow that they understand the art of teaching.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 50, line 13, after the word "Army," to strike out "the total cost of which, including the heating and plumbing apparatus, wiring, and fixtures, shall exceed in the case of quarters of a general officer the sum of \$8,000; of a colonel or officer above the rank of captain, \$6,000; and of an officer of and below the rank of captain, \$4,000," and to insert "except in case of emergency with the approval of the Secretary of War," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That no part of said sum shall be expended for the construction of quarters for officers of the Army, except in case of emergency with the approval of the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction and repair of hospitals," on page 52, line 21, after the word "alteration," to insert "or enlargement," so as to read:

For construction and repair of hospitals at military posts already established and occupied, including all expenditures for construction and repairs required at the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark., and for the construction and repair of general hospitals and expenses incident thereto, and for additions needed to meet the requirements of increased garrisons, and for temporary hospitals in standing camps and cantonments; for the alteration or enlargement of permanent buildings at posts for use as hospitals, construction and repair of temporary hospital buildings at permanent posts, construction and repair of temporary general hospitals, rental or purchase of grounds, and rental and alteration of buildings for use for hospital purposes in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including necessary temporary quarters for hospital personnel, outbuildings, heating and laundry apparatus, plumbing, water and sewers, and electric work, cooking apparatus, and roads and walks for the same, \$529,360; *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the construction of new hospitals.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 12, to increase the appropriation for maintenance and repair of quarters for hospital stewards at military posts already established and occupied from "\$5,000" to "\$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Quartermaster General," on page 54, line 2, before the word "messengers," to strike out "seven" and insert "five"; in line 3, before the words "assistant messengers," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "ten"; and at the end of line 4 to strike out "\$563,060" and insert "\$557,780," so as to make the paragraph read:

Salaries: Chief clerk, \$2,750; principal clerks—2 at \$2,400 each, 5 at \$2,250 each, 4 at \$2,000 each; clerks—22 of class 4, 30 of class 3, 68 of class 2, 203 of class 1, 22 at \$1,000 each; draftsmen—1 \$2,400, 1 \$2,000, 1 \$1,800, 4 at \$1,600 each, 4 at \$1,400 each; electrical engineer, \$3,200; marine engineer, \$3,500; executive assistant, \$4,000; architect, \$3,600; structural engineer, \$3,600; mechanical engineer, \$3,600; civil engineers—1 \$3,600, 1 \$3,000; traffic clerks—2 at \$2,000 each, 1 \$1,800; textile expert, \$2,000; carpenter, \$1,200; mimeograph operator, \$1,200; 2 mimeograph operators at \$1,200 each; 4 photostat operators at \$1,200 each; blue-print operator, \$1,000; 4 blue printers at \$900 each; 5 messengers at \$840 each; 10 assistant messengers at \$720 each; 4 laborers at \$720 each; in all, \$557,780.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 14, to strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$3,000," so as to read:

The sum of \$50,000 of the appropriation available for the fiscal year 1923 for the "Disposition of remains of officers, soldiers, and civilian employees," may be expended for personal services in the Cemeterial Division, office of the Quartermaster General, for compiling, recording, preparing, and transmitting data incident to bringing home and disposition of remains from abroad; *Provided*, That no person shall be employed under this allotment at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum except one person at \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Signal Corps—Signal Service of the Army," on page 56, line 15, to increase

the appropriation for telegraph and telephone systems from "\$1,750,000" to "\$1,900,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 18, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$375,000" and insert "\$525,000," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That not to exceed \$475,000 from this appropriation may be expended for salaries and wages of civilian employees; not to exceed \$525,000 may be expended for commercial and existing Government-owned telephone and telegraph service; not to exceed \$500,000 may be expended for signal equipment for organizations; not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended for pigeon service; not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for photographic and cinematographic service; and not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the operation and maintenance of Camp Alfred Vail.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 13, to insert:

For replacing the worn-out portions of the Washington-Alaska submarine cable system, to remain available until expended, \$1,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Chief Signal Officer," on page 58, line 4, before the word "messengers," to strike out "three" and insert "two," and at the end of line 5, to strike out "\$41,900" and insert "\$41,060," so as to read:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER.

Salaries: Chief clerk, \$2,000; clerks—4 of class 4, 4 of class 3, 7 of class 2, 8 of class 1, 3 at \$1,000 each; 2 messengers, at \$840 each; 1 assistant messenger, \$720; laborer, \$660; in all \$41,060.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 15, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$40,000," so as to read:

The services of skilled draftsmen and such other services as the Secretary of War may deem necessary may be employed only in the Signal Office to carry into effect the various appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, and for the Signal Service of the Army, to be paid from such appropriations, in addition to the foregoing employees appropriated for in the Signal Office; *Provided*, That the entire expenditures for this purpose for the fiscal year 1923 shall not exceed \$40,000 and the Secretary of War shall each year in the annual estimates report to Congress the number of persons so employed, their duties, and the amount paid to each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Air Service, Air Service, Army" on page 50, line 9, after the word "with," to insert "and the establishment of landing and take-off runways"; on page 60, line 10, after the word "therewith," to insert "for the marking of military airways where the purchase of land is not involved"; and on page 61, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "\$12,431,000" and to insert "\$13,000,000," so as to read:

For creating, maintaining, and operating at established flying schools and balloon schools courses of instruction for officers, students, and enlisted men, including cost of equipment and supplies necessary for instruction, purchase of tools, equipment, materials, machines, textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, instruments, and materials for theoretical and practical instruction; for maintenance, repair, storage, and operation of airships, war balloons, and other aerial machines, including instruments, materials, gas plants, hangars, and repair shops, and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction, or equipment of all types of aircraft, and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith and the establishment of landing and take-off runways; for purchase of supplies for securing, developing, printing, and reproducing photographs in connection with aerial photography; improvement, equipment, maintenance, and operation of plants for testing and experimental work, and procuring and introducing water, electric light and power, gas and sewerage, including maintenance, operation, and repair of such utilities at such plants; for the acquisition of land or interest in land by purchase, lease, or condemnation where necessary to explore for, procure, or reserve helium gas, and also for the purchase, manufacture, construction, maintenance, and operation of plants for the production thereof and experimentation therewith; salaries and wages of civilian employees as may be necessary, and payment of their traveling and other necessary expenses as authorized by existing law; transportation of materials in connection with consolidation of Air Service activities; experimental investigation and purchase and development of new types of aircraft, accessories thereto, and aviation engines, including patents and other rights thereto, and plans, drawings, and specifications thereof; for the purchase, manufacture, and construction of airships, balloons, and other aerial machines, including instruments, gas plants, hangars, and repair shops, and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction, or equipment of all types of aircraft, and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith; for the marking of military airways where the purchase of land is not involved; for the purchase, manufacture, and issue of special clothing, wearing apparel, and similar equipment for aviation purposes; for all necessary expenses connected with the sale or disposal of surplus or obsolete aeronautical equipment, and the rental of buildings, and other facilities for the handling or storage of such equipment; for the services of such consulting engineers at experimental stations of the Air Service as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, including necessary traveling expenses; purchase of special apparatus and appliances, repairs, and replacements of same used in connection with special scientific medical research in the Air Service; for printing and binding, including supplies, equipment, and repairs for such Air Service printing plants outside of the District of Columbia as may be authorized in accordance with law; for

publications, station libraries, special furniture, supplies and equipment for offices, shops, and laboratories; for special services, including the salvaging of wrecked aircraft, \$13,000,000:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 9, before the word "may," to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$300,000," so as to read:

Provided, That not to exceed \$2,750,000 from this appropriation may be expended for pay and expenses of civilian employees other than those employed in experimental and research work; not exceeding \$300,000 may be expended for experimentation, conservation, and production of helium.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I ask the Senator to allow this amendment to go over for the present until I can look into it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well; let the item be passed over.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 61, in line 11, before the word "may," to strike out "\$3,250,000" and insert "\$3,750,000," so as to read:

not exceeding \$3,750,000 may be expended for experimental and research work with airplanes or lighter-than-air craft and their equipment, including the pay of necessary civilian employees; not exceeding \$450,000 may be expended for the production of lighter-than-air equipment; and not exceeding \$324,000 may be expended for improvement of stations, hangars, and gas plants for the Regular Army.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 8, to insert:

The sum of \$48,500 of the appropriation for the Air Service for the fiscal year 1920 contained in the "act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, shall remain available until June 30, 1923, for the payment of obligations incurred under contracts executed prior to June 30, 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Chief of Air Service," on page 62, line 21, after the words "at \$840 each," to strike out "two at \$720 each" and to insert "one at \$720," and in line 23, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$195,720" and insert "\$195,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

Salaries: Chief clerk, \$2,400; principal clerks—1 at \$2,400, 2 at \$2,250 each, 2 at \$2,000 each; clerks—6 of class 4, 10 of class 3, 38 of class 2, 80 of class 1; addressograph operator, \$900; messengers—2 at \$840 each, 1 at \$720; 2 messenger boys, at \$480 each; 2 laborers, at \$720 each; in all, \$195,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 7, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$65,000," and to insert "\$90,000," so as to read:

The services of aeronautical engineers, skilled draftsmen, and such other technical services as the Secretary of War may deem necessary may be employed only in the office of the Chief of Air Service to carry into effect the various appropriations for aeronautical purposes, to be paid from such appropriations, in addition to the foregoing employees appropriated for in the office of the Chief of Air Service: *Provided*, That the entire expenditure for this purpose for the fiscal year 1923 shall not exceed \$90,000, and the Secretary of War shall each year in the annual estimates report to Congress the number of persons so employed, their duties, and the amount paid to each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical Department," on page 65, line 6, to increase the appropriation for the medical and hospital department from "\$1,000,000" to "\$1,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "no part" and to insert "not more than \$16,600"; and in line 9, after the words "of the," where they occur the second time, to strike out "World War" and to insert "war with Germany," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That not more than \$16,600 of this appropriation shall be used for payment of any expense connected with the publication of the Medical and Surgical History of the War with Germany.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Library, Surgeon General's office," on page 66, line 4, to increase the appropriation "for the library of the Surgeon General's office, including the purchase of the necessary books of reference and periodicals," from "\$10,000" to "\$12,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Surgeon General," on page 66, line 8, after the figures "\$1,800," to strike out "assistant librarian, \$1,800" and to insert "2 assistant librarians, at \$1,800 each"; at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "15" and to insert "16"; at the end of the same line, to strike out "34" and insert "36"; in line 12, before the words "of class one," to strike out "55" and insert

"59"; in line 15, before the words "assistant messengers," to strike out "8" and to insert "6"; and at the end of line 19, to strike out "\$213,520" and to insert "\$223,280," so as to make the paragraph read:

Salaries: Chief clerk, \$2,250; principal assistant librarian, \$2,250; principal clerk, \$2,000; pathologist, \$1,800; microscopist, \$1,800; 2 assistant librarians, at \$1,800 each, anatomist, \$1,600; entomologist, \$1,600; photographer, \$1,500; translator, \$1,800; clerks—16 of class 4, 14 of class 3, 36 of class 2, 59 of class 1, 9 at \$1,000 each, 2 at \$900 each; multigraph operator, \$1,200; engineer, \$1,400; skilled mechanic, \$1,000; 2 messengers, at \$840 each; 6 assistant messengers, at \$720 each; chauffeur, \$840; 3 firemen, at \$720 each; 3 watchmen, at \$720 each; superintendent of building (Army Medical Museum and Library), \$200; 6 laborers, at \$660 each; 4 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$223,280.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Chief of Bureau of Insular Affairs," on page 67, line 10, before the word "of," to strike out "9" and to insert "10"; in line 11, before the word "of," where it occurs the third time, to strike out "14" and to insert "12"; and at the end of line 13, to strike out "\$66,630" and insert "\$66,030," so as to make the paragraph read:

Salaries: Chief clerk, \$2,250; clerks—10 of class 4, 6 of class 3, 9 of class 2, 12 of class 1, 6 at \$1,000 each; 3 messengers, at \$840 each; laborer, \$660; in all, \$66,030.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Engineer operations in the field," on page 70, at the end of line 1, to strike out "\$85,000" and to insert "\$100,000," so as to read:

For expenses incident to military engineer operations in the field, including the purchase of material and a reserve of material for such operations, the rental of storehouses within and outside of the District of Columbia, the purchase, operation, maintenance, and repair of horse-drawn and motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and such expenses as are ordinarily provided for under appropriations for "Engineer depots," "Civilian assistants to engineer officers," and "Military surveys and maps," \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 25, after the word "defense," to strike out "at the following localities: Hawaiian Islands, \$3,000; Philippine Islands, \$3,000," and to insert "in the insular possessions, \$6,000"; so as to read:

For preparation of plans for fortifications and other works of defense in the insular possessions, \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] in charge of the pending bill that when reached the amendment on page 83, line 4, under the head of "Chemical Warfare Service," proposing to strike out the appropriation of \$500,000 and in lieu thereof to insert "\$750,000," may be passed over.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 14, after the word "wharves," to strike out the comma and the following: "at the following localities: Hawaiian Islands, \$15,000; Philippine Islands, \$50,000"; and in lieu thereof to insert "in the insular possessions, \$55,000," so as to read:

For protection, preservation, and repair of fortifications, including structures for submarine mine defense, for which there may be no special appropriation available, and for maintaining channels for access to submarine mine wharves in the insular possessions, \$55,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 22, after the word "operation," to strike out "at the following localities: Hawaiian Islands, \$20,000; Philippine Islands, \$40,000"; and in lieu thereof to insert "in the insular possessions, \$60,000," so as to read:

For maintenance and repair of searchlights and electric light and power equipment for seacoast fortifications, and for tools, electrical and other supplies, and appliances to be used in their operation in the insular possessions, \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Seacoast defenses, Panama Canal," on page 73, line 16, to strike out "\$30,000" and to insert "\$40,000," so as to read:

For maintenance and repair of searchlights and electric light and power equipment for fortifications, and for tools, electrical and other supplies, and appliances to be used in their operation, \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 16, to strike out:

For maintenance of clearings and trails, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Chief of Engineers," on page 73, line 22, before the word "messengers," to strike out "four" and insert "three," and at the

end of line 24, to strike out "\$109,010" and to insert "108,170," so as to make the paragraph read:

Salaries: Chief clerk, \$2,250; 2 chiefs of divisions at \$2,000 each; clerks—8 of class 4, 12 of class 3, 17 of class 2, 26 of class 1, 6 at \$1,000 each, 3 at \$900 each; 3 messengers, at \$840 each; 2 assistant messengers, at \$720 each; laborer, \$660; in all, \$108,170.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 10, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$125,000" and to insert "\$150,000," so as to read:

The services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, and such other services as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, may be employed only in the office of the Chief of Engineers to carry into effect the various appropriations for rivers and harbors, surveys, preparation for and the consideration of river and harbor estimates and bills, fortifications, engineer equipment of troops, engineer operations in the field, and other military purposes, to be paid from such appropriations: *Provided*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1923 shall not exceed \$150,000; the Secretary of War shall each year, in the annual estimates, report to Congress the number of persons so employed, their duties, and the amount paid to each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 6, to strike out "That no money appropriated herein shall be expended for maintenance, repair, or operation of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle employed wholly or in part for personal, social, or other similar use or for any use except for military and official business: *Provided further*,"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 3, after the word "homes," to insert a semicolon and the following: "For manufacture and purchase of ammunition, targets, and other accessories for small arms, hand and machine gun target practice and instruction; and ammunition, targets, target materials, and other accessories which may be issued for small-arms target practice and instruction at the educational institutions and State soldiers and sailors orphans' homes to which issues of small arms are lawfully made, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe"; and in line 11, to strike out "\$508,500" and to insert "\$650,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

ORDNANCE STORES, AMMUNITION.

For the development, manufacture, purchase, and maintenance of airplane bombs; of ammunition for small arms and for hand use for reserve supply; of ammunition for burials at the National Soldiers' Home in Washington, District of Columbia, and of ammunition for firing the morning and evening gun at military posts prescribed by General Orders, No. 70, Headquarters of the Army, dated July 23, 1867, and at National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and its several branches, including National Soldiers' Home at Washington, District of Columbia, and soldiers and sailors' State homes; for manufacture and purchase of ammunition, targets, and other accessories for small arms, hand and machine gun target practice and instruction; and ammunition, targets, target materials, and other accessories which may be issued for small-arms target practice and instruction at the educational institutions and State soldiers and sailors orphans' homes to which issues of small arms are lawfully made, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, \$650,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, after line 11, to strike out:

SMALL-ARMS TARGET PRACTICE.

For manufacture and purchase of ammunition, targets, and other accessories for small arms, hand and machine-gun target practice and instruction; and ammunition, targets, target materials, and other accessories which may be issued for small-arms target practice and instruction at the educational institutions and State soldiers and sailors orphans' homes to which issues of small arms are lawfully made, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, \$400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from New York whether there is any specific appropriation in this bill for the maintenance of an army in Europe?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; there is not.

Mr. NORRIS. There is no reference made to it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. None at all.

Mr. NORRIS. I noticed in the public press some time ago that the President had decided to bring home all of the American soldiers in Europe. Recently I have seen that disputed. Can the Senator tell the Senate what the facts are in regard to that matter?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The committee was informed by the Secretary of War and General Pershing and General Harbord that the troops were ordered home and were coming home.

Mr. NORRIS. All of them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. All of them, with the possible exception of a little clean-up squad, consisting of a few men.

Mr. NORRIS. How soon will they all be back?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are supposed to start by the 1st of July. They are coming on the regular trips of the transport.

Instead of sending transports over on special trips to bring them back, it is more economical to have the transport returning on its regular trip to bring back such men as it can carry.

Mr. NORRIS. What arrangements, if any, have been made in regard to the payment of the troops over there from money paid by the German Government? There was some misunderstanding in regard to that, and our troops were not paid.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The committee did not inquire into that; that is a matter with which the State Department has to do. Of course, we understand that our claim against the German Government for the payment of our troops upon the Rhine is good and must be honored.

Mr. NORRIS. But the only difficulty is that Germany was not at the time the information was furnished me allowed to use any of her money for the purpose of paying our troops, because our recent allies would not permit it; they wanted all the money for themselves.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think, as a result of a message sent by the administration, I believe through Secretary Hughes, the Governments represented on the Reparation Commission have acknowledged the rights of the United States to secure payment for its troops on the Rhine.

Mr. NORRIS. Would the Senator have any objection to an amendment to this bill to prohibit the use of any money appropriated by the bill for the purpose of maintaining an army in Europe?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; Mr. President, on general principle I would. I do not think the Congress should exercise the functions of Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. In a general way, I fully agree with the Senator, and yet I think the Congress has a definite knowledge as to why the American troops were maintained over there, and a general knowledge which, I think, everybody possesses, that the use of keeping them there has long since passed. That is particularly true if our allies are not going to permit German funds to be used for the payment of our military expenses there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator is basing his suggestion upon two assumptions, neither of which, I think, is accurate: First, that we intend to keep them there. We do not intend to keep them there; they are ordered home. Second, that the Germans do not intend or will not be permitted to pay us. They will be permitted to pay us.

Mr. NORRIS. They have not been permitted up to the time of the last information received by me.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They have not paid the expenses of the armies of occupation of any government thus far.

Mr. NORRIS. I should be very glad, indeed, to know that we were getting our share of the money from Germany to pay the expenses of our troops on the Rhine; but, Mr. President, it has been a long time since there was any use for our troops there, and a considerable time since the announcement was made that our troops were all going to be brought home, but they have not all been brought back yet. If we are going to permit the Executive branch of the Government to decide to keep them there forever, there will certainly come a time eventually when Congress will wake up enough to decline to appropriate money to keep them there. If there is any reason why they should be kept or any obligation on the United States, I certainly would not want to prohibit the payment of money to keep them there; but I have never yet heard what to my mind was a sufficient reason or, for that matter, any reason, why we should maintain a single soldier in Europe.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I should like to state to the Senator from Nebraska that I understood the last of the troops in Germany were ordered home last month; but for some reason the order was rescinded and the time of the departure of some of the troops was delayed. I think, however, that they are to leave within the next few days.

Mr. NORRIS. All of them?

Mr. HARRIS. The last of the troops remaining there; that is my understanding.

Mr. WADSWORTH. All but a clean-up squad.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Manufacture of arms," on page 76, line 24, to reduce the appropriation for manufacturing, repairing, procuring, and issuing arms at the national armories, from "\$400,000" to "\$375,000."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether he prefers to have that amendment passed over or to consider an amendment to it at the present time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will suit the convenience, of course, of the Senator from Nebraska. I am perfectly willing to have it considered now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We have been pursuing the policy, I understand, of passing over amendments to which there is objection. I will say to the Senator that I either propose to strike out the whole paragraph or to reduce the appropriation to \$75,000. The Senator will recall that the testimony before the committee indicated that 300 men are engaged in the manufacture of rifles, while we have on hand something like 2,800,000 rifles, and the Springfield armory is now in operation simply for the purpose of employing men, not because the Government needs the rifles.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Nebraska can state that as his recollection, but the Senator from New York does not quite recall all of that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the testimony will so indicate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not quite.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator from New York desires to refresh his memory of the testimony before the committee, I think it will bear out my statement.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am perfectly willing that the amendment shall go over, if it will suit the Senator's convenience.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Very well; let it go over with the others.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Ordnance stores and supplies," on page 77, line 5, after the word "preserving," to insert "at places other than establishments under the direct control of the Chief of Ordnance," so as to make the paragraph read:

For overhauling, cleaning, repairing, and preserving ordnance and ordnance stores in the hands of troops and at the arsenals, posts, and depots, except material for cleaning and preserving at places other than establishments under the direct control of the Chief of Ordnance; for purchase and manufacture of ordnance stores to fill requisitions of troops, \$150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Tanks," on page 77, line 18, to reduce the appropriation for the purchase, manufacture, test, maintenance, and repair of tanks and other self-propelled armored vehicles, to remain available until June 30, 1924, from "\$300,000" to "\$200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Field Artillery armament," on page 77, line 23, to reduce the appropriation for purchase, manufacture, and test of mountain, field, and siege cannon, including their carriages, sights, implements, equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture, from "\$750,000" to "\$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 3, to reduce the appropriation for purchase, manufacture, maintenance, and test of ammunition for mountain, field, and siege cannon, including the necessary experiments in connection therewith, the machinery necessary for its manufacture, and the necessary storage facilities, from "\$400,000" to "\$300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 7, to increase the appropriation for alteration and maintenance of the mobile artillery, including the purchase and manufacture of machinery, tools, and materials necessary for the work, and the expenses of the mechanics engaged thereon, from "\$400,000" to "\$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 11, to reduce the appropriation for purchase, manufacture, and test of ammunition, subcaliber guns, and other accessories for mountain, field, and siege artillery practice, including the machinery necessary for their manufacture, from "\$75,000" to "\$65,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Rock Island Bridge, Rock Island, Ill.," on page 78, after line 24, to insert:

For special repairs and strengthening of bridge, \$141,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 14, to reduce the appropriation for repairs and improvement of arsenals and depots, etc., from "\$805,000" to "\$600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, after line 14, to strike out the following subhead: "Civilian schools, ordnance reservations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, after line 15, to strike out:

For the maintenance and operation of schools for children on ordnance reservations, \$17,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Seacoast defenses, United States—armament of fortifications," on page 79, line 23, after the word "manufacture," to strike out "\$450,000" and to insert "\$400,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For purchase, manufacture, and test of seacoast cannon for coast defense, including their carriages, sights, implements, equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture, \$400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 2, after the word "manufacture," to strike out "\$350,000" and to insert "\$300,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For purchase, manufacture, and test of ammunition for seacoast cannon, and for modernizing projectiles on hand, including the necessary experiments in connection therewith, and the machinery necessary for its manufacture, \$300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, at the end of line 7, to strike out "\$60,000" and to insert "\$50,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For purchase, manufacture, and test of ammunition, subcaliber guns, and other accessories for seacoast artillery practice, including the machinery necessary for their manufacture, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Seacoast defenses, insular possessions," on page 80, line 16, after the word "arsenals," to strike out "\$150,000" and to insert "\$125,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For purchase, manufacture, and test of seacoast cannon for coast defenses, including their carriages, sights, implements, equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture at the arsenals, \$125,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, at the end of line 24, to strike out "\$60,000" and to insert "\$85,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For alteration and maintenance of the seacoast artillery, including the purchase and manufacture of machinery, tools, and materials necessary for the work, and expenses of the civilian mechanics, \$85,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Seacoast defenses, Panama Canal," on page 81, line 9, after the word "mechanics," to strike out "\$55,000" and to insert "\$60,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For the alteration and maintenance and installation of the seacoast artillery, including the purchase and manufacture of machinery, tools, and materials necessary for the work, and expenses of civilian mechanics, \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Chief of Ordnance," on page 81, at the end of line 14, to strike out "messengers—2 at \$840 each, 2 at \$780 each, 2 at \$720 each," and to insert "2 messengers, at \$840 each; 2 assistant messengers, at \$720 each," and in line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$150,040" and to insert "\$149,080," so as to make the paragraph read:

Salaries: Chief clerk, \$2,500; chief of division, \$2,000; principal clerk, \$2,000; clerks—9 of class 4, 12 of class 3, 25 of class 2, 44 of class 1, 12 at \$1,000 each, 4 at \$900 each; 2 messengers, at \$840 each; 2 assistant messengers, at \$720 each; laborer, \$660; in all, \$149,080.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 4, to increase the appropriation for the Chemical Warfare Service from "\$500,000" to "\$750,000."

Mr. WADSWORTH. At the request of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] I ask that the amendment on page 83, line 4, be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be passed over.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of an amendment which will become a part of the paragraph headed "Office of the Chief of Chemical Warfare Service." I send the amendment to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 83, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following as a separate paragraph:

The services of skilled draftsmen, chemical engineers, chemists, and such other services as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, may be employed in the office of the chief, Chemical Warfare Service, to carry into effect the appropriations for that service, to be paid from such appropriations.

Provided, That the entire expenditure for this purpose for the fiscal year 1923 shall not exceed \$21,600, and the Secretary of War shall each year in the annual estimates report to Congress the number of persons so employed, their duties, and the amount paid to each.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the amendment? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was under the subhead "National board for promotion of rifle practice. Quartermaster supplies and services for rifle ranges for civilian instruction," on page 83, line 19, after the word "insignia," to strike out the semicolon and the following: "For the transportation of employees, instructors, and civilians to engage in practice; for the purchase of materials, supplies, and services, and for expenses incidental to instruction of citizens of the United States in marksmanship, and their participation in national and international matches, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, and to remain available until expended, \$89,900: *Provided*, That out of this appropriation there may be expended for the payment of transportation, and for supplying meals, or furnishing commutation of subsistence of civilian rifle teams authorized by the Secretary of War to participate in the national matches, not to exceed \$80,000," and to insert "\$10,000"; so as to make the paragraph read:

To establish and maintain indoor and outdoor rifle ranges for the use of all able-bodied males capable of bearing arms, under reasonable regulations to be prescribed by the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and approved by the Secretary of War; for the employment of labor in connection with the establishment of outdoor and indoor rifle ranges, including labor in operating targets; for the employment of instructors; for clerical services; for badges and other insignia, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, at the end of line 20, to reduce the appropriation for national trophy and medals for rifle contests from "\$10,000" to "\$7,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 6, before the word "Benning," to strike out "Camp" and to insert "Fort," so as to make the subhead read: "Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 12, before the name "Benning," to strike out "Camp" and to insert "Fort," so as to make the paragraph read:

For the purchase of textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers; instruments and material for instruction, employment of technical and special services, including the services of one translator at the rate of \$150 per month, and for the necessary expenses of instruction at the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., \$35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, after line 18, to strike out "In the Philippine Islands, \$12,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Chief of Coast Artillery," on page 90, line 4, after "each," to strike out "two messengers, at \$720 each," and to insert "messenger, \$720"; and in line 5, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$19,440" and to insert "\$18,720," so as to make the paragraph read:

Salaries: Chief clerk, \$2,000; clerks—one of class 4, two of class 3, three of class 2, four of class 1, two at \$1,000 each; messenger, \$720; in all, \$18,720.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Militia Bureau: Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard," on page 90, line 9, to reduce the appropriation for procurement of forage, bedding, etc., for animals, from "\$1,002,800" to "\$1,928,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 11, to increase the appropriation for compensation of help for care of matériel, animals, and equipment, from "\$750,00" to "\$1,910,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 12, to increase the appropriation for expenses, camps of instruction, from "\$8,500,000" to "\$9,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 17, to increase the appropriation for pay of property and disbursing officers for the United States from "\$55,000" to "\$60,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 22, to increase the appropriation for travel of officers and noncommissioned officers of the Regular Army in connection with the National Guard from "\$200,000" to "\$300,000."

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, I notice that in every one of these items there is an increase, and a very large

increase. Should not the Senate have some explanation of the necessity for these very heavy increases?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the appropriations, as passed by the House of Representatives, with the exception of one item—the item known as "Pay of National Guard (armory drills)," which will be found on page 91, line 4—are inadequate for the support of the guard as now constituted, officers and men. There are 150,000 officers and men in the National Guard to-day, as contrasted with something like 100,000 a year ago. The guard has been growing steadily and healthily under the provisions of law. The States have joined in helping the guard very loyally and cheerfully. Several of them have built armories to house the units, have provided places where the Federal property may be taken care of, and in every way have shown a quality of teamwork with the Federal Government which is most encouraging.

The appropriations suggested by the Senate committee are just sufficient to meet the obligations imposed upon the Federal Government under the law in proportion to the present strength and prospective strength during the next fiscal year of the National Guard.

For example, it is estimated that there will be 160,000 men in the National Guard by July 1. A few new units will be admitted, federalized, and units already existing are being recruited to greater strength within the peace limitation. Those men are all entitled to go, and should go under the statute, to a summer training camp for 15 days. The House appropriation for the summer training camps would only be sufficient to send about 105,000 or 110,000 men. It would leave behind—uncared for, unrecognized, unencouraged, and contrary to the spirit of the law itself—something like 40,000 or 45,000 National Guard men. The summer training camp, of course, is the most valuable training that the guard receives in its entire year of training and instruction; so the Senate committee believed that the appropriation for the expenses of camps of instruction found on line 12 of page 90 should be increased to the amount which is actually necessary to carry out the statute and meet the spirit of the guard and the spirit of the States which have helped form the guard.

To fail to do so is merely to neglect and ignore the statute which the Congress itself passed in 1920, and, worse than that, to neglect and ignore these citizen soldiers who have enlisted in the citizen component of the Army of the United States, who want to go to the camps, who are entitled to go under the statute, and, even worse than that, it is to ignore the States themselves, who through their governors and adjutants general have joined in this work so cheerfully and loyally.

Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that every one of these increases is suggested by the committee simply and solely for the purpose of taking care of the guard as it will stand during the next fiscal year. The sum total of them is actually below the estimates made by the Budget Director, but is sufficient, in the view of the committee, to take care of the guard for the next fiscal year. The guard, it is expected, will start the fiscal year with 160,000 men. It probably will average throughout the next fiscal year in the neighborhood of 180,000 to 190,000.

This bill will permit 160,000 to go to camp this coming summer. The training camp season starts about the 1st of July. This bill will also enable the guard to keep the horses which the Federal Government has supplied to it. The Senator from Georgia will probably recollect that under the statute each troop of cavalry of the guard and each battery of field artillery is furnished with 30 horses by the Federal Government. Of course, the men in those units secure additional horses in nearly every case. The Government merely supplies the nucleus of the horses for these mounted units, and under the statute the Government is to supply the hay and grain for those horses. There are 8,000 of those Government horses in the possession of the guard to-day. The House appropriation for forage is sufficient to supply hay and grain for only 4,000 horses, so that over 4,000 Government horses will starve, or must be taken away from the guard and sent back to Federal remount stations, thereby dismounting troops of cavalry and batteries of field artillery of the National Guard, and in effect destroying the efficiency, the morale, and the enthusiasm of the fine young men who have enlisted in the mounted branches of the National Guard. That, in brief, is the feeling of the committee concerning this amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, what is the size of the National Guard at the present time; about 175,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; at present it is about 150,000, but with the units which are to be admitted and federalized in the next month, and taking into consideration also the increase in

the size of the units now recognized by ordinary recruiting, it is expected that by July 1 it will be 160,000. These appropriations will take care of that number in the camps.

Mr. BORAH. I read in the hearings that it would be increased within a certain time, I believe it was after this fiscal year, to 190,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is expected that it will reach that number some time late in the fiscal year, but that number can not be reached until some time after the expiration of the training-camp period, which, of course, is in the summer.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, I am entirely friendly to the organization known as the National Guard, though I very much regretted the revolution in the system that took away from State governors their discretion as to whether they would respond to the call of the President. When that proposition was offered in the House 30 years ago by General Cutting, of California, I was able to attract the attention of the chairman of the Special Judiciary Committee, Col. William C. Oates, of Alabama, and with his assistance we defeated the measure, and left the law as to the State militia as it was. Some years afterwards Congress passed the Dick bill, which entirely changed the system.

The Senator from New York will doubtless recall that at the time of the whisky rebellion in Pennsylvania President Washington and Alexander Hamilton called up Governor Mifflin, of Pennsylvania, Governor Lee, of Virginia, and the Governor of Maryland, whose name at this moment I do not recall, and the Governors of Virginia and Pennsylvania led their State contingents into the field to the point of rendezvous. The Governor of Maryland, as I remember, was sick and could not go, but he sent his representative, who led the Maryland contingent. It was not until those State troops came into the field that the Federal officers took charge of them.

It has always seemed to me a very dangerous proposition for the initiative on the part of the State and the discretion on the part of the governor to be taken away and the power given to the President to arbitrarily send troops of New England into the South, or vice versa, from the South into New England; troops of the South into the West or troops of the West into the North, without any discretion on the part of the governor at all as to whether he would assign State troops to that duty. But, as we now have this system, the explanation of the Senator from New York is entirely satisfactory.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, at the end of line 4, to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That 25 per cent of the foregoing amounts for arming, equipping, and training the National Guard shall be available interchangeably for expenditure for the purposes named; but not more than 25 per cent shall be added to the amount appropriated for any one of such purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, line 19, after the word "Artillery," to strike out the comma after the words "Engineer or Signal," and insert "or Engineer," so as to make the additional proviso read:

Provided further, That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to issue from surplus or reserve stores and matériel now on hand and purchased for the United States Army such articles of clothing and equipment and Field Artillery, Engineer, and Signal matériel and ammunition as may be needed by the National Guard organized under the provisions of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act approved June 4, 1920. This issue shall be made without charge against militia appropriations. None of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used for purchase of arms, Field Artillery or Engineer matériel, public animals, or chevrons.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, after line 21, to strike out:

The mounted, motorized, and tank units of the National Guard shall be so reduced that the appropriations made in this act shall cover the entire cost of maintenance of such units for the National Guard during the fiscal year 1923.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was at the top of page 93, to insert:

None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be available for the organization or equipment or field training of new Cavalry, motorized, tank, or air units of the National Guard presented for Federal recognition after the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United States Military Academy. Pay of Military Academy," on page 93, after line 13, to strike out:

Permanent establishment: For pay of seven professors, \$26,500; one chaplain, \$2,400; master of the sword, \$3,500.

For pay of cadets, 1,300 at \$780 each, \$1,014,000.

The pay of cadets for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, shall be fixed at \$780 per annum and one ration per day or commutation thereof

at the rate of \$0.75 per ration, to be paid from the appropriation for the subsistence of the Army.

For pay of one constructing quartermaster, in addition to his regular pay, \$1,000.

For additional pay of professors and officers for length of service, \$8,000.

Military Academy band: For pay of Military Academy band: One master sergeant, at \$74 per month, \$888.

Fifteen staff sergeants, at \$45 each per month, \$8,100.

Fifteen privates, first class, at \$35 each per month, \$6,300.

Twenty privates, at \$30 each per month, \$7,200.

Fifteen specialists, second class, at \$20 each per month, \$3,600.

Twenty specialists, third class, at \$15 each per month, \$3,600.

Additional pay for length of service, \$4,500.

In all, Military Academy band, \$34,188.

Field musicians: For pay of field musicians: One staff sergeant, at \$45 per month, \$540.

Two corporals, at \$37 each per month, \$888.

Seven privates, first class, at \$35 each per month, \$2,940.

Twenty-one privates, at \$30 each per month, \$7,560.

Twenty-eight specialists, sixth class, at \$3 each per month, \$1,008.

Additional pay for length of service, \$990.

In all, field musicians, \$13,926.

Service detachment: For pay of service detachment:

One first sergeant, at \$53 per month, \$636.

Forty-seven sergeants, at \$45 each per month, \$25,380.

Twenty corporals, at \$37 each per month, \$8,880.

Fifty-five privates, first class, at \$35 each per month, \$23,100.

One hundred and fifty-three privates, at \$30 each per month, \$55,080.

Forty specialists, third class, at \$15 each per month, \$7,200.

Fifty specialists, fourth class, at \$12 each per month, \$7,200.

Eighty specialists, fifth class, at \$8 each per month, \$7,680.

Additional pay for length of service, \$23,360.

In all, service detachment, \$158,516.

Cavalry detachment: For pay of Cavalry detachment:

One first sergeant, at \$53 per month, \$636.

Fourteen sergeants, at \$45 each per month, \$7,560.

Sixteen corporals, at \$37 each per month, \$7,104.

Sixty-five privates, first class, at \$35 each per month, \$27,300.

One hundred and twenty-four privates, at \$30 each per month, \$44,640.

Ten specialists, fourth class, at \$12 each per month, \$1,440.

Thirteen specialists, fifth class, at \$8 each per month, \$1,248.

Two specialists, sixth class, at \$3 each per month, \$72.

For additional pay for length of service, \$14,000.

In all, Cavalry detachment, \$104,000.

Artillery detachment: For pay of Artillery detachment:

One first sergeant, at \$53 per month, \$636.

Twenty-three sergeants, at \$45 each per month, \$12,420.

Twenty-one corporals, at \$37 each per month, \$9,324.

Seventy-five privates, first class, at \$35 each per month, \$31,500.

One hundred and eighteen privates, at \$30 each per month, \$42,480.

Eight specialists, fourth class, at \$12 each per month, \$1,152.

Fifteen specialists, fifth class, at \$8 each per month, \$1,440.

Three specialists, sixth class, at \$3 each per month, \$108.

For additional pay for expert first-class gunners at \$5 each per month, first-class gunners at \$3 each per month, and second-class gunners at \$2 each per month, \$6,000.

Additional pay for length of service, \$9,000.

In all, Artillery detachment, \$114,060.

Engineer detachment: For pay of Engineer detachment: One first sergeant, at \$53 per month, \$636.

Three staff sergeants, at \$45 each per month, \$1,620.

Nine sergeants, at \$45 each per month, \$4,860.

Twelve corporals, at \$37 each per month, \$5,328.

Thirty-nine privates, first class, at \$35 each per month, \$16,380.

Fifty-two privates, at \$30 each per month, \$18,720.

Additional pay for length of service, \$5,000.

Additional pay for marksmen, sharpshooters, and expert riflemen, \$2,400.

Two specialists, third class, at \$15 each per month, \$360.

Three specialists, fourth class, at \$12 each per month, \$432.

Two specialists, sixth class, at \$3 each per month, \$72.

In all, Engineer detachment, \$55,808.

Signal Corps detachment: For pay of Signal Corps detachment: One master sergeant, at \$74 per month, \$888.

One technical sergeant, at \$53 per month, \$636.

One staff sergeant, at \$45 per month, \$540.

Two sergeants, at \$45 each per month, \$1,080.

Two corporals, at \$37 each per month, \$888.

Three privates, first class, at \$35 each per month, \$1,260.

Two privates, at \$30 each per month, \$720.

One specialist, fifth class (chauffeur), at \$8 per month, \$96.

Additional pay for length of service, \$648.40.

Additional pay for expert military telegrapher, first-class military telegrapher, and military telegrapher, \$324.

In all, Signal Corps detachment, \$7,080.40.

Coast Artillery detachment: For pay of Coast Artillery detachment:

One first sergeant, at \$53 per month, \$636.

One master sergeant, at \$74 per month, \$888.

One technical sergeant, at \$53 per month, \$636.

One staff sergeant, at \$45 per month, \$540.

Five sergeants, at \$45 each per month, \$2,700.

Twenty-one privates, first class, at \$35 each per month, \$8,820.

Nine specialists, fifth class, at \$8 each per month, \$864.

For additional pay for first-class gunners, at \$3 each per month, and second-class gunners, at \$2 each per month, \$1,080.

Additional pay for length of service, \$2,000.

For additional pay of rated men (2 plotters, 1 observer, first class, 1 observer, second class, and 4 gun commanders), \$744.

In all, Coast Artillery detachment, \$18,908.

Miscellaneous: Travel allowance due enlisted men on discharge, \$5,000.

Interest on deposits due enlisted men, \$2,000.

Additional pay of enlisted men under the last proviso of section 4b of the Army reorganization act of June 4, 1920, \$5,000.

For pay of one warrant officer, to be on duty in the headquarters, United States Corps of Cadets, \$1,320.

For pay of two staff sergeants, to be on duty in the headquarters, United States Corps of Cadets, at \$45 each per month, and additional pay for length of service, \$1,296.

For pay of one master sergeant, \$1,243.20.

For pay of one master sergeant, \$1,154.40.
 For pay of one staff sergeant, \$645.
 For pay of civilians:
 One teacher of music, \$2,000.
 For pay of nine clerks in the office of the quartermaster, as follows:
 One chief clerk, \$1,800.
 One clerk, \$1,500.
 Two clerks, at \$1,400 each, \$2,800.
 Two clerks, at \$1,200 each, \$2,400.
 Three clerks and stenographers, at \$1,200 each, \$3,600.
 For pay of one expert architectural draftsman in office of constructing quartermaster, \$2,500.
 For pay of 12 clerks and stenographers employed at headquarters, United States Military Academy, in the offices of the superintendent and adjutant, as follows:
 One chief clerk, \$1,800.
 One clerk and stenographer to superintendent, \$1,500.
 Three clerks, at \$1,400 each, \$4,200.
 One clerk, \$1,400.
 Six clerks, at \$1,000 each, \$6,000.
 For pay of one clerk to the treasurer, \$1,800.
 For pay of one clerk and stenographer in the office of the commandant of cadets, \$1,200.
 For pay of two civilian instructors of French, to be employed under the rules prescribed by the Secretary of War, at \$2,000 each, \$4,000.
 For pay of two civilian instructors of Spanish, to be employed under the rules prescribed by the Secretary of War, at \$2,000 each, \$4,000.
 For pay of two expert civilian instructors in fencing, broadsword exercises, and other military gymnastics as may be required to perfect this part of the training of cadets, at \$1,500 each, \$3,000.
 For pay of one professional civilian instructor in military gymnastics, fencing, boxing, wrestling, and swimming, \$1,500.
 For pay of two expert assistant civilian instructors in military gymnastics, fencing, boxing, wrestling, and swimming, at \$2,000 each, \$4,000: *Provided*, That these civilian instructors employed in the department of modern languages and the department of tactics shall be entitled to public quarters and fuel and light.
 For pay of one librarian, \$3,000.
 For pay of one assistant librarian, \$1,500.
 For pay of one custodian of gymnasium, \$1,200.
 For pay of one superintendent of gas works, \$1,500.
 For pay of one chief engineer of power plant, whose duties will include those of engineer of heating and ventilating apparatus, \$2,700.
 For pay of one assistant chief engineer of same, \$1,100.
 For pay of three assistant engineers of same, at \$1,200 each, \$3,600.
 For pay of eight firemen, at \$780 each, \$6,240.
 For pay of two oilers for power plant, at \$720 each, \$1,440.
 For pay of one draftsman in the department of civil and military engineering, \$1,200.
 For pay of one mechanic and attendant skilled in the technical preparation necessary to chemical and electrical lectures and to the instruction in mineralogy and geology, \$1,200.
 For pay of one mechanic assistant in department of natural and experimental philosophy, \$840.
 For pay of one custodian of academy buildings, \$1,000.
 For pay of one electrician, \$1,600.
 For pay of one chief plumber, \$1,600.
 For pay of one assistant plumber, \$900.
 For pay of one plumber's helper, \$600.
 For pay of one scavenger, at \$60 a month, \$720.
 For pay of one chapel organist and choirmaster, \$1,500.
 For pay of one superintendent of post cemetery, \$1,200.
 For pay of one engineer and janitor of Memorial Hall, \$900.
 For pay of one printer at headquarters, United States Military Academy, \$1,600.
 For pay of one assistant printer at headquarters, United States Military Academy, \$1,100.
 For pay of one janitress, Memorial Hall, \$600.
 For pay of one master mechanic, \$1,800.
 For pay of one clerk and photographer in the department of drawing, \$1,300.
 For pay of one stenographer, typewriter, and attendant in charge of the library in the department of law, \$900.
 For pay of one overseer of the waterworks, \$720.
 For pay of one engineer of steam, electric, and refrigerating apparatus for the cadets' mess, \$1,200.
 For pay of one copyist, stenographer, clerk, librarian, typewriter, and attendant in the department of modern languages, \$1,040.
 For pay of one mechanic and attendant skilled in the operation necessary for the preparation of lectures and of material in the department of drawing, \$720.
 For pay of one janitor for bachelor officers' quarters, \$600.
 For pay of one stenographer, typewriter, and attendant in the department of English and history, \$840.
 For pay of one bookbinder at headquarters, United States Military Academy, \$1,200.
 For pay of two book sewers in bindery, at \$540 each, \$1,080.
 For pay of one skilled pressman in the printing office, headquarters, United States Military Academy, \$1,100.
 For pay of one charwoman, headquarters, United States Military Academy, \$480.
 For pay of one messenger for the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, \$720.
 For pay of one skilled copyist, confidential stenographer, librarian, typewriter, and attendant in the department of mathematics, \$1,000.
 For pay of one stenographer, typewriter, and clerk in the medical department and department of military hygiene, \$840.
 For pay of one confidential stenographer, copyist, librarian, typewriter, and multigraph operator in the department of natural and experimental philosophy, \$1,000.
 In all, pay of civilians, \$106,380.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Permanent Establishment: For seven professors, \$27,000; chaplain, \$2,400; master of the sword, \$3,500; constructing quartermaster, in addition to his regular pay, \$1,000; additional pay of professors and officers for length of service, \$11,345; subsistence allowance of professors and officers, \$4,539; in all, \$49,844.
 For 1,300 cadets, \$1,014,000.
 Military Academy Band: Master sergeant; 15 staff sergeants; 15 privates, first class; 20 privates; specialists—15, second class, 20, third class; additional pay for length of service; in all, \$39,882.

Field musicians: Staff sergeant; 2 corporals; 7 privates, first class; 21 privates; 28 specialists, sixth class; additional pay for length of service; in all, \$13,450.

Service Detachment: First sergeant; 47 sergeants; 20 corporals; 55 privates, first class; 153 privates; specialists—40, third class, 50, fourth class, \$0, fifth class; additional pay for length of service; in all, \$156,048.

Cavalry detachment: First sergeant; 14 sergeants; 16 corporals; 65 privates, first class; 124 privates; specialists—10 fourth class, 13 fifth class, 2 sixth class; additional pay for length of service; in all, \$99,039.

Artillery detachment: First sergeant; 23 sergeants; 21 corporals; 75 privates, first class; 118 privates; specialists—8 fourth class, 15 fifth class, 3 sixth class; additional pay for qualification in gunnery; additional pay for length of service; in all, \$105,543.

Engineer detachment: First sergeant; 3 staff sergeants; 9 sergeants; 12 corporals; 39 privates, first class; 52 privates; specialists—2 third class, 3 fourth class, 2 sixth class; additional pay for length of service; additional pay for qualification in marksmanship; in all, \$53,433.

Signal Corps detachment: Master sergeant; technical sergeant; staff sergeant; 2 sergeants; 2 corporals; 3 privates, first class; 2 privates; specialist, fifth class (chauffeur); additional pay for length of service; in all, \$8,127.

Coast Artillery detachment: First sergeant; master sergeant; technical sergeant; staff sergeant; 5 sergeants; 21 privates, first class; 9 specialists, fifth class; additional pay for qualification in gunnery; additional pay for length of service; in all, \$18,285.

Miscellaneous: Travel allowance due enlisted men on discharge; interest on deposits due enlisted men; warrant officer and 2 staff sergeants for duty in the Cadet Corps headquarters; 2 master sergeants; staff sergeant; additional pay for length of service; in all, \$15,418.

Civilians: Teacher of music, \$2,000; two chief clerks at \$1,800 each; clerks—1 \$1,500, 6 at \$1,400 each, 2 at \$1,200 each, 6 at \$1,000 each; 4 clerks and stenographers at \$1,200 each; clerk and stenographer to superintendent, \$1,500; clerk to the treasurer, \$1,800; expert architectural draftsman, \$2,500; 2 civilian instructors of French and 2 civilian instructors of Spanish, to be employed under rules prescribed by the Secretary of War, at \$2,000 each; 2 expert civilian instructors in fencing, broadsword exercises, and other military gymnastics, at \$1,500 each; professional and expert assistant civilian instructors in military gymnastics, fencing, boxing, wrestling, and swimming—2 at \$2,000 each, 1 \$1,500; librarian, \$3,000; assistant librarian, \$1,500; custodian of gymnasium, \$1,200; superintendent of gas works, \$1,500; chief engineer of power plant, \$2,700; assistant chief engineer of power plant \$1,100; 3 assistant engineers of power plant at \$1,200 each; 8 firemen at \$780 each; 2 oilers at \$720 each; draftsman, \$1,200; mechanic and attendant, \$1,200; mechanic assistant, \$840; custodian of academy buildings, \$1,000; electrician, \$1,600; chief plumber, \$1,600; assistant plumber, \$900; plumber's helper, \$600; scavenger, \$720; chapel organist and choirmaster, \$2,500; superintendent of post cemetery, \$1,200; engineer and janitor of Memorial Hall, \$900; printer, \$1,600; assistant printer, \$1,100; janitress, Memorial Hall, \$600; master mechanic, \$1,800; clerk and photographer, \$1,300; stenographers, typewriters, attendants, copyists, clerks, librarians, or multigraph operators—1 \$1,040, 2 at \$1,000 each, 1 \$900, 2 at \$840 each; overseer of waterworks, \$720; engineer of steam, electric, and refrigerating apparatus, \$1,200; mechanic and attendant, \$720; janitor, \$600; bookbinder, \$1,200; 2 book sewers at \$540 each; skilled pressman, \$1,100; charwoman, \$480; messenger, \$720; in all, \$107,380.

Provided, That the civilian instructors employed in the departments of modern languages and tactics shall be entitled to public quarters, fuel, and light.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I think just a word of explanation of this amendment would be serviceable to Senators who have not served on the Appropriations Committee working on the bill. The amendment, while it appears to be very extensive in the number of pages it covers, makes but one or two actual changes in the Military Academy appropriations.

The purpose of the committee was to conserve space in printing. It will be noted that the bill as it reached the Senate from the House was printed in such fashion as to take up many pages of print. It is itemized, and the items are strung along in such a way as to cover something like 15 pages. Several members of the committee have discussed this in years gone by, and upon encountering it in this bill, the committee made up its mind that it would present this portion of the bill to the Congress in compact form, covering exactly the same items, but printed in such a way that, instead of using up 15 to 19 pages, it can be contracted into 4 or 5 pages. That is the object of striking out page after page of the House text, and substituting the committee amendment.

I merely want to call attention to the changes which are made in the first amendment. The pay of seven professors of the Military Academy is raised from \$26,500 to \$27,000, that being due to the new pay bill.

There are other changes in the total of pay of the different military detachments stationed at the academy, and those changes in the aggregate form a reduction as compared with the House text, and each of them is due to the change in the pay schedules in accordance with the new pay bill.

One salary is raised, that of a civilian—I refer to the organist and choirmaster at West Point. It is proposed that his salary should be raised from \$1,500 to \$2,500, for reasons which the committee believe were exceedingly good. In fact, the committee was unanimous in its belief that this man, who has made an extraordinary success at West Point, shall receive for his services at least \$2,500.

So far as the paragraph "Pay, Military Academy," is concerned, I think I have pointed out the changes made by the

Senate. They result in an actual decrease of about \$5,800 in the total of pay for the Military Academy.

So I ask that the amendment, commencing on line 14, page 93, striking out all of the bill down to line 4, page 104, and substituting the matter in italics commencing on line 5, page 104, and extending to line 19, page 107, be considered as one amendment, striking out and substituting practically the same text.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, line 20, to reduce the total appropriation for pay, Military Academy, from "\$1,685,928" to "\$1,681,049."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, after line 21, to insert:

All the moneys hereinbefore appropriated for pay of the Military Academy shall be disbursed and accounted for as pay of the Military Academy, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. There is a provision in the law passed at the last session of Congress with reference to inhibiting deficits. Is that in this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is in the same place in this bill. As I recollect, the Senator from Idaho was the author of it.

Mr. BORAH. It is kept in this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is kept here. I am quite sure I know what the Senator refers to, the so-called Borah amendment, which is kept in this bill.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maintenance, United States Military Academy," on page 108, after line 1, to strike out:

Current and ordinary expenses: For the expenses of the members of the Board of Visitors, or so much thereof as may be necessary, \$750.

Contingencies for superintendent of the academy, \$3,000.

Repairs and improvements, namely: Timber, plank, boards, joists, wall strips, laths, shingles, slate, tin, sheet lead, zinc, screws, nails, locks, hinges, glass, paints, turpentine, oils, labor, etc., \$55,000.

For fuel and apparatus, namely: Coal, wood, etc., including labor, \$60,000.

For gas pipes, gas and electric fixtures, etc., \$10,000.

For fuel for cadets' mess hall, shops, and laundry, \$15,000.

For postage and telegrams, \$1,200.

For stationery, namely: Blank books, paper, etc., \$3,500.

For transportation of materials, cadets, discharged cadets, etc., \$15,000.

Printing and binding, etc., \$3,000.

For department of Cavalry, Artillery, and Infantry tactics: Tan bark or other proper covering for riding hall, to be purchased in open market upon written order of the superintendent, \$1,500.

For camp stools, office furniture, etc., \$4,000.

For gymnasium and athletic supplies, etc., \$7,500.

For the maintenance of one automobile, \$300.

For repairs to saddles, bridles, etc., \$500.

For the purchase of carbons and for repairs and maintenance of searchlights, etc., \$250.

For the purchase of stationery and office supplies for the office of senior instructor of Coast Artillery tactics, \$75.

For the purchase of machines, tools, textbooks, and material for the practical instruction of cadets in the maintenance, repair, and operation of all classes of motor transportation and automobile or internal combustion engines, \$1,000.

For repair of mattresses, machines, etc., in gymnasium of Cavalry barracks, \$100.

For material for hurdles, etc., riding hall, \$600.

For general maintenance and repairs to the site of the cadet camp, \$10,000.

For repair of obstacles on mounted drill ground, and for constructing other obstacles, etc., \$100.

For the purchase of thread, wax, needles, etc., in the Cavalry stables, \$200.

For the purchase of thread, wax, needles, etc., in the Artillery stables, \$200.

For material for preserving floors, etc., Artillery barracks and stables, \$150.

For the purchase of tools, machines, etc., Artillery gun shed, \$500.

For repair to mattresses, machines, etc., in drill hall and gymnasium of Artillery barracks, \$100.

For the purchase of new and upkeep of worn-out rubber matting in squad rooms of Artillery barracks, \$150.

For purchase of stationery and office furniture in office of senior assistant instructor of Field Artillery tactics, \$100.

For material for preserving floors, etc., Cavalry barracks and stables, \$100.

For repair of mattresses, machines, etc., in drill hall and gymnasium of Engineer barracks, \$100.

For department of civil and military engineering: Textbooks, stationery, etc., \$1,200.

For department of natural and experimental philosophy: Textbooks, apparatus, etc., \$3,500.

For department of instruction in mathematics: Textbooks, stationery, etc., \$1,250.

For department of chemistry, mineralogy, and geology, \$2,500.

For department of drawing: Drawing materials, etc., \$2,000.

For department of modern languages: Stationery, etc., \$1,900.

For department of law: Books, stationery, etc., \$2,000.

For department of practical military engineering: Models, books, stationery, etc., \$4,500.

For department of ordnance and gunnery: Models, instruments, books, etc., \$2,150.

For the purchase of machines, tools, etc., for practical instruction of cadets in wood and metal working, \$500.

For department of military hygiene, \$500.

For department of English and history: For purchase of stationery, books, etc., \$1,000.

For department of economics and government and political history: Purchase of textbooks, stationery, etc., \$1,000.

For a course of lectures for the more complete instruction of cadets, \$1,200.

For the maintenance of one automobile truck, \$300.

In all, current and ordinary expenses, \$219,475.

Miscellaneous items and incidental expenses: For commercial periodicals, stationery, etc., for the office of the treasurer United States Military Academy, \$300.

For gas coal, oil, candles, etc., for operating the gas plant, \$18,000.

For water pipe, plumbing, and repairs, \$8,000.

For material and labor for cleaning and policing public buildings, \$6,620.

For supplies for recitation rooms not otherwise provided for and for renewing and repairing furniture in same, \$1,000.

Increase and expense of library, \$7,200.

For contingent funds, to be expended under the direction of the academic board: For instruments, books, repairs to apparatus, and other incidental expenses not otherwise provided for, \$500: *Provided*, That all technical and scientific supplies for the departments of instruction of the Military Academy shall be purchased by contract or otherwise, as the Secretary of War may deem best.

For the purchase and repair of instruments and maintenance of the band, \$1,500.

For the repair and purchase of cooking utensils, chairs, etc., cadet mess, which may be expended without advertising, to be immediately available, \$3,000.

For the policing of barracks and bathhouses, \$25,000.

For supplying light and plain furniture to cadets' barracks, \$10,000.

For the purchase and repair of cocoa matting for the aiseways in the stables of the riding hall, \$300.

For maintaining the children's school, etc., \$6,500.

For purchase and repair of fire-extinguishing apparatus, \$1,000.

In all, miscellaneous items and incidental expenses, \$88,920.

Buildings and grounds: For cases, materials, etc., ordnance museum in headquarters building, \$1,500.

For repairs to ordnance laboratory and other buildings pertaining to department of ordnance and gunnery, \$150.

For general repairs to cadet laundry building, etc., to be expended without advertising, \$400.

For general incidental repairs and improvements to the cadet store building, including storerooms, office, tailor shops, and shoe-repairing shops, \$1,000.

For materials and labor for repairs, etc., soldiers' hospital, \$165.

For repair and upkeep of quarters of the staff sergeant, Medical Department, at soldiers' hospital, \$50.

For waterworks, \$3,000.

For the repair and restoration of retaining walls along the line of the Popopen pipe line, \$3,000.

For carrying on the development of the general plan for improvements to roads and grounds, \$3,000.

For repairs and necessary alterations and additions to the cadet hospital, as follows: For materials for radiators, piping, furniture, etc., \$120.

For purchase of flowers and shrubs for hospital grounds, \$100.

For repairing the cadet exchange, \$1,000.

For necessary repairs and replacements in steam heating system and line in cadet mess, which may be expended without advertising, \$1,000.

For repairs to the cadet mess building, which may be expended without advertising and to be immediately available, \$1,000.

For repairs and improvements to the West Point Army mess building, including supplying and renewing furniture and fittings, \$2,500.

Altering coal bunkers in power plant, \$10,000.

For repair and maintenance of the cadet bathhouse and the purchase and maintenance of boats and canoes for the instruction of cadets in rowing, \$750.

For the repair and upkeep of quarters of the master sergeant, Medical Department, at the cadet hospital, \$50.

For repairs to the cadet barracks, to be immediately available, \$15,000.

For maintaining and improving grounds of post cemetery, \$2,000.

For continuing the construction of breast-high wall in dangerous places, \$1,000.

For broken stone and gravel for roads, \$10,000.

For repairs of boilers, engines, dynamos, motors, etc., cadet mess, which may be expended without advertising, to be immediately available, \$3,350.

For the repair and improvement of cadet polo field, \$600.

For waterproofing the post headquarters, bachelor, gymnasium, and other large buildings, \$2,000.

For care and maintenance of organ in cadet chapel, \$250.

For general repairs to the buildings of the Coast Artillery fire-control system, \$100.

For material and labor for repair of Field Artillery target range, \$500.

For repair and upkeep of stable No. 4 and corral, for purchase of paint, nails, etc., \$300.

For erection of steel hangar now on hand, \$1,500.

And to insert in lieu thereof:

For text and reference books for instruction; increase and expense of library; office equipment and supplies; stationery, blank books, forms, printing and binding, periodicals; expenses of lectures (not to exceed \$1,200); equipment, supplies, and materials for purposes of instruction and athletics and maintenance and repair thereof; musical instruments and maintenance of band; equipment for cadet mess; postage, telephones and telegrams; freight and expressage; transportation of cadets and discharged cadets; maintenance of children's school; contingencies for Superintendent of the Academy (not to exceed \$3,000); expenses of the members of the Board of Visitors; contingent fund, to be expended under the direction of the academic board, for instruments, books, repairs to apparatus, and other incidental expenses not otherwise provided for (not to exceed \$500); improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings and grounds (including roads, walls, and fences), and labor, material, and equipment incident thereto; water and sewers; maintenance and repairs to cadet camp site; fire extinguishing apparatus; machinery and tools and repair of same; maintenance, repair, and operation of an automobile and one motor truck; policing buildings and grounds; furniture for official purposes at the Academy; fuel for heat, light, and power; and other necessary incidental expenses in the discretion of the superintendent; in all, \$357,580, of which \$7,350 shall be immediately available.

For altering coal bunkers in power plant, \$10,000.

For repairs to the cadet barracks, to be immediately available, \$15,000.

For erection of steel hangar now on hand, \$1,500.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This is the same sort of an amendment as the one I described a few moments ago. It is to consolidate the printing of the bill, to shorten it, and thereby to save really thousands and thousands of dollars in printing bills for the Government. But I desire to perfect the committee amendment.

On page 116, line 14, after the word "power" at the end of the line and before the semicolon, I move to insert in parentheses the words "not exceeding \$65,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I desire to offer one more perfecting amendment, to conform to the amendment which has just been adopted. On line 16, page 116, the figures "\$350,580" should be stricken out, and there should be substituted the figures "\$352,580."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 117, after line 12, to strike out:

In all, buildings and grounds, \$65,685.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 117, in line 15, to strike out "\$304,080" and insert in lieu thereof "\$384,080."

Mr. WADSWORTH. The amendment should be changed to read "\$379,080."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, in line 16, to strike out "\$2,060,008" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,065,129," so as to read:

In all, Military Academy, \$2,065,129.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That should be corrected also as a total. It should read \$2,060,129.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 117, after line 16, to strike out:

No part of the moneys appropriated in this act shall be used for paying to any civilian employee of the United States Government an hourly wage or salary larger than that customarily paid by private individuals for corresponding work in the same locality.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, after line 2, to strike out:

Except as expressly otherwise authorized herein, no part of the sums appropriated by this act for military purposes shall be expended in the purchase from private manufacturers of any material at a price in excess of 25 per cent more than the cost of manufacturing such material by the Government, or, where such material is not or has not been manufactured by the Government, at a price in excess of 25 per cent more than the estimated cost of manufacture by the Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, after line 11, to strike out:

Expenditures for carrying out the provisions of this act shall not be made in such manner as to prevent the operation of the Government arsenals at their most economical rate of production, except when a special exigency requires the operation of a portion of an arsenal's equipment at a different rate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 120, line 15, after the name "New Jersey," to strike out "\$93,538.69" and to insert "\$92,449.23"; at the end of line 21 to strike out "radio dynamic torpedoes, \$720,000"; and on page 121, at the end of line 4, to strike out "\$3,694,944.95" and to insert "\$2,973,855.49," so as to read:

The following unexpended balances or portions of unexpended balances or combined unexpended balances or combined portions of unexpended balances of appropriations for the support of the Military Establishment and for other purposes shall be carried to the surplus fund and be covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act: Arming and equipping the militia, \$178,120.96; field artillery for Organized Militia, \$549.84; temporary office building, War Department, \$4,907.10; military posts, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, \$856.60; transportation for refugee American citizens from Mexico, \$50,846.69; transportation to China of Chinese refugees, \$31,165; memorial archway at Vicksburg, Miss., \$500; National Memorial Celebration and Peace Jubilee, Vicksburg, Miss., \$23,229.63; medals for officers, men, etc., of National Guard, War with Spain, and Mexican border service, \$207.87; equipping Army transports with lifeboats and rafts, \$2,218.08; exchange of Army cold-storage plant, Chicago, Ill., \$500; supply depot, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., \$1,017.49; Army supply depot, Fort Mason, Calif., \$2.64; road to national cemetery, Salisbury, N. C., \$235.09; Signal Service of the Army, \$407.10; repair and restoration of defenses of Galveston, Tex., \$1,797.81; sea walls and embankments, Panama Canal, \$3,270.99; land defenses, Panama Canal, \$1,165.30; terminal

storage and shipping buildings, \$21,440.43; armament of fortifications, act of February 28, 1920, \$2,619; proving ground, Sandy Hook, N. J., \$92,449.23; ordnance depot, Panama Canal, \$35,980.22; storage facilities at armories and arsenals, \$1.45; automatic rifles, \$2,439.20; ordnance depot, Honolulu, Hawaii, \$42.68; Army powder factory, \$2.40; international rifle competition, Camp Perry, Ohio, \$2,202.38; inland and port storage and shipping facilities, \$2,000,000; Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa., \$165,777.64; Picatinny Arsenal, Dover, N. J., \$92,824.11; Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill., \$243,384.04; San Antonio Arsenal, San Antonio, Tex., \$3,723.31; Springfield Arsenal, Springfield, Mass., \$1,945.01; Watervliet Arsenal, West Troy, N. Y., \$2,237.62; Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass., \$5,788.58; total appropriations recovered, \$2,973,855.49.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under Title II—Nonmilitary activities of the War Department, subhead "Quartefmaster Corps—National cemeteries," on page 121, line 20, after the word "Chapel," to insert a comma and the words "and an additional sum of \$15,000 for said repairs is hereby appropriated," so as to make the paragraph read:

The unobligated balance of \$5,000 of the appropriation for construction of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater and Chapel is hereby made available for expenditure under the direction of the Quartermaster General, United States Army, for repairs to the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater and Chapel, and an additional sum of \$15,000 for said repairs is hereby appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 122, to strike out:

For reconditioning the road from Fort Gibson, Okla., to the Fort Gibson National Cemetery, Okla., \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 123, line 5, after the figures "\$70,000," to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the purchase of headstones of a design different from that heretofore furnished for the graves of Union and Confederate soldiers.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 124, line 1, after the word "Academy," to strike out "acting assistant" and to insert "contract"; at the beginning of line 2 to insert "members of the Army Nurse Corps"; in line 19, after the word "list," to insert "including civilian employees of the Army in the employ of the War Department who die abroad, in Alaska, in the Canal Zone, or on Army transports, or who die while on duty in the field"; and on page 125, line 4, after the word "France," to strike out "the sum of \$400,000 is hereby made available during the fiscal year 1923 from the unobligated balance of the amounts available for this purpose for the fiscal year 1922" and to insert "for the care and maintenance of graves of officers, soldiers, and civilian employees of the Army abroad, including the erection of necessary buildings and improvements at permanent American cemeteries and care and maintenance thereof; the sum of \$1,143,720 of the unobligated balances of the appropriations for 'Disposition of remains of officers, soldiers, and civilian employees,' for the fiscal years 1920, 1921, and 1922 is hereby made available for the fiscal year 1923 for the purposes set forth in this paragraph," so as to make the paragraph read:

Disposition of remains of officers, soldiers, and civilian employees: For interment, cremation (only upon request from relatives of the deceased), or of preparation and transportation to their homes or to such national cemeteries as may be designated by proper authority, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, of the remains of officers, cadets, United States Military Academy, contract surgeons, members of the Army Nurse Corps, and enlisted men in active service, and accepted applicants for enlistment; for interment or preparation and transportation to their homes of the remains of civilian employees of the Army in the employ of the War Department who die abroad, in Alaska, in the Canal Zone, or on Army transports, or who die while on duty in the field; interment of military prisoners who die at military posts; for the interment and shipment to their homes of remains of enlisted men who are discharged in hospitals in the United States and continue as inmates of said hospitals to the date of their death; for interment of prisoners of war and interned alien enemies who die at prison camps in the United States; for removal of remains from abandoned posts to permanent military posts or national cemeteries, including the remains of Federal soldiers, sailors, or marines interred in fields or abandoned private and city cemeteries; and in any case where the expenses of burial or shipment of the remains of officers or enlisted men of the Army who die on the active list, including civilian employees of the Army in the employ of the War Department who die abroad, in Alaska, in the Canal Zone, or on Army transports, or who die while on duty in the field, are borne by individuals, where such expenses would have been lawful claims against the Government, reimbursement to such individuals may be made of the amount allowed by the Government for such services out of this sum, but no reimbursement shall be made of such expenses incurred prior to July 1, 1910; expenses of the segregation of bodies in permanent American cemeteries in Great Britain and France; for the care and maintenance of graves of officers, soldiers, and civilian employees of the Army abroad, including the erection of necessary buildings and improvements at permanent American cemeteries and care and maintenance thereof; the sum of \$1,143,720 of the unobligated balances of the appropriations for "Disposition of remains of officers, soldiers, and civilian employees," for the fiscal years 1920, 1921, and 1922 is hereby made available for the fiscal year 1923 for the purposes set forth in this paragraph.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator whether, if the provision for the size of the Army should be changed and it should be reduced to the limit fixed by the House or any intermediate number, the items that are being considered now would have to be reverted to and changed in any way?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; unfortunately this item can never be changed; it affects the dead in France.

Mr. KING. I refer to the various items just passed. I am not speaking of any particular one.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We are now on the nonmilitary activities of the War Department, none of which have anything to do with the size of the Army.

Mr. KING. Have all the items been passed over which would be required to be changed if the personnel provision were changed?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are about three of them under the general group of items of pay of the Army—subsistence, transportation, and regular supplies.

Mr. KING. The question of military posts and forts is what I had in mind. Would not the number of those which are retained be materially modified if the number of the personnel of the Army was reduced to 100,000 or 107,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The truth of the matter is that the permanent posts in the United States are not now sufficient to hold the Army. Some of the Army is still in temporary cantonments and they are being given up anyway. We can not reduce the number of permanent posts. This bill, in effect, provides only for the care of permanent posts, as the temporary ones are being given up, and even then the posts will be crowded.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator was of the opinion, according to my recollection, that many of the large military posts, forts, and so forth, that we had for years, should be abandoned.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think they should be.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But we can not abandon them until we concentrate the housing facilities into a smaller number of posts and to do that means appropriations for the building of barracks.

Mr. KING. Are not provisions contained in the bill or in some other legislation for the abandonment of many of those posts which are unnecessary?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are provisions contained in other legislation for the abandonment of certain installations. I do not think that there are any mandatory provisions of legislation concerning Army posts, but there are for depots, docks, wharves, munitions factories, and seaboard bases, and installation of that kind, at which Army personnel and civilian employees under the War Department are now stationed, and they, I should hope, would soon be withdrawn.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows far better than I that there are a good many posts in the interior of the United States, at various parts of the United States, which were deemed to be wholly unnecessary even if we had a large Army, much larger than that fixed in the bill. I was wondering if any provisions had been made in this legislation or in any other legislation for the permanent abandonment or disposition of some of those useless and unnecessary posts.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There has not.

Mr. KING. Does the committee intend to make any recommendation concerning that matter?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We understand that the House Committee on Military Affairs are giving a great deal of study to the whole question of War Department real estate. I have no doubt they will determine the disposition of some of the old permanent posts as well as some of the real estate and buildings which were acquired during the war. But let me remind the Senator that the permanent posts, the old-time permanent posts which we had prior to our entrance into the war against Germany, in continental United States, will only house 72,000 men.

Mr. KING. Of course, many of those, as the Senator knows, no matter whether we had a large or small Army, would never be used again.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Nearly all of them are used, but I think it is uneconomical to use as many, scattered as they are. However, the Secretary of War has been powerless. He has no right to sell or get rid of any of the posts. He can close them, or rather move the troops away, but he has to leave a caretaking detachment there. So there is hardly any economy in moving the troops away from such posts, because they still have to be taken care of.

Mr. KING. That is what I had in mind, and I was about to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that a great deal of

cost is incurred in the upkeep of those posts which are unnecessary. It occurred to me that we ought to make some disposition of them. I called the Senator's attention to the matter during the consideration of the last Army appropriation bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the Army is ever permitted by the Congress to reach a point where it is stable in numbers and in distribution, then the War Department and the Congress can tell what posts should be abandoned and what posts should not. But ever since April 6, 1917, the Army has been in a state of flux, and is to-day. There is not an officer in the Army from the Secretary of War down who knows how big the Army is going to be or how long it is going to stay at any particular size. I wish Congress would finally make up its mind whether or not it wants an army; and if so, how large. When we make up our minds to that then we can tell how we shall house that army.

Mr. KING. I do not think the Senator can proceed upon the theory that there will be fixed for a definite period the number of officers and personnel of the Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is not the theory upon which the posts are held.

Mr. KING. I understand that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They can not be sold.

Mr. KING. Then why should we not report some legislation authorizing the disposition of those forts and posts?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think it would be proper, but I must again point out to the Senator that it is almost impossible for any committee of Congress to lay down a general housing plan until the general military plan is laid down first.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator in that, but I have talked with some members of the staff as well as others, and I think it is the consensus of opinion of the Army officers that there are a good many posts in the United States that never will be utilized, no matter how large an Army we have. It does seem to me that as to those there should be some legislation providing for their disposition. Of course, I am not a member of the committee, and I can not force the committee to make any recommendation, but it does seem to me it ought to take that matter into account and make some recommendation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the Senator from Utah is exactly right about these posts. I hope the Senator will offer an amendment to the bill giving the Secretary of War power to dispose of the old posts that are not being used. They are an expense to the Government. I think, perhaps, the committee would agree to such an amendment. The Secretary of War ought to have that power, and as long as Congress does not give it to him he is powerless to do anything to save expense. We could use the money obtained from the sale of those posts in the enlargement of other posts where the Army would be stationed and thus save a good deal of money for the Government.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me say that I wish Congress would do something like that, but I have not the slightest hope that Congress will do any such thing. I do not believe Congress is going to authorize the Secretary of War to sell the Army posts in his discretion, for nearly every Member of Congress who has an Army post in his State would not want the Secretary of War to sell that post and hence would not vote to give the Secretary of War power to do it. I would vote to give the Secretary of War that power to-day.

Mr. KING. So would I.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But we will find terrific opposition to any such proposition.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Georgia expressed the wish that I would offer such an amendment. I dislike to do that. I have such confidence in the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I know he has labored so industriously and faithfully to prepare a good bill, that I would dislike to do that. I had hoped that the committee itself would see the wisdom and propriety of offering in the bill a provision of that character.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, it would be legislation on an appropriation bill, and the committee had made up its mind that it must not attempt legislation on this bill which would arouse contention, and, of course, result in a point of order. Such a point of order would cause the whole bill to go back to the committee. There were three little amendments which I have offered, which the committee has picked out as three legislative suggestions to which no one could ever object, and we decided to offer them on the floor after asking unanimous consent. However, the committee discussed this matter in connection with several other matters, and made up its mind that it would not offer as a part of the bill legislative amendments

which certainly would give rise to objection, and hence to a point of order, and hence to a recommittal of the bill.

Mr. KING. Much as I would like to see that legislation, I feel that I ought not to resist the attitude of the committee, but I do regret that the committee has not reported a bill of that character. I hope it will do so at an early date, because I think it is very unfortunate that we have to maintain such a large number of posts, at considerable expense, when it is apparent they never will be used. I think the committee ought to report a bill authorizing the Secretary of War, and, of course, he would consult the Chief of Staff and military officials, to make such investigation as he may deem necessary, and then to dispose of all military land and forts and posts that are regarded as unnecessary for the future needs of the Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then we can not fix the housing for any definite period.

Mr. KING. That may be true, and yet we might determine whether certain forts and posts, whether there is a big or little Army shall be retained, because it is manifest there are a great many posts which, even though we had an Army of 500,000 men, would not be utilized. It seems to me the height of folly to keep these posts upon the theory that we have yet to determine how big the Army is going to be, and therefore we must hold on to them.

If the Senator from New York would report such a bill, I am sure he would find in this Chamber almost unanimous support for it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the anticipations of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] are perfectly well founded. He may expect opposition to any movement of that character. In my judgment, legislation of that kind would be exceedingly unwise. I think such posts as may have no military value ought to be disposed of individually. Take the post at my home town, Fort William Henry Harrison. The original site consisted of a thousand acres of land adjacent to the city and was acquired by popular subscription by the citizens of the community and presented to the Government as a site for that post. Additional lands have since been acquired by the Government. Upon what basis of justice is the Government now going to take that property and sell it to the highest bidder for private uses?

Take Fort Assiniboine, in the northern part of my State. That is an old post which was established during the time of the Indian troubles. It was a very famous headquarters for military operations. General Miles made his headquarters there for many years. Buildings were constructed there at very great cost to the Government of the United States. Congress eventually, after the post was abandoned, deemed it wise to present the buildings, with a portion of the grounds, to the State of Montana for the purpose of an agricultural experiment station. I think it would be a most unfortunate thing if that property had been put up for sale and sold to anybody who might be willing to take the buildings for their wreckage value, whatever that might be.

I think these posts ought to be disposed of in some way or other, but there are so many peculiar conditions surrounding the various posts that I think it would be exceedingly unwise to authorize the Secretary of War to dispose of them at public auction.

Mr. KING. I suggest to the Senator from Montana that it seems to me a general bill could be so framed as that the particular cases to which he has called attention and others might be guarded and provided for. For instance, there would be no impropriety, indeed, it would be quite proper, to provide in such a bill that where, as in the case first mentioned by the Senator from Montana, the citizens had purchased the property and had given it to the Government, the Secretary of War would have authority in a case of that kind out of the proceeds derived from the sale to refund to the State or to the people the amount which they had contributed.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me instance Fort Assiniboine, which comprised at one time a great reservation of some 40,000 acres. The buildings, my recollection is, with 1,000 acres were donated to the State for educational purposes. The remainder of the 40,000 acres was open to settlement under conditions stipulated in the act. I think it would be an unfortunate thing to authorize the Secretary of War to sell off the 40,000-acre reservation to somebody who would use it for a cattle preserve. So I submit that it will be found exceedingly difficult to frame, as I think, a statute generally applicable to abandoned military reservations.

Mr. KING. I concede from the statement of the Senator from Montana that there would be some very serious difficulties in providing general legislation on the subject; but that only illus-

trates the proposition, that if we should attempt to enact general legislation, perhaps, there ought to be a supervisory board and a good deal of latitude provided. At any rate, if a general bill is not introduced, it would seem that a committee or the Secretary of War should be authorized to make a survey and report to Congress what military posts are unnecessary, with such recommendations as they feel it proper should be made. Then, Congress, acting upon that report, should take such steps in accordance therewith as it might deem necessary.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That would seem to be quite wise, and some definite action ought to be taken with respect to that matter. A great deal of embarrassment has ensued by reason of the fact that it is impossible to get from the War Department a declaration of its purposes with reference to many posts that are not now occupied. If I remember aright, we sought to secure the use of quite a number of them for hospitalization of ex-service men who were suffering and in need of care. We asked that they be turned over to the Public Health Service. They had not been occupied for years for military purposes, yet the War Department apparently is unwilling either to occupy them or to let them go. Perhaps Congress should bear a share of the blame for not adopting a definite policy, as indicated by the Senator from New York, concerning the size of the Army, for, perhaps, it is impossible for the War Department to tell just how many ought to be preserved until they know exactly what the size of the Army is to be.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, I recognize the force of what has been said by the Senator from Montana, but it seems to me that Congress might relinquish the Government's claim to these lands, allow the Senate to take title, and then let the States in their wisdom make some disposition of them. Perhaps each abandoned post would stand on a different footing. In my State there are some useless forts which are maintained at the expense of the Government, and I know that the State would like to have them and would make wise use of them; and no doubt the same thing would be done in Montana and in various other States. If the proposition were put up to Congress that each State should make its own disposition of these useless forts and relieve the Federal Government of the expense of their maintenance, it might meet the approval of both Houses.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator in charge of the bill how many Army posts there are now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In continental United States there are 240.

Mr. BORAH. I have been absent for a few moments and do not know what the discussion has been. Has there been any concerted or systematic action on the part of the department toward reducing the number of posts and getting rid of some of them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There has been no concerted carefully planned out action, for the simple reason that the War Department has never been able to tell during the last two or three years how much of an Army we were going to have; but it is perfectly plain that, if the Army should once reach a figure of stability, the War Department would be able to recommend the abandonment of certain posts.

Mr. BORAH. I do not suppose that we will ever have anything like a recognized and established standard as to the size of the Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If it would not fluctuate so violently the department would be in a better position. Last year, it will be recalled, we discharged in three months 80,000 men, which was a very violent fluctuation, and this year it is proposed by a bill introduced in the Senate to discharge 75,000 more. Of course, the War Department can not tell where it stands with legislation of that kind pending all the time.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know who introduced that bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. BORAH. I thought the Senator from New York was referring to me.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; the Senator from Utah "saw it first."

Mr. BORAH. What I was going to say was that we will scarcely have an Army at any time, unless there is actual war, to require the number of posts in the United States indicated by the Senator from New York. Many of these posts would not be used under any ordinary circumstances for any sized Army within three hundred or four hundred thousand men.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The barracks at the posts to-day will not house 100,000 men.

Mr. BORAH. I know of a number of posts so situated geographically that they can not be utilized.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true of some, but not of others. For example, the posts which I have named, there are 75 Coast

Artillery posts and fortifications. Only 25 of them to-day are manned, but they are all armed with guns. We would have to retain them.

Mr. BORAH. That may be true with reference to those posts; but a number of posts were established during the days of Indian warfare which are still being maintained.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; and in a stand-by condition, and they ought to be given up.

Mr. BORAH. I know of several myself.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator will be surprised how hard it is to give them up if the question is put to the Congress.

Mr. BORAH. I was approaching that subject. If the Army post and navy yard questions were eliminated from the Army and Navy appropriation bills, respectively, we would have vastly more desirable bills.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 125, line 22, after the word "forces," to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the funds made available by Public Resolution No. 44, Sixty-seventh Congress, for the purchase of real estate and improvement of cemeteries in Europe for American military dead shall remain available for the purposes specified in that resolution until June 30, 1923.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 126, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "\$5,600,000" and to insert "\$3,000,000," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided further, That the sum of \$3,000,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation "Disposition or remains of officers, soldiers, and civil employees," for the fiscal years 1920, 1921, and 1922, shall be carried to the surplus fund and be covered into the Treasury upon the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 127, line 10, to increase the appropriation for repairs and preservation of monuments, tablets, roads, fences, etc., made and constructed by the United States in Cuba and China to mark the places where American soldiers fell, from "\$100" to "\$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical and Surgical History of the World War," on page 128, line 6, after the word "illustrations," to strike out "\$4,800" and to insert "\$100," so as to make the paragraph read:

Toward the preparation for publication under the direction of the Secretary of War of a medical and surgical history of the war with Germany, including services of an editor, and printing and binding at the Government Printing Office and the necessary engravings and illustrations, \$100: *Provided*, That the total cost of such history shall not exceed \$150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I am going to take the liberty, on behalf of the committee, and I do it in the hearing of the present occupant of the chair (Mr. LENROO in the chair), to move to strike out, in line 4, on page 128, the words "including services of an editor, and." If those words are included in the text of the paragraph and the appropriation is left at \$100, it will be impossible to pay the editor at all. If the words are stricken out, the editor of this medical history will be paid under the \$16,600 appropriation which is provided earlier in the bill for this purpose. I move, therefore, that the words "including services of an editor, and" be stricken from the bill. It will then read:

Toward the preparation * * * of a medical and surgical history of the war with Germany, printing and binding at the Government Printing Office, and necessary engravings—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 130, line 2, after the word "Park," to strike out "\$50,000" and to insert "to be immediately available, \$100,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For completing the construction of a reflecting pool in west Potomac Park, to be immediately available, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill why some of these parks and the reflecting pool in Potomac Park should be charged directly upon the Government of the United States? Why should not a part of those costs be paid by the District? They are in the District and are for the benefit of the residents of the District, as much so as any of the parks in the District; and it occurs to me that it would be wise to transfer to the District the charge of these parks and playgrounds and pools, and so forth, many of which are provided for in this bill. I will ask the

Senator whether that subject has received the attention of the committee? The Senator knows that if they were transferred to the District, then 40 per cent or 50 per cent or 60 per cent of the cost, depending upon the ratio of appropriation fixed as between the Government and the District, will be paid by the District.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The maintenance of all the parks in the District of Columbia is shared between the Federal Government and the District.

There are two national monuments here—the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial—which are purely national in character. Although I have never before heard the suggestion the Senator from Utah has just made, for one I think it would be exceedingly unfair to ask that half of the maintenance of the Washington Monument be assessed against the taxpayers of the District of Columbia.

Mr. KING. I did not refer to the Washington Monument.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Or the Lincoln Memorial. The reflecting pool to which the Senator refers is in a sense, and a very true sense, a portion of the Lincoln Memorial. It is part of the work that is done in connection with the erection and completion of the Lincoln Memorial. This is only for construction. I think the citizens of this District should not be called upon to pay for the reflecting pool, which never would have been built except as an adjunct of the Lincoln Memorial. Indeed, it is a part of the Lincoln Memorial.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator there. If this is a part of the Lincoln Memorial, then I share the views of the Senator; but I was speaking generally, and not with reference to this item alone.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator will notice that there are no parks at all in this appropriation. They are found in the District bill.

Mr. KING. My understanding was that many of these parks were charged to the Government exclusively. If I am in error, then much of my criticism is inapplicable.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the Senator is—just those two things, the maintenance of the Washington Monument and the roads and walks immediately around it, and the maintenance of the Lincoln Memorial and the roads and walks immediately around that.

Mr. KING. Then I have no objection to that.

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

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 130, at the end of line 12, to reduce the appropriation for survey of northern and northwestern lakes, etc., from "\$107,000" to "\$75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 131, line 17, to increase the appropriation for the construction, repair, and maintenance of military and post roads, tramways, ferries, bridges, and trails, Territory of Alaska, from "\$425,000" to "\$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation facilities, inland and coastwise waterways," on page 132, line 21, after the figures "1920," to strike out "\$30,000" and to insert "\$330,000," so as to read:

For additional expense incurred in the operation of boats, barges, tugs, and other transportation facilities on the inland, canal, and coastwise waterways acquired by the United States in pursuance of the fourth paragraph of section 6 of the Federal control act of March 21, 1918, and operated in pursuance of section 201 of the transportation act approved February 28, 1920, \$330,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 132, line 21, after the word "That," to insert "not to exceed \$30,000 of"; and on page 133, line 3, to strike out "\$4,500" and to insert "\$4,000," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That not to exceed \$30,000 of this appropriation may be used for the payment of experts, clerks, and other employees in the War Department in accordance with the provisions of section 201 (e) of the transportation act, 1920, approved February 28, 1920, but no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation in excess of \$3,000 per annum except 1 at \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask for my own information, not by way of criticism, the reason for including in the military bill some items which would seem to belong to the river and harbor bill—for instance, the flood control.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The river and harbor bill is in here, too.

Mr. KING. In this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. KING. I was not advised of that fact.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It would be much easier and quicker to say what is not in this bill than to recite what is in it.

Mr. KING. Then this is a military bill and a river and harbor bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is. It also includes the soldiers' homes, the Panama Canal Zone, parks and cemeteries, Alaska roads, cables to Alaska, and—but, as I said, it would take too long to recite what is in it.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Utah that I presume the reason why all of these things are assembled in this bill is because the work on rivers and harbors is done under the direction of the engineers who are connected with the Army, and therefore that work is here, with all the others.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Utah that those of us out in the West who are interested in the reclamation of arid lands had better make a move to put them under the Army engineers if we are going to get any money for the purpose.

Mr. KING. It seems to me that this is going to be an omnium gatherum bill; we had better put appropriations in it with respect to other matters of which the Government takes cognizance. I supposed this was a military appropriation bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is the War Department appropriation bill. Anything that the War Department has anything to do with is covered in this bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the jurisdiction of the various committees, and particularly of the Appropriations Committee, was recently revised, as the Senator from Utah will recall; and it was under that revision that all of the activities of the War Department are assembled under one bill, known as the military appropriations bill, which goes now to the Appropriations Committee instead of to the Military Affairs Committee; but three members of the Military Affairs Committee sit in conjunction with the Appropriations Committee while this particular bill is under consideration. This is a part of the result of the reorganization of the committees in both Houses of Congress intended to give effect to the Budget system.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Arkansas if he knows how much of an appropriation this bill carries for items which under former practice would be included in the river and harbor bill?

Mr. ROBINSON. The item carried in this bill is \$42,500,000.

Mr. KING. For rivers and harbors?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

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

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers," on page 138, after line 9, to strike out:

Northwestern Branch, Milwaukee, Wis.: Current expenses, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$38,000;

Subsistence, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$140,000;

Household, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$70,000;

Hospital, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$70,000;

For transportation of members of the home, \$500;

Repairs, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$30,000;

Farm, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$8,000;

In all, Northwestern Branch, \$356,500.

Eastern Branch, Togus, Me.: Current expenses, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$38,000;

Subsistence, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$95,000;

Household, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$90,000;

Hospital, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$48,000;

Transportation of members of the home, \$500;

Repairs, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$28,000;

Farm, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$18,000;

In all, Eastern Branch, \$317,500.

Southern Branch, Hampton, Va.: Current expenses, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, and including the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger vehicles, \$54,000.

Subsistence, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$195,000;

Household, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$90,000;

Hospital, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$80,000;

For transportation of members of the home, \$1,000;

Repairs, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$44,000;

Farm, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$12,000;

In all, Southern Branch, \$476,000.

Western Branch, Leavenworth, Kans.: Current expenses, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$44,000;

Subsistence, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$185,000;

Household, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$100,000;

Hospital, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$80,000;

For transportation of members of the home, \$500;

Repairs, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$35,000;

Farm, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$18,000;

In all, Western Branch, \$462,500.

Pacific Branch, Santa Monica, Calif.: Current expenses, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$48,000;

Subsistence, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$250,000;

Household, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$100,000;

Hospital, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$100,000;

For transportation of members of the home, \$2,500;

Repairs, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$45,000;

Farm, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$14,000;

In all, Pacific Branch, \$559,500.

Marion Branch, Marion, Ind.: Current expenses including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$25,000;

Subsistence, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$120,000;

Household, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$50,000;

Hospital, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$90,000;

For transportation of members of the home, \$300;

Repairs, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$25,000;

Farm, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$9,000;

In all, Marion Branch, \$319,300.

Danville Branch, Danville, Ill.: Current expenses, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$54,000;

Subsistence, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$220,000;

Household, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$100,000;

Hospital, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$80,000;

For transportation of members of the home, \$500;

Repairs, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$30,000;

Farm, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$11,000;

In all, Danville Branch, \$495,500.

Mountain Branch, Johnson City, Tenn.: Current expenses, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$25,000;

Subsistence, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$120,000;

Household, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$80,000;

Hospital, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$80,000;

For transportation of members of the home, \$500;

Repairs, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$30,000;

Farm, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$16,000;

In all, Mountain Branch, \$322,500.

Battle Mountain Sanitarium, Hot Springs, S. Dak.: Current expenses, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$27,000;

Subsistence, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$70,000;

Household, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$60,000;

Hospital, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$40,000;

For transportation of members of the home, \$2,000;

Repairs, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$18,000;

Farm, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$6,000;

In all, Battle Mountain Sanitarium, \$223,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

For "Current expenses," "Subsistence," "Household," "Hospital," "Transportation," "Repairs," and "Farm," at the following branches, including the same objects respectively specified herein under each of such heads for the Central Branch, namely:

Northwestern Branch, Milwaukee, Wis.: Current expenses, \$38,000; subsistence, \$140,000; household, \$70,000; hospital, \$70,000; transportation, \$500; repairs, \$30,000; farm, \$8,000; in all, \$356,500.

Eastern Branch, Togus, Me.: Current expenses, \$47,000; subsistence, \$105,000; household, \$90,000; hospital, \$48,000; transportation, \$500; repairs, \$28,000; farm, \$18,000; in all, \$336,500.

Southern Branch, Hampton, Va.: Current expenses, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger vehicles, \$54,000; subsistence, \$195,000; household, \$90,000; hospital, \$80,000; transportation, \$1,000; repairs, \$44,000; farm, \$12,000; in all, \$476,000.

Western Branch, Leavenworth, Kans.: Current expenses, \$44,000; subsistence, \$185,000; household, \$100,000; hospital, \$80,000; transportation, \$500; repairs, \$35,000; farm, \$18,000; in all, \$462,500.

Pacific Branch, Santa Monica, Calif.: Current expenses, \$48,000; subsistence, \$250,000; household, \$100,000; hospital, \$100,000; transportation, \$2,500; repairs, \$45,000; farm, \$14,000; in all, \$559,500.

Marion Branch, Marion, Ind.: Current expenses, \$25,000; subsistence, \$120,000; household, \$50,000; hospital, \$90,000; transportation, \$300; repairs, \$25,000; farm, \$9,000; in all, \$319,300.

Danville Branch, Danville, Ill.: Current expenses, \$54,000; subsistence, \$220,000; household, \$110,000; hospital, \$90,000; transportation, \$500; repairs, \$40,000; farm, \$11,000; in all, \$525,500.

Mountain Branch, Johnson City, Tenn.: Current expenses, \$25,000; subsistence, \$120,000; household, \$60,000; hospital, \$80,000; transportation, \$1,500; repairs, \$20,000; farm, \$16,000; in all, \$322,500.

Battle Mountain Sanitarium, Hot Springs, S. Dak.: Current expenses, \$27,000; subsistence, \$70,000; household, \$60,000; hospital, \$40,000; transportation, \$2,000; repairs, \$18,000; farm, \$6,000; in all, \$223,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 145, after line 16, to strike out:

Provided, That moneys allotted to the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers by the Veterans' Bureau for support, maintenance, and care of World War veterans shall not be used to augment the appropriations made herein under the heads of "Current expenses," "Repairs," and "Farm."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 146, line 18, to increase the total appropriation for National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers from "\$4,483,800" to "\$4,532,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "The Panama Canal," on page 147, after line 6, to insert:

The limitations on the expenditure of appropriations hereinbefore made in this act shall not apply to the appropriations for the Panama Canal.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 148, line 25, after the figures "\$10,000," to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That not to exceed \$4,000 additional may be allowed the governor for expenses for entertainment, payable from the funds of the Panama Railroad Co.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 149, line 20, after the word "officer," to strike out "\$500,000" and to insert "\$550,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For sanitation, quarantine, hospitals, and medical aid and support of the insane and of lepers, and aid and support of indigent persons legally within the Canal Zone, including expenses of their deportation when practicable, and including additional compensation to any officer of the United States Public Health Service detailed with the Panama Canal as chief quarantine officer, \$550,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 149, line 24, to increase the appropriation for civil government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone from "\$915,000" to "\$950,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 150, line 1, to increase the total appropriation for the Panama Canal from "\$4,074,434" to "\$4,159,434."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 150, line 7, after the word "surplus," to strike out "or reserve stocks" and to insert "stock," so as to make the paragraph read:

The Governor of the Panama Canal, so far as the expenditure of appropriations contained in this act may be under his direction, shall, when it is more economical, purchase needed materials, supplies, and equipment from available surplus stock of the War Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 150, after line 7, to strike out:

No part of the foregoing appropriations for the Panama Canal shall be used to pay the salary for any position at a rate in excess of the rate in effect for such position on June 30, 1921.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 150, line 20, after the word "supplies," in line 19, to insert "and except for the permanent operating organization under which the compensation of the various positions is limited by section 4 of the Panama Canal act," so as to make the paragraph read:

Except in cases of emergency or conditions arising subsequent to and unforeseen at the time of submitting the annual estimates to Congress, and except for those employed in connection with the construction of permanent quarters, offices and other necessary buildings, dry docks, repair shops, yards, docks, wharves, warehouses, storehouses, and other necessary facilities and appurtenances for the purpose of providing coal and other materials, labor, repairs, and supplies, and except for the permanent operating organization under which the compensation of the various positions is limited by section 4 of the Panama Canal act, there shall not be employed at any time during the fiscal year 1923, under any of the foregoing appropriations for the Panama Canal, any greater number of persons than are specified in the notes submitted, respectively, in connection with the estimates for each of said appropriations in the Budget for said year, nor shall there be paid to any such person during that fiscal year any greater rate of compensation than was authorized to be paid to persons occupying the same or like positions on July 1, 1921; and all employments made or compensation increased because of emergencies or conditions so arising shall be specifically set forth, with the reasons therefor, by the governor in his report for the fiscal year 1923.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I think that finishes the reading of the bill for amendment, except for the amendments that have been passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the first amendment passed over.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] probably desire to give consideration to the first amendment that was passed over, which commences on page 15, and as that is the amendment which governs the size of the Regular Army, and perhaps will be considered of most importance by a good many Senators, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gerry	McCumber	Robinson
Borah	Glass	McKinley	Sheppard
Brandege	Gooding	McNary	Shorridge
Broussard	Hale	Myers	Simmons
Bursum	Harrell	Nelson	Smith
Calder	Harris	New	Smoot
Cameron	Hefin	Newberry	Spencer
Capper	Hitchcock	Nicholson	Sterling
Caraway	Johnson	Norris	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Oddie	Swanson
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Page	Townsend
Curtis	Kendrick	Pepper	Wadsworth
Dial	King	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Ladd	Poindexter	Warren
Ernst	La Follette	Pomerene	Watson, Ga.
France	Lenroot	Ransdell	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Rawson	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Secretary will state the first amendment passed over.

The READING CLERK. The first amendment passed over was, on page 15, after line 7, in the item "Finance Department, pay, etc., of the Army," to strike out and insert:

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I want to make some observations which relate more particularly to the item on page 83, under Chemical Warfare Service.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May we go to that item, then, Mr. President, and consider it?

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment on page 83.

The READING CLERK. On page 83, line 4, Chemical Warfare Service, the committee proposes to strike out "\$500,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$750,000."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, what is known in history now as the disarmament conference adjourned in Washington in the fore part of February. The object of that conference was not only to actually reduce armaments and to take some steps toward peace, but supposedly also to create an atmosphere of peace, to break the war spirit, and to give encouragement to and make progress in the direction of world peace.

The most humane and, if it could have been carried out, the most important treaty, which the conference put out, was the treaty between the powers in relation to the use of submarines and noxious gases in warfare. While there were other treaties, particularly the one dealing with the naval ratio, which received much more attention and perhaps impressed more the public mind, yet that treaty disposed largely of what, in my judgment, would have soon become obsolete instruments of naval warfare. In all probability time and economic conditions, as well as the science of naval warfare, would have accomplished what this treaty with reference to the naval ratio accomplished—that is, the reduction of the number of battleships. In my opinion they were becoming obsolete, so far as modern naval warfare is concerned. But the treaty relating to the use of submarines and the noxious gases dealt with those instruments of modern warfare which are now being perfected and developed so as to become in all probability the dominating instruments in case a war should be visited upon us again.

The conference was unable to effectuate a real control of submarines or a definite control of noxious gases. For reasons which are now well understood by everyone, upon the objections of certain powers, it seemed impossible for the conference to limit the building of submarines or to circumscribe the jurisdiction of the different powers with reference to these instruments. But they did negotiate a treaty which, if there had been good faith behind it, might have been as desirable and have brought about equally as good results, as a definite obligation, to limit building. That treaty provides, among other things:

A merchant vessel must be ordered to submit to visit and search to determine its character before it can be seized.

A merchant vessel must not be attacked unless it refuse to submit to visit and search after warning, or to proceed as directed after seizure.

A merchant vessel must not be destroyed unless the crew and passengers have been first placed in safety.

Belligerent submarines are not under any circumstances exempt from the universal rules above stated, and if a submarine can not capture a

merchant vessel in conformity with these rules the existing law of nations requires it to desist from attack and from seizure and to permit the merchant vessel to proceed unmolested.

When that treaty was put out there were some people, including myself, who had doubt as to the good faith which was behind it, a doubt which one does not like to entertain but which one is compelled to entertain by reason of the glaring facts which stare you in the face.

These powers, in other words, unwilling to limit the use of submarines undertook to prescribe and proscribe the manner in which they should be used, which if carried out in good faith would have been as effective as prohibiting the use of them, because if submarines must be used as provided in this treaty, they have been rendered largely ineffective in modern sea warfare. The very object of a submarine is and it does its best service in doing the things contrary to the rules provided for in this treaty.

So when we looked upon the situation and observed that the nations refused to go direct to the subject and deal with it directly and limit the building of the submarines, but were willing to put in a provision limiting the use of them, practically destroying them, it occurred to some of us that they never intended to carry out that treaty.

This treaty has not been ratified except by the Senate of the United States. We ratified it in great haste, because we were told that the whole world was impatiently waiting for the United States to take the first step toward world peace and that as soon as we should act the other nations of the world would be glad to follow. After we ratified the treaties they passed into the pigeonholes of the foreign nations and have never been heard from since. Neither France, Great Britain, nor Japan has seen fit to take up these treaties even for consideration.

This particular clause which I have just read has nothing to do with anything contained in this bill, of course, but there is a clause in this treaty which seems to me relevant for discussion, and that is article 5 of the same treaty:

The use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous, or other gases, and all analogous liquids, materials, or devices having been justly condemned by the general opinion of the civilized world and the prohibition of such use having been declared in treaties to which a majority of the civilized powers are parties. The signatory powers, to the end that this prohibition shall be universally accepted as a part of international law binding alike the conscience and practice of nations, declare their assent to such prohibition, agree to be bound thereby as between themselves and to invite all other civilized nations to adhere thereto.

If this meant anything at all it meant that the signatories to this treaty were determined to take the first step toward the limiting of the use of noxious gases in warfare.

Since the adjournment of the disarmament conference the movement, not only in this country but in Japan, Great Britain, and France, has been such as to practically destroy the beneficial results of the disarmament conference. I entertained no doubt at the time that some movement would be made in that direction, but I had no idea that they would move so rapidly as they have in the last few months. If you will survey the budgets of the other powers with reference to these particular instruments of warfare, you will find that they are not only in some instances violating what in my judgment is the letter but they are in a multitude of instances violating the spirit of these treaties. It is true that they have not ratified them, and I would judge from the manner in which they are dealing in their budgets with the subjects covered by the treaties that they do not propose to ratify them.

I observed in the news items some 10 days since this statement:

Nations of the world, no less than seven of them, have sought information from the United States on the manufacture of poison gas since the armament conference here drafted a treaty to outlaw chemical warfare. Information to this effect was verified yesterday at the War Department.

Five nations meet in Washington in February and solemnly sign a treaty in which they put the ban of condemnation upon the use of this instrument, poison gas, and then, within six months, seven nations meet in the same capital for the purpose of exchanging views as to how they can most expedite the perfecting of the use of this instrument of modern warfare. In other words, the city of Washington becomes the distributing bureau or the distributing depot of the best information, which information is only desirable upon the theory that this treaty is to be disregarded.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. There are many nations which were not parties to this treaty, and if those nations continue the use of

poison gas, and there is no prohibition against their doing so, does the Senator think that any nation can afford not to have the latest information possible concerning it for its own safety?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, that shows how utterly and absolutely useless is the treaty which we have ratified. If the United States, one of the signers of the treaty, is to become the central distributing bureau or depot for the information which was condemned by the treaty, we are not only waiting for the other nations to initiate a violation, but we are conniving at it ourselves and encouraging it. Why should we have an international conference on poison gas and thereby encourage and stimulate other peoples to devote their money and their genius to perfecting this hellish means of death? In my opinion we are acting in flagrant violation of the spirit of the treaty and the whole disarmament conference.

Mr. LENROOT. On the contrary, we are waiting until the other nations adhere, until all the nations of the world adhere.

Mr. BORAH. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator say the United States Government is the central distributing point of information on chemical-warfare gases?

Mr. BORAH. That is my understanding.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Who represented the Government and with what authority did he so represent the Government and upon what occasion?

Mr. BORAH. I will read this article again.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would like very much to hear it.

Mr. BORAH. It reads as follows:

Nations of the world, no less than seven of them, have sought information from the United States on the manufacture of poison gas since the armament conference here drafted a treaty to outlaw chemical warfare. Information to this effect was verified yesterday at the War Department.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is that all?

Mr. BORAH. No; that is not all, but that is subject to my comment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did they get the information?

Mr. BORAH. I understand so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. How does the Senator understand so?

Mr. BORAH. I understand it from the newspapers. I have much more here.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is not entirely reliable.

Mr. BORAH. Not entirely reliable? I venture to say that they did get the information. I venture to say that if the Senator will call up the Secretary of War he will find that they did get it. It was published in the newspapers, as stated, upon the approval by the War Department, that they had no information to conceal from the representatives of the English Government upon this subject. It came as a quotation and statement from the War Department. They were assembled here for that purpose; met with representatives of the War Department, as the paper said, and I assume that is correct. It was a most important news item. It was published throughout the country. The statement as published stated specifically that its verity was confirmed by the War Department. No reputable paper would say that it was confirmed by the War Department unless it had been confirmed. I believe the report to be true.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The assumption of the Senator goes to very great length. He would apparently include the formulae for any gas if made under the auspices of the United States Government, and I doubt very much—in fact, I do not believe—that these formulae were given away.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from New York does not believe it, but the Senator from Idaho does believe it. I may be mistaken.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am certain the Senator is mistaken. Before assertions of this sort are made—this is a serious matter—

Mr. BORAH. I think it is a very serious matter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It seems to me some inquiry might be made of the War Department before an assertion of that sort is made public, for the Senator recollects perfectly well that there was at least one chemical-warfare gas developed during the latter period of the war by American chemists under auspices of the United States Government the formula for which was secret. Not a nation on earth knew what it was, nor any American citizen knew what it was, except within a very restricted number. The assertion of the Senator from Idaho is that this formula has been given away.

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not say they gave all the information away. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I asked the Senator what information was given away and when and by whom. The Senator said these foreigners came here from seven nations and got the information, and that it was given to them by the War Department.

Mr. BORAH. I stated it upon the publication which is found in a daily paper published here in the city and which no one representing the Government has seen fit to deny. It was not only published under the eye of the department but it has been published all over the country and editorial comment made at great length. I supposed, in view of the fact that the publication stated the news item had been confirmed at the War Department, that it was true, otherwise there would have been a denial.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If we denied all things that appear in the daily papers, we would not be doing anything else but denying.

Mr. BORAH. Whom does the Senator mean when he says "we"?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Anybody, the Senator or myself or the War Department.

Mr. BORAH. Here is a matter which the Senator well says is a very serious matter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is.

Mr. BORAH. It has been published, and apparently published upon the statement of the War Department. If it was a serious matter and false, it was the duty of the War Department to brand it as false. It was no ordinary statement. In fact the circumstances are quite conclusive that it is true. It is in harmony with many other things calculated, if not designed, to destroy the good results of the disarmament conference.

Mr. WADSWORTH. My criticism, if I may call it such, is that the Senator's assumption goes much further than it should go based upon the announcement of the War Department. The Senator stated earlier in his remarks that the United States Government has become the central distributing agency of the knowledge and use of chemical warfare gases. That includes everything the United States Government knows.

Mr. BORAH. I have these circumstances about which there is no doubt, that the representatives of seven nations came here. It is not to be presumed that they came without the knowledge of the War Department that they were coming. They met with the War Department. It is not to be presumed that the War Department permitted them to come to practice a fraud upon them, and yet concealed from them the purpose of their coming, to wit, to interchange views with reference to the use of poisonous gases. They were here from a distance, upon a serious errand, at expense to their Governments, representing their Governments, and meeting with our Government representatives. I assume they dealt with one another in sincerity when they met together.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I assume that, too; but that would not imply that everything they knew was told.

Mr. BORAH. If it comes down to the proposition of the War Department concealing something from them, that is a different proposition. They might have had some secrets which they did not let them have. There is no such indication here, however.

I will read a little further:

Chemical-warfare experts of the British Army, who have recently concluded a course of study at the American Army chemical-warfare headquarters at Edgewood Arsenal, Md., it is learned, make no secret of the fact that the British Government intends to continue full speed ahead its research work in connection with the use of gas in warfare, notwithstanding the treaty which already has been ratified by the United States Senate.

In view of the treaty, and if the spirit of the treaty is to be regarded, why should the experts of these nations either be invited or permitted to come here and pass within the jurisdiction of our Government works for the purpose of obtaining information? Why should we take an active part in spreading information as to how we can most brutally and effectively kill our fellow men?

France, experts here declare, is pursuing her experiments with gas and is especially developing the technique of the use of gas in connection with airplanes in anticipation of attack from Germany.

The latest development which causes surprise here is the marked tendency on the part of smaller nations of Europe to interest themselves in chemical fumes. Friends of chemical warfare assert that all such shells should be barred if the new explosive is to be prohibited.

INTERPRETATION OF TREATY.

Consideration of this problem has brought attention to the fact that since the treaty prohibits the use of all gases in warfare the employment of such harmless vapors as hydrogen and helium in balloons and dirigibles also come under the ban if the treaty were strictly interpreted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator will recollect that I called attention to that in a speech before the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. That I remember. I also called attention to the fact that I did not believe they would ever carry out the treaty.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Perhaps we can exchange recollections in the matter.

Mr. BORAH. Now, I will read further. This is from the New York Times of May 25:

Although a treaty was signed at the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armament by which the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan bound themselves to adhere to agreements for the prohibition of the use of noxious gases in warfare, it is apparent from information received at the War Department that several Governments are continuing experiments in the preparation of poisonous chemicals for war purposes.

Brig. Gen. Amos O. Fries, Chief of the Gas Service of the Army, said to-day:

"All our information indicates that other nations are working feverishly to make the most of chemical warfare."

Interpretation of the poison-gas treaty negotiated in Washington has been brought to the front by the completion of experiments here on a new high-explosive shell. Experts say that the new explosive, with all the strength of T. N. T., generates 40 per cent of phosgene gas, a deadly chemical developed during the World War. The Washington treaty does not prohibit the use of high-explosive shells but the question has arisen as to whether the new explosive should be barred from use in warfare because it generated a considerable amount of poison gas.

It is contended by some that as all high-explosive shells generate a certain amount of deadly gases, all such shells should be barred if there is to be a prohibition placed on the use of the new explosive. It is maintained also that as the treaty covers all gases in warfare in a prohibitive way the use of harmless vapors like hydrogen and helium in aircraft would come under the ban if the treaty is to be strictly interpreted.

The United States is the only Government signatory to the poison-gas treaty which has ratified it. At the War Department to-day it was said that seven nations had sought information from this Government concerning the manufacture of poison gases since the Conference on Limitation of Armament. One of these is Great Britain. All the others are Governments not parties to the gas treaty. Chemical experts of the British Army have recently completed a course of study at the United States Army gas center at Edgewood Arsenal, Md. They are credited with having made no secret of the intention of the British Government to continue its research work in the use of gas in warfare.

I take it from the reading of these articles that at least these facts will not in all probability be successfully disputed: First, that we signed the treaty and we have ratified it. Secondly, that since the signing of the treaty two of the powers—Great Britain and the United States—have met here and have been conversing and exchanging views with reference to perfecting the use of these noxious gases. Thirdly, that, as stated at the time by an officer of the Army or representative of the War Department, no information which the United States has would be retained or concealed or kept back from the British Government. In other words, while calling upon the world in the treaty to stop the use of poison gas, we set about to perfect it, to make it more cruel and destructive, and then invite in the representatives of other nations to confer and give them the benefit of our work. It is all in violation of the spirit if not the letter of the treaty. It makes a mockery of the disarmament conference.

I am not now accentuating the proposition as to whether the United States gave up all its information. That is not my object in discussing the matter. What I say is that the United States, by permitting this conference here, encourages what must inevitably result in the complete breakdown of the gas treaty. I go further and say that the very fact that seven nations come here, confer together, interchange views—whether candidly and fully or not is another question—in reference to the use of those gases, the perfecting of them, and so forth, is in violation of the spirit of the treaty. It might be justified under the treaty, or notwithstanding the treaty, for the United States to pursue its own individual studies and individual consideration of the matter—that is a matter about which we might differ—but I look with disfavor upon the proposition that they should come here and in a conference deal with the subject which the treaty was supposed to prohibit. This whole disarmament conference and all the treaties are the sheerest hypocrisy unless the work of that conference is to be carried out in good faith. It is not treaties which count, it is the honor and the good faith of the nations. And I denounce as a betrayal of the whole fight for disarmament this encouragement of the things which are in contravention to its whole spirit and purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ASHURST. Let the amendment be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 83, Chemical Warfare Service, strike out "\$500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$750,000."

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I simply state that the amount is merely for research work and will not permit the Chemical Warfare Service to manufacture anything in quantity? Most of its research, in fact, practically all of it, will be on the defensive side.

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

Mr. HALE (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELER], I vote "yea."

Mr. NEW (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD], and vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when Mr. OVERMAN's name was called). I wish to announce for the day the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. OVERMAN].

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I transfer my standing pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW], and vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON of Indiana (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BALL. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I understand that Senator has not voted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). The senior Senator from Florida has not voted.

Mr. BALL. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Florida to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], and vote "yea."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Transferring my general pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], I vote "yea."

Mr. BROUSSARD. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HARRISON. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and vote "nay."

Mr. KENDRICK. Transferring my general pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK] to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], I vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and vote "nay." I ask that this announcement of the transfer of my pair may stand for the day.

Mr. JONES of Washington (after having voted in the affirmative). Has the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Virginia is necessarily absent. I promised a pair with him during the day. Not being able to secure a transfer of my pair I withdraw my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I am requested to announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] is paired with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL].

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—46.

Asburt	Gooding	Myers	Sheppard
Ball	Hale	Nelson	Shortridge
Brandegge	Harrel	New	Smoot
Bursum	Harris	Newberry	Spencer
Calder	Kellogg	Nicholson	Sterling
Cameron	Ladd	Oddie	Sutherland
Culberson	Lenroot	Page	Townsend
Curtis	Lodge	Pepper	Wadsworth
Dillingham	McCumber	Phipps	Warren
Ernst	McKinley	Poindexter	Watson, Ind.
France	McLean	Ransdell	
Frelinghuysen	McNary	Rawson	

NAYS—22.

Borah	Harrison	La Follette	Underwood
Capper	Heflin	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Hitchcock	Pomerene	Watson, Ga.
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Robinson	Willis
Dial	Kendrick	Simmons	
Glass	King	Smith	

NOT VOTING—28.

Broussard	Fletcher	Moses	Stanfield
Colt	Gerry	Norbeck	Stanley
Crow	Johnson	Overman	Swanson
du Pont	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Trammell
Edge	Keyes	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	McCormick	Reed	Weller
Fernald	MCKellar	Shields	Williams

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I now suggest, if the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] is willing that we should do so, that we return to the amendment on the bottom of page 76 of the bill, where the committee propose to strike out "\$400,000" and to insert "\$375,000."

I may say for the information of the Senate that this item is applicable alone to the Springfield Arsenal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the committee referred to by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 76, under the subhead "Manufacture of arms," in line 24, after the word "armories," the Committee on Appropriations propose to strike out "\$400,000" and to insert "\$375,000," so as to make the clause read:

For manufacturing, repairing, procuring, and issuing arms at the national armories, \$375,000.

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

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether it would be competent for me to move as a substitute for the committee amendment to strike out the entire paragraph?

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the Senator, first, if he will be good enough to tell me if his purpose is to wipe the Springfield Arsenal off the Government books?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What I really purpose is simply to put a stop to the manufacture of rifles. I understand, however, that there is some other work there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the entire paragraph should be stricken out, of course, there would be no work; and, so far as the Government's accounts would be concerned, there would be no Springfield Arsenal.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I had some doubt about it. I have been looking at the testimony, and I am inclined to think that there probably should remain an appropriation of \$75,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is not necessary to strike out the entire paragraph to attain the Senator's object.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then I move to substitute \$75,000 for the committee amendment proposing to insert \$375,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. In lieu of \$375,000, the amount proposed to be inserted by the committee, on page 76, line 24, it is proposed to insert \$75,000.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, this proposed legislation involves a really important principle. The testimony of General Peirce before the committee showed conclusively that at the Springfield Arsenal we are manufacturing, at an expense of \$900 a day, rifles for which we have no use. The testimony of General Peirce further showed that we have on hand at the present time 2,800,000 rifles and that we are manufacturing 30 rifles a day at that institution at an expense of \$900. When asked why we were manufacturing these rifles, the general said it was done simply to keep the working force together, so as to have skilled men in that line. As I have stated, this matter now involves a question of high principle: Shall the money of the people be expended in an Army appropriation bill for supplies that are not needed in a military sense to keep a few skilled men employed, on the theory that they might some time be needed?

I do not think there can be any dispute as to the facts. I can take the time to read the testimony of General Peirce; but his testimony was, in effect, that it was necessary to have this appropriation in order to keep those men employed. The supply of 2,800,000 rifles which we now have on hand and stored, except for the few that are in the hands of the soldiers, is certainly large enough in any possible contingency that can be conceived of. We did not have use for as many rifles as that during the war, when we had 4,000,000 men under arms, and it is not conceivable that we will ever have use in our day for the number of rifles that we now have on hand; and it is for the Congress to decide whether we are going to spend \$900 a day of the people's money simply for the purpose of keeping a few hundred men employed in manufacturing something that is not needed.

I therefore move to reduce the appropriation to \$75,000, which will cover all of the necessary expenditures to keep the armory for storage purposes and for certain small manufacture that seems to be required there; and on that I should like to have the yeas and nays.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection to the yeas and nays being ordered, as long as I may have an opportunity to state the position of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is made for a yea-and-nay vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not want to interrupt. I thought we were going to have a vote, and I wanted to ask the Senator from New York to give his version of this matter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is what I was about to do.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Nebraska states, this matter is one which might perhaps be called one of policy. The Springfield Arsenal is the only arsenal which the Government owns. It has been the home of rifle making for generations. It is the only place in the entire United States where the art of making a military rifle is being preserved. At no other point in this country is a military rifle made.

It is perfectly true that we have 2,800,000 serviceable rifles in the hands of troops or in storage in the United States to-day. It is perfectly true that from the immediate military standpoint, or from the standpoint of the immediate future, we do not need any additional rifles. The question is, Do we need to preserve the art of making a rifle in this country? That is all that there is before the Senate.

Prior to the war the Springfield Arsenal was running at very low capacity. When we went into the war we were astounded to find out that the Springfield Arsenal had been turning out only 75 rifles a day for a year or two or three years before we went to war with Germany. We paid the penalty for that folly by having to go to private manufacturers and accept a British-designed rifle, readjust it to American ammunition, and spend millions and millions and millions before we could get rifles for our soldiers. The Springfield Arsenal had been neglected. With war staring us in the face for two years at least we dawdled along at 75 rifles per day, just a little group of men under the employ of the United States Government who knew something about making a rifle with which our men could defend themselves and their country.

The Senate committee proposes that \$375,000 be appropriated to keep this arsenal going. It will permit the arsenal to manufacture 30 rifles per day; that is all. The men employed upon those rifles will be the only men in the United States preserving the art of rifle making. I think I am accurate in saying that those men are the descendants of rifle makers; that they and their families have lived in and about Springfield for generations. They are a little group of skilled artisans that can not be duplicated anywhere in this country. It is proposed under this appropriation to employ approximately 300 men in this great arsenal that employed thousands upon thousands when we had to have rifles immediately. A portion of the 300 will be used in making 30 rifles per day. The rest will be used in carrying on certain experimental construction in connection with semiautomatic rifles—an undertaking quite different from that of the manufacture of the Springfield service rifle.

The rifles are going to cost us \$300,000, less than one-tenth of 1 per cent of the money carried in this bill. For one-tenth of 1 per cent of all the appropriations that it is suggested shall be made for the War Department in its military and nonmilitary activities and all the related activities, for that tiny percentage we hope to keep alive in this country and keep gathered together at one spot, at least, in this country the knowledge of how to make a military rifle.

The testimony before the committee was to the effect that a production of less than 30 rifles per day would be so grossly uneconomical as practically to forbid its being attempted. If the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is adopted, we close practically the entire plant. The \$75,000 will be largely eaten up by administrative expenses, the salaries of watchmen, and the cost of heating, lighting, and guarding the property; and we might just as well mark this great, old, historic armory off the books of the Government and abandon any attempt to maintain the art of rifle making in this country.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I have not any objection to closing the Springfield Armory. I doubt whether it is a sufficiently valuable purpose, but it was at the suggestion of the Senator from New York that I merely moved to reduce the proposed appropriation \$300,000, so as to leave the arsenal in operation for the minor purposes stated by General Peirce in his testimony.

If we are to continue the manufacture of rifles for the purpose of educating men in the manufacture of rifles, I do not see any reason why we should not continue the manufacture of heavy artillery, or why we should not continue the manufacture even of chemicals for chemical warfare, although we are trying to agree with the nations not to use it, or why we should not go on with the building of battleships just simply for the purpose of keeping men employed in building battleships and training them in the work. There is no more real

reason why artisans should be kept manufacturing rifles that are not used and can not be used within our day than there is for keeping men employed in manufacturing armor that we do not intend to use, for the ostensible reason of keeping people educated in that art.

The United States is not the only place where rifles are manufactured. They are manufactured in all of the great nations of Europe; and these men are not the only men in the world who know anything about manufacturing rifles. It will not become a lost art simply because we stop the manufacture of the rifles. It is true that these men have been devoting themselves to that particular thing, and it is true that they are high-priced men and receive very large pay; but it is a policy that is involved. Are we justified, in an appropriation bill to supply the Army of the United States, in bringing in here and there large expenditures, amounting in this case to nearly a thousand dollars a day, year in and year out, simply for the purpose of keeping people educated in the art of warfare?

I do not care to enter upon a further discussion, but I ask to have inserted in my remarks the testimony of General Peirce on this subject before the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

MANUFACTURE OF SMALL ARMS AND SMALL-ARMS AMMUNITION AT FRANKFORD AND SPRINGFIELD.

General PEIRCE. There is one other consideration that I wished to explain that has entered into some of these estimates, and that is the desire to keep at the arsenals a skeleton force to preserve the art of manufacture. In those cases where this development program did not of itself afford the necessary work, and there are two instances of that: One is at Frankford Arsenal, where the small-arms ammunition is made; and the other is at the Springfield Armory, where the small arms are made.

Now, of the standard caliber .30 ammunition used in the standard service rifle, we have enough on hand for our reserve purposes and for our actual needs for the coming year; but unless we have some money to manufacture some small-arms ammunition at Frankford and some rifles at Springfield it will be necessary to close those departments down entirely and lose all the men that have any knowledge of that sort of work; so that part of this estimate is to provide a little work at those two places. The estimates provide for a little work at these places in order to keep a very small number of men there.

Senator HARRIS. You say "a little work." How does that compare with the amount before the war or last year? I remember, in the discussion before, that as a matter of fact, we simply made the appropriation for the arsenal in Pennsylvania for Senator Knox after his speech. You remember that. The showing made was that we had all the ammunition necessary. I am in sympathy with what you are trying to do now, to keep a skeleton organization, but to manufacture more ammunition when there is a large quantity on hand would not seem to me just and wise. If I am in error about that, I would like to hear you.

General PEIRCE. We have not sufficient ammunition on hand of all the different kinds of small-arms ammunition. We have enough of the ball ammunition, but there are various kinds of armor-piercing ammunition for use against tanks, and incendiary ammunition for use in the Air Service; and above all, this caliber .50 ammunition that is used in the new caliber .50 machine guns. In those cases we have not any satisfactory quantity on hand. So that we are really accomplishing two purposes with this money; we are keeping a certain small number of men employed and keeping alive a force, and at the same time we are getting ammunition that is needed.

Senator HITCHCOCK. How many men are employed?

General PEIRCE. About 700 at Frankford now. There will be less than 500 after the 1st of July on this estimate.

Senator WADSWORTH. I wanted to ask you to set me straight, at least, and perhaps it will help the other members of the committee also about these different items. Take the bill there, please. Under ordnance stores, ammunition, there is \$508,500 appropriated.

General PEIRCE. Yes.

Senator WADSWORTH. That item begins on line 21, page 65: "For the development, manufacture, purchase, and maintenance of airplane bombs, of ammunition for small arms, and for hand use for reserve supply." How is that work distinguished from that under the next item, which is "For manufacture and purchase of ammunition, targets, and other accessories for small arms, hand and machine gun target practice and instruction; and ammunition, targets, target materials, and other accessories which may be issued for small-arms target practice," etc.? That also says for manufacture and purchase of ammunition.

General PEIRCE. The items under the latter appropriation are all for specific purposes of target practice, and the ammunition used in the national matches is special ammunition that is different from the service ammunition.

Senator WADSWORTH. Then you want \$100,000 for target-practice ammunition?

General PEIRCE. And for everything else. I have the details here. Senator WADSWORTH. Then the ammunition made under ordnance stores is made at Frankford?

General PEIRCE. Yes.

Senator WADSWORTH. Except, perhaps, the bombs?

General PEIRCE. The bombs, of course, are some of them made at Frankford and some at Rock Island.

Senator WADSWORTH. Then that appropriation can be said generally to be for the support of the Frankford Arsenal; or is some of it for Rock Island?

General PEIRCE. Yes.

Senator WADSWORTH. And the next one; where is that mostly spent?

General PEIRCE. The target material is either manufactured or procured by Rock Island. The ammunition that is purchased, of course, comes from private manufacturers. If manufactured, it would be at the Frankford Arsenal.

Senator WADSWORTH. Is there no service ammunition manufactured under the second item?

General PEIRCE. Under the small-arms target practice?

Senator WADSWORTH. Yes.

General PEIRCE. There is a .30-caliber gallery-practice ammunition for training of the Army and there is manufacture of .30-caliber gallery-practice ammunition for civilian training camps, and there is manufacture of special ammunition for the national matches.

Senator WADSWORTH. Special types of small-arms ammunition. It is not ordinary service type ammunition?

General PEIRCE. No, sir; there is some blank .45-caliber pistol ammunition for training purposes.

Senator WADSWORTH. Blank ammunition?

General PEIRCE. Yes.

Senator WADSWORTH. In the "manufacture of arms," the next item, that is at Springfield Arsenal, is it?

General PEIRCE. That is at Springfield; yes, sir.

Senator JONES of Washington. Generally, as to this preceding item, if we should not increase the amount of the House you would then do, then, of course, those things that you considered the most important?

General PEIRCE. Yes.

Senator JONES of Washington. Do you think that the Army would suffer any real serious injury by losing that \$400,000?

General PEIRCE. I did not get those figures, Senator.

Senator JONES of Washington. There is \$400,000 here for small-arms target practice. If we should leave that \$400,000 out, do you think there would be any serious results?

General PEIRCE. I feel that at least \$400,000 will be necessary under this item.

Senator WADSWORTH. I asked you a while ago how it was that this year's appropriation was \$250,000 and next year's \$400,000—why the increase? It seems that there was an unexpended balance from 1921 and available for 1922, and therefore the additional appropriation for 1922; was not that it? Have you used up that unexpended balance? I think in the House committee it was stated that there was about \$35,000 carried over.

General PEIRCE. \$35,000 carried over.

Senator WADSWORTH. Then there is a possible \$435,000 available?

General PEIRCE. Yes.

MANUFACTURE OF ARMS.

Senator WADSWORTH. Now, what is the next item?

General PEIRCE. The next item is "Manufacture of arms."

Senator WADSWORTH. Yes; that is at the Springfield Armory. The estimate was \$453,000. What had you expected to do with that?

General PEIRCE. There are a number of small items for continuation of development work in connection with the semiautomatic rifle, in connection with the receiver sight of the caliber .30 shoulder rifle, and a number of other items, one of them \$4,000, and another \$2,000, another \$6,000, and so on; but the main item is for the manufacture of United States service rifles, \$300,000. That is sufficient, it is estimated, to produce about 30 rifles a day, which is a very much smaller number than has ever been produced at Springfield, and the minimum that we figure we can operate the plant for and keep the smallest force there that has been maintained at Springfield within my recollection.

Senator SPENCER. That is, to produce 30 rifles a day you would need \$450,000?

General PEIRCE. No, sir; \$300,000.

Senator SPENCER. Which, with the other items, would make \$450,000?

General PEIRCE. Yes, sir.

Senator HARRIS. The rifles manufactured are different from the ones used during the war?

General PEIRCE. No, sir; we used two rifles during the war, one the Springfield rifle of the model of 1903 and the other the model of 1917.

Senator HARRIS. I am referring to the Springfield now.

General PEIRCE. That is this one.

Senator HARRIS. Do you need those rifles? Have you not enough left over from the war to last?

General PEIRCE. Yes; we have a very large stock. This is simply asked for for the purpose of a continuation of the operation of the Springfield Armory; otherwise we will have to close it down.

Senator HARRIS. How many men are employed there now?

General PEIRCE. Less than 400, and it probably will go down to 300 or under.

Senator HARRIS. If we reduce that to \$150,000 now, could you not hold a skeleton organization that you could build up in case of necessity?

General PEIRCE. Not all of the employees there, of course, would be engaged in the manufacture of the rifles. The armory has one other function, an issuing function, as well as a manufacturing function. But we do not figure that we could operate the manufacturing plant at a less rate than 30 rifles a day without going to a prohibitive cost; as it is, the manufacture has been concentrated in a few buildings, and a considerable part of the plant would be absolutely closed up anyway.

Senator WADSWORTH. You have a small rifle manufactory at Rock Island?

General PEIRCE. Yes.

Senator WADSWORTH. That is closed down now?

General PEIRCE. Absolutely closed down, except that they are at present doing a little repairing there. But there is no manufacturing going on.

NUMBER OF RIFLES ON HAND.

Senator HITCHCOCK. How many rifles have we on hand?

General PEIRCE. About 2,000,000 of the model of 1917 rifle, which was the modified Enfield rifle we procured during this war, and about 800,000, I should say, of the Springfield rifle.

Senator HITCHCOCK. Did you develop any difference between them as to efficiency?

Senator WADSWORTH. The Springfield rifle was always regarded as being a little better. We could not make that rifle fast enough.

General PEIRCE. There were three large factories equipped to produce the Enfield, and only Springfield and Rock Island equipped to produce the Springfield model of 1903.

Senator SPENCER. Is the ammunition interchangeable?

General PEIRCE. Yes, sir.

Senator WADSWORTH. This all comes down to the matter of policy. Of course, we do not need the 30 rifles a day that you would make?

General PEIRCE. No.

Senator WADSWORTH. It is only keeping a little organization going so that it will not perish.

Senator HARRIS. That is what I was trying to develop, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that 150 men would be a pretty good organization. They ought to be able to build up from that. You use how many now?

General PEIRCE. There are about 400 there now.

Senator HITCHCOCK. How many of those are really manufacturing rifles?

General PEIRCE. I should say that probably 100 of those employees are engaged in other—nonmanufacturing—work.

Senator WADSWORTH. You expect to run about 200 men in the actual production?

General PEIRCE. Yes.

Senator WADSWORTH. That includes the semiautomatic rifle work?

General PEIRCE. Yes; everything in the manufacturing way.

Senator WADSWORTH. That is experimental work?

General PEIRCE. Yes. It is tool-room work, pure and simple. They are making models.

Senator WADSWORTH. Of course, that is important, that experimenting in plans?

General PEIRCE. Yes. I was at Springfield just before the war when it was at the lowest point that it had ever been, and we were turning out then 75 rifles a day. We found it difficult to see how we could go to a less number and still run the plant without the cost being prohibitive. We are figuring it down now by concentrating the machines and machine tools, and closing down a large part of the plant, thereby shutting off the heat and power and light so that we can get down to 30 a day, and still operate.

Senator HITCHCOCK. That makes a pretty expensive rifle.

General PEIRCE. Yes; it makes the rifle cost about \$30.

Senator HITCHCOCK. What are other countries doing in the manufacture of rifles—Great Britain, France, and Italy?

General PEIRCE. That I have not any definite information on.

Senator HITCHCOCK. Have they not quit?

General PEIRCE. I do not think they have, sir; not any more than we have. I think they are down to as small a basis as they can run on.

Senator HITCHCOCK. Is there anything about the manufacture of this rifle that is such a specialty that men, expert machinists, could not take it up?

General PEIRCE. Yes; there is. There are things about an instrument of that sort that is almost impossible to put on paper, that the workman learns, and really carries under his hat, and we find that wherever a plant of that kind has been closed and the force has been entirely dissipated, it takes a surprisingly long time to collect a new force and get it into satisfactory production.

Senator HITCHCOCK. During the war we did succeed in making several million rifles on rather short notice, did we not?

General PEIRCE. We did, sir; but the only reason they were able to do that was that they had three very large factories, of great capacity and employing many thousands of men, who had been producing this Enfield rifle for more than a year prior to our entrance into the war. Those three factories could be thrown at once onto the production of the modified Enfield, and the modifications were so slight in character that they did not affect the production materially.

Senator HITCHCOCK. Suppose we should actually become engaged in war during the next 10 years, some time; we would have something to start with, something like 3,000,000 rifles. Would we not be able, with that great number to start with, to organize and start in the manufacture, even if we dropped it now, with ordinary good mechanics and experts, in a short time?

General PEIRCE. Of course, to begin with, we would not have the 3,000,000 rifles by that time. There is a certain wastage every year of the stock on hand. I can say that it took a year and a half—about a year and a half—for those factories that I spoke of to get really into production after they started, with all the pressure that there was upon them in the war, before we got into it. It also took us, at Springfield, almost a year to get into full production there, with the war pressure on us. So that these things are not easy. You can not make as much haste as it would seem possible to make. In those times everything makes for delay and nothing makes for acceleration.

Senator HITCHCOCK. You estimate you will make 30 rifles a day there at a cost of \$30 apiece?

General PEIRCE. \$30.

Senator HITCHCOCK. Is that correct?

General PEIRCE. That is 10,000 rifles.

Senator HITCHCOCK. So that it takes \$900 a day really to manufacture rifles that you do not need, virtually for the purpose of keeping men trained for the purpose of manufacture?

General PEIRCE. Keeping the plant alive; yes, sir.

Senator HARRIS. Could you not arrange to have those men manufacture something else and hold your organization together, and let them be at work on something we need instead of on something we do not need? Is there not anything else that you could manufacture?

General PEIRCE. There is nothing else in the ordnance line that that plant would be equipped for making for which we have any more money, at least, than we have for rifles. That is a plant that is specially designed, laid out, and equipped for the manufacture of rifles. Not only the type of machines but the number required for the different operations are all calculated, and the location and sequence of the machines as placed is determined on that basis, so that it does not lend itself to other purposes.

Senator HITCHCOCK. Are you operating more than one plant?

General PEIRCE. No, sir.

Senator HITCHCOCK. Just that at Springfield?

General PEIRCE. Just at Springfield. The Rock Island plant is closed down.

Senator HITCHCOCK. What was the pre-war manufacture at Springfield?

General PEIRCE. As I said, the lowest that they had ever gotten, to my knowledge, was 75 rifles a day. That was just before the war.

Senator HITCHCOCK. At what cost was that?

General PEIRCE. That was around \$17, Senator, at that time.

Senator WADSWORTH. Wages have gone up in the meantime. Wages have practically doubled?

Senator HITCHCOCK. You said there were 700 men manufacturing ammunition. Does that mean all kinds of ammunition for all purposes?

General PEIRCE. That was the entire activity at Frankford. For instance, there are various kinds of small-arms ammunition, and there are also made there optical instruments and fuses for field artillery. That number was the entire number.

Senator HITCHCOCK. That is, those 700 men were not working on ammunition entirely?

General PEIRCE. No, sir.
 Senator HITCHCOCK. What number were working on ammunition?
 General PEIRCE. I have not an estimate of that. Major Harris says there were about 300.

Senator HITCHCOCK. Does that mean—have we any other men employed in the manufacture of ammunition than the 300?
 Major HARRIS. No, sir; Frankford is the only place we make the small-arms ammunition.

Senator HITCHCOCK. Then, what you had there were employed on ammunition for artillery and other purposes?

General PEIRCE. The only thing done in that line is the manufacture of some fuses, which is at Frankford, and some development work at Picatinny Arsenal in the manufacture of experimental shells and fuses. There is no artillery ammunition and there is no artillery shell being made for service.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, before the Senate votes upon this matter, I should like to make an inquiry for information. I had an idea that the private manufacturers of rifles in the United States—Colt, Remington, Savage, and so forth—had brought the art to a very high state of perfection. Is there so very much difference between the manufacture of an Army rifle—I mean, as a matter of the art—and the manufacture of rifles for hunting purposes, in which, perhaps, we may not lead the world, but we are certainly in the front rank of manufacturing arms of that character?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is the question directed to me?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I shall be very glad to have the information from any source. I had an idea that in case of necessity we might be able to get skilled labor from those who have been employed in manufacturing arms in private establishments.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is my judgment, Mr. President. I do not think it will take many months to take any skilled artisan engaged in rifle manufacture or arms manufacture in any private establishment and drill him into this manufacture. In fact, we did that very thing during the war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; Mr. President; we did not do that very thing during the war. We did almost the opposite. We found that we could not make in the United States military rifles of our own pattern, and what we had to resort to was this: We found that two companies in the United States, prior to our entrance into the war, had after two years of struggle in their shops, learned how to make the British military rifle, and we had to adopt that. We could not make our own rifle, after we went into the war, outside of the Springfield armory. There must be some difference between the manufacture of a military rifle and that of a sporting rifle, because none of the plants that make the sporting rifle could be converted into the making of the military rifle. In fact, we went to the other extreme, and asked the plants that were making a military rifle for Great Britain to stop making them for Great Britain here in the United States and make them for us. They had taken two years to build up their organizations fit to make a military rifle. We seized their organizations, as it were, and made them turn out rifles for us.

That accounts for 2,000,000 of the 2,800,000 rifles we now have on hand. Two millions of the rifles to which the Senator from Nebraska refers are British-model rifles, not Springfield rifles. They have been rechambered and recalibered to fit our ammunition, but they are a British model. They can not be made again in this country, and they can not be made anywhere else, because there is not a factory in the world that is now tooled to make those rifles. Of course, they are going to last us a long time; there is no doubt about that; but when the time comes when we shall need rifles, somewhere, some day—and I fear we shall, somewhere, some day—I hope that we shall have at least a little nucleus of men that know how to make the Springfield rifle, the best rifle in the world.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, it is true that of these 2,800,000 rifles we have on hand, 2,000,000 are the adapted Enfield rifle. They shoot the same ammunition, and they have the same results the old Springfield had. There are the lovers of the Springfield rifle, and the advocates of it, who think it is a little better, but the two rifles have substantially the same range, as was demonstrated during the war. They have a little better range, as I recall, than the German Army rifle. We have on hand 2,800,000 interchangeable rifles, shooting the same ammunition, whether they are called Springfields or Enfields. The testimony before the committee showed that at the time we went into the war there were three factories in the United States making this Enfield rifle. They had been making the Enfield rifle for the use of the British, but shortly after we went into the war they began manufacturing the Enfield rifle for us, using the same sized ammunition we were using in our Springfield rifle. Our soldiers used those rifles effectively, their range was found good, their accuracy was beyond any criticism, and we have them now. To say that the manufacture of Springfield rifles is likely to become a lost art, and that we could not take it up if many years from now we were involved in a war, and

the present supply of rifles should fail, is to my mind unreasonable. Certainly, for the outbreak of any war we have more rifles on hand than we have of any other supply, and it is not conceivable that at the outbreak of a war we would need over the 2,800,000 we now have on hand. They might become obsolete; there may be a better rifle at that time, but those rifles are as good as now exist in the world, and that supply certainly is an ample provision for any possible war. I think, taking into account the fact that we are trying to do away with war, it probably is very excessive.

I read a few lines of the testimony before the committee:

Senator HITCHCOCK. Are you operating more than one plant?

General PEIRCE. No, sir.

Senator HITCHCOCK. Just that at Springfield?

General PEIRCE. Just at Springfield. The Rock Island plant is closed down.

Senator HITCHCOCK. What was the pre-war manufacture at Springfield?

General PEIRCE. As I said, the lowest that they had ever gotten, to my knowledge, was 75 rifles a day. That was just before the war.

Senator HITCHCOCK. At what cost was that?

General PEIRCE. That was around \$17, Senator, at that time.

I call attention to the fact that they are being manufactured now at a cost of \$30. Prior to that this testimony was given:

Senator HITCHCOCK. How many rifles have we on hand?

General PEIRCE. About 2,000,000 of the model of 1917 rifle, which was the modified Enfield rifle we procured during this war, and about 800,000, I should say, of the Springfield rifle.

Senator HITCHCOCK. Did you develop any difference between them as to efficiency?

Senator WADSWORTH. The Springfield rifle was always regarded as being a little better. We could not make that rifle fast enough.

General PEIRCE. There were three large factories equipped to produce the Enfield, and only Springfield and Rock Island equipped to produce the Springfield model of 1903.

Senator PEIRCE. Is the ammunition interchangeable?

General PEIRCE. Yes, sir.

Senator WADSWORTH. This all comes down to the matter of policy. Of course, we do not need the 30 rifles a day that you would make?

General PEIRCE. No.

Senator WADSWORTH. It is only keeping a little organization going so that it will not perish.

That is the issue. If the Congress feels justified, in an appropriation bill, as a matter of policy, keeping the organization of men manufacturing rifles that are not needed, those in favor of that item will support this provision.

Mr. BORAH. How many men are employed there, and in possession of this art of making rifles, how many experts?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. My recollection is that there are 300, but I am not entirely sure of that.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is correct.

Mr. BORAH. Suppose a war should come, and we should need that rifle; we would have only 300 men in the United States who knew how to make it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That would be the conclusion.

Mr. BORAH. That would not do us any good.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I can not see that this is anything more than employing men to manufacture something which, after it is manufactured, might as well be thrown into the ocean.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the arsenal under consideration happens to be in the State which my colleague and I represent. As the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has said, it is one of the oldest, perhaps the oldest arsenal in the United States, I think certainly the oldest establishment for the manufacture of fine military rifles.

I do not sympathize with the doctrine of disarmament by example, disarming the United States alone, when no other country is disarming. Nor am I in sympathy with the idea, which is, no doubt, founded in fact to a certain extent, that if we close this arsenal down and should need rifles, we could probably buy them from some other country. I think it is better to have them made here; that it is very important that we should maintain that industry in making those military rifles, which are made nowhere else in the United States. I believe it is generally regarded that the Springfield new model is the best rifle there is, and I think it very important that this industry should not be extinguished.

As the Senator from New York has pointed out, it took two years to get some of the factories which made sporting rifles into condition to make military rifles, and although 300 men may be a small number, you have there the expert knowledge which makes it possible to expand it very rapidly if you need expansion.

I think it is somewhat like saying, "We are not at war; we are not likely to be at war, and as it costs a good deal of money to fire the guns on board ship, why do it?" If anything should go wrong, it is very desirable to have some men in the United States who are not foreigners who do know how to fire the big guns on board ship.

The economy which would destroy this industry is the kind of economy from which this country has suffered frightfully

every time it has had a war. It means the abolishing of all preparation, and we know how frightfully that has cost us every time we have been unfortunately obliged to go to war. I believe it would be a great economic mistake, and no advantage to the cause of peace to break up that group of expert workmen, just as I think it would be an intolerable mistake to break up our Army or our Marine Corps.

I hope for that reason that this arsenal, which has always done such good work, which has these trained men, will, on a very small scale, be maintained.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from New York if any of the large nations of the world have abandoned the business of manufacturing military arms.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no information on that score; I do not know.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If we adopt this amendment, does it mean that the United States would go out of the business of manufacturing arms?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; military rifles. We would make no more.

ATTORNEY GENERAL DAUGHERTY—THE MORSE CASE.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three editorials which I shall read may be published in the RECORD in 8-point type as a part of my remarks.

The first is from the New York World of to-day, the first column on the editorial page, under the headline, "Sharing the blame." It reads:

SHARING THE BLAME.

"Glutted with normalcy, the esteemed Tribune hysterically implores Congress to adjourn at once in order to save the November elections and protect the administration's prestige. It regards the situation as so serious that it appeals to the President to intervene long enough to get the Senators and Representatives out of Washington.

"If that were done, if the tariff and the bonus were put aside, the Tribune thinks that Republican control of the next Congress would be made secure, and the administration would be able to carry out its "future program," whatever that may be.

"But to what good? If the Republicans carry Congress in the fall the Sixty-eighth Congress will have the same leaders as the Sixty-seventh Congress, unless Republican luck should bring about the defeat of the Lodges, the McCumbers, the Fordneys, and the Mondells. Even in that event their successors would be equally dull-minded reactionaries who had achieved leadership through seniority, and the legislative branch of the Government would be in the same mess that it is now.

"Bad as Congress is, its adjournment would not transform Mr. Harding into a leader. Neither would it vindicate Attorney General Daugherty or establish public confidence in Secretary Fall or reduce taxation or whitewash NEWBERY or change by so much as a comma the record on which the Republicans must make their appeal to the country in November.

"It is easy to abuse Congress, but Congresses differ from one another less than most people think. The average of intelligence does not change much, however majorities change. The difference between a competent Congress and an incompetent Congress is mainly a matter of leadership, and the American party system has vested the leadership in the President.

"Given a Congress of his own party, a President who knows what he wants done can usually manage to get it done. The country may not be satisfied with the achievement, but it will know what it is voting about when it goes to the polls, and the party in power will have something on which it can ask for a vote of confidence.

"The failure of the Sixty-seventh Congress has been almost wholly a failure in leadership, and the full responsibility goes further back than Mr. Harding's nomination. In order to manufacture a fictitious issue against Mr. Wilson the Senators who controlled the Republican National Convention in 1920 set up the fiction that Mr. Wilson was a tyrant and a despot who had tried to overthrow the legislative branch of the Government. In order to carry out this myth Mr. Harding abdicated all claim to leadership long in advance of his election. The President was to go his way and Congress was to go its way, but the communion of the 'best minds' would make it certain that both would be going in the same direction at the same time.

"The usurpation argument against Mr. Wilson was thoroughly dishonest, but the Republican Senators maintained it so vigorously that Mr. Harding has never dared to assert himself as leader of the party, and as a result Congress is in the worst muddle that the country has seen for a generation. The muddle

will continue until Mr. Harding becomes the leader of his party in fact as well as name or there is a new administration.

"A Congress that is left to drift is bound to drift. There have been times when the leadership within Congress was strong enough to hold it to a consistent program even when the Executive was weak, but there has been no instance in which Congress was able to function with any degree of intelligence when both the Executive and congressional leadership was flabby.

"Governor Miller, of New York, has made a convincing demonstration of the capacity of a strong, capable leader to obtain extraordinary results from a mediocre legislature. If Mr. Harding had been a Nathan L. Miller the record of the Sixty-seventh Congress would have been radically different. That is the whole story, and Mr. Harding can not get rid of his own responsibilities merely by getting rid of Congress. Whatever blame there is for the record, he must share it."

From the independent Philadelphia Record editorial page of to-day I read an editorial, in the second column, appearing under the headline—

BALLINGER AND DAUGHERTY.

"When the New York World says that 'the Attorney General has already become the Ballinger of the Harding administration,' it seems to us to be doing rather an injustice to the gentleman who was President Taft's first Secretary of the Interior. Ballinger was never a person of much importance or influence, and previous to his appointment to the Cabinet was no better known to the American public than he has been since he dropped into oblivion. He was not a politician of commanding authority, and hailed from one of the smallest States of the Union—Washington—so far as prestige is concerned.

"The charge against Ballinger, and the one which drove him from office, was that he unduly favored large interests which desired to exploit the natural resources of Alaska. If there were any partisan complications in the case they have been forgotten.

"Harry M. Daugherty is a much more formidable figure in every way. He has been a leading politician of Ohio for many years, and it was through his backing that Warren G. Harding was brought out as a presidential candidate, though having little strength either in his own State or in the country at large."

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, I dislike to interrupt the Senator, but I wish to call his attention to the rapt attention he is receiving from the other side of the Chamber at this time. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is one who can afford to hear it without a cringe and without a blush, and for that reason he is here. But the others have gone.

There is an animal called the ostrich, who sometimes puts his head in the sand and fancies he is not seen, although in that way he makes other portions of his anatomy only the more prominent. There are those who put their fingers in their ears and fancy they have silenced the accusing voice, because having made themselves dumb they no longer hear it. Gentlemen may hide their heads in the sand and put their fingers in their ears, but along about November in thunder tones they will hear, "Daugherty!" "Daugherty!" "Daugherty!"

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Continuing the editorial which was so pleasantly and pertinently interrupted by my brilliant friend from Kentucky, I read:

"He"—

That is, Daugherty—

"had an active part in nominating Mr. Harding at Chicago and in managing his campaign. It was in gratitude for these services and because of their long personal friendship that the President selected him for the Cabinet, despite the vigorous opposition to his choice.

"Daugherty differs from Ballinger largely in his much greater powers for mischief. With his low standards of public morality and his belief in the efficacy of practical politics he is accused of turning the Department of Justice into a political machine. If he has failed to prosecute war grafters the suspicion is that these grafters have some pull, either as prominent Republicans or in some other way, and that he is protecting them. His connection with the Morse case is unsavory because of the trickery used in persuading President Taft to pardon that notorious person. In his year and a quarter in the Department of Justice he has not a single notable achievement to his credit so far as the public is aware. This record is in striking contrast with that of his predecessors.

"Ballinger was a weakling in comparison with the sinister figure of the Attorney General, the practical political manager,

corporation agent, and wirepuller. If Mr. Harding is wise he will give heed to public sentiment on this subject. To imitate General Grant's example and stand by friends, whether good or bad, will be suicidal. Harry M. Daugherty is capable of bringing much greater discredit upon his administration than Ballinger ever did upon President Taft."

From the Baltimore Sun of to-day I read from the editorial page, as follows:

THE WHITWASH OF SILENCE.

"To whitewash a fence in springtime is an excellent idea. It makes it look better, and if it is a bit rotten it conceals the evidence of decay. To whitewash a public official at any time of the year is a foolish thing, and it is especially foolish when an election is coming on.

"The Republican majority in the House of Representatives is making this mistake with regard to Attorney General Daugherty. The two Republicans who have been demanding an investigation of the causes of the Attorney General's delay in prosecuting war frauds and war grafters are suppressed in the interest of party repute, and the whitewash brush and the wholesome and attractive aspect to the Attorney General's domains.

"There may be nothing to hide, but the political friends of Mr. Daugherty are doing their best to create the impression that there is something back of the charges that will not bear investigation. One of the names that will be heard most frequently from every stump in the congressional campaign will be that of Mr. Harding's reputed mentor and close friend, Mr. Daugherty, of Ohio."

Another of these great daily papers says that among the 40 rooms which Daugherty has rented for his prosecuting staff, one ought to be devoted to himself, in order that he may be investigated as to the trickery and fraud and the perjury committed in the case of the notorious criminal, Charles W. Morse.

Mr. President, the office of Attorney General is one of the highest in importance. It ought to be filled by a lawyer who is capable and who is honest. It ought to be filled by a man who is worthy to wear the shoes of Edmund Randolph, of William Wirt, of Hugh Legare, of Reverdy Johnson, of Jeremiah Black, and many brilliant and able lawyers who have filled that office so worthily. It ought to be filled by a man who is proud of the profession that gave to the world such glorious lawyers as Ulpian and Tully, whose names come ringing down the corridor of time; such men as Sir Samuel Romilly and Thomas Erskine; such men as Daniel Webster and Henry Clay. The office ought to be filled by a man whose conception of his profession is that it is one of the noblest that ever a man embraced, giving him splendid opportunities to protect the widow in her rights and the persecuted man in his liberties.

I have heard in my life many a sweet word, but outside of my own domestic circle I have never heard sweeter words than the verdict of a jury, which gave me the right to put back into the hands of a mother the child which she was about to lose, or back in the arms of his wife the man who was being tried for a capital offense. "We, the jury, find the defendant not guilty," are words which every lawyer loves to hear, when he feels that he has been pleading the cause of the innocent.

Mr. President, this Attorney General thinks that he can draw around himself the cloak of mystery and maintain unbroken silence when almost every newspaper in the land is clamoring for him to speak, and when the voters already are on their way to the polls to pronounce their verdict.

Mr. President, the newspapers inform us that the noble efforts of Republican Congressmen JOHNSON and WOODRUFF to get an investigation of the Department of Justice have been choked down in the other House. That is another of the blunders Mr. Daugherty is making. The American people admire a man who will face his enemies and who, if he has to go down, will go down fighting, like the sailor on the battleship and the soldier on the battle line. They do not love a man who skulks, who slinks away, who will not face his enemies, who will not answer material charges when made by persons responsible, as they have been made here on the floor of the Senate by representatives of great sovereign States.

Mr. Daugherty has been charged again and again with having falsified as to the Morse case and his connection with it, and he does not answer because he can not. He has been charged with having ordered the release of the British ship *J. M. Young*, which had come into New York Harbor with a cargo of liquor, in violation of the Federal statutes. It has been charged that T. B. Felder, the unspeakably corrupt crook, came here to Washington City and prevailed upon the Attorney General to telegraph to New York to have the proceedings dismissed and the liquor restored to those who had it in charge. He has been specifically charged with having ordered the release of \$200,000 worth of wine seized in up-State New York.

The wine was released, although those who had it were violating the law of the land. He has been charged with having stopped the proceedings against four or five dry agents who had proven recreant to their trust, and had illegally released 2,000,000 gallons of whisky in New York.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—
Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STANLEY. Has the Senator read the great and highly unctuous address of the Attorney General to the Bar Association of America at Cincinnati?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. If the Senator from Kentucky is alluding to the most recent one, I have not read it.

Mr. STANLEY. It is a most devout address. I understand that he submitted it to the head of a great propaganda in favor of more drastic sumptuary legislation for his approval before it was given to the Associated Press. Now, in all fairness, does the Senator from Georgia believe that a multitude of dry words ought to excuse a few wet acts?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. We are told in Holy Writ that even the devil may quote Scripture, and if he can do that, he may also preach sermons.

Mr. President, another one of these definite charges hurled at the Attorney General from this floor, whose records he says he does not read, and with whose daily paper he had better become more familiar, perhaps, is that he caused the pardon of an Ohio millionaire who had violated the Federal law known as the Mann Act, the victim being a little 15-year-old girl. What reason could any honorable lawyer give for recommending a pardon in such a case? A crime like that proceeds from deliberation, premeditation, full consciousness of guilt, full consciousness of the penalty about to be risked; and when that penalty falls upon him, as the law requires, it is the Attorney General, acting officially, who has the President pardon him. My God! what kind of reason did the Attorney General give the President of the United States for clemency in a case like that?

Mr. President, the young man who gave to me the information for which, as Senators will remember, I did not vouch when I stated it here on the floor of the Senate, but which I merely called to the attention of the Attorney General, and which he has not noticed, was so imprudent as to go to my office without looking around to see whether or not he was being shadowed.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] says that the Attorney General has had a negro shadowing him. I do not know and I do not care whether there is anybody shadowing me. I have no secrets to hide, even if Mr. Daugherty has. I have nothing to conceal from the agents of W. J. Burns, the great detective, who left Georgia in a hurry after his nefarious conduct in the Leo Frank case. He just did get away in time.

As I was saying, Mr. President, this young man was so indiscreet as to visit my office without noticing whether or not he was being followed, but in 15 minutes after he left my office he had been nabbed by one of the Burns men and put in jail. For what? For having passed, as they allege, a bad check for \$30 a year and a half ago. The sleeping dog suddenly woke up when the young man visited my office. The old case was suddenly revived, the resurrection and the life came into it. In 15 minutes after he left my office, and he is now in jail. This morning he was carried before Judge McCoy, of the District of Columbia Supreme Court. They were trying to railroad him back to Ohio, the State where the hotel is located on which he imposed, as alleged, with a \$30 check a year and a half ago.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. KING. I should judge from what the Senator stated in his last sentence that if an offense had been committed it was against the laws of the State. If that be true, what jurisdiction did Mr. Burns or the Federal officials have over this young man?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. None whatever, Mr. President, as I understand the law. It is merely a "strong-arm method."

Well, this young man was taken before Justice McCoy, of the District of Columbia Supreme Court. He asked the judge for a continuation of his hearing on the extradition proceedings until this morning. He believed that he was being "framed up," and most Senators will so believe. The country at large will ask why this sudden action on the old case, a year and a half old, about a little \$30 check? Why the arrest of this man so soon after he had been to a Senator's office? I did not give his name away, but they must have run him down. The detectives, when they saw him go to my office, believed that he was the man who gave me the information.

He sent a request through one of the members of the press gallery urging me to come to see him this afternoon before the prison closed at 5 o'clock. I promised to go, and made ready

to go; but my latest information is that the Cleveland police authorities have decided to drop their charges against him. I am told that the Cleveland detectives returned this afternoon without him. The lawyer of the young man says that this conduct substantiates the young man's charge that he is being "framed up" to keep him from telling me and other Senators all that he knows about Felder and Daugherty.

Mr. President, can this Attorney General remain silent after an accusation like this? Do they think the country has no sense of honor? Do they think public indignation has lost the power to lash public men with its scorpion whip? Do they think that public sentiment can be defied? Are people always going to be patient when rich men who debauch little children of 15 years old are turned out and poor men are kept in jail for having said a few words which did no harm? Let them not think it. The country is aroused, and the country will be heard from in the election.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10871) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to the amendment reported by the committee, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as heretofore as to the transfer of my pair, I vote "yea."

Mr. NEW (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to the transfer of my pair which I made on the previous vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. WATSON of Indiana (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the last vote with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. EDGE. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] and vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Washington (after having voted in the negative). The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent, and I am paired with him for the day. I find I can transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES]. I do so, and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. Not being able to secure a transfer, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HALE. Making the same announcement as heretofore with regard to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. HARRISON. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New Jersey has not voted.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have a general pair with that Senator, and in his absence, being unable to secure a transfer of the pair, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. STERLING (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD], and allow my vote to stand.

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

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]; and

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL].

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Borah	Harrison	King	Stanley
Caraway	Hefflin	La Follette	Underwood
Dial	Hitchcock	Ransdell	Watson, Ga.
Gerry	Jones, N. Mex.	Robinson	
Harris	Kendrick	Simmons	

NAYS—47.

Ashurst	Calder	Cummins	Edge
Brandeger	Cameron	Curtis	Ernst
Bursum	Capper	Dillingham	France

Hale	McLean	Pepper
Johnson	McNary	Phipps
Jones, Wash.	Myers	Poin Dexter
Kellogg	Nelson	Pomerene
Ladd	New	Rawson
Lenroot	Newberry	Sheppard
Lodge	Norris	Shortridge
McCumber	Oddie	Smoot
McKinley	Page	Spencer

NOT VOTING—31.

Ball	Fletcher	Moses	Smith
Broussard	Frelinghuysen	Nicholson	Stanfield
Colt	Glass	Norbeck	Swanson
Crow	Gooding	Overman	Trammell
Culberson	Harreld	Owen	Walsh, Mont.
du Pont	Keyes	Pittman	Weller
Elkins	McCormick	Reed	Williams
Fernald	McKellar	Shields	

So Mr. HITCHCOCK's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may we now go back to the first amendment which was passed over, commencing on page 15? It has to do with the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Regular Army.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if we can have a test vote upon the amendment on page 24, so far as I am individually concerned I shall not desire to delay the matter further. I do not know whether any other Senator desires to discuss this question or not, but the circumstances are such that I shall not undertake to discuss it this afternoon. If I can have a yeas-and-nays vote upon that amendment, I shall be content to let the matter go. That will test the question of the size of the Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It will.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, does the Senator now refer to the item commencing on line 15?

Mr. BORAH. Line 15, page 24.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator if that amendment is rejected whether that would automatically reduce the Army to the number provided in the House bill?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; 115,000. Upon that, Mr. President, if the Senator in charge of the bill is willing that we shall have a vote at this time, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I have no objection, of course, to the yeas and nays. I think for the purpose of the Record, at least, and possibly for the information of Senators, I should make a statement concerning the enlisted strength of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, the yeas-and-nays vote is desired upon the amendment on lines 15 to 21 on page 24.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The amendment is to strike out and substitute. The amendment really extends from line 5 to line 21, inclusive.

Mr. President, the House provides specifically for a Regular Army of 115,000 men. When I use the term "Regular Army" and discuss these figures, I exclude the Philippine Scouts, as they are not included in this appropriation, "Pay of enlisted men." In passing, I may say that the strength of the Philippine Scouts is 6,991 men. Let us call it 7,000 for easy figuring.

The House, as I said, provides for a strength of 115,000 American Regulars. The present authorized strength, in accordance with the terms of the Army appropriation bill passed nearly a year ago, is 150,000 American Regulars. The present actual strength of the Regulars is 134,000 men, 16,000 below the authorized strength of 150,000.

The reason for the Army having fallen so far below the strength authorized by the Congress for the fiscal year 1922, and appropriated for by the Congress for the fiscal year 1922, is that the appropriation for transportation of the Army for this fiscal year, 1922, was so drastically cut that the Army recruiting service has had to confine its efforts for the last six months or so to recruiting only in the immediate vicinity of Army posts, where the recruits, as they were picked up by the recruiting parties, could be sent on their own feet or in an Army automobile to the Army post. For several months past there has been no fund available for the transportation of recruits from the centers of population to the recruiting depots, the transportation item having been exhausted. That accounts for the decrease of the Army by 16,000 men below the authorized and appropriated for strength. This bill proposes that the average strength of the Regular Army, exclusive of the Philippine Scouts, shall be for the next fiscal year, 1923, the total of 133,000 men, 1,000 less than we actually have to-day, and 17,000 less than the Congress authorized as of to-day.

Their distribution, roughly speaking, would be somewhat as follows: Overseas, exclusive of troops on the Rhine, there would be, in round figures, 30,000 men. That includes the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, which is a part of the Regular Army, and, roughly, there are 1,400 men on the island of Porto Rico. It includes the garrison at Panama, which is to be fixed at 10,000 men. It includes the garrison at Hawaii, which should be 15,000 men. It includes in the Philippine Islands approximately 3,000 white Regular Americans. There are to-day in the Philippine Islands, let me say, a little over 6,500 white troops. It is the purpose of the department to bring back about half of them to continental United States, or else to Hawaii, and to reduce the Philippine white garrison to a trifle over 3,000.

There would be 570 men in China, stationed at Tientsin, guarding the railway communication between Tientsin and Peking, in accordance with an arrangement made following the Boxer troubles in 1902.

There would be 558 men as the entire garrison of Alaska. These total in the neighborhood of 30,000 men overseas, outside of the continental limits of the United States, leaving for the United States approximately 103,000 men of all arms and branches, overhead, noncombatant, nonmobile, and mobile troops of every kind and description.

Of the 102,000 or 103,000 men to be stationed in and over the United States approximately 25,000, or one-fourth of them, are stationed along or near the Mexican border, in the States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California.

Excluding the border contingents, which can not be reduced when one considers that they cover a frontier of 1,900 miles, we will have then in the United States for general purposes, to meet any kind of an emergency which may arise, and for which Federal troops may be used, about 77,000 men, including all overhead. Now I want to tell the Senate about the overhead and about the noncombatant troops, whose numbers must be deducted from this total number of available troops.

The use of chemical warfare has been denied by treaty. So the chemical-warfare contingent, numbering 403 men, not a very impressive contingent, may I say to the Senator from Idaho, must be subtracted.

The Coast Artillery Corps mans the seacoast fortifications, and can not be sent away. There are 9,088 of them in the United States.

There are 5,754 enlisted men in the Army detached from organized units and attached to the units of the National Guard, or Organized Reserves, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in the several schools, colleges, and universities, and at the service schools, engaged directly or indirectly in these services in assisting in the teaching of citizen soldiers.

In the Finance Department, a noncombatant branch, there are 426 men.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, are the men in the item last mentioned but one, 5,754 men, enlisted men or enlisted men and officers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are all enlisted men. I am speaking of nothing but enlisted men.

Mr. KING. Are there not a great many officers employed in teaching in the various colleges?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are, but not as many officers as men.

Mr. KING. Are they embraced within the 5,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; I am speaking only of enlisted men. There are 5,754 enlisted men engaged upon a character of work which is of exceeding value, and which is tremendously appreciated by the citizen components of the Army of the United States, the Organized Reserves, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and the National Guard.

The medical department numbers 6,649 enlisted men. The Ordnance Department, a noncombatant branch, numbers 3,343 enlisted men. The Quartermaster Corps, which, generally speaking, is known as a noncombatant branch, but a portion of which, of course, accompanies combat troops into the field for purposes of supply, numbers 9,814.

The figures I am giving are the numbers in the noncombatant or nonmobile or overhead detachments or branches in the United States, and the sum total of them must be subtracted from the 77,000 men who are available all over the United States for any kind of emergency after the further deduction of 25,000 men along the border, and adding up these overhead, nonmobile, and noncombatant troops, we find that they foot up to 35,477.

Subtracting them from approximately 77,000 men, you find that you have not quite 40,000 men in the United States who can be used as a striking force outside of and in addition to the 25,000 men along the border.

Counting the men along the border, 25,000, and the other mobile, combatant, striking troops, scattered all over this great continent, under the terms of the Senate committee bill you will have only 65,000 men.

Some people say that we should disarm still further than that. I can not see it. I think we have reached rock-bottom. I would not advocate for one moment reducing the overseas garrisons below 30,000 men. The men who I have estimated will be available for use in the United States include the men now in Germany, brought back here; they include 3,500 men now in the Philippines to be brought back here. Everything is included. All subtractions are made. The last estimate is laid before you. I submit, Senators, that America should not decrease her forces any lower than they are decreased. In my judgment it would be folly to do so. Already the Regular Army finds it almost impossible to carry on the missions and functions imposed upon it by the national defense act passed by Congress itself.

Reduce it any further and it will be absolutely necessary for the War Department and the Army to come to Congress and ask the Congress to restate its mission; ask the Congress, "Do you want us to maintain the overseas garrisons at proper strength? Do you want us to detach officers and men to help the guard and the Organized Reserves? Do you want us to man the few fortifications along the seacoast that we are now manning?" We are manning to-day only 25 out of 75 in continental United States. Fifty seacoast fortifications are to-day in the hands of caretakers with the guns not manned and no drill or training taking place in connection with them.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KING. The statement was made during the discussion over a year or two years ago by one of the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee, who reported the so-called fortifications bill, as I recall it, that much of the money which had been appropriated for fortifications was unnecessarily appropriated, and that a different plan ought to be adopted with respect to the fortifications. The idea which was conveyed, as I interpreted his remark, was that a different method of fortification was required, and that in view of the long-range guns, and in view of the submarines and aircraft, the present policy of maintaining the coast fortifications was somewhat impolitic and archaic. For my own information, I would like to inquire whether there has been any modification of those plans, or whether the Senator accedes to the accuracy of that view?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, it would take a military expert, a man of long experience and most ripe judgment, to comment intelligently on the question of the Senator from Utah. I am not competent to do it. I can say, however, for the Senator's information, that we are building no fortifications now, with the exception of three. We are building a very important fortification at Rockaway Beach to protect the city of New York, and we are mounting there a very small number of 16-inch rifles, which are about completed. They will be completed this summer, mounts and all.

At the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay, at Fort Story, it is proposed to mount a couple of 16-inch rifles, and it is proposed also at Panama to strengthen the fortifications at the entrance of the canal with 16-inch rifles, it now being conceded that the rifles at present at Panama are outranged by the rifles which the treaty on the limitation of naval armament permits foreign naval vessels to carry. Aside from those, no fortifications are being built. In order to show the Senate that certainly the committee can not be charged with extravagance, I am going to dissect portions of this bill for just a moment.

The bill now contains the old Army appropriation bill, the old West Point appropriation bill, and the old fortifications bill. Those bills provided for the military activities of the War Department. If you segregate from the pending bill those items which belong to last year's Army appropriation bill, including the appropriation for West Point, for last year West Point was put in the Army appropriation bill, you will find that this bill carries a total appropriation for those purposes of \$261,972,000.

Last year's appropriation for the very same and identical purpose amounted to \$327,688,000. In other words, for the military activities, the support of the Regular Army, all its fortifications, supplies, transportation, subsistence, and everything, including West Point and every conceivable military operation, the bill carries \$65,700,000 less than last year's bill, a direct saving in what might be termed armament or preparation for war—\$65,700,000.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will permit me, during the past year it has been presumed that there has been some of the liquidation process going on, and with the return to normalcy, to use President Harding's expression, there would be a material reduction in the expenses paid for the Army and for the Navy.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, the Senator can ascribe it to anything he wants to. I am stating facts. The pending bill carries \$65,700,000 below last year's bill, and is that far below last year's appropriations because the committee, in the first place, has agreed to a reduction of the Army from 150,000 to 133,000, and, in the second place, the pay schedules of the Army have been revised at a substantial saving. These are the two big reasons. The other things to which the Senator refers do not amount to a snap of the finger in saving in these matters.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I followed the Senator's very clear statement as to the condition in the Army, but I am not sure that I got it into my head thoroughly. After eliminating staff corps—I mean those corps that can not be used for defensive or guard purposes—and eliminating the number of men in the foreign service—and I agree thoroughly with the Senator in that I do not think that force can be reduced at this time—he stated that it left us 65,000 men.

Mr. WADSWORTH. At the maximum; and may I say that that is based upon a theory that not one of them is sick at any time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That includes the men on the border?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Eliminating the 25,000 men on the border from the 65,000 leaves 40,000 available men for police service in the States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Approximately.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is, under the terms of the pending bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If we reduce it to the number of men provided for by the House and assume that we have the same number in the border service, how many would it leave for police service in the country?

Mr. WADSWORTH. If we take the House figures?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Twenty-two thousand men would be left.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. For service throughout the States?

Mr. WADSWORTH. For the entire United States outside of the border.

Mr. BORAH. What is the size of the National Guard to-day?

Mr. WADSWORTH. One hundred and fifty thousand.

Mr. BORAH. It will be increased to 190,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Over a course of months. As the National Guard increases the Regular Army has been decreasing, but the proportion of decrease in the Regular Army is more gradual according to these figures than the increase in the National Guard. We have reduced the Regular Army from an authorized strength of 280,000 down to 133,000, as proposed in the bill.

Last year at this time when we were talking about the size of the Army and the bill was before the Senate, the Regular Army consisted of approximately 220,000 men. We reduced it by act of Congress in the appropriation bill to 150,000. We discharged 70,000 men in four months. It was a stupid thing to do, because it cost us more money than to have let them go out naturally. We had to pay six or seven million dollars in transportation for those men to get home, at an average of \$55 per man, but it had to be done for effect. So 70,000 men were thrown out and instantly the department started to recruit again. The Senate committee does not believe that is good business. We know it does not save a cent. The figures we adopt are the present approximate strength of the Army.

Mr. BORAH. It has resulted in reducing the Army to 133,000 men.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly; it would have been reduced if we had stopped recruiting.

Mr. BORAH. It would not have been reduced as promptly, however.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The method, however, was not a good one.

Mr. BORAH. It had the effect, however.

Mr. WADSWORTH. From a dollar and cents standpoint it was not a good method.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I am interested in the number of troops which will be available for striking purposes, as I understood the Senator's expression.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The mobile force.

Mr. KING. The actual troops. It seems from the Senator's figures that it needs one man extra for every soldier put in the field.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at all.

Mr. KING. Practically that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, no.

Mr. KING. I think so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator forgets the figures.

Mr. KING. Oh, no; I do not forget the figures.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator must have forgotten them.

Mr. KING. Very well, then, the Senator must have forgotten them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will read them again. The Senator from Utah has stated that it would require one overhead and supply man and noncombatant for each soldier.

Mr. KING. Substantially.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now, let us see. I stated that there are 35,000 men in the overhead, noncombatant, and nonmobile troops. There are 65,000, including the men on the border, for combatant purposes and mobile purposes.

Mr. KING. How many combatant troops will there be out of the 150,000, or whatever number is provided for in the bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. One hundred and thirty-three thousand is the average strength provided in the bill.

Mr. KING. Of course, that does not include officers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No.

Mr. KING. What proportion of those will be available for strictly military purposes? And when I say strictly military purposes I do not include the commissary department, the medical department, and so on.

Mr. WADSWORTH. About 65,000 men.

Mr. KING. Then we would get about one-half of the number for strictly military purposes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the United States, and there are 30,000 overseas.

Mr. KING. We have how many in the United States in the Medical Corps?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the Medical Corps?

Mr. KING. Yes. My recollection is that there are 6,000 privates in the Medical Corps. That does not take into account the officers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the Medical Corps there are 6,649.

Mr. KING. In continental America?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course some medical troops, some commissary troops, and so forth, go with the mobile troops in the field, but the great bulk are on the line of communication, to use a military term, and are not a part of the combat or striking forces.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know how many civilians are employed in the War Department?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. KING. In all branches of the military service, to be available for utilization in the military strength provided in the bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can give the exact number of people of civilian status under the War Department in and out of Washington compared with the number before the war and at the high peak.

Mr. KING. I am asking for the present number under the pending bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It will be somewhat less than the figures which I presented to the Senate. As I said, the committee has reduced the net number of civilian employees. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] can probably give some information about the reduction in the number of men.

Civilian employees in Washington at the time of the armistice were 37,406, and over the entire country, including Washington, there were 251,634. To-day there are in Washington, instead of 37,406, only 5,648.

Mr. KING. At the time of the armistice there were 4,000,000 men in the service.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator need not interrupt me. I understand that perfectly well.

Mr. KING. The Senator is furnishing information which I did not ask for and with which I am perfectly familiar. I am asking for the number of civilian employees.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I understand that I have the floor, and I am endeavoring to furnish information which might be of interest perhaps to others than the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. If the Senator desires to give information to others, I have no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. KING. I shall be glad if the Senator will give the information I asked for.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think if the Senator will be patient he will get it.

Mr. KING. I shall wait with supreme patience for the learned Senator to furnish the information I asked for.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I was stating the number of civilian employees of the War Department. I thought it might be of interest to show how that number has been reduced. At present in the city of Washington there are 5,648 civilian employees, and over the entire country, including Washington, there are 48,691. Before we entered the war in 1916 there were all over the country, including Washington, 45,911. In other words, we are down now in the matter of civilian employees to within less than 3,000 of the number we had in 1916 in spite of the fact that since 1916 two branches have been added to the Army, each necessitating a number of civilian employees or clerks, namely, the Chemical Warfare Service and the Air Service. Those two services taken together account for 5,340 civilian employees in the War Department to-day. If they are subtracted and the calculation made upon the basis of the Army as it existed as to branches and tactical organization in 1916, we find that Secretary of War Weeks and the War Department are actually employing fewer clerks than were employed in 1916.

I think myself it is a most astonishing achievement, considering that much of the aftermath of the war itself is still on the hands of the War Department. We have still immense installations which have not been sold or realized on, which require watchmen to guard and clerks to take care of in the matter of accounts and fiscal operations. The bill will reduce the number still further, and I verily believe when the bill passes, if it should pass in the form even as proposed by the Senate committee, we shall have fewer civilian employees in the War Department than we had in 1916, and yet our Army will be 25,000 or 30,000 larger than in 1916, and twice as good an Army.

Mr. WARREN. It should be remembered, in making the reduction from last year's Army strength, that all the civilian employees were carried in other appropriation bills than the Army appropriation bill, so that the figures given awhile ago by the Senator from New York hardly do justice to the real shrinkage in the cost of the Army as stated.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is very true.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. KENDRICK. I have listened very carefully to the very clear and comprehensive statement made by the Senator from New York, but on one point I am not quite certain that I understood him fully. The Senator stated, as I understood him, that the authorized Army strength at present is 150,000 men?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; that is the authorized strength.

Mr. KENDRICK. But owing to a lack of appropriation or other causes, it is short of that number in the present quota by 16,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is.

Mr. KENDRICK. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that by some provision in the pending bill or other authorized provision the Army will be arbitrarily fixed at 133,000 after the passage of this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not fixed at that number, but the appropriation for pay of enlisted men, which is stated in the face of the bill itself, shall be used and shall be sufficient for paying an Army averaging in strength throughout the year 133,000. The authorized maximum strength would be 140,000. That provision is put in to give some leeway to the recruiting service, but throughout the entire year the average strength must not be over 133,000. If it goes up to 140,000 at one time during the year, it must go an equal distance below 133,000 for an equal portion of the year.

Mr. KENDRICK. Which has the same effect as fixing it arbitrarily at 133,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; it has that effect.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New York a question. If I understood him correctly, the number of civilian employees under this bill will be approximately 54,000 in the United States and elsewhere?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, no. The present number is 48,691. That includes all the civilian employees of the department wherever stationed—overseas, in continental United States, Germany, anywhere.

Mr. KING. What will be the number of civilian employees under this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not give the Senator an exact estimate as to that. It certainly will be less, because certain restrictions are in the bill which are applicable to the employment of civilian employees in certain branches.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that the number will be reduced to 40,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I could not say.

Mr. KING. Well, assuming that the number is reduced to 40,000—and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] sotto voce says he does not think it will be reduced so low as that, if I understand him correctly—does not the Senator from New York think that it is a rather large number of civilian employees for the Army which is provided for in this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, if the number were merely for the Army alone, I would say yes, but unfortunately the War Department is saddled with many activities which have nothing to do with the Army. It has to take care of the national cemeteries; it has to run a cable to Alaska and to man it; it has to build roads and trails in Alaska; and it is necessary to have a clerical force to keep track of the accounts. It carries on river and harbor works, and, of course, it requires a clerical staff in the office of the Chief of Engineers and a clerical staff in the field with the Army officers who are supervising the work. The War Department conducts other similar activities that have nothing to do with the Army.

Mr. KING. Then this number would include the clerical civilian force for all those activities to which the Senator from New York has just referred?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It includes everybody who is employed by the War Department.

Mr. KING. May I suggest to the Senator, with a view of obtaining information, that some criticisms have been made in my hearing and to me by persons who are somewhat acquainted with the Army, to the effect that civilian employees are pressed into service to do work which, perhaps, the officers or soldiers might perform. Does the Senator from New York know to what extent that criticism is warranted?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; I do not. It has not reached my ears. Of course, however, if we go on reducing the civilian employees and go on reducing the number of soldiers, both at the same time, the criticism could not stand; and that is what we have been doing.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator from New York two questions. How much larger is the Army as provided for in the Senate committee amendment than the Army was in 1916?

Mr. WADSWORTH. My recollection is that in 1916 the Army numbered in the neighborhood of 102,000 men. At that time, however, we had no Air Service and we had no Motor Transport Corps, both of which, of course, are absolutely essential. It may be of interest to note also that at that time we had no machine-gun battalions whatsoever in the Army of the United States. Those agencies, which are positively essential, have been added since that time by statute and by regulation, in order to meet the requirements of an army which is expected to be able to take the field, and they more than account for the difference in size between about 102,000 and 133,000 men.

Mr. NORRIS. That is the question I was leading up to. Taking the enlisted men of the Regular Army under the Senate committee amendment, will there be more or less than we had of enlisted men in 1916?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There will be more.

Mr. NORRIS. How many more?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Approximately the difference between 102,000 and 133,000.

Mr. NORRIS. How did the size of the Army in 1916 compare, for instance, with the size of the Army in 1914? Was not the Army in 1916 increased considerably in size over the Army which existed before the breaking out of the war in Europe?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No. The first increase which occurred in the Army occurred as the result of the act of June 3, 1916, which was known as the national defense act. That act, as I recollect, found the Army numbering about 102,000 men. The act provided that for five years thereafter, to wit, from June 3, 1916, there should be annual increments to the Regular Army until its strength at the end of the five years—which would have been in 1921—would have been in the neighborhood of 225,000 men. That was the military policy which was laid down in 1916, a year before we went into the war; but that policy has been abandoned. We have now gone back and have suggested an Army of 133,000 enlisted men.

Mr. NORRIS. That does not quite answer my question.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That was the first increment.

Mr. NORRIS. How large was the Army just before that increase?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Army numbered 102,000 men.

Mr. NORRIS. Before 1916?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have not the figures before me, but my recollection is that the Army had varied between 88,000 and 102,000 for several years, but the old method of computation upon which 88,000 was based did not include the Medical or Quartermaster Corps; they were not counted as troops.

Mr. NORRIS. What conditions, in the Senator's judgment, exist now that did not exist before the war which require more troops in the Regular Army? Does the Senator think there were not enough in the Army at that time?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There certainly were not, according to my judgment.

Mr. NORRIS. It is not the Senator's idea, then, so far as the Army is concerned, to ever get it back to its pre-war size?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I should hope it would not be allowed to go that low. I do not think it should; I do not think it would be safe.

Mr. NORRIS. The House bill reduced the enlisted strength of the Army to 115,000 men. That number is still about 13,000 more than were in the Army before the war, is it not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. If the Army is to be reduced to that level, we might as well be perfectly frank about it. In that event we shall be compelled to withdraw from the National Guard and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in the colleges those splendid sergeants and corporals and some privates, first class, who have been assisting in training those boys and who have been exceedingly successful in their work. If we continue to reduce we have got to withdraw officers and men, wherever the reduction takes place, from these educational activities upon which the whole military policy of this country is founded. If in time of peace we are not to train citizens so that they shall have a decent chance for themselves and for the country in time of war, if war shall overtake us, then we have no military policy at all and no defense, because the Regular Army can never be a large army.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to inquire upon what the Senator bases his assertion that we should have to withdraw those instructors. As I understand his statement, outside of those acting as instructors and the men on the border and men overseas, we still have stationed at different places throughout the continental United States an Army much larger than the Army we had before the war, and an Army which has not any particular duty to perform except as emergency may arise here and there over the country, when it may be found necessary to send a few Regular troops into various communities.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It depends, of course, upon what the Senator means by "duty to perform." I consider that the Regular Army has a duty to perform.

Mr. NORRIS. We would still have left somewhere in the neighborhood of 40,000 men.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; 40,000 men. Of course it may be said that we will get along all right with 40,000 men as long as there is no trouble.

Mr. NORRIS. We did get along—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; until the war came.

Mr. NORRIS. We got along with much less than the number proposed, and of course if war came 40,000 would not be a drop in the bucket, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are merely a nucleus.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But if you keep on reducing the nucleus there will be practically nothing left.

Mr. NORRIS. But for instruction of the National Guard, and so forth, it seems to me that there was no necessity before the war, and I do not understand why there should be now the necessity of using such a large Army. I never remember a time in the days before the war when we were short of the United States troops to quell any disturbance that might arise or that there was any complaint that there was a shortage of troops. Now, we are practically doubling the Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, no; we are not anywhere near doubling it. We had 102,000 before the war, and the committee suggests an Army of 133,000.

Mr. NORRIS. When I say doubling I am referring to the portion of the Army that is still left after making allowance for all the officers and men on special duty.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, in 1916 there was no provision of law for training the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and no provisions of law for the Organized Reserves, involving the detail of officers and men from the Regular Army as

instructors. We had no special-service schools at all; but we learned a lesson from the war, and I hope it will never be necessary again for American officers and soldiers to have to go to French schools and British schools to learn the tactics of their respective branches. We have now established tactical schools—schools of a very special character, such as Camps Benning, Riley, Knox, Bragg, and Eustis, all part of the system of instruction—to which National Guard officers and National Guard enlisted men go on their own volition to take the various courses, and where they are taught by officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army. All of that, of course, takes personnel.

Mr. NORRIS. We had none of that prior to the war?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We had none of that prior to the war. At that time a National Guard man was not allowed to go to a Regular Army school.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the training of the National Guard and of civilians constitutes one reason, it seems to me, why we do not need such a large standing Army. We have developed all those activities which we did not have before the war, when we had a much less number of soldiers in the Regular Army than we have now.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But those activities have to be carried on by soldiers of the Regular Army.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes; I understand that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is one reason for a part of the increase.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has taken all those out, and I have excluded them from my calculations. It seems to me that with the number of officers and men that have been detailed, amounting to several thousand—the Senator gave the figures a short while ago—for educational and instruction purposes in schools and for training National Guard officers, and all that, instead of demanding an increase in the standing army it ought to bring about a decrease, because that means that we will not be under the necessity, as the Senator said we previously were, of sending our officers and men to foreign schools, although, so far as that is concerned, foreign governments send their men to our schools. We have soldiers here from practically all the nations in the world studying in various localities in the United States, and I suppose we send our men to other countries. We are giving military instruction to civilians, and we have developed the National Guard until its present organization far surpasses its organization before the war, so that the old National Guard can not be compared in its ability to perform military duty on short notice with the National Guard as at present organized. If that means anything, if it has any value whatever, it seems to me that the value is that it will be unnecessary to maintain so large a standing army, because we have military information and training given to the ordinary citizen and provided in the various schools and in the National Guard. Such activities are used as a reason why we should have a larger Army; the fact that they were not carried on prior to the war and that we got into trouble is used as an argument by the Senator from New York why our Army should be increased now. As a matter of fact, it is an argument for a smaller standing army, because, in case of difficulty, we would be able to rely upon the instruction, upon the information, and upon the training that has been given to the National Guard and to civilians through these very activities. Hence if the training amounts to anything—and I think it does—it would mean that we could equip an army of trained soldiers a great deal quicker than we ever did before; and, so far as time is concerned, we did it very quickly during the recent war.

There can be no argument made for a large standing army because we need a large standing army to do the fighting in case of war. If that were so, then we must maintain a million men. It is not intended to have a standing army that will be equipped as fighting men during time of peace, but only a nucleus. Now it is proposed to increase the number of enlisted men provided by the House bill by 22,000 men.

Mr. WADSWORTH. By 18,000.

Mr. NORRIS. By 18,000; I stand corrected. It is proposed to increase it by 18,000, when as a matter of fact the House bill itself provides an increase of 13,000 over the number of men in the Regular Army before the war. Then, in addition to that, we now have the National Guard in a condition that the Senator himself says is far superior to anything that ever existed before the war, so that the reason for a larger standing army falls.

I should like to call upon any Senator here to point to the occasion or the time before the great World War when we were ever handicapped by not having a standing army that was large enough to meet every contingency and every emer-

gency that ever arose in time of peace. Have we any reason to believe now that it will be different, especially when we take into consideration the fact that we have a National Guard and a citizen soldiery equipped with military knowledge such as we never had before, such as we never had even an indication of, away beyond anything that ever existed? And now, on top of all that, it is said that we must increase the standing army!

It seems to me that not a single argument has been produced to show that the standing army should be greater than before the war. In fact, the argument is that it should be, and could be without any risk whatever, less, because of these other activities that the Senator from New York has so well mentioned and described.

Mr. President, it was said when the last Army bill was here, and shown conclusively, that practically the only place where we could get any material reduction in the way of taxation was through reducing the Army and the Navy appropriation bills. Now, at a time when no argument is shown for an increase of the standing army, but the argument is the other way, coupled with the fact that the American people are bowed down to the earth with the burdens of taxation, and here is a place where we can cut it off by the millions without any injury or risk, it seems to me that we shall fall far short of performing our duty if we do not apply the pruning knife.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, after cessation of the hostilities of the World War, and while he was still President, Woodrow Wilson urged that the United States maintain a standing army of 300,000 men. At the same time Newton D. Baker, then Secretary of War, urged that the United States maintain a standing army of 300,000 men; and as a parting admonition, before those eminent officials retired from public office, they urged very strongly that Congress should not, under any circumstances, reduce the strength of the standing army below 200,000 men.

I do not believe that anybody could properly accuse either one of those worthy gentlemen of being a militarist. I do not think there is anything in the record or career of Woodrow Wilson to show that he is or ever was a militarist. He is, I think, admittedly one of the most world-renowned and eminent advocates of world peace, one of the most ardent and passionate devotees of peace that the world has ever known. With him, love and advocacy of peace are a passion. He devoted some of the best and most precious years of his life to a supreme effort to establish permanent world-wide peace. He sacrificed his health and almost sacrificed his life in an effort to establish world peace, and I know that nobody can justly accuse him of wanting to see the world an armed military camp.

All of his ideas and ideals are those of a man of peace. A just, world-wide peace has been the ambition of his life. Hon. Newton D. Baker is cast very much in the same mold, and yet they both insisted after the end of the World War that the needs of this country required a standing army of 300,000 men. I think their first figures, looking back at them now, may have been rather liberal; they may not have been entirely justified; but when they said that the country should always have a standing army of at least 200,000 men I think they were well within the bounds of reason.

General Pershing has always argued that this country, under the reorganized scheme of maintaining an Army which Congress has enacted and provided for, required a standing army of at least 200,000 men and has pleaded very strongly that it should not be reduced below that number; and yet the tendency of the times has been, undoubtedly owing to the great expense of the World War and the enormous burden of taxation under which the people of this country are staggering, to reduce the size of the Army below what many thought it should be maintained at when the World War closed. There may be some semblance of reason in favor of that contention, but I think we should be very careful not to go too far in that direction. In spite of the pleadings of President Wilson and Secretary of War Baker and General Pershing before the close of the last preceding administration, Congress reduced the size of the Army to 150,000 men. I thought then and I think now that that was and is the very lowest figure consistent with safety and prudence under the scheme of reorganization which Congress has enacted and provided for keeping up a standing army in this country; and yet we are now confronted with the proposition which comes from the House, as set forth in this bill, of reducing it to 115,000 men.

I think that is going entirely too far and wholly beyond the bounds of reason, in the direction of economy, if economy be the ground. We need to economize in this country, undoubtedly, but we should economize with prudence and in accordance with reason. I do not think we should destroy or cripple an essential branch of the Government merely for purposes of economy. That would not be wise economy.

If this great country, the greatest in the world, which possesses a larger area of the earth's surface than any other country in the world, excepting Great Britain and Russia; a country with 11,000 miles of seacoast, 10,000 cities and towns, and 1,900 miles of Mexican border; with its great rivers and numerous harbors; with great industrial centers and a vast system of railroads; with its 48 States, to which it is pledged to guarantee and maintain a republican form of government, and to each of which it owes the bounden duty to enforce and maintain within its borders law and order, if the State authorities are unable to do so; with the Philippines, Hawaii, Alaska, Porto Rico, Guam, the Panama Canal strip, and the Virgin Islands as outlying territorial possessions, where it must maintain order; I repeat, if such a country does not need a standing army of 134,000 men, then I must confess that in my opinion it does not need any at all. If 134,000 men are not reasonably necessary, then 34 men would be sufficient, or none at all. If we are going to maintain an army at all, on the plan of a reorganized and reconstructed system, the framework of which was carefully worked out by Congress and provided as a permanent basis for maintaining a standing army equal to our needs, then I think 134,000 men the least number that should be considered. If, under that plan, we are not going to maintain an army of 134,000 men, I do not think we need to undertake to maintain any at all. The truth is, in this great country of vast territory, vaster responsibilities, great stretch of seacoast, complicated industrial life; a country of more than 110,000,000 population, which is rapidly growing; in this great country, I say, the truth is a standing army of 134,000 men is a mere pittance, a trifle, only a handful of soldiery. It is insignificant. It amounts to little more than a good police force. Of course, some people are opposed to any army at all. Some people want no army. There are elements of our population that oppose having any army at all; even oppose a State militia; but in every civilized country of the world there is need for some army, and it always will be so until the coming of the millennium; and a self-governing country of law and order should have a decently adequate army. It is an essential part of governmental housekeeping.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas, with pleasure.

Mr. CARAWAY. How does the Senator arrive at 134,000 as being the proper number? Why does he think that that is safe, and below that is dangerous, and above that is too many?

Mr. MYERS. The Senator is entirely mistaken. I have not said that nor anything like it. I do not think above that number is too many. I think we might well and should maintain an army of 150,000 men, as Congress provided for a year ago, and I have said so.

Mr. CARAWAY. I thought the Senator said that 134,000 was safe, but that he would not go above or below that number.

Mr. MYERS. No. I said that if we were not going to maintain an army of 134,000 I did not see any use of maintaining any at all, but that I felt that that number was the least number we should consider under our present plan of army reorganization. A year ago Congress and its committees carefully worked out the idea that 150,000 men was the least number of men that we could have to maintain even a skeleton organization of an army, in all of its essential parts, according to the plan that had been devised by Congress, and I think Congress was right when it did so, and so declared. Here, however, is a proposition to reduce the number 16,000 below that figure, and another proposition comes from the House to reduce it by 35,000. I think 150,000 needed, but as between the two propositions before us, I prefer the plan proposed by the Senate committee, the one which proposes the larger number—the one more nearly approaching our needs. I think the House proposition absurd.

The Senate proposition comes nearer to what was deliberately agreed upon by both branches of Congress a year ago as being essential for keeping up a skeleton of our reorganized Army under the plan that Congress had deliberately devised and the Executive had approved. We came to that conclusion a year ago, and I can see no reason for abandoning it if we are going to keep up an Army at all on that plan. If we are not going to keep up an Army on that plan, then I think we should devise some other plan that would call for a lesser number of troops; but as long as we adhere to that plan I think we ought to have an Army of 150,000 men or as near to it as we can get.

I realize that there are few ways in which a Member of Congress may appeal more strongly to popular favor than by "jumping on" the Army, as you might say, decrying the Army, and wanting continually to reduce it. I know that it meets with much popular favor; there is always a hue and cry against any

standing Army; but, at the same time, the Army is an essential branch of our Government. It is liable at any time to be just as essential as the lawmaking branch of the Government. Congress and the Executive make the laws of the country. The Executive must enforce them. In enforcing the laws the executive branch must rely upon the administrative officials of the Government to enforce the law. If they fail, or prove insufficient, he must call upon the posse comitatus, and if that fails him or proves insufficient he must fall back in the last resort upon the Army. Then, if the Army proves insufficient, the Government must fall. Unless we are going to have a decent-sized Army, well organized and equipped, ready to meet any emergency from without or within, I do not see any reason for undertaking to have any at all.

I am in sympathy with the figures set forth in the amendment that is recommended by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. I think the figures are entirely within the bounds of reason, and think they come the nearest to what our military officials say we ought to have. My only objection to them is that they are too low, but they appear to be the best there is any chance of getting, and I favor the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs said some time ago that we have at the present time an Army twice as good as it formerly was. I presume he referred to pre-war days. I agree with him. It is not possible to sit upon the Committee on Military Affairs and listen to the testimony of officers of the department who come before the committee without being impressed by the spirit, the discipline, and the high order of intelligence of the organization, and I unite with the Senator in paying a meed of praise to the Army of the United States. I think it has come out of the war enormously improved, and what is true of the Army is to a considerable extent true of the organization of the War Department.

I agree also that it is a matter of some difficulty for a civilian to listen to those officers pleading for military perfection in an organization and not yield to their recommendations for maintaining a large organization, and probably it is true that if we reduce the size of the Army below what it is now, there may be some deterioration as measured by perfection.

But, Mr. President, this is a matter in which the people of the United States have a right to make a decision. It is hardly within the probabilities that the American people want a perfect military machine. What they want is an adequate military machine, for protection, to preserve the science of warfare, to maintain trained officers, to teach the civilian population enough about military affairs, so that in the possible, though remote, chance of war, we would be able to go into the war with credit and with safety.

The fact is that this bill comes to us from the House of Representatives providing for a total appropriation of \$287,897,000. My judgment is that that appropriation was fixed, and the limitation was made, in response to a widespread demand among the American people for a reduction of military expenditures. It is not simply because the American people are overburdened with taxes; it is because they are against excessive expenditures for military purposes. As I have said, they want adequate military protection, but they do not demand military perfection.

This bill emerges from the Senate committee with a total appropriation of \$333,882,851, which is an addition of practically \$46,000,000. A part of that increase in the appropriation is necessary. It is necessary, because the House in considering the bill used the rate of pay of 1908, and the Congress has already passed an act raising the pay, although leaving it below the pay of the officers and men during the war. So a part of that addition of \$46,000,000 is necessary.

Another part, I believe, is justified by the action of the Senate in increasing the number of officers above what the House had provided. I believe in that increase, not because I believe in a larger Military Establishment, but because I believe in providing officers for the teaching of civilians who are unorganized, or those civilians who are organized in the National Guard. I believe in providing as many officers in our schools and our colleges as are needed. I believe in providing officers in our civilian camps, where training takes place during the summer. In other words, I believe that the increase in the number of officers is justified because of the opportunity it gives to train a limited number of the civilian population. So some increase, in my opinion, is justified by that.

However, when we come to the increase in the number of enlisted men from 115,000, as provided in the House, to 140,000, as provided in the Senate committee bill, I am disposed not to go with the committee. I know the chairman of the committee says that is a maximum; but so is 150,000 a maximum.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We actually appropriated for 150,000 for this year.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am coming to that now. As a matter of fact, a year ago, when the Congress insisted on reducing the limit of the Army to 150,000 men, we were met by the Secretary of War and the military officers of the War Department with a storm of protest. They said then the same thing they say now, that it would demoralize our Military Establishment; that it would make it impossible to perform the duties which Congress required of our Military Establishment, and, as I recall it, they were fully as emphatic then in opposing a limit of 150,000 as they are now determined to have 150,000.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, does the Senator remember that that amendment was condemned by the President when he signed the bill?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not remember his words.

Mr. CARAWAY. In effect, was it not condemned?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think it was condemned by the President, and that he said he would not ask his Secretary to enforce it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I would like to know if President Wilson did not make a like condemnation when we limited it to 175,000.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is quite likely.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He vetoed the bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not criticizing President Harding for what he said. If I should hold the office of Secretary of War, as Mr. Weeks now holds it, and if I were surrounded by those military officers, who should come to me one after another and insist that any diminution of their particular departments would send the country to the bow wows, I suppose I would be influenced by them. Any civilian is influenced by them, and as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and as a member of the subcommittee, I confess that at times I was influenced by the positive statements of those officers, many of them young, keen, bright, alert, highly trained, and highly educated. I was influenced by what they said. I am not a radical by any means, for that reason. I can hardly be regarded as a radical.

But I say that the reduction of the Army to 150,000 men carries out the will of the people; that the will of Congress as expressed a year ago has proven a success, and that at the present time we have not 150,000 men.

We have only about 141,000 men actually enlisted, and things seem to be getting on very well. The ruin has not come; war has not been provoked, the Military Establishment has not been disjoined, and I am morally certain in my own mind that if we make a still further reduction we shall find at the end of the year that the Military Establishment will still be here. There might not be quite the military perfection in all departments which theoretically the officers think there would be if we maintained a larger number, but I believe the country will find by experience, after another reduction, that the Nation still lives, and that no material damage has been done.

I think it is of importance that Congress should respond to the demand of the American people for relief from taxation. I would not like to be forced to choose between the House limit and the limit provided by the committee of the Senate, although if I am, I believe I shall vote for the House limit. I believe that there should be a mid-position taken. I believe we should make another reduction this year, in the hope that we can make still another one next year.

I realize in saying that that men who are in close contact with military officers are, perhaps, in a better position to judge than I am, but Congress is between the demand of the people for a reduction and the financial need for a reduction and the demand of these officers for what I might call a theoretically perfect Military Establishment.

I believe that if we err at all we should err in the direction of economy. If we should find that we made a mistake, it would be very easy to retrace. So, if I am forced to choose, I shall vote for the House limitation of 115,000 men.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 24, inserting the item "Pay of enlisted men." The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to the transfer of my pair, I vote "yea."

Mr. NEW (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to the transfer of my pair as on the previous vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). In the absence of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], with whom I am paired, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). Again announcing the transfer of my pair, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BALL. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] and vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH. Has the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. SMITH. I have a general pair with that Senator. In his absence, I am compelled to withhold my vote.

Mr. HALE. Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. COLT. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] to the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] and vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH. I have just been informed that my pair [Mr. STERLING], if present, would vote as I am going to vote, and therefore I take the liberty of voting. I vote "yea."

Mr. BROUSSARD. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] to my colleague [Mr. RANSELL] and vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and vote "nay."

Mr. HARRISON. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. EDGE (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] and allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—49.

Ashurst	Gerry	McNary	Smith
Ball	Gooding	Myers	Smoot
Brandegee	Hale	Nelson	Spencer
Bursum	Heflin	New	Sutherland
Calder	Johnson	Newberry	Townsend
Cameron	Jones, Wash.	Oddie	Underwood
Colt	Kellogg	Page	Wadsworth
Cummins	Kendrick	Pepper	Warren
Curtis	Lenroot	Phipps	Watson, Ind.
du Pont	Lodge	Poindexter	Williams
Edge	McCumber	Rawson	
Ernst	McKinley	Sheppard	
France	McLean	Shortridge	

NAYS—21.

Borah	Harrison	Norris	Walsh, Mont.
Broussard	Hitchcock	Robinson	Watson, Ga.
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Simmons	Willis
Caraway	King	Stanley	
Dial	Ladd	Swanson	
Harris	La Follette	Walsh, Mass.	

NOT VOTING—26.

Crow	Glass	Norbeck	Shields
Culberson	Harreld	Overman	Stanfield
Dillingham	Keyes	Owen	Sterling
Elkins	McCormick	Pittman	Trammell
Fernald	McKellar	Pomerene	Weller
Fletcher	Moses	Ransdell	
Frelinghuysen	Nicholson	Reed	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask that we now return to the committee amendment which commences on page 15, "Pay of officers," and which was passed over.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The committee report, on page 15, after line 9, to strike out:

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

standing on the promotion list, or on the relative list if their names are not on the promotion list, or those of less than 10 years' commissioned service in the Regular Army may be discharged with one year's pay, or those of more than 10 years' commissioned service and less than 20 years' service may be placed on the unlimited retired list with pay at the rate of 2½ per cent of their active pay multiplied by the number of complete years of such commissioned service, or those of more than 20 years' commissioned service in the Regular Army may be placed upon the unlimited retired list with pay at the rate of 3 per cent of their active pay multiplied by the number of complete years of such commissioned service, not exceeding 75 per cent; all under such regulations as the President may prescribe.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Pay of officers: For pay of officers of the line and staff, \$35,390,438: *Provided*, That after five months from the date of approval of this act no part of the sum herein appropriated for pay of officers shall be used for the pay of more than 13,000 commissioned officers of the active list of the Regular Army: *Provided further*, That hereafter there shall be officers as now authorized by law except that there shall be 494 colonels, 555 lieutenant colonels, 1,850 majors, 3,700 captains, 5,735 lieutenants, including first and second lieutenants of whom not to exceed 3,515 may be first lieutenants and of whom no officer shall be promoted to the grade of first lieutenant until he shall have served at least three years in the grade of second lieutenant, 1,053 officers of the Medical Corps, 177 officers of the Dental Corps, 144 officers of the Veterinary Corps, 81 officers of the Medical Administrative Corps, 136 chaplains, and the number of officers of the Medical Department and chaplains shall be as prescribed herein notwithstanding changes that may occur in the authorized enlisted or commissioned strength of the Army: *Provided further*, That for five months after the date of approval of this act there shall be no promotions to grades below brigadier general of officers of the Regular Army except of officers of the Medical Department and chaplains and thereafter there shall be no promotions to any grade that would cause the numbers hereinbefore authorized for each grade to be exceeded, and vacancies now existing in any grade below brigadier general not actually filled by the acceptance of an appointment tendered prior to the date of approval of this act shall not be filled and there shall be no appointments of officers of the Medical Department that will cause the total number thereof to exceed 1,455: *Provided further*, That within five months of the date of approval of this act the number of officers shall be reduced to such number in each grade and in the branches of the Medical Department and chaplains as the President may direct, not exceeding the numbers hereinbefore authorized except that there may be retained until absorbed not to exceed 194 additional majors, 395 additional captains, 32 additional officers of the Dental Corps, 40 additional officers of the Medical Administrative Corps, and 22 additional chaplains: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall convene a board of five general officers who, under regulations prescribed by him, shall recommend to the President such officers for retirement or discharge as may be necessary in addition to the reduction in numbers accomplished by other means, to complete the reduction to be made within five months of the date of approval of this act: *Provided further*, That hereafter the President may, in his discretion, place upon the retired list any officer who, under existing law, may be retired on his own application, and within five months of the date of approval of this act the President may, in his discretion, place upon the retired list or discharge the officers recommended to him by the board of general officers under the preceding proviso and such other officers as may apply for retirement or discharge, the total in any grade or branch so retired or discharged not exceeding in number the reduction to be made within five months, the retirements and discharges herein authorized within five months to be under the following conditions: Officers of more than 10 years' service may be placed upon the unlimited retired list with retired pay at the rate of 3 per cent of their active pay multiplied by the number of complete years of their service, not exceeding in any case 75 per cent; officers of not more than 10 years' service may be honorably discharged with one year's pay unless they shall have had more than seven and one-half years' service, in which case they shall be discharged with two years' pay: *Provided further*, That the term "service" as used in the preceding proviso shall include all service credited to commissioned officers for retirement or for increased pay for length of service; and any officer whose name is carried on the promotion list and who was originally appointed in a grade above second lieutenant shall be credited with a length of service that shall be the same as the commissioned service in the Regular Army of the officer next above him on the promotion list who was originally appointed in the grade of second lieutenant; and any officer of the Medical Corps, Dental Corps, Veterinary Corps, or any chaplain, originally appointed in a grade above the lowest authorized grade of the branch in which commissioned, shall be credited with a length of service that shall be the same as the commissioned service in the Regular Army of the officer of the same branch next senior in rank who was originally appointed in such authorized lowest grade; and any colonel, except of the Medical Department, whose name is not borne on the promotion list, and who was originally appointed in a grade above second lieutenant, shall be credited with a length of service that shall be the same as the commissioned service in the Regular Army of the colonel, exclusive of colonels of the Medical Department, next senior in rank who was originally appointed in the grade of second lieutenant: *Provided further*, That any officer whose actual length of service as hereinbefore defined is greater than the service with which he would be credited under the foregoing proviso shall be credited with his actual length of service: *Provided further*, That so much of section 24 of the act approved June 4, 1920, as provides that any person originally appointed under the provisions of said act at an age greater than 45 years shall, when retired, receive retired pay at the rate of 4 per cent of active pay for each year of commissioned service shall not be construed as applicable to said officers when retired under the provisions of this act or when retired for physical disability incident to the service: *Provided further*, That officers shall be assigned to the several branches of the Army so that the number assigned to any branch, except of the Medical Department and chaplains, shall be 82½ per cent of the number prescribed for such branch by the act of June 4, 1920, but the President may increase or diminish the number of officers assigned to any branch by not more than a total of 30 per cent.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I shall have to ask the Senate to reconsider the vote by which the amendment just

agreed to was adopted, as I want to offer two perfecting amendments to it, which, however, make no real difference in the meaning of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered.

Mr. WADSWORTH. On page 17, line 10, after the words "commissioned officers" I move to insert the words "plus emergency officers in hospitals undergoing physical reconstruction." That amendment is for the purpose of making it perfectly certain that 40 or 50 unfortunate emergency officers who are still in hospitals, who are crippled from wounds in the World War, shall continue to be paid.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. On page 18, line 16, after the word "Medical," I move to strike out the word "Department" and to insert the word "Corps"; so that it will read:

There shall be no appointments of officers of the Medical Corps that will cause the total number thereof to exceed—

And so forth.

Then, in line 17, I move to strike out the words "four hundred and fifty-five" and to insert the words "and fifty-three"; so as to read "that will cause the total number thereof to exceed 1,053"; and then insert the words "of the Dental Corps 177, of the Veterinary Corps 144, or of the Medical Administrative Corps 81." The sum total of those is 1,453.

That completes the statement of the amendment which I propose to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] to the committee amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 18, line 16, after the words "Medical," it is proposed to strike out the word "Department" and to insert the word "Corps"; and in lines 17 and 18, to strike out the words "four hundred and fifty-five" and to insert the words "and fifty-three, of the Dental Corps, one hundred and seventy-seven, of the Veterinary Corps, one hundred and forty-four, or of the Medical Administrative Corps, eighty-one."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 21, line 24, after the word "pay," to insert "and allowances," and in line 25, after the word "Corps," to strike out "\$250,000" and to insert "\$2,000,000," so as to read:

For pay and allowances of the officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, \$2,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 22, after line 21, to strike out "For pay of warrant officers, \$1,534,336: *Provided*, That the sum herein appropriated for pay of warrant officer shall not be used for the pay of more than 40 warrant officers of the Mine Planter Service: *Provided further*, That no vacancies in the grade of warrant officer shall be filled until the number in such grade is reduced to 600, and thereafter the number shall not be increased above 600," and in lieu thereof to insert:

For pay of warrant officers, \$1,951,632: *Provided*, That no vacancies in the grade of warrant officer, exclusive of warrant officers in the Mine Planter Service, shall be filled until the number in such grade is reduced to 600, and thereafter the number shall not be increased above 600, and to effect such reduction warrant officers, upon their own application, may be placed on the unlimited retired list after 30 years' service and may compute for retirement such double time as they may have earned while serving as enlisted men: *Provided further*, That nothing contained herein shall prevent the appointment of qualified band leaders for authorized bands: *Provided further*, That no vacancies in the grade of warrant officer of the Army Mine Planter Service shall be filled until the number in such grade is reduced to 40, and thereafter the number shall not be increased above 40.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 23, line 21, to increase the appropriation for aviation increase to officers of the Army from "\$846,000" to "\$1,021,840."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I may say that the amendments following from this point are all in accordance with the new pay bill, and also in accordance with the number of officers and the number of enlisted men as just determined by the Senate. It is entirely a mathematical proposition governed by statute.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 24, line 4, to increase the appropriation for additional pay to officers for length of service from "\$4,000,000" to "\$5,440,317."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 24, after line 4, to strike out:

Pay of enlisted men: For pay of enlisted men of the line and staff, \$48,863,088. The Secretary of War is directed under such reasonable regulations as he may prescribe to grant applications for discharge of enlisted men serving in the continental United States without regard to the provisions of existing law respecting discharges until the number in the Army has been reduced to 115,000 enlisted men, not including the Philippine Scouts. The provisions of this paragraph shall take effect immediately upon the approval of this act.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Pay of enlisted men: For pay of an average number of 133,000 enlisted men of the line and staff, not including the Philippine Scouts, \$60,981,795: *Provided*, That the total authorized number of enlisted men, not including the Philippine Scouts, shall be 140,000, and this number shall not be exceeded unless in emergency.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 24, line 24, to increase the appropriation for pay of enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps from "\$100" to "\$7,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 25, line 2, to increase the appropriation for aviation increase to enlisted men of the Army from "\$150,000" to "\$216,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 25, line 2, to strike out the following proviso:

Provided, That this appropriation shall not be available for increased pay on flying status to more than 500 enlisted men.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 25, line 11, to reduce the appropriation for additional pay for length of service to enlisted men from "\$4,500,000" to "\$2,235,043."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 25, line 13, to increase the appropriation for pay of officers on the retired list from "\$5,000,000" to "\$6,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 25, line 15, to reduce the appropriation for increased pay to retired officers on active duty from "\$207,560" to "\$44,533."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 25, line 16, to increase the appropriation for pay of retired enlisted men from "\$4,500,000" to "\$6,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 25, line 18, to increase the appropriation for pay and allowances of retired enlisted men on active duty from "\$2,904" to "\$13,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 26, line 3, before the words "at \$2,000 each," to strike out "5" and to insert "9"; in the same line, before the words "at \$1,800 each," to strike out "25" and to insert "40"; in line 4, before the words "at \$1,600 each," to strike out "44" and to insert "60"; in line 6, before the words "at \$1,400 each," to strike out "61" and to insert "80"; in line 5, before the words "at \$1,200 each," to strike out "95" and to insert "130"; in line 6, before the word "messengers," to strike out "80" and to insert "65"; and at the end of line 6 to strike out "\$382,400" and to insert "\$500,800"; so as to make the paragraph read:

Pay of Army field clerks and civil service messengers at headquarters of the several territorial departments, corps areas, Army and corps headquarters, territorial districts, tactical divisions and brigades, service schools, camps and ports of embarkation and debarkation: Army field clerks—9 at \$2,000 each, 40 at \$1,800 each, 60 at \$1,600 each, 80 at \$1,400 each, 130 at \$1,200 each; 65 messengers at \$720 each; in all, \$500,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

For additional pay while on foreign service, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 26, after line 8, to strike out:

For commutation of quarters and of heat and light, \$97,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 26, after line 10, to strike out:

For commutation of quarters and of heat and light for field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, \$75,021: *Provided*, That said clerks, messengers, and laborers shall be employed and assigned by the Secretary of War to the offices and positions in which they are to serve: *Provided further*, That no clerk, messenger, or laborer at headquarters of tactical divisions, military departments, brigades, service schools, and office of the Chief of Staff shall be assigned to duty in any bureau of the War Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 26, after line 19, to insert:

No clerk, messenger, or laborer at headquarters of tactical divisions, military departments, brigades, service schools, and office of the Chief of Staff shall be assigned to duty in any bureau of the War Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 26, line 24, after the word "pay," to insert "and allowances," so as to read:

Miscellaneous: For pay and allowances of contract surgeons, \$41,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 27, line 1, to increase the appropriation for pay of nurses from "\$509,280" to "\$799,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 27, line 2, to reduce the appropriation for pay of hospital matrons from "\$3,000" to "\$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 27, after line 7, to strike out:

For commutation of quarters and heat and light to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Nurse Corps, and enlisted men on duty at places where no public quarters are available, including enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, \$4,250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 27, after line 13, to insert:

For rental allowances, \$6,097,644.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 27, after line 14, to insert:

For subsistence allowances, \$5,551,978.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 27, after line 18, to strike out:

For additional 10 per cent increase of pay of officers on foreign service, \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 27, after line 20, to strike out:

For additional 20 per cent increase of pay of enlisted men on foreign service, \$700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 28, line 1, after the name "Alaska," to insert "or remote posts in the United States"; so as to make the paragraph read:

For payment of exchange by officers serving in foreign countries and when specially authorized by the Secretary of War, by officers disbursing funds pertaining to the War Department when serving in Alaska or remote posts in the United States, and all foreign money received shall be charged to and paid out by disbursing officers of the Army at the legal valuation fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 8, to insert:

All the money hereinbefore appropriated for pay of the Army and miscellaneous shall be disbursed and accounted for as pay of the Army, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is one very small amendment of a corrective character at the bottom of page 62.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an amendment on the page preceding which has been passed over.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] is interested in that amendment; it relates to the experimentations in connection with helium gas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 61, at the beginning of line 9, it is proposed to strike out "\$400,000" and to insert "\$300,000," so as to read

not exceeding \$300,000 may be expended for experimentation, conservation, and production of helium.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, if I understand the situation correctly, the committee has recommended that the amount appropriated by the House, to-wit, \$400,000, be reduced to \$300,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. For experimentations in connection with helium gas; yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to submit to the Senate and to the Senator from New York that this is a case where it would be in the interest of economy to retain the amount appropriated by the House. The Army and the Navy share equally the expense involved in the production of helium gas. After looking into the matter thoroughly the Military Affairs

Committee of the House agreed to recommend an appropriation of \$400,000 and the Naval Affairs Committee of the House agreed to recommend an appropriation of a like amount, making \$800,000 in all for the next fiscal year.

I wish to say that helium is a noninflammable gas, and that we have a monopoly of that kind of gas in the United States. If the *Roma*, for instance, had been so constructed that it could have been inflated with helium gas instead of the ordinary gas, it would not have been consumed by fire. It was the destruction of the *Roma* that led the House committee to increase the appropriation for helium gas in order that we might secure as great an amount as possible. This led them to favor a larger amount than that originally estimated for.

The Government has expended to date about \$8,000,000 in an effort to manufacture helium gas. The principal plant for making this gas is located at Fort Worth, Tex. The source of helium is a helium-bearing gas, produced from wells at Petrolia, Tex., about 100 miles north of Fort Worth. To-day we have in storage about 2,400,000,000 feet of helium gas. This is the net result of \$8,000,000 expended for plants and experimentation. It is stored in metallic cylinders and will last for 20 or 30 years.

The helium content of the gas is extracted by a certain process which was discovered two or three years ago. The ordinary gas, which contains helium, is being transported by pipe line from the wells at Petrolia to Fort Worth, Tex., and other cities for commercial uses, and every day on which the helium is not extracted from this commercial gas means its permanent loss to that extent.

To-day the Fort Worth plant, representing an investment of millions, is idle. The amount of the gas from which helium can be obtained is limited. Therefore we are constantly losing quantities of this one item of national defense, of which the United States has a monopoly, by not making proper provision for the extraction of the helium element from the commercial gas as it passes by the plant at Fort Worth.

We expended \$500,000 last year in operating the plant at Fort Worth and produced about 2,000,000,000 feet of the helium gas. The representatives of the Bureau of Mines say that, with an appropriation of \$800,000, which will keep the plant continuously in operation for almost a year, we can produce 10,000,000,000 feet of the helium gas. Manifestly, Mr. President, it is in the interest of economy to follow the action of the House Naval Affairs Committee and the House Military Affairs Committee in appropriating \$400,000 each for the operation of this plant, and thus to produce 10,000,000,000 cubic feet of helium gas during the year to come instead of appropriating \$600,000 or \$700,000 and producing a far smaller amount. With \$500,000 we produced a bare 2,000,000,000 feet at Fort Worth last year.

We possess a monopoly of helium, and it ought not to be allowed to go to waste. The naval appropriation bill, as it comes from the House, carries an appropriation of \$400,000, the amount which is to be appropriated for the Navy's share of this non-inflammable gas. The \$400,000 appropriated by the House on the recommendation of the Military Affairs Committee of the House is the Army's share, and I suggest to the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that this arrangement ought to be carried out. I ask him if he will not agree to the restoration of the original amount.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Texas that I have no authority to abandon the amendment on the part of the committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then I ask for a vote, Mr. President. I believe it is in the interest of economy to restore the amount agreed to by the House Military Affairs Committee and the House itself.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, is not the Senator mistaken in saying that the House Military Affairs Committee agreed to that? Was not that amount raised upon the floor of the House?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; the House committee reported it in the House bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think it was raised on the floor of the House.

Mr. LENROOT. My recollection is that it was raised upon the floor of the House, and I think the Senator will find that that is true.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If that be true, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin it was agreed to by the House committee. The House committee did not resist it. It was after the *Roma* disaster that the House committee came to the conclusion—and the House, too, for that matter—that we ought to make every effort to conserve as much of this helium gas as possible.

Mr. LENROOT. This helium gas is not destroyed. It accumulates. It is not lost.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But it is being wasted every day that we do not extract it from the commercial gas.

Mr. LENROOT. That is true.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And there is only a limited amount of helium-bearing gas in existence.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the committee will prevail, reducing this amount \$100,000. Senators realize that even with the committee amendment we are proposing to spend next year \$600,000 for helium gas. It is a very serious question whether we will have use in the future for the gas that \$600,000 will produce in addition to what we already have. The use of these very large Zeppelins is very questionable.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the Senator know how much we have now?

Mr. LENROOT. About 2,000,000 feet, as I recollect.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Two million four hundred thousand feet, and that is only enough to fill a ship like the *Roma* twice.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; and we do not know yet whether we want any ships or not. It is all an experiment thus far.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We are building one at present, and we are to get one from Germany.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; and if we have the same experience with those that we have had with the two already purchased by the United States we will never build another.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is the point exactly. Those were destroyed because they did not have the noninflammable gas, or at least one of them was so destroyed.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, no; the Senator is mistaken about that. They were not destroyed because of any such reason. One was destroyed because of defective construction. The other was not destroyed because of lack of helium gas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The disaster to the *Roma* was due, as I understand, to the ignition of the gas.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, it burned up after it was wrecked; yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; my understanding was that it was due to the fact that it was filled with inflammable gas; but the point is, if we are going to continue to operate the plant, whether it is not economy to appropriate \$800,000, which will keep the plant going continuously for 10 months and produce 10,000,000 cubic feet of this gas, thereby preventing a continuous waste through failure to extract it from the commercial gas, or whether we should appropriate a smaller amount and produce a much smaller amount of gas.

Mr. LENROOT. Why does the Senator say that with \$600,000 we can produce only 2,000,000 feet, while with \$800,000 we can produce 10,000,000 feet?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Because that is what the testimony here shows; that with \$500,000 we produced but 2,000,000 feet approximately last year.

Mr. LENROOT. What can that possibly be based upon?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is based upon the fact that when you once get the plant going and your personnel assembled, the longer you can operate it the greater will become the production.

Mr. LENROOT. I am satisfied that there can not be any such difference. The plant is in a going condition to-day, and all that it requires is the getting together of the personnel and the operating. I think \$600,000 is plenty to appropriate in a single year for helium gas, the use of which, except for balloons, is still questionable.

Mr. SHEPPARD. With an appropriation of \$500,000 we only produced 2,000,000 cubic feet last year. I was basing my calculation on that fact. I believe it would be in the interest of economy to keep in the military and naval appropriation bills the amounts which were put in them by the House. The Naval Affairs Committee has recommended \$400,000 for the Navy's share, and the House has put in the Army bill \$400,000 for the Army's share.

I ask for a vote upon the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRANDEGEE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from New York that I shall endeavor to place facts before him which I believe will convince him that the \$400,000 should be retained in conference.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well.

Mr. President, on the bottom of page 62, on line 25, I ask that the word "other" be struck out after the word "such."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 62, line 25, after the word "such," it is proposed to strike out the word "other," so that it will read:

And such technical services as the Secretary of War—

And so forth.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. On the same line, after the word "technical," I ask that the words "and other" be inserted, so that it will read "and such technical and other services."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The READING CLERK. On page 62, line 25, after the word "technical," it is proposed to insert "and other."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, that finishes the committee amendments to the bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 132, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

MUSCLE SHOALS.

For the continuation of the work on Dam No. 2 on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Ala., to be immediately available, \$7,500,000.

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

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have not considered in any way the merits of the amendment, but I should like to ask whether that is in order under the rule about amendments offered by another committee—I do not know the facts—whether or not it has been referred to the Committee on Appropriations one day before, as the rules, I think, require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has no information about it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I was unable to hear the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I asked whether the amendment had been referred to the Committee on Appropriations one day before, as required by the rule.

Mr. NORRIS. Whether this amendment was so referred?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. It was not.

Mr. LODGE. Section 2 of Rule XVI provides:

All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and when actually proposed to the bill no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received—

And so forth.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think the amendment is in order by virtue of the new rule—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask a question? Do I understand that there is a point of order pending?

Mr. NORRIS. I did not understand that the Senator from Massachusetts made a point of order.

Mr. LODGE. I made an inquiry of the Chair. I did it because I did not know the facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts propounded a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand, but I wanted to know if there was a point of order pending. If no point of order is made, of course—

Mr. LODGE. I will make the point of order under the rule, because I think it ought to be settled. This amendment has not complied with the rule as I read it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I just wanted to know whether or not there was a point of order before we started to discuss it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There had not been, but there now is, as the Chair understands.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, on the point of order, I think this amendment is in order under the new rule adopted by the Senate. As I understand, it is not in the manual yet. I am reading from the resolution as it was agreed to by the Senate:

Resolved, That clause 1 of Rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate be amended so as to read as follows, to wit:

1. All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law—

This is in order under that provision, as a matter of fact.

Or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate or proposed in pursuance of an estimate submitted in accordance with law.

This amendment is in order under two different clauses that I have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator permit the Chair to call his attention to the fact that what he has read is the new rule to be substituted for the first clause of Rule XVI?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But the point of order made by the Senator from Massachusetts, as the Chair understands, is made under the second clause of Rule XVI.

Mr. NORRIS. If the second clause of Rule XVI conflicts with the new rule, of course the new rule will take precedence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But the new rule amends only the first clause.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that; but if the first clause then conflicts with the second clause, the first clause, being the last enactment, of course prevails.

I want to say to the Chair that this amendment is in order, as I have said, under two provisions: First, the rule says that no new amendment shall be offered unless—now, what are the exceptions? One of them is unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law. That is true of this amendment. Under the national defense act provision was made for the development of the necessary power to make explosives in time of war and fertilizers in time of peace.

The President, under the act, was authorized to locate the place or places in the United States where that law should be carried out. In accordance with that act, the President, by official communication, selected Muscle Shoals as one of the places. This amendment is to carry out the provisions of that law. Under that law the particular dam to which this amendment applies was partially constructed. Under the law and under the designation of the President the dam known as No. 2, to which this amendment applies, was begun. Work was carried on, and \$17,000,000 were expended in carrying it on, and it is in that condition to-day, partially constructed.

It will take three years to develop it. It will take three times the amount of money that is provided by this particular amendment, if this applies to only one year. So under that provision the amendment I have offered is in order, even if it were not offered under the direction of a standing committee.

I think this rule is complete in itself, a new rule adopted after the other one was in force, and that the amendment was in order under the other provision as being moved by direction of a standing committee. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which has had this matter under consideration for a great many weeks, have had very extended hearings on it and most of the committee made a personal inspection of the work itself, and after all of that consideration and deliberation unanimously directed the chairman of the committee to offer the amendment I have proposed.

It seems perfectly clear to me, therefore, that under either one of these provisions the amendment is in order. It is true I have not read the law to the Chair, but no one denies that that is the law. I had no idea that a point of order would be made against the amendment. In my office I have a copy of the official letter of President Wilson designating Muscle Shoals under the provisions of the national defense act. There can be no question about it, and therefore, Mr. President, no one will question but that the work there in contemplation, partially finished, is carrying out a provision of law directing the President of the United States to make this particular improvement.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I would like to call the Senator's attention to the language of what he says is the new rule. The part he read is merely a repetition of the old rule and does not change it in any particular.

Mr. NORRIS. Is the part I have read the same as the old rule?

Mr. LENROOT. It is a part of the old rule.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that while the point of order seems to be justified, it can easily be obviated if the Senate desires to do so, and I apprehend if the Senate is unwilling to do that it would not adopt the amendment upon a direct vote on it.

The provision of the rule which is invoked as rendering the amendment obnoxious at this time is as follows:

All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

If the point of order be sustained, the Senator can ask that his amendment be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and then postpone final action upon the bill until another day, when consideration of the amendment will be in order.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to inquire of the Senator from Arkansas why this amendment is not in order under that provision of the rule providing that an amendment is in order

if it is proposed for the purpose of carrying out something authorized by law?

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not wish to put myself in the attitude of arguing against the position taken by the Senator from Nebraska, although in frankness I have stated that I am inclined to the opinion that the amendment at this time is obnoxious to the rule; but I will answer the Senator's question.

The same language is employed in the old rule as is used under this new rule, and paragraph 2 of the old rule, as I construe it in connection with paragraph 1, provided that even in case an amendment is proposed which is intended to carry out existing law, if it is moved by direction of a standing committee of the Senate, it must be proposed one day before it is considered. The object of the rule is manifest; to give the Appropriations Committee an opportunity of considering it, and of giving the Senate an opportunity also of becoming familiar with it.

The new rule does not change that in any particular, and clause 2, in my judgment, has the same force under the new rule that it had under the old rule. But, as I have already suggested, if the Senator decides to do so—and I am in sympathy with his purpose—he can accomplish his end by having the amendment referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and then by postponing further consideration of this bill until to-morrow, when the amendment may be considered.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Chair sustains the point of order I think I shall then offer the amendment as an individual. Paragraph 2 does not apply to an amendment offered by an individual Senator, even if the Senator's argument is correct, and it would be in order under that provision of the rule which makes it in order to offer an amendment to carry out a provision of law.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think the Senator could do that. He can offer the amendment again in his own right, but it might be again held subject to a point of order.

Mr. LODGE. It is perfectly obvious that the course which the Senator from Arkansas has suggested can be pursued. Therefore, pressing this point of order would have no effect, except to delay, and I have no desire to delay the bill—far from it—and, as far as I am concerned, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. ROBINSON. I made the suggestion because I thought that would be the result. I thought the Senator from Massachusetts would take that view of it when that situation was presented and withdraw his suggestion, and I thank him for doing it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not care to take up the time of the Senate in debate on this amendment unless it becomes necessary. As far as I know, every Senator who has investigated this question is satisfied that this amendment ought to be adopted, and that this work ought to proceed. If there are any Senators who do not agree to that or think that some further explanation ought to be made, I am prepared to go on and give in detail a statement of the conditions down there.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I have to leave the Chamber in a moment, and I would like to make a short statement.

Mr. NORRIS. I yield the floor.

Mr. LENROOT. No. The Senator need not yield the floor, as I shall take just a moment. Heretofore I have opposed this appropriation, as the Senate well knows, and I based my opposition wholly upon the ground that as the situation then existed I was satisfied the Alabama Power Co. would be the only customer for this power. I am satisfied that the situation has now changed, and if this dam is completed there will be no difficulty in securing a fair price for the power, because there will be a sufficient demand for it. I shall therefore favor the appropriation.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Senator. I do not care to take up the time unless some one wants to ask me a question.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator a question. I have not had an opportunity to look into the proposals which have been made to Congress by Mr. Ford and others. I do not know whether Mr. Ford's proposal should be accepted or not, but I wonder what effect the adoption of this amendment, if it shall become a part of the law, would have with reference to that proposition.

Mr. NORRIS. The question asked by the Senator from Washington is a very natural one. It is one which might occur to any Senator. Permit me to say, in answer to it, that there were quite a number of propositions made. Mr. Ford has made one, the Alabama Power Co. has made one, Mr. Engstrom has made one, and there are two or three others who have submitted offers. The committee has given a great deal of consideration to them. There will be a marked difference of opinion in the committee, to some extent, as to which of the propositions should be accepted, if any. There will very likely be a lengthy

discussion by Members of the Senate as to what our permanent policy there should be. There is plenty of opportunity for disagreement. That, however, is not involved now, and the committee are unanimous in this action, even though they disagree, as I think they will, as to these proposals. This will not interfere with anybody's proposition. It will not interfere with any bid that has been made. The only difference will be that, whatever bid is accepted, there will be a slight modification because of the additional money the Government of the United States puts into it, and in connection with all the bids, practically, but one, the Government would have to do all the building, anyway.

So those who are for one proposition or those who are for another; those who think the Alabama Power Co. ought to have it or somebody else ought to have it; those who think the Government ought to retain it, can all rest at ease in the knowledge that those questions will not be determined or jeopardized by this action. The matter will still be open and the committee figures that that question being such an important one, and the tariff bill being before the Senate and likely to take up most of the time, it would probably be a physical impossibility for the Congress to determine what the permanent policy should be, or whose offer, if anyone's, should be accepted.

As I said, the Government has spent \$17,000,000 there; they have a railroad clear across the river. They have all kinds of machinery there, mixing machinery, and all the necessary paraphernalia to go ahead with the work. All they need is the money to do it, and there is likely to be, and will be sooner or later, if we delay long enough, a loss of \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000. The improvements there are not intended to be permanent. For instance, at one end of the dam there are 13 acres of the river bed surrounded by cofferdams. There are other places where temporary structures of that kind are made, other cofferdams, for the purpose of doing the work. If they should go out, or if the bridge on which the railroad crosses the river, only a temporary structure, of course, not intended to be permanent, should go out, a damage of perhaps \$2,000,000 or \$2,500,000 might occur at any time, and sooner or later will occur, because it is only temporary, and can not last very many years. It is not built to last.

So this particular appropriation, to permit the Government to go ahead, was agreed to unanimously. The officers of the Government who will have charge of the work are there now. The machinery is all there, the cars are there, the engines are there, the mixers are there, the machinery to put in the wheels and everything is stored there in sheds. It is all there, and it is really an economic crime to delay a moment in going ahead.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand the theory and the opinion of the Senator, and I suppose of the committee, is that this work will be done?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Either by the Government, or by private parties under an arrangement with the Government, or in some other way, but that the great work there will be done and carried to completion, and that it is more economical, and in the interest of getting it done quickly, to make this appropriation and have the work go on now.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I am not going to detain the Senate at this late hour. I think the situation with reference to Muscle Shoals and the testimony which has come before Congress has clearly demonstrated the fact that there is only one economical way to handle the question of that dam, and that is to finish it at the earliest possible moment. I say, without fear of contradiction, now that the testimony has been brought before the two Houses of Congress on the proposals which have been made to the Secretary of War, when we complete this dam it will be an asset in the hands of the Government worth every dollar expended, and if it is not completed there is \$17,000,000 lost in the river.

This does not settle the question as to how the Muscle Shoals Dam and project shall be disposed of. As to the dam itself there is a variance of views. If Mr. Ford's proposition comes before the Senate, I shall vote for it, but that question is not involved here now. I think it would be a waste of money and a waste of time for the Government to wait until we determine what we are going to do with the dam before we finish it. I think it will be a much better asset to dispose of if we proceed to finish it at once. Therefore I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska will be agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I was "just thinking," as the New England home comedy says, in my irresponsible sort of way, what would have become of the Henry Ford proposition for the Government of the United States to turn over the Muscle Shoals proposition at the high price set, if Henry Ford had been a standpat Republican instead of being

what he is. I am sorry that I can not even tell the Senate what he is. Sometimes I think that he is a Democrat, sometimes I think that he is a shade of Bolshevik, and sometimes I think that he does not himself know just what school of politics he belongs to. All the same, outside of his hatred of Jews, which is totally unjustified, he has been a remarkable man in his chosen occupation. No man has ever shown the genius for making money out of power and out of locomotives of one sort or another that Henry Ford has shown.

Unfortunately for him as a business proposition he happened to run against a very distinguished standpat Republican and happened to be apparently defeated by him, and there happened to be a trial in the Senate later on. The consequence was that the word passed around—I think more or less privately, somewhat spiritualistically—that whatever else happened, Henry Ford must not be allowed to make any money out of the United States Government. After that word passed around, the next argument or word from the standpatters was that Henry Ford was offering to take over an impossible proposition that would bankrupt him.

Of course, I know that the average standpatter did not have away back in the back of his head even that reason as the only reason, because I know that if he wanted to do anything in God's world it was to bankrupt Henry Ford. So all the arguments that have been made to the effect that Henry Ford could not carry out his contract and might be bankrupted are pure camouflage, not even of the scientific and coloristic variety that during the war zigzagged, but of the original variety of woodpecker that tried to hide its red head behind a green bower.

Now, Mr. President, seriously speaking, I think it is about time we quit this foolishness. Here is a proposition that the United States Government absolutely wanted to throw into the junk pile. There was expert advice to them that there was no money in it, and that the Government had better sever itself from it and divorce itself from it just as soon as possible. "No money in it, no possible money in it," no anything in it. It looked as if for a little while that the plant would be sold, like one of the transport ships built during the war, for about one-tenth the price that it cost. Then out comes a man, an excoriated man in certain circles, a man who succeeded in gaining the admiration of some men of tolerably good sense—he succeeded in gaining mine—who offers to take over the whole thing at a very high price, a price so high that part of the men who were fighting him say that it will bankrupt him and he can not make it pay. Then these two things come together and the consequence is that Henry Ford's Muscle Shoals proposition has been hanging fire for I do not know how many months—I think about 12 or 14, but I do not remember. The consequence of all that is that even a point of order was made a few moments ago.

There is something peculiar about a point of order. Nobody is sworn to observe the parliamentary law of any legislative body. A point of order in its making is within one's discretion. I have never known a point of order to be made by anybody, except one fool in the House about 21 years ago who thought he was a parliamentary sharp and made a point of order in order to prove that he knew, unless the mover of it wanted to defeat the main proposition. I have never known it to be made but once by a man who did not want to defeat the main proposition.

So we stand with the point of order made by the Republican floor leader and with the arguments that have been made in the press, without much argument in the Senate of one description or another. Of course, the object of a point of order was to keep from having a trial by the jury, and then when the point of order is withdrawn it merely means that the man who by analogy put a "demurrer" in the court has thought that he discovered that the court might decide against him, and therefore he had better withdraw it and go on the issue to the jury. This explains his withdrawal of it. Now, we have the issue before the jury on the first plea of the case, not the last one. I am sorry it is not the last one.

If there ever was, this is a case where a Government had on its hands a white elephant that was worthless, as its experts told it. Experts! Of all the contemptible words in the English language the word "expert" is the most contemptible. The experts said that it was a white elephant, and that it could neither work nor sell, and its political advisers told the Government not to regard Ford's proposition because "there was politics in the proposition."

This man undertakes to take over this plant and to work it out, and to give to the Government a certain amount of money at the risk of bankrupting himself—the experts say with a certainty of bankrupting himself, some of the standpat politicians say with a certainty of bankrupting himself, and some others say with a certainty of "profiteering" to an immense

amount at the expense of the United States Government. We can leave the profiteer pleader and the bankruptcy pleader discussing the matter with each other.

Here this man makes his offer. It has been hanging here, with expense accumulating, overhead and otherwise, while the Government has been losing money, some 14 months or more just simply because that man happened to have run upon a Democratic ticket in the State of Michigan for the Senate of the United States.

That is all. If you think you can fool the country about it you are vastly mistaken. There are fools in this country, and every now and then in a general election a majority of fools temporarily. You can fool a majority of them some of the time, but you can not fool a majority of them all the time, and as a rule you can not fool them over about three or four months after they have been fooled once, whether it was at a general election or otherwise.

I remember the great French author's work "J'accuse." I am not putting myself in his place, but I "charge" that the only reason in the world why the Ford proposition has not been accepted by both Houses of Congress in its former form, or in its present form, which is still more favorable to the Government, is because a majority of this body and a majority of the other body are Republicans and Ford is not. Now, mark you, I do not even say he is a Democrat, because according to my idea of democracy, according to my school of thought, he is not quite a Democrat. But he was at least a candidate against a standpat Republican of the old style in one State of this Union. After that he still further cultivated the standpat hatred by carrying on a contest in this body, a contest in the issue of which he had nothing to hope for, only that in his opinion the man who was not entitled to the seat should not be seated. That was all.

Oh, that there could be an appeal to the conscience of the standpat Republican Party. Of course, I realize that there can not be, but if there could be, I would appeal to it to-day to do something which would bring money into the Treasury at no expense to the Government, at a time when the Treasury is not working equal to the disbursements that go out of it day by day, threatened through bonus bills and other things with irretrievable bankruptcy—and here is a proposition to put money into the Treasury and help the Government and hurt nobody except, perhaps, Henry Ford, who may go bankrupt.

Let the proposition go through. All of you remember as well as I do the time when you considered Muscle Shoals as being on the junk pile, and that we might just as well pay somebody to take it over, and the Republican official reports show that that was the condition, and that was the congressional opinion. Then comes up a wild ass in the desert, Bolshevik, in the opinion of some of you, wild ass in the opinion of others of you, intermeddler and disturber of the peace of the Senate in the opinion of others of you, and says, "I will pay you a very large sum of money for that plant"; more money than the average man in a lifetime of 70 years of hard industry could earn to save his life; earned by a man with a peculiar genius for developing the use of motive power.

He is met by all sorts of obstruction in committee of the House of Representatives, and in the Senate itself, in committee here and in the House, and by points of order here and there. He is met by a little Democratic opposition, too, now and then. Somebody avers that his son was not loyal during the war. However, if the fellow is a wild ass of the desert, if he does not know what he is doing, and if he is a bad scamp of every description, then let him have the contract and pay the money into the Treasury and bankrupt himself, and let him go at that.

Are you not capable of that amount of magnanimity, at any rate, notwithstanding the fact that he was the author, that he was the gatherer together, call it, of evidence in a lately contested and very celebrated election case?

Mr. President, of course I am not appealing to the "standpat" conscience; no man of real knowledge ever appeals to a thing that is nonexistent, but I am appealing to the memory of the time when there was a "standpat" conscience, and I am also appealing to the common sense and political wisdom of the present standpatters, who, each and all, in view of the recent primaries in Indiana and Pennsylvania, are now rushing to deny that they are or ever were standpatters.

I tell you it would be better political wisdom for you to make the most that can be made out of this situation for the Government in a businesslike way, and to surrender your hatred of Henry Ford.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not think the Senator from Mississippi understands that this is merely an appropriation for the dam; that it has nothing whatever to do with the other features of the proposition, and will not interfere with any of the offers to lease the property. I feel sure that the Senate will vote for this appropriation and make the necessary beginning of this work.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that thoroughly. The Senator is often mistaken when he undertakes to give the Senator from Mississippi a bit of information about what is going on. It is a question of the completion of the dam, but, if it is defeated, it affects the entire proposition. The Senator from Georgia knows that as well as I. This is the skirmish before the battle upon the question of Ford's undertaking the Muscle Shoals development project. Is not that true?

Oh, well, if the Senator from Georgia does not think so, I know that this is the opening skirmish; this is the firing on the picket line in connection with the larger proposition of allowing Henry Ford to develop the Muscle Shoals project. I know that as well as I know any situation, and he, with average intelligence, ought to know it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let us vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CUMMINS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 14 it is proposed to strike out lines 14 to 21, inclusive, and to insert the following:

For the preparation, for historical purposes, of the following documents and information concerning officers and soldiers from the several States and the District of Columbia who were in the military service of the United States during the World War; and which The Adjutant General of the Army is hereby directed to furnish to the adjutant generals of the several States and the District of Columbia, \$250,000, to be immediately available.

(1) As to individuals—

(a) True and correct copies of the individual record cards of all officers and all enlisted or selected men, excepting such as have heretofore been so furnished; and

(b) A statement as to each officer or enlisted or selected man who died in the service, showing the place and date of death of such officer or man and the cause of death, whether by wounds, accident, or disease; and such statement shall be furnished in each case, irrespective of whether the individual record card of such officer or man has heretofore or is to be hereafter furnished: *Provided*, That in all such cases, if death occurred in a hospital, the name or number and location of such hospital shall appear; and if the death occurred in action or in the field, the official designation of such action, if any, together with the local designation of the place where the same occurred, shall appear.

(2) As to units—

(a) A tabulated statement showing the title of the organization; the race of the unit, white or Negro; the date it was authorized; its maximum strength; where and when mobilized or organized, and when it left the United States, if at all, for service overseas; its stations, assignments, and service, both in the United States and overseas, with the dates thereof, and appropriate remark as to combat or other service of importance; when returned to the United States; when and where demobilized, transferred, or otherwise discontinued as a distinct organization; and

(b) A tabulated statement showing the designation of each noncombat unit which formed a part of or was attached to any division or other tactical unit during the World War, and the dates of joining or relief therefrom, in such form as may be used as an addition to the histories of divisions and other tactical units heretofore furnished to the adjutant generals of the several States and the District of Columbia; *Provided*, That, for the purposes of this and the preceding paragraph, the term "overseas service" shall mean any service outside or beyond the continental limits of the United States, but in case the unit did not serve overseas its stations in the United States shall be given.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I am fairly familiar with the text of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa, and other members of the committee have also had a view of it. If the other members of the committee do not object to the amendment, for one I am willing to accept it and see if we can thrash the matter out in conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I desire to offer one more amendment, and this will be my last proposal, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent to insert on page 62, after line 15, the amendment which I send to the desk. Its effect will be to place the Aviation Service upon the same status as the other supply corps in the matter of making contracts for current needs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 62, after line 15, it is proposed to insert:

Hereafter whenever contracts which are not to be performed within six months are made on behalf of the Government by the Chief of Air Service or by officers of the Air Service authorized to make them, and are in excess of \$500 in amount, such contracts shall be reduced

to writing and signed by the contracting parties. In all other cases contracts shall be entered into under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Chief of Air Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ORDER FOR RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session to-day it shall take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

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

RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENT WORK.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have received a telegram, which I ask may be read. It relates to a pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read the telegram.

The reading clerk read as follows:

ONTARIO, OREG., June 1, 1922.

Senator ASHURST,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

The Ontario (Oreg.) Chamber of Commerce sends you a vote of thanks for your stand in demanding that the Smith-McNary bill be passed at this session. We hope you will not let them adjourn until they do so. The following is a copy of the telegram we are sending to-day to President Harding:

"Hon. WARREN G. HARDING,
White House, Washington, D. C.:

"The hopes of the West are centered upon the passage of the Smith-McNary bill which has been held up by Congress. May we not ask you to exert your influence with Congress to help in the passage of this bill at this session. Ten million people in the West are requesting this to be done as part of the Republican platform. The passage of this measure will mean 1,000,000 new homes in the West on lands and in towns, will stimulate business all over the United States, and give employment to thousands of men. We ask your help in getting action at this session."

ONTARIO COMMERCIAL CLUB.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, in connection with the telegram I wish to say that the McNary-Smith irrigation bill has been reported favorably from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. I spoke a few words upon it some days ago, but I ought to say, in view of the telegram which has just been read, that the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], has done everything within human power to advance the bill. I am sure that no one could have done more. I wish again to express the hope that the gavel will not be allowed to fall in either House, bringing about final adjournment of the present session of Congress, until that bill shall have been passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened; and (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, June 3, 1922, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 2 (legislative day of April 20), 1922.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Lewis P. Summers, of Virginia, to be United States attorney, western district of Virginia, vice Thomas J. Muncey, deceased.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Frank T. Newton, of Michigan, to be United States marshal, eastern district of Michigan, vice Henry Behrendt, term expired.

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Col. Joseph Wheeler, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 22, 1920.

Col. Charles Higbee Bridges, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. Ralph Brewster Parrott, Infantry, with rank from December 23, 1920.

Lieut. Col. George Luther Hicks, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. David Yulee Beckham, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. John Fleming Clapham, Infantry, with rank from November 26, 1921.

Maj. Stuart Ainslee Howard, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Hugh Lawson Walthall, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. John Buchanan Richardson, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Clarence Andrew Mitchell, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Torbert MacMillan, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Henry Newbold Sumner, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. James Sylvester Mooney, Cavalry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Walter Cyrus Gullion, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Frank Cornelius Reilly, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Charles Clement Quigley, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

Nan E. De Yampert to be postmaster at Wilmot, Ark., in place of B. H. Harper, not commissioned.

CALIFORNIA.

Earl C. McWayne to be postmaster at Firebaugh, Calif. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

COLORADO.

Thomas E. Downey to be postmaster at Ordway, Colo., in place of S. P. Ilgenfritz. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

CONNECTICUT.

Francis W. Chaffee, jr., to be postmaster at Eagleville, Conn., in place of J. W. Green, resigned.

Walfred C. Carlson to be postmaster at Washington Depot, Conn., in place of W. C. Carlson. Incumbent's commission expired April 30, 1922.

GEORGIA.

William M. Redman to be postmaster at Jackson, Ga., in place of Bessie Waldrop. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1922.

ILLINOIS.

Daisy F. Lynk to be postmaster at Mokena, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Luella H. McCoid to be postmaster at Venice, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

William A. Kelley to be postmaster at Jonesboro, Ill., in place of J. C. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1921.

Nelson H. Webster to be postmaster at Naperville, Ill., in place of E. M. Dieter, resigned.

INDIANA.

Hugh A. Fenters to be postmaster at Macy, Ind. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Clarence E. Sparling to be postmaster at Osgood, Ind., in place of O. R. Jenkins, resigned.

IOWA.

Henry L. Shaffer to be postmaster at Crawfordsville, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

John Geiger to be postmaster at Minden, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Gust A. Hall to be postmaster at Colo, Iowa, in place of W. F. Bales. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1921.

KENTUCKY.

Ward H. Metcalfe to be postmaster at Brooksville, Ky., in place of H. H. Poage. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

Carl H. Boone to be postmaster at Leitchfield, Ky., in place of E. W. McClure, resigned.

Tom H. Brown to be postmaster at Millersburg, Ky., in place of J. B. Cray. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1922.

LOUISIANA.

John F. Basty to be postmaster at Destrehan, La. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

David S. Leach to be postmaster at Florien, La. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Louis P. Bourgeois to be postmaster at Gramercy, La. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Claud Jones to be postmaster at Longleaf, La. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Weston W. Muse to be postmaster at Lottie, La. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Nelle Masten to be postmaster at Woodworth, La. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Marion H. Page to be postmaster at Fullerton, La., in place of M. H. Page, resigned.

Otis Waguespack to be postmaster at St. Patricks, La., in place of F. J. Bourgeois. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1922.

MINNESOTA.

Marie D. Anderson to be postmaster at Carlos, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

MONTANA.

Rudolph P. Petersen to be postmaster at Rudyard, Mont., in place of R. P. Petersen. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1922.

NEW YORK.

Albert C. Stanton to be postmaster at Atlanta, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1920.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Chester C. Lord to be postmaster at Montreat, N. C., in place of A. R. Bauman. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1921.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Jacob Omdahl to be postmaster at Galesburg, N. Dak. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

OHIO.

Ferne V. Boone to be postmaster at Sterling, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

James M. Light to be postmaster at Greenville, Ohio, in place of A. H. Meeker, deceased.

OKLAHOMA.

Elmer E. Heady to be postmaster at Gate, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Louia M. Amick to be postmaster at Jefferson, Okla. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

Cora E. Morris to be postmaster at Manchester, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Reuben J. Knox to be postmaster at Rutledge, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Daniel Jones to be postmaster at Coaldale, Pa., in place of Edward Cavanaugh. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1920.

George E. Baldwin to be postmaster at Hastings, Pa., in place of P. V. Abel, resigned.

Andrew L. Coffman to be postmaster at Phoenixville, Pa., in place of J. A. Hartman, removed.

Florence H. Gray to be postmaster at Rosemont, Pa., in place of J. C. McDowell, deceased.

James A. Woodard to be postmaster at Shinglehouse, Pa., in place of F. H. Failing, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Andrew L. Dickson to be postmaster at Calhoun Falls, S. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

Samuel W. Parks to be postmaster at Fort Mill, S. C., in place of B. H. Massey, resigned.

TENNESSEE.

Frank J. Nunn to be postmaster at Brownsville, Tenn., in place of William Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

TEXAS.

Claud C. Morris to be postmaster at Rosebud, Tex., in place of H. C. Connally, resigned.

Clinton J. Farrell to be postmaster at Vernon, Tex., in place of J. V. Townsend, resigned.

VIRGINIA.

Charles L. Horne to be postmaster at Glade Spring, Va., in place of A. T. Hull, resigned.

William J. Crockett to be postmaster at Graham, Va., in place of W. C. Greever, resigned.

WASHINGTON.

Lillian M. Tyler to be postmaster at Brewster, Wash., in place of L. A. Dale, resigned.

Matthew E. Morgan to be postmaster at Lind, Wash., in place of M. C. Hayden. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1922.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Harvey A. Henderson to be postmaster at Minden, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1920.

Edward E. Reyburn to be postmaster at Vivian, W. Va., in place of E. E. Reyburn. Incumbent's commission expired April 30, 1922.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 2 (legislative day of April 20, 1922).

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Albert W. Harvey to be United States marshal, district of Vermont.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

To be ensigns.

Harold L. Fudge.
William H. Egan, jr.
Carl R. Brown.
Beverly M. Coleman.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

Henry F. Hanmer, Wethersfield.

GEORGIA.

William D. Lynn, Collins.
Jett M. Potts, West Point.

NEW JERSEY.

Matilda M. Hodapp, Spotswood.

NEW YORK.

Frederick Theall, Hartsdale.
Clarence M. Herrington, Johnsonville.
Fannie E. Rooney, Schroon Lake.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Orin R. York, High Point.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Otto W. Petry, Elk Lick.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

George F. Wilson, Darlington.

TEXAS.

Charley R. Jamison, Boyd.
Bert J. McDowell, Del Rio.
Fred C. Davis, Harrisburg.
Daisy M. Singleton, Marble Falls.
Henry E. Cannon, Shelbyville.
Ada A. Ladner, Yorktown.

VERMONT.

Marion C. White, Cavendish.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate June 2 (legislative day of April 20), 1922.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Edwin Philip Hart, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 27, 1921.

First Lieut. Leonard Louis Davis, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 27, 1921.

First Lieut. Harold Leo Stiebel, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 29, 1921.

First Lieut. Webster Fletcher Putnam, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from December 1, 1921.

First Lieut. Merle Halsey Davis, Ordnance Department, from December 4, 1921.

First Lieut. George Berry Dobyms, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 4, 1921.

First Lieut. Henry Devries Cassard, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 9, 1921.

First Lieut. Edward Hanson Connor, jr., Infantry, from December 10, 1921.

First Lieut. Neal Creighton, Air Service, from December 11, 1921.

First Lieut. George Peter Toft, Quartermaster Corps, from December 15, 1921.

First Lieut. Alonzo Maning Drake, Air Service, from December 16, 1921.

First Lieut. Charles Raymond Melin, Air Service, from December 16, 1921.

First Lieut. Victor Herbert Strahm, Air Service, from December 16, 1921.

First Lieut. Robert Jesse Whatley, Infantry, from December 18, 1921.

First Lieut. Waldo Sebastian Ickes, Finance Department, from December 18, 1921.

First Lieut. Ira Robert Koenig, Air Service, from December 19, 1921.

First Lieut. Harry Allen Sanford, Philippine Scouts, from December 22, 1921.

First Lieut. Earl Wells, Philippine Scouts, from December 22, 1921.

First Lieut. Raynor Garey, Field Artillery, from December 22, 1921.

First Lieut. Philip Schneeberger, Air Service, from December 23, 1921.

First Lieut. Gouverneur Hoes, Infantry, from December 24, 1921.

First Lieut. Victor Schmidt, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 24, 1921.

First Lieut. George Franklin Parris, Air Service, from December 24, 1921.

First Lieut. Fred Bidwell Lyle, Field Artillery, from December 25, 1921.

First Lieut. Karl Shaffner Axtater, Air Service, from December 26, 1921.

First Lieut. Clinton Bowen Fisk Brill, Quartermaster Corps, from December 28, 1921.

First Lieut. William Joseph Flood, Air Service, from December 28, 1921.

First Lieut. Francis Dundas Ross, jr., Infantry, from December 30, 1921.

First Lieut. Frank Edward Monville, Quartermaster Corps, from January 1, 1922.

First Lieut. George Merrill Palmer, Air Service, from January 1, 1922.

First Lieut. Charles Rawlings Chase, Cavalry, from January 2, 1922.

First Lieut. Loren Francis Parmley, Cavalry, from January 4, 1922.

First Lieut. Erle Fletcher Cress, Cavalry, from January 4, 1922.

First Lieut. Lynn Packard Vane, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 6, 1922.

First Lieut. John Austin Pixley, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 7, 1922.

First Lieut. Otta Marshall, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 8, 1922.

First Lieut. Edwin Cleveland Callicutt, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 9, 1922.

First Lieut. Ray Harrison Green, Quartermaster Corps, from January 11, 1922.

First Lieut. Hugh Williamson Rowan, Chemical Warfare Service, from January 12, 1922.

First Lieut. Russell William Goodyear, Quartermaster Corps, from January 12, 1922.

First Lieut. Lewis Rinehart Pfoutz Reese, Air Service, from January 15, 1922.

First Lieut. Byron Turner Burt, jr., Air Service, from January 21, 1922.

First Lieut. Earle Gene Harper, Air Service, from January 28, 1922.

First Lieut. Philip Gilstrap Bruton, Corps of Engineers, from January 29, 1922.

First Lieut. Eugene Joseph Minarelli FitzGerald, Infantry, from January 31, 1922.

First Lieut. Charles Earl Whitney, Ordnance Department, from February 5, 1922.

First Lieut. Lotha August Smith, Air Service, from February 5, 1922.

First Lieut. Edward Higley Guilford, Air Service, from February 11, 1922.

First Lieut. Junius Augustus Smith, Air Service, from February 22, 1922.

First Lieut. William Henry Carthy, Air Service, from February 22, 1922.

First Lieut. Horace Leland Porter, Corps of Engineers, from February 22, 1922.

First Lieut. Arthur Leo Lavery, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 22, 1922.

(The resignation of First Lieut. Edwin Philip Hart, Coast Artillery Corps, May 25, 1922, necessitates the removal of his name from the nomination list and causes a change in the vacancies for all first lieutenants junior to him who have been nominated for promotion.)

First Lieut. Ernest Andrew Thompson, Signal Corps, from February 22, 1922.

First Lieut. William Andrew Gray, Air Service, from February 22, 1922.

First Lieut. Franz Joseph Jonitz, Quartermaster Corps, from February 24, 1922.

First Lieut. William Valery Andrews, Air Service, from February 24, 1922.

First Lieut. George Stefekluh, Quartermaster Corps, from February 25, 1922.

First Lieut. Frank Marion Barrell, Quartermaster Corps, from February 28, 1922.

First Lieut. Stanton Higgins, Cavalry, from February 28, 1922.

First Lieut. Holden Spear, Quartermaster Corps, from February 28, 1922.

First Lieut. Frank Merrill Bartlett, Air Service, from March 2, 1922.

First Lieut. Benson Glenwood Scott, Field Artillery, from March 2, 1922.

First Lieut. Redding Francis Perry, Cavalry, from March 2, 1922.

First Lieut. Walter Arthur Metts, jr., Field Artillery, from March 5, 1922.

First Lieut. Frank Camm, Field Artillery, from March 6, 1922.

First Lieut. Robert Morgan Burrowes, Infantry, from March 7, 1922.

First Lieut. Richard Oscar Bassett, jr., Infantry, from March 9, 1922, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Percy Stuart Lowe, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 12, 1922.

First Lieut. Lewis Alonzo Murray, Corps of Engineers, from March 14, 1922.

First Lieut. Rene Edward de Russy, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 23, 1922.

First Lieut. Marion Gardner Putnam, Air Service, from March 27, 1922.

First Lieut. Clyde Grady, Infantry, from March 29, 1922.

First Lieut. Walter Drake Williams, Air Service, from March 29, 1922.

First Lieut. William Henry Payne, Quartermaster Corps, from April 1, 1922.

First Lieut. Thomas Tilson Conway, Infantry, from April 2, 1922.

First Lieut. Edgar Ambrose Jarman, Infantry, from April 4, 1922.

First Lieut. Regeon Victor Love, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 5, 1922.

First Lieut. Svening Johannes Bang, Cavalry, from April 6, 1922.

First Lieut. Allan Sheldon Willis, Infantry, from April 6, 1922.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, June 2, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, for all encouragements that make us more hopeful, we bless Thee; for all loving messages and glad surprises, we thank Thee; for sincere friendships that mean trust and confidence, we praise Thee, and for all the little joys and sweet blessings that come to us through the hours of each day we are grateful to Thee. Strengthen us by daily communications of truth and wisdom and always may our fidelity to duty be without hesitation. Subdue and restrain all evil passions. May there be the enjoyment of fellowship and the exercise of high and just desire among our fellow citizens, and may hate be a bitterness unknown. O make the whole earth glad with a new song, young with a new spring, and alive with a new hope. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. APPLEBY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on H. J. Res. 337, with respect to the port of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. APPLEBY. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I appreciate your courtesy in permitting me to extend my remarks in the