

their respective companies at once; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of mass meeting of parents and citizens in Powell School and District of Columbia urging Congress to take immediate action on appropriation bill now pending in Senate as will increase salaries of teachers in public schools 100 per cent; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. GREGG: Petition of residents of Palestine, Texas City, and Crockett, Tex., asking for repeal of postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Memorial of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, urging restoration of powers of Interstate Commerce Commission to suspend rates and indorsing Senate bill 5020; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce urging legislation for Roosevelt National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Dr. and Mrs. Frederick S. Gould, Santa Barbara, Cal., urging favorable consideration of Lewis-Raker bill, conferring military rank upon Army nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution of Connecticut Legislature, urging that principle of self-determination be applied to all small nations, including Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Cranston, R. I., urging passage of legislation respecting self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of certain residents of Hartford County, Conn., protesting against the luxury-tax provisions in pending revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Hartford, Conn., for providing labor, etc., for honorably discharged men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Conn., favoring establishment of league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Petition of Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, Lodge No. 904, Sayre, Pa., favoring Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of members of Keystone Council, No. 50, Daughters of America, McKeesport, Pa., Mrs. Annie Townsend, secretary, urging passage of Senate bill 5139; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Woodrow Lodge, No. 1038, I. A. of M., Pitcairn, Pa., urging Government control of all railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Pennsylvania Confectioners' Association of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging that the revenue act of October 3, 1917, remain in force, thus making the passage of the pending revenue act unnecessary; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Retail Merchants' Association of Pittsburgh, Pa., W. M. Jacoby, secretary, protesting against retention of the luxury taxes in the revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of Fred C. Ray and other citizens of Hallowell, Me., for national ownership and Government management of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of certain citizens of Uno, Cal., asking for repeal of postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of women's committee of the California State Council of National Defense, relating to reconstruction problems and policies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Baldemann Chocolate Co., of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the proposed revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Santa Barbara (Cal.) Nurses' Association, indorsing the conferring of rank on Army nurses, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Federal Employees Union, No. 1, San Francisco, Cal., urging increased compensation for Government employees; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Mississippi Valley Waterways Association, urging upon Congress the development of inland waterways; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of R. H. Alcorn, chairman, indorsing the Keating retirement bill (H. R. 12352); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of New York Produce Exchange, urging the discontinuance of price-fixing and control of foodstuffs by the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Western Fruit Jobbers' Association of America, urging the return of Federal-controlled utilities to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Union Hardware Co., of Los Angeles, Cal., against the proposed tax of 10 per cent on arms and ammunition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, requesting Congress to repeal the provisions of the Federal-control act and indorsing Senate bill 5020; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Collins McArthur Candy Co., of San Francisco, Cal., urging against passage of the pending revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of Executive Committee, California Teachers' Association, Central Section, favoring creation of a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Memorial of Baudette Board of Trade, Baudette, Minn., in support of the proposition to provide deeper waterways connection via the St. Lawrence River to the Atlantic; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, memorial of Brainerd Chamber of Commerce, Brainerd, Minn., in support of the proposition to provide deeper waterways connection via the St. Lawrence River to the Atlantic; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of Blennerhassett Lodge, No. 699, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, Parkersburg, W. Va., relative to control of railroads by the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 7, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, with the duties pressing upon us, with the divine call ringing in our hearts for the advance of the interests of Thy people, with the solemn sense of our responsibility to Thee and to our fellow citizens, we begin the service of this day. As we lift our hearts to Thee, as we open them to Thy presence, we pray, Thee to fill us with Thy divine spirit that we may properly discern between the right and the wrong, that we may lead as Thou dost lead us, that we may commit ourselves and our Nation solely to Thy purpose. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when on request of Mr. KING and by unanimous consent the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present the credentials of Hon. MEDILL McCORMICK, duly elected by the people of the State of Illinois a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1919, which I ask to have read and placed on the files.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on the files, as follows:

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November, 1918, Hon. MEDILL McCORMICK was duly elected by the people of the State of Illinois a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1919.

Witness: His excellency, our governor, Frank O. Lowden, and our seal hereto affixed at Springfield, this 5th day of February, A. D. 1919.

By the governor:  
[SEAL.]

LOUIS L. EMMERSON,  
Secretary of State.

TRIALS BY COURTS-MARTIAL (S. DOC. NO. 380).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, in response to a Senate resolution, which will be inserted in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

The communication is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, February 4, 1919.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Senate resolution of January 27, 1919, which directs the Secretary of War "to send to the Senate the number of individuals who have been tried and convicted by court-martial proceedings since our entrance into the war, April 6, 1917, together with a brief statement of the offense charged and the nature and extent of the punishment inflicted upon or assessed against each."

This resolution is interpreted by the department to refer to the major offenses tried by the general courts-martial and not to the minor offenses tried by inferior courts. Under the interpretation thus placed upon the resolution, it will be necessary to examine about 22,000 records and approximately three weeks will be required to prepare the report. If the resolution be construed to apply to all minor offenses tried by special and summary courts, it will be necessary to examine about 350,000 additional records in this country and in France, and the preparation of the report will require several months and will necessitate the services of a very large clerical force.

In the belief that the interpretation which, as above stated, has been placed upon this resolution by the department is both in accordance with the intent of the resolution and is necessary in order that action may be taken by the department without undue delay, I have directed that the report to be prepared pursuant to this resolution cover only the approximately 22,000 records of cases tried by general courts-martial.

Trusting that this action will meet with the approval of the Senate, I am,

Respectfully,

NEWTON D. BAKER,  
Secretary of War.

#### GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the Assistant Secretary of Labor (S. Doc. No. 383), the Acting United States Food Administrator (S. Doc. No. 382), and the Assistant United States Fuel Administrator (S. Doc. No. 381), transmitting in response to a resolution of December 23, 1918, a list showing the number of civil employees in their respective departments on January 28 and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the National Academy of Sciences for the year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

#### CONDITIONS AT ARMY CAMPS IN FRANCE.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to present the following telegram, which I received from New York:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, N. Y., February 3, 1919.

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Hundreds of wounded soldiers returning complain of insanitary living conditions and of disciplinary measures at American Army classification camp at St. Aignan, France. Boys say they have to stand in mess lines for hours in mud and water over boot tops. Some report wounded dropped dead in lines. Latrines 10 feet from tents. Camp built for 8,000 has 25,000. Guardhouse full of men who violated minor rules. If one-tenth of what returning men say is true, place is hell hole and disgrace to Army and to United States. Boys call it Camp Agony. Urge investigation at once that will assure country something more than a whitewash.

JOHN J. BUSH,  
President Michigan Society of New York.

I have the original telegram here, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I trust they will inquire into the condition of that camp.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, on the 2d day of January I introduced a resolution asking for an investigation of certain conditions reported to exist at the camp at Brest, France. The resolution was objected to by Senators on the other side of the Chamber on the ground that an investigation had already been undertaken by the Secretary of War. Since that there has been no communication, to the Senate at least, and no statement given to the public by the Secretary other than the published statement from Maj. Gen. Harbord a day or two after the 3d of January, in which he stated, in response to a telegram sent by the Secretary of War, that while the conditions at Brest were bad, they were improving. That was the general purport of his telegram. Since that, if anything whatever has been done with reference to the improvement of conditions there, no statement of it has ever been given either to Congress or to the public.

I send to the desk and ask that the Secretary may read the following from the Washington Post of this morning, taken from a statement in the New York Telegram of yesterday. I will merely add that within the last 48 hours I have talked with Army officers who left the port of Brest as late as January 17, who, without knowledge of this article at all, have told me of the conditions there, and their statements bear out the statements printed in this article.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to reading the article?

There being no objection, the Secretary read as follows:

BREST CAMP "VILEST"—COST LIVES OF 3,000 UNITED STATES SOLDIERS, SAYS ARMY OFFICER—"PLAYING POLITICS" BLAMED—BARRACKS BUILT FOR 4,000 FRENCH TROOPS MADE TO ACCOMMODATE 12,000 AMERICANS, IT IS ALLEGED—OFFICER WHO ASSERTS "SCANDAL" IS DUE TO INCOMPETENCY.

NEW YORK, February 6.

Based upon information given by a Regular Army officer of high rank, who declares the camp for American troops at Brest "the vilest hole in France," the Evening Telegram prints a six-column article describing the deplorable conditions at the camp.

3,000 UNNECESSARY DEATHS.

The Telegram's article, in part, says:

"The so-called rest camp for American troops at Brest is 'the vilest hole in France.'

"More than 3,000 American soldiers died there as a result of improper housing and sanitary conditions, and many of these were officially reported as 'killed in action.'

"Regular Army officers, playing politics and thus dominating National Guard officers, deliberately refused to correct the conditions, which menaced life and caused indescribable hardships.

"One Regular Army officer who had been grossly negligent while in charge at Brest was honored with an important diplomatic mission after the armistice had been signed, while another officer who had done everything in his power to correct conditions at Brest and protect the lives of the men who were obliged to 'rest' there was removed from active command after he had been personally appointed by Gen. Pershing."

MADE BY HIGH ARMY OFFICER.

These charges and many more are laid deliberately before the Evening Telegram by an officer high in rank in the Regular United States Army who has just returned to this country after having spent more than nine months in the midst of the conditions he describes.

Through the whole story told by this officer, whose name is withheld for obvious reasons, runs a plaint regarding the "powers at Tours," where, he intimates, it appeared to be the belief that the Regular officer could do no wrong.

It was to Tours that a certain major was sent "with a whole nest, including a young Austrian who had been raised from cook in the American Army to lieutenant," after charges had been made against him in Brest, only to be given an important task, raised in rank to lieutenant colonel, and the young lieutenant made adjutant of a casual officers' depot.

CONDITIONS LONG A SCANDAL.

The Evening Telegram's informant charges that Brest has been a scandal from the very day it was selected as a rest camp and debarkation port; that an incompetent officer was sent there to organize it and made a miserable failure; that opportunities to obtain or renovate proper buildings for the care of troops was wholly neglected while the men were forced to sleep in "pup tents" without floors, on filthy, muddy ground; that barracks erected by the French for 4,000 troops, and which were terribly overcrowded when 8,000 Russian troops were placed in them, were made to accommodate 12,000 American soldiers.

When Brig. Gen. Nathaniel F. McClure finally was put in charge of the camp, the officer continues, he took over an old slaughterhouse and made it habitable for the troops as they debarked, but as soon as Gen. McClure had been ordered away the renovated slaughterhouse was abandoned and the men once more were sent out into the muddy fields with their floorless pup tents.

READY TO FACE COMMITTEE.

While the officer making these charges would not permit his name to be used, he said that he would be perfectly willing to appear before the Military Affairs Committee of either the House or the Senate at Washington, where his statements would be, or at least "could be," substantiated by reports which now are on file in the War Department, or should be there.

He is certain that a congressional investigation into the conditions at Brest, at least as far as they existed up to last November, must result from the reports which already have been forwarded to Washington. It is said that several officers recently returned from France have been summoned to Washington, and it is believed they will be asked to throw what light they can on the conditions at Brest, which are described in the official reports.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts for just one second? I ask the Senator from Massachusetts, if it meets his approval, to add in his request to have a copy of the telegram which he had read sent to the Secretary of War? I think instead of waiting for the Military Committee, which has much work to do—

Mr. LODGE. I have not the slightest objection.

Mr. LEWIS. Will not the Senator add to his request to have a copy sent immediately to the Secretary of War?

Mr. LODGE. It has been published, and I should be delighted to have it sent to the Secretary of War, but it is wholly useless, if experience is to be any judge.

Mr. LEWIS. I can not accept the latter conclusion. I would regret very much if any Senator felt that he should judge the Secretary of War even before he had an opportunity—

Mr. LODGE. I have not.

Mr. LEWIS. I request the eminent Senator to have a copy sent to the Secretary of War, because I am in receipt of a communication from the Secretary of War, in replying to a complaint that I sent, begging me to assure the Senate that in response to letters such as the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] had received he would be exceedingly pleased if Senators would send these complaints direct to him in person, so that he could immediately start the investigation of every one.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, I am only too delighted to have a copy sent to the Secretary of War, and I have no doubt that the committee will send it, although if he is deeply interested he can probably read it in the daily press or in the RECORD, in which it will appear. I appeal to the committee for an investigation, because I hope and believe it will make an investigation, but I have seen so many cases of references to the War Department which have resulted in suppression and white-washing that I want something that will tell us the truth.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I would like to make a suggestion. It seems to me that while it is perfectly proper to send a copy of this telegram to the Secretary of War, of course the Secretary of War ought to be informing the Senate in regard to the conditions at the Army camps rather than waiting for newspapers and for the Senate to inform him. The Secretary of War of all men in the land, unless it is the President of the United States, who is Commander in Chief of the Army, ought to know the conditions at these great camps in France.

Mr. NEW. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NEW. I call the attention of the Senator from Washington to the fact that the course now suggested by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is exactly the one that was recommended with reference to the resolution I introduced on the 2d day of January. That was brought to the attention of the Secretary of War in the same way, but so far as anyone in Congress or out of it knows, that was the end of that matter.

Mr. LEWIS. If the Senator from Washington will allow me to say—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just one moment if the Senator please, and then I will take my seat.

Mr. LEWIS. I do not ask the Senator to take his seat. I only wish to respond that the information brought out by the Senator from Massachusetts seems to be a telegram from the President of the Michigan Society setting forth matters which no doubt he must know about in the form of complaint. It will be impossible for the Secretary of War to know of the different complaints which have been made until they are made to him. He could not know these conditions and the subject of the complaint until some one had complained.

Therefore, I think the Senator will realize that the only way he could get information would be to have the complainant send it as quickly as possible, and when it comes to a Senator who puts confidence in the writer, and he presents it to this body, I think the Secretary of War would attach much more importance to it than a newspaper article which we know we read every day ourselves without attaching great weight to all of them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The matter of these camps in France does not depend entirely upon newspaper articles.

Mr. LEWIS. I am referring rather, may I add, if I may be pardoned, to the telegram of the Senator from Massachusetts. As to the Senator from Indiana, the camp in France not only should be investigated, but it seems to me that from January until now some response could have come, and I join in a regret that officers there have not complied with the request of the Secretary of War with that facility, that quickness, they could have done, for it must be apparent they have not made response, because I am sure the Secretary of War would have sent it to us if there had been any made.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The assertion is made in the article which was read by the Secretary at the request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] that an Army officer of considerable rank is authority for the statements contained in it, and these statements have been made from so many different sources that it becomes almost a matter of public knowledge. That statement includes the information that 3,000 men died as the result of insanitary conditions. It is very circumstantial in the account that it gives of the effort which was made by the commander, who was temporarily in charge of certain features of the camp, who had commandeered the buildings and given accommodations in them for troops. He was sent elsewhere and the troops taken out of those buildings in order to go into tents without floors on the wet and mud of the camp which is complained of.

I only rose, however, to emphasize what seems to me to be the principle that ought to govern the conduct of these affairs. My observation is that the Secretary of War rather resents information in regard to failures of the War Department.

Mr. LEWIS. I assure the Senator he has been misinformed as to that.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Well, I may be; but I have observed that, notwithstanding the exposures that have been made by the legislative branch of the Government, sometimes under the leadership of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs

[Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], who is a loyal Democrat, and the report made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] in regard to airplanes that exposed their bad condition, I do not think it can be successfully contradicted that there was gross inefficiency and a great deal of self-seeking in the conduct of the Aviation Service of the War Department, with the result that the war ended, and after we had been in it considerably over a year, and this great manufacturing country, the richest and the most efficient in the world, had not produced one plane of attack, but had depended entirely upon our allies—now, I believe that I can make this statement without fear of contradiction, that there can not be produced by the Senator from Illinois or by anybody else a single word from the Secretary of War condemning that colossal scandal. On the contrary, he defended it.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just one second. My impression is that the Secretary of War first, of all the citizens of this country, ought to condemn it and to excoriate it and expose it and punish the men who are responsible for it; but the attitude that he has taken is an attitude of justification and excuse and defense where he ought to be the agent of punishment and the exposé of truth and of inefficiency; but he depends upon the legislative branch of the Government to inform him, the head of the department, of conditions which he first of all ought to know.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

Joint resolution [J. Res. No. 19, A] relating to the tobacco industry and requesting the Federal Trade Commission to report on such industry.

Whereas during the fall of 1918 the price of tobacco was approximately 40 cents per pound at a time when all the markets of the central powers and most of the markets of the neutral powers were not being supplied; and

Whereas upon the cessation of hostilities, and continuing to the present time, the price of this product dropped to 20 cents per pound, notwithstanding the fact that world commerce had opened up and the tobacco markets of Europe were waiting to be supplied; and

Whereas the tobacco farmers of Wisconsin, while of the opinion that such a decline in the price of their product is not justified by existing conditions, desire to be properly informed, so that if such decline is based upon good reasons continued good relations may exist between buyer and seller; and

Whereas the matter is of the most serious consequence to all business interests in our State, due to the fact that the decline in price, if continued, would mean a loss of approximately \$8,000,000 to the producers: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the assembly, the senate concurring,* That the Federal Trade Commission be respectfully requested to at once investigate the conditions of the tobacco industry and to make a report to the present legislature with all convenient speed, such investigation and report to be of such nature as to fully advise the tobacco producers of the true causes of the present market conditions: And be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the chairman of said commission at Washington, D. C., to each of the two Senators, and to the Congressmen from this State.

EDWARD F. DITTMAR,  
President of the Senate.  
O. G. MUNDON,  
Chief Clerk of the Senate.  
RILEY S. YOUNG,  
Speaker of the Assembly.  
C. E. SHAFFER,  
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I present a resolution unanimously adopted at the regular meeting of the Manufacturers' Association of Wilmington, Del., held in their office Wednesday, February 5, 1919, relative to a bill now pending before Congress carrying an appropriation of over \$14,000,000 for the purpose of perpetuating and enlarging the United States Employment Service, which was created to aid the Federal Government in coordinating the interests of the country for war production. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MOSES. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, relative to the extermination of insects and pests, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by the New Hampshire Legislature February 5, 1919.

Whereas a new, important, and exceedingly dangerous insect pest known as the European borer has gained foothold in certain areas in eastern Massachusetts;

Whereas this new pest if not controlled is expected to cause extraordinary damage to our most valuable field crops and vegetables throughout the entire United States and may render unprofitable the growing of such important crops as field corn;

Whereas such opportunity as may still exist for suppression of the pest will speedily disappear as the insect spreads beyond the present limited territory: Be it

*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to make immediate appropriations whereby adequate measures of suppression of this pest may be undertaken without delay by the proper Federal authorities.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Minnesota Independent Telephone Association, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying that Congress fix a definite date for the return of the telephone lines to their owners, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from A. G. Rugles, State entomologist, of St. Paul, Minn., praying that an appropriation of \$500,000 be made for the extermination of the corn borer, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Growers' Association of Minnesota, of St. Paul, Minn., praying that the so-called "market reporting service" be continued and that provision be made therefor in the Agriculture appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a memorial of Local Union No. 871, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Battle Creek, Mich., remonstrating against the operation of the Federal employment system as now constituted, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Woman's Literary Union, of Androscoggin County, Me., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I present a resolution adopted by the Common Council of Detroit, Mich., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

CITY OF DETROIT, January 23, 1919.

Hon. CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,

Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am transmitting herewith copy of a resolution presented by Councilman Bielman and adopted by the common council at the session of January 21 relative to congressional action to provide funds for men discharged from the Army or Navy:

"From: The clerk:

"To: The honorable the Common Council.

"GENTLEMEN: I beg to advise your honorable body that I am in receipt of the following communication from the American Red Cross.

"Respectfully submitted.

"RICHARD LINDSAY,

"City Clerk.

"The following is the communication referred to:

"Mr. RICHARD LINDSAY,

"City Clerk.

"DEAR SIR: I am inclosing herewith a resolution which, at the suggestion of Councilman Lodge, I have drawn up as a result of a meeting of a number of men who represent organizations caring for the returned soldier, and while I can not, as a Red Cross official, perhaps, urge such action, as a private citizen I can and do most earnestly, so that men who have gone from Detroit may be saved, so far as possible, the humiliation of standing around in their uniforms until some good-natured person hands them a job.

"There is a fundamental question of right in this matter which can not be overlooked, and we want our city to be among the first to recognize this obligation to her citizens.

"Very truly, yours,

"G. D. POPE."

"By Councilman Bielman:

"Whereas citizens of this community liable for military service have met in full that obligation to our country, leaving their homes and their affairs to bear their part in the military duty required to uphold justice and the ideals of this Nation; and

"Whereas, their work accomplished, they are now being returned to this community at a time when industrial readjustments make their reentry into industry exceedingly difficult, and inasmuch as this city and this Nation owe these men an unpayable debt of gratitude and obligation, and should in no wise permit the burden and sacrifice of unemployment to fall unsupported upon those who have already sacrificed so much in our service: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That it be, and hereby is, the opinion of this body that such steps should be taken by the War Department, or, if need be, congressional action, which will immediately provide funds for men discharged or about to be discharged from the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps as will be sufficient to support them properly for a period of 60 to 90 days after their discharge and pending their return to their former positions as self-supporting citizens: Furthermore, be it

"Resolved, That a copy of this motion be forwarded to our Representatives in the Senate and House, with the urgent request that such action will be taken as will secure the immediate realization of this proposal.

"Yeas—Councilmen Bielman, Bradley, Castator, Kronk, Littlefield, Nagel, Simons, Vernor, and the president.

"Nays—None."

Yours, very truly,

RICHARD LINDSAY,

City Clerk.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I present a memorial from the Board of Trustees of the Tacoma Branch of the American Protective League, representing about a thousand of the best citizens there, who have given a great deal of their

time, in connection with the prosecution of the war, in aiding the various branches of the Government in the detection of sedition and disloyalty, and all that sort of thing. In this memorial they set out in concise form their conclusions from what they have ascertained and learned as to what ought to be done.

I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD, and as they make recommendation with reference to immigration and naturalization, I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The memorial referred to is as follows:

To the honorable the Congress of the United States of America:

The undersigned, the board of trustees of the Tacoma Branch of the American Protective League, respectfully represent:

That immediately after the declaration of the war with Germany a part of their number, with several hundred other American citizens of Tacoma, organized the Tacoma Home Guards, and, about the same time, others of their number organized the Tacoma Minutemen, and in their respective organizations they acted from the start in the general direction, management, and control of the various activities of said organizations; that after a few months of separate operation they amalgamated in the American Protective League, with a combined membership of more than 1,000, and they, your memorialists, became the managing and directing board of said combined force, and have continued to act as such to this date, January 27, 1919.

That during said entire period of 22 months they have in person, and through their entire membership of more than 1,000 persons, as well as by volunteer investigators and paid detectives, been engaged in aiding all departments of the United States Government, and particularly the Department of Justice and the Army, in the work of guarding and protecting property, discovering, preventing, and punishing disloyalty, aiding Army enlistments, enforcement of the selective-service laws, arresting deserters and slackers, and generally doing such war service as could be found to do.

That in carrying on such work a vast number of investigations were made, and a great mass of information gathered, from which we have become profoundly impressed with the necessity for prompt revision of the Federal laws relating to both immigration and naturalization. We must be better protected against the immigration and naturalization of all persons not likely to become attached to the principles embodied in our Constitution and laws, or become industrious, law-abiding, and patriotic citizens. We have had a rude awakening.

While we have found many of our foreign-born citizens splendidly loyal, we have also found an astonishing number to be only half American in real sentiment, and very many positively disloyal and hostile to the United States in its hour of need. We know that fear has bridled many a tongue and stayed many a hand.

We find that among the disloyal, and preachers of disobedience to law, destruction of property, and general seditious conduct, fully 90 per cent are foreign born or of foreign parentage, and this in a population 77 per cent of which is native born. We find that the dangerous unrest now prevalent, and which promises to become more acute, is almost entirely the result of propaganda carried on by a naturally seditious element of foreign birth, many of whom have come here expressly to find a freer and more fertile field for their propaganda.

It is our unanimous and deliberate judgment that, unless a speedy cure is provided by the enactment of properly protective immigration and naturalization laws, irreparable harm will result to the people of the United States.

Such legislation must contain whatever provisions as are necessary to really accomplish the desired purpose, and while some inconvenience may be occasioned to a few excellent people, this fact must not be allowed to stand in the way of accomplishing the necessary reform.

We have the honor to submit the following suggestions as an outline of some provisions which ought, in our judgment, to be embodied in proposed legislation:

First. Pending passage of other laws and organizing the administration thereof, stop all immigration, with only necessary exceptions.

Second. All persons coming into the United States should be required to fill out, in the country from which they come, a questionnaire, giving a true history of their lives, showing their education, times and places and kinds of employment, if convicted of any crime, the time, place, and circumstances, whether felony or misdemeanor, social, and other organizations of which applicant is or has been a member, and all other pertinent facts upon which a fair judgment of character may be founded. Such document should be made before a United States consular or immigration officer, resident in the foreign country, and filed with him at least 90 days prior to date of expected embarkation for the United States. Such officer should then make investigation as to fitness of applicant to become a resident and citizen of our country, and, if found worthy, issue to him a certificate to that effect, and make a similar indorsement on the questionnaire. If found not worthy, certificate should be refused, and that fact indorsed on questionnaire.

All questionnaires to be filed in and become a permanent record in the proper office in the United States.

If approval has been given, applicant may enter United States as an immigrant, subject to the final approval of United States at place of entry into the United States.

After entry into the United States the immigrant should be required to learn to intelligently speak, read, and write the English language within two years, after learning which, and after two years, he may declare his intention to become a citizen, which he may complete after an additional period of five years.

In order that proper track may be kept of his conduct, a system of registration should be required, with proper officers in the various places of his residence, at all times up to time of admission to citizenship.

Failure on part of foreigners to comply with any or all laws, rules, and regulations relating to foreigners resident in the United States, either temporarily or permanently, or engaging in riots, or any breach of State or Federal law, and advocating, or associating with others who advocate, any kind of unlawful violence, sedition, breach of law, overthrow of lawful authority or government, should subject the foreigner to punishment or deportation or both at the discretion of the United States.

On making application for admission to citizenship he should again make out and file with his application a questionnaire, giving a complete history of his life in detail, and at least three months prior to

time fixed for hearing the application, to allow of thorough investigation into the life of applicant by Federal agents. Any willfully untrue statement made or pertinent fact covered up should bar admission and be followed by deportation if fraudulent intent is found to exist.

The law should provide that after admission to citizenship retention of that right is a trust subject to forfeiture at any time for sufficient cause, such as conviction of felony, unpardoned advocacy of violence or disorder, engaging in or advising riots, advising, aiding, or abetting seditious or disorderly conduct by others, or any conduct which the proper Federal authority may find calculated to undermine orderly and efficient government.

All such laws should be made to apply to foreigners and naturalized citizens now here, as well as those yet to come, for no man has any right to hold a citizenship the privileges of which he abuses, nor has he a right to retain citizenship in any country and at the same time advocate its destruction.

Vigorous sedition laws should be at once enacted if the war measures now in force are either inadequate or inapplicable in times of peace, and these laws would, of course, apply to foreigners and citizens alike, in so far as punishments go. We, your memorialists, have, however, become so deeply convinced that all seditious organizations and propaganda are traceable so largely to the undesirable foreign element possessing no adequate conception of the fundamental principles of our Government, and knowing no distinction between the true liberty of a self-governing people and individual license to act without restraint, that no permanent relief can be had until all foreigners of seditious tendencies are not only barred from citizenship but from entry into the country, and, if already here, are denied the right to remain.

With proper regulations relating to foreigners engaging in business, and travelers, for specified and limited periods, we believe the foregoing general proposition will, if acted on promptly and fearlessly, save our country from grave dangers and disorders.

We are gravely apprehensive of after-war conditions, when Europe shall settle down to orderly government and its Bolsheviks seek the freedom of America to carry on its propaganda of tyranny and destruction, and we, therefore, pray your earnest, prompt, and conscientious consideration of these momentous problems, always having in mind that you are representing the American people, for whose benefit and protection its laws should be primarily made.

Respectfully submitted this 27th day of January, 1919.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF TACOMA BRANCH,  
AMERICAN PROTECTIVE LEAGUE,  
D. D. A. OUTCALT, *President*,  
J. H. HOLME, *Secretary*.

#### PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted a report (No. 690) accompanied by a bill (S. 5553) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that committee:

S. 201. Charles F. Cavanaugh.  
S. 254. Milton M. Lile.  
S. 327. Amme A. Wilson.  
S. 1073. Charles B. Smith.  
S. 1501. Edward Flannery.  
S. 1731. Thomas Kent.  
S. 1958. Palmyra Johnson.  
S. 2132. James H. Criswell.  
S. 2195. Andrew E. Waterman.  
S. 2251. Henry L. Henrysen.  
S. 3049. Isaac F. Roberts.  
S. 3107. Eugene M. Symonds.  
S. 3290. Mary E. Allen.  
S. 3497. Frank H. Seay.  
S. 3590. William H. Hart.  
S. 3706. Thomas J. Scanlain.  
S. 3866. Arthur G. Bosson.  
S. 4214. Albert Grimes.  
S. 4326. James L. Graham.  
S. 4331. David Britton.  
S. 4335. George W. Carter.  
S. 4411. John Clark.  
S. 4412. George E. Lawrence.  
S. 4545. Charles Weiffle.  
S. 4579. Mary Melissa Anderson.  
S. 4655. Wilfred W. Phaneuf.  
S. 4657. Rufus H. Hopkins.  
S. 4730. Ulysses S. G. Canfield.  
S. 4737. Joseph J. Horan.  
S. 4744. Dennis Driscoll.  
S. 4756. James D. Wilder.  
S. 4778. Lemuel Lunger.  
S. 4796. George Moir.  
S. 4821. Charles H. Skillings.  
S. 4845. Elizabeth E. Baker.  
S. 4846. John F. Mannel.  
S. 4851. Joseph W. Culbertson.  
S. 4863. Elvina Adams.  
S. 4867. Ellen Jones.  
S. 4880. Cornelia A. Nickels.  
S. 4908. James J. Butler.  
S. 4935. Susan Owens.  
S. 4958. John Franklin Haynes.

S. 4977. Marion T. Mitchell.  
S. 4978. Francis E. Searway.  
S. 5007. John J. Duke.  
S. 5009. Emeline A. Spaulding.  
S. 5046. Jacob D. Emery.  
S. 5110. Lily D. Murphy.  
S. 5111. Albert L. Newland.  
S. 5124. George W. McMahan.  
S. 5196. Oscar S. Pomeroy.  
S. 5209. David W. Herriman.  
S. 5219. Edwin W. Gordon.  
S. 5252. John Daley.  
S. 5310. Charles F. Hahn.  
S. 5330. Arthur H. Letts.  
S. 5379. Carrier Thompson.  
S. 5381. Floyd E. Driskel.  
S. 5399. Sarah Hale.  
S. 5454. Amanda F. Mahin.  
S. 5527. William W. Treadway.  
S. 5529. Benjamin H. Kimbler.  
S. 5530. Lee Begley.  
S. 5531. Henry Fields.  
S. 5532. Charley Shelton.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted a report (No. 691) accompanied by a bill (S. 5554) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that committee:

S. 1053. Jonathan M. Ragner.  
S. 1314. Peter L. Leuszler.  
S. 1346. R. W. Duncan, alias "Pack" Duncan.  
S. 1717. Mary E. Williams.  
S. 1718. Mary Alcinda Wingert.  
S. 1841. Leonora V. Lunt.  
S. 2226. William H. Makee.  
S. 2556. Charles E. Haskell.  
S. 2699. Sarah Van Doozer.  
S. 2819. Anna F. Baugh.  
S. 2880. Esther U. McKelvey.  
S. 2892. Mary Snow.  
S. 2971. Martha A. Tucker.  
S. 3014. Mary M. Ayer.  
S. 3042. Frederick Deppe.  
S. 3044. Eliza E. Herman.  
S. 3048. George N. Morse.  
S. 3145. Hilda Johnson.  
S. 3279. Sarah F. Steele.  
S. 3281. Josiah McKnight.  
S. 3282. Sylvester H. Gaskill.  
S. 3292. Jennie Magee.  
S. 3345. Henrietta Buswell Brown.  
S. 3377. Joseph Masden.  
S. 3423. Mary L. Colnay.  
S. 3466. Cora W. Merryman.  
S. 3623. Alexander D. Tanyer.  
S. 3628. W. Lafayette League.  
S. 3650. Mary Hermann.  
S. 3651. Clara Stillman.  
S. 3712. Mary Rumbold.  
S. 3850. Nancy J. Bower.  
S. 3854. William H. Henkle.  
S. 3855. Camm T. Sanders.  
S. 4050. John T. Showalter.  
S. 4173. Cora C. O'Neill.  
S. 4377. Anna C. Seaman.  
S. 4384. Davis Parsons.  
S. 4386. Frances L. Haha.  
S. 4461. Abbie B. Garrett.  
S. 4577. Susan E. Guyn.  
S. 4582. William McDonald.  
S. 4585. John W. Huffman.  
S. 4589. Boman R. Butcher.  
S. 4615. Henry H. Niles.  
S. 4680. Charles F. Perry.  
S. 4695. James Hanners.  
S. 4704. Catherine A. Brownlee.  
S. 4705. Ida B. Willison.  
S. 4718. George Graham.  
S. 4751. Albert F. Nelson.  
S. 4757. Lewis Newman.  
S. 4764. John W. Combs.  
S. 4788. Elizabeth Hagadorn.  
S. 4797. Ida V. Haskins.

S. 4804. Clara E. Buckland.  
 S. 4809. Henry M. Chase.  
 S. 4834. William T. Potts.  
 S. 4847. Louisa Jones.  
 S. 4853. Andrew J. Moody.  
 S. 4869. William F. Blanchard.  
 S. 4896. William B. Douglas.  
 S. 4898. Emeline C. Starr.  
 S. 4903. Samuel Lockwood.  
 S. 4905. Ella A. Mead.  
 S. 4920. Isaac D. Hamilton.  
 S. 4926. Charles Wiley.  
 S. 4927. Newell Strout.  
 S. 4933. Lucy A. Schriver.  
 S. 4943. Jesse W. Bowdle.  
 S. 4981. Sarah M. Geiger.  
 S. 5012. Isabell Cunningham.  
 S. 5021. James H. Cornell.  
 S. 5031. Lucina E. Smith.  
 S. 5078. James C. Daly.  
 S. 5091. Jennie L. Barrows.  
 S. 5103. Mary M. Hood.  
 S. 5106. Amos L. Hood.  
 S. 5107. Henry H. Hering.  
 S. 5118. Charles Blitz.  
 S. 5131. Maranda E. McHaffie.  
 S. 5142. George F. Griffith, alias Frank W. Morton.  
 S. 5145. Carrie E. Hewett.  
 S. 5164. Robert B. Patrick.  
 S. 5165. George F. Hood.  
 S. 5166. Stewart Orr.  
 S. 5184. Effie E. Milton.  
 S. 5204. Hermann Hoffmeister.  
 S. 5218. Alonzo R. Cole.  
 S. 5225. Sarah F. Robinson.  
 S. 5241. George Forker.  
 S. 5242. Georgia M. Hodgson.  
 S. 5253. Milton W. Burnhan.  
 S. 5268. Sarah C. Vaughan.  
 S. 5272. James H. Johnston.  
 S. 5276. John F. Lichty.  
 S. 5324. Rouser Mettler.  
 S. 5383. Arabella Roberts.  
 S. 5387. Alonzo J. Finch.  
 S. 5407. Levi M. Starne.  
 S. 5411. Catharine Derstine.  
 S. 5418. Horthon Mosher.  
 S. 5425. Alexander Faries.  
 S. 5427. Jacob R. Stillwagon.  
 S. 5455. Franklin Bryan.  
 S. 5466. William Dugent.  
 S. 5468. Benjamin A. Sturtevant.  
 S. 5481. William E. Hughes.  
 S. 5483. James Roland.  
 S. 5501. Edward D. Hamilton.  
 S. 5509. William J. Vanhoose.  
 S. 5519. Daniel C. Darlington.  
 S. 5520. Mary A. Lake.  
 S. 5524. Isaac N. White.

#### MAHONING RIVER BRIDGE, OHIO.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 12995) granting the consent of Congress to the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a combined bridge and dam across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill just reported by him. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, does this bill provide for the construction of a dam across a river? If it does, that is a new proposition—the construction of a combined bridge and dam.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask the Secretary to read the bill. The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, operate, and maintain a combined bridge and dam and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the town of Struthers, county of Mahoning, State of Ohio, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906: *Provided*, That no dam constructed under the consent hereby granted shall be used to develop water power nor to generate electricity.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the bill had better go over until we have an opportunity to examine it. That is certainly a strange combination—a bridge and dam across a navigable stream.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The War Department has approved the bill, and it seemed to be an ordinary bridge bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think I shall have to ask that it go over.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I withdraw the report for the present.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no objection to the report being withdrawn.

#### NIAGARA RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 5534) granting the consent of Congress to Oliver Cabana, jr., Myron S. Hall, E. G. Connette, William F. MacGlashan, John H. Bradley, and M. A. Hurt to construct a bridge across Niagara River within or near the city limits of Buffalo, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 694) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MAHONING RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 12996) granting the consent of Congress to the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio, and I submit a report (No. 692) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE RED RIVER OF THE NORTH.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 13232) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North, between Traill County, N. Dak., and Polk County, Minn., and I submit a report (No. 693) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MAHONING RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 12997) granting the consent of Congress to the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio, and I submit a report (No. 695) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### PENSION APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WALSH. From the Committee on Pensions I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 15219) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 696) thereon.

Mr. President, although this bill carries a very large appropriation, there are no authorizations contained in it, but simply provision for the payment of pensions authorized by general legislation and by other bills. It is the usual appropriation bill, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, namely:

Army and Navy pensions, as follows: For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, Army nurses, and all other pensioners who are now borne on the rolls, or who may hereafter be placed thereon, under the provisions of any and all acts of Congress, \$215,000,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation aforesaid for Navy pensioners shall be

paid from the income of the Navy pension fund, so far as the same shall be sufficient for that purpose: *Provided further*, That the amount expended under each of the above items shall be accounted for separately.

For fees and expenses of examining surgeons, pensions, for services rendered within the fiscal year 1920, \$30,000.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, and read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass? The bill was passed.

#### AMENDMENT OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE ACT.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 621, being the bill (H. R. 13273) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a bureau of war-risk insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and an act in amendment thereto, approved October 6, 1917.

I may state that the bill has passed the House, and the Secretary of the Treasury has informed the chairman of the Finance Committee that its enactment into law is urgently essential to the efficient administration of the war-risk insurance act. It is very short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a bureau of war-risk insurance in the Treasury Department" be, and is hereby, amended by adding the following new paragraph to section 210 of Article II of the said act:

*Provided, however*, That whenever the commissioner shall by further investigation or reinvestigation modify the existing award, no reimbursement from the person receiving an allowance shall be required for allotments and allowances already paid nor shall any deductions be made from allotments and allowances to be paid in the future for any change in award made in previous allotments and allowances, except where it is conclusively shown that the person receiving the allowance does not bear the relationship to the enlisted man which is required by the act and except in cases of manifest fraud."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SIMMONS:

A bill (S. 5555) to amend the war-risk insurance act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BECKHAM (for Mr. WILLIAMS):

A bill (S. 5556) to provide for the erection of memorials and the entombment of bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, in Arlington National Cemetery, Va.; to the Committee on the Library.

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. THOMAS submitted an amendment authorizing the President to appoint Col. William C. Brown, United States Army, retired, to the rank of brigadier general on the retired list, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$125,000 for promoting and developing the farm and domestic commerce of the United States, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 14945) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FLETCHER (for Mr. WILLIAMS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### THE CENSUS CONFERENCE REPORT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that the conference report on the Census bill be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate 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. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] was interested in this conference report. I will ask the Senator from Texas if he knows anything about that? I may be mistaken, but I was under the impression that the Senator from Maryland was interested in this matter and wished to be present when it was brought up for consideration.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I shall state to the Senator that the time is so short until adjournment that I do not believe it will be fair to the bill to hold it up until any particular Senator can be present, but if the Senator from Maryland is not present I shall not insist on considering the conference report now.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It may be that the Senator from Maryland may not be interested. Does the Senator from Texas know whether or not the Senator from Maryland is interested in this report?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from Maryland is interested in the report.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I hope, then, that the Senator from Texas will not bring it up just now. I do not know why the Senator from Maryland is absent; I know he is generally here.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Maryland has been sent for.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand that the Senator from Maryland has been sent for and will be here in a short time. So I ask the Senator from Texas to withhold action on the report for a little while.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well; that is satisfactory to me.

#### SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] for just a moment, I desire to state that, in view of certain statements which were made by the Senator from Michigan, as well as by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], on yesterday toward the close of the afternoon's debate, I shall not press Senate resolution 415 at the present time. I shall meanwhile hope to confer with the members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and if it is deemed desirable shall call them together with a view of arranging some plan which will prove satisfactory.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have no objection at all to that arrangement. I wish it thoroughly understood by the Senator, in order that there shall be no misunderstanding, that I should like to know before the plan is put out, if I may be granted that courtesy, as to what the Senator's idea is as to the proposed resolution. If he intends to introduce another one I shall be glad to cooperate with him.

Mr. POMERENE. I think the Senator from Michigan should be kept fully informed, and I shall be glad to keep in touch with him on the subject.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

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

The other day when I called the attention of the Senate to an advertisement or an appeal to the American Bolsheviks by Nikolai Lenine, published in the St. Louis Post Dispatch, I stated that it appeared to be an advertisement. I am informed that it was not and that I was mistaken. I know the Post Dispatch to be a paper of high standing and the gentlemen who manage it to be gentlemen of character, and I very gladly withdraw the statement. It was published as a reprint of an article which appeared in a magazine in New York edited by Max Eastman. I am very glad to make the statement that it was published as a matter of news.

#### SHIP WORKERS' STRIKE.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, in view of what has been stated heretofore in connection with the shipbuilders' strike on the Pacific coast I submit an interview had with Mr. Charles Piez, Director General of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, on that subject, which I believe will be somewhat enlightening and perhaps clear up the situation to some extent.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to suggest to the Senator from Florida that I have already had put into the Record all of the statements that have been called to my attention by Mr. Piez. I put in an interview and statements, I think, a couple of days ago, and then on yesterday I had inserted in the Record subsequent statements purporting to be an interview and a statement by Mr. Piez. They are the ones I received from Mr. Piez yesterday morning in the mail.

Mr. FLETCHER. Perhaps it is the same thing. It is an interview that was to be issued February 4, I believe.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. And a subsequent one. I did not know but what this might be subsequent to what the Senator has offered; but perhaps it covers the same ground.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am inclined to think that it covers the same ground.

Mr. FLETCHER. Very well. Then I will not make the request.

BOLSHEVIKI PROPAGANDA IN WASHINGTON.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, Mr. Judson King, who, it is stated, was the chairman of a meeting at Poli's Theater, concerning which the Senate has ordered an investigation, and as to which there has been considerable discussion, has written a letter to Senators and Representatives denying flatly the statements in the newspapers which caused the controversy. He called upon me this morning and expressed a desire that that letter be placed in the RECORD. I was not present at the meeting; I know nothing of the facts concerning it; but I think it is only fair, in view of what has occurred, that this letter be inserted in the RECORD, and I make that request.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, before that request is agreed to—

Mr. KING. I think that I shall object to the request. This matter is before the committee for investigation, and if this gentleman desires vindication, if he thinks he has been injured, doubtless he will have full opportunity. I object.

Mr. LENROOT. Before the Senator from Utah objects—

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator allow me a word?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think that, inasmuch as the meeting referred to has been criticized, those who have been subjected to criticism are entitled to be heard through the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have excoriated individuals occasionally since I have been here, perhaps unjustly, but I have never declined, no matter how personally abusive the reply was, to insert in the RECORD, if requested, the answers which have been made to me upon my position. I think it but fair and just. If I say something about a man that is wrong, I want to be the first to know it and to apologize. In any event, he has the right to be heard by way of reply.

Mr. LENROOT. I wish to suggest that in this statement there is no reflection upon any Senator.

Mr. KING. I had supposed that it was a rebuke of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], who had called the attention of the Senate to the matter, but with the assurance of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], I withdraw the objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would not permit a document of that kind to go into the RECORD.

Mr. ASHURST. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair decide it. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

3015 FOURTEENTH STREET NW.,  
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1919.

To Members of the Senate and House of Representatives:

For your information permit me to state that at the meeting at Poli's Theater Sunday afternoon, at which I presided, there was no advocacy of anarchy or violence, no attack upon the American form of government, and no propaganda that Bolshevism be adopted in our country. The well-nigh unanimous sentiment of audience and speakers was that American troops be withdrawn and Russia be permitted to settle her own fate in her own way.

The article in Monday's Washington Post, headed "Urge Red America," is an absurd perversion of the truth and a gross violation of journalistic ethics. Discussions in Congress regarding this meeting, based, apparently, upon this article, have proceeded under a misapprehension of facts. Whether any attempt was made to verify the truth of the article I do not know. No inquiry was made of me.

Far from being a meeting of "reds," the gathering was attended by hundreds of cultured men and women of this city, of every political party and of every creed and class, including clergymen, who have no sympathy with Bolshevist methods or even the economic principles of socialism. No protest from those in attendance has reached me; many have expressed appreciation of the facts learned from Mr. Williams's address and are ready to testify that the sort of publicity given to the meeting is false, disgusting, and an insult to intelligence.

I am informed by the secretary of the committee having the meeting in charge that an invitation was mailed to every Member of Congress. This letter stated:

"The purpose of the meeting is to afford citizens of Washington opportunity to learn what is happening in Russia, not to propagate Bolshevism."

That purpose was adhered to. The meeting did not originate with me. I was asked to preside, and did so on my own responsibility. I had learned in Boston, Mr. Williams's home city, from men who differ with his opinions, of his high character and ability. I had read his articles in reputable magazines and knew he had given the address proposed to be given here before the American Academy of Political and Social Science and at the City Club in Philadelphia, at Ford Hall and the Economic League in Boston, at the Church of the Holy Trinity in Brooklyn, the Church of the Ascension in New York, and other places. I knew the Department of Justice was fully advised as to Mr. Williams and what he was saying,

and concluded that what would not contaminate Boston, New York, and Philadelphia would not injure Washington.

Mr. Williams delivered his usual address here, a typewritten copy of which was handed by him to a Post reporter at the meeting, but which was falsified in the report.

Myself and other nonsocialist citizens of this city will welcome any investigation of this open meeting, with the hope—perhaps vain—that the same publicity be given the truth as was given the distortion. At bottom this is the old question of free speech and as to whether a respectable audience of American citizens can peaceably assemble to ascertain the truth about a public issue without being lied about, vilified, and intimidated.

I respectfully suggest that, if hearings are held, the committee be empowered to extend an inquiry as to whether there is a conspiracy afoot to prevent the American people from learning the truth about Russia.

Respectfully, yours,

JUDSON KING.

MEN OF MOTOR TRANSPORT CORPS AT GUM SPRINGS, VA.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I submit a resolution for reference to the Committee on Military Affairs. I ask to have the resolution read.

The resolution (S. Res. 442) was read, as follows:

Whereas the men composing Company 553 of the Motor Transport Corps, now located at Gum Springs, near Alexandria, Va., were enlisted in the mechanical course of the University of Wisconsin and the mechanical courses maintained by the Government at many other places for the special training of men for services in the Motor Transport Corps; and

Whereas these men received this special training from June 15 to August 15, 1918, at which time they were sent to the aforesaid camp at Gum Springs, Va.; and

Whereas since August 15, 1918, to date this company has not been employed in motor-transport work, but has been employed in road-building work; and

Whereas the men of this company have been working at soldiers' pay for from 10 to 12 hours a day and doing the same character of work and employed alongside of colored civilian labor employed by a contractor who had a contract for building this road, and who paid this colored civilian labor at the rate of \$4.50 and upward per day of eight hours; and

Whereas while they have been thus employed these men have received no military training and no training to make them more efficient in the Motor Transport Service, but have been continuously employed as common laborers; and

Whereas many of these men are married, with families and parents dependent upon them, many have business interests at home urgently requiring their personal attention, further absence from which will in many cases result in irreparable loss, and many others have lucrative employment awaiting them if they could secure prompt discharge from the Army; and

Whereas members of this company have filed or attempted to file applications for discharge with the commanding officer, who has refused to consider such applications upon their merits, except in a few instances where Senators and Representatives have, after long delay, succeeded in obtaining a discharge; and

Whereas in the presence of the men the commanding officer has on numerous occasions stated that no discharges will be granted nor will any applications for discharge be favorably recommended by said officer; and

Whereas these men did not and would not make any complaint so long as the country was at war, but cheerfully performed this labor to which they were assigned, although it was not the service for which they were trained; and

Whereas the road work upon which they were employed is completed, and there is no reason for the continuance in the service of Company 553 or Company 516 of the Motor Transport Service, which is similarly situated, has been similarly treated, and is under the same command: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or a subcommittee of said committee, be, and it is hereby, directed to investigate the Gum Springs camp and ascertain and report to the Senate at the earliest possible date upon the following questions:

(1) Is there any military necessity for longer retaining these organizations in the service?

(2) Have the officers of these companies discouraged the filing of applications for discharge, neglected and delayed action upon applications filed with them, and refused discharges in cases upon which they have acted, without any just reason therefor, or for the purpose of maintaining their own places while they have been personally seeking new assignments for themselves or for the organizations?

(3) Have the men of either of these companies been from time to time required to perform services other than in the line of military duty?

(4) The committee is directed to make a like investigation and report as to the Motor Transport Service located at Camp Humphreys and other camps in the vicinity of Washington, D. C.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, as I understand, this resolution has been referred to the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I received a letter a few days ago on behalf of three or four enlisted men at this station. They did not set out in detail all the matters referred to in this resolution, but they did state that they had been employed at road work alongside men who were getting from four and a half dollars to, I think they said, ten dollars a day. They also stated that the commanding officer had stated publicly that he would not receive applications for discharge; that he would not give them any consideration whatever. They could not understand why this was done. They stated in this letter that they were perfectly willing to do this kind of work, or any kind of work, while the war was going on, any work necessary to the

prosecution of the war, but they could not understand why they were to be kept in the service, working alongside of men who were getting many times the pay that they were getting, and work not at all connected with the prosecution of the war.

I took up the matter with the War Department. They advised me there, of course, that the commanding officer had no right to announce that he would not receive applications for discharge, and they assured me that they would take up the matter at once with the proper official. I have stated all the facts that were set out in the letter; but, as I say, they did not refer to many of the things referred to in this resolution.

I hope the resolution will be acted upon by the committee, and acted upon very promptly, because it seems to me there is a wholly unwarranted and unjustifiable condition of things at this Gum Springs Motor Transport Camp.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I think the fact is that the War Department has vested in the commanding officer the right to make discharges; but my judgment is that a commanding officer who stated that he would not receive an application for discharge or for any other reason would be subjecting himself to severe military punishment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, can the Senator see any justification now for working men on the building of roads alongside of men who are employed at very high wages?

Mr. WEEKS. I not only can not see any justification for it, but I can see every reason why it should not be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further concurrent or other resolutions? [A pause.] The morning business is closed.

#### POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, the Post Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from Alabama. I now offer the amendment which was read and explained last night, which simply provides, where State constitutions have to be amended, that the part which could not otherwise be used shall be set aside in the Treasury.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have examined that amendment very carefully, and so have other members of the committee. I think it is very important, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. After the word "act," in line 13, on page 37, it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

*Provided*, That where the constitution of any State prohibits the same from engaging upon internal improvements, or from contracting public debts for extraordinary purposes in an amount sufficient to meet the monetary requirements of the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, or restricts annual tax levies for the purpose of constructing and improving roads and bridges, and where a constitutional alteration or amendment to overcome either or all of such prohibitions must be submitted to a referendum at a general election, the sum to which such State is entitled under the method of apportionment provided in the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, shall be withdrawn by the Secretary of the Treasury from the principal fund appropriated by the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, upon receipt of the certification of the governor of such State to the existence of either or all of said prohibitions, and such sum shall be carried by the Secretary of the Treasury as a separate fund for future disbursement as hereinafter provided: *Provided further*, That when, by referendum, the constitutional alterations or amendments necessary to the enjoyment of the sum so withdrawn have been approved and ratified by any State, the Secretary of the Treasury, upon receipt of certification from the governor of such State to such effect, shall immediately make available to such State, for the purposes set forth in the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, the sum withdrawn as hereinbefore provided: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to prevent any State from receiving such portion of said principal sum as is available under its existing constitution and laws.

Mr. KELLOGG obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KELLOGG. I should like a vote on this amendment, if there is no objection to it, and I do not understand that there is.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall be compelled to make a point of order against this amendment. It engrafts general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. KELLOGG. I hope the Senator will not do that. It does not affect the appropriation in the least. It does not bear on the question of the amount, and, if the appropriation is going

to be made, all the States ought to have a right to take advantage of it. I yield, however, to the Senator from California.

Mr. THOMAS. Just a word, Mr. President. I do not want to do anything that is disagreeable to the Senator, but our rules certainly mean something, and we are becoming prone not only to an occasional but to a constant change of the spirit as well as the letter of our bills by amendments which are not germane to them. Complaint was made last night, and justly so, by the Senator having charge of this bill that it has been four days before the Senate and we have not made much progress upon it. That is due to the fact that it has been transformed by amendments from a Post Office appropriation bill to a good-roads bill. If it were not for the amendment it would have been passed long ago.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of the revenue bill, consisting of some 360 pages. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] will probably remember that a few days ago he asked the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] where the money was coming from to meet these expenditures. This is the answer. The Senator said the Finance Committee will attend to that. We have tried to attend to it, but even here appears an appropriation. We can not even pass a revenue bill without appropriating some of the money in advance. We provide here for paying the discharged soldiers \$60 apiece, or \$400,000,000. That is an amendment to a revenue bill. Congress is discounting its own bills 6½ per cent, and I understand that it would have been difficult to secure its enactment but for something of that sort.

There is no question but that the Senator's amendment will improve this bill; but it is new legislation, and certainly we must somewhere, at some time, terminate this constant practice of transforming bills of all sorts into appropriation bills through general legislation. This does not increase the appropriation, but it certainly changes the form of the bill by engrafting general legislation upon it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am in full accord with every word the Senator from Colorado has just said. Of course I do not like this road appropriation upon this bill, but I ask the Senator from Colorado to withhold the point of order because—

Mr. THOMAS. I will do that. I will withhold it, of course, but I will not promise not to renew it.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like even to ask the Senator not to renew it, because if this appropriation is made I certainly want it as far as it is possible to be, and the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota is nothing but fair to the different States of the country. I hope the Senator will finally conclude not to press the point of order.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me, I have perhaps already made myself more obnoxious than is personally desirable. I do not care to do so any more than is absolutely necessary. If the Senator from Utah says this is an improvement to the bill I will withdraw the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

#### AMERICAN TROOPS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I move that the pending measure be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate take up and consider Senate resolution 411.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. BORA. Upon that I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. THOMAS. What was the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To lay aside the appropriation bill and proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 411, upon which the yeas and nays have been requested.

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

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I do not see him in the chamber and I withhold my vote.

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I am informed by his colleague that if present he would vote "yea." I will therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. I

observe that he is not present. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSELL] and vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I am unable to secure a transfer and I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote I would vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded,

Mr. SAULSBURY. I desire to announce the necessary absence from the Chamber of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] because of illness, and also of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] for the same cause.

Mr. KENDRICK. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the senior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. FLETCHER. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (after having voted in the negative). Has the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I will have to withdraw my vote, having a pair with that Senator.

Mr. PENROSE (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I note that he has not voted. I will transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] on business of the Senate.

Mr. MOSES. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN] to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 37, not voting 27, as follows:

YEAS—32.			
Ashurst	Harding	La Follette	Penrose
Baird	Hardwick	Lenroot	Sherman
Borah	Johnson, Cal.	Lodge	Smoot
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	McCumber	Spencer
Curtis	Kellogg	McNary	Sutherland
Frelinghuysen	Kenyon	Moses	Vardaman
Gronna	Kirby	New	Wadsworth
	Knox	Page	Warren

NAYS—37.			
Bankhead	King	Pollock	Swanson
Beckham	Lewis	Pomerene	Thomas
Culberson	McKellar	Robinson	Thompson
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Trammell
Gay	Myers	Sheppard	Underwood
Henderson	Nelson	Simmons	Walsh
Hollis	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Smith, Ga.	
Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Smith, S. C.	
Kendrick	Poindexter	Sterling	

NOT VOTING—27.			
Brandeggee	Gerry	Norris	Smith, Md.
Calder	Goff	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Gore	Pelan	Townsend
Colt	Hale	Ransdell	Watson
Dillingham	Hitchcock	Reed	Weeks
Fall	McLean	Saulsbury	Williams
Fernald	Martin, Ky.	Shields	

So the motion of Mr. JOHNSON of California was rejected.

#### POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, on page 37, line 10, after the numerals "1920," I move to strike out down to and including the numerals "1921," in line 11, in the following words:

And the sum of \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

The effect of that amendment will be to reduce the appropriation \$75,000,000, but it applies only to the appropriation for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, or, in other words, it provides that at this time Congress shall not authorize an appropriation of \$75,000,000, which under this amendment, if it becomes a law, may not be expended until the year 1924.

There is no necessity whatever to appropriate money now that may not be used before the year 1924, and as a matter of wisdom and policy it should not be done. The next Congress or the Congress following can appropriate the money just as well as not to carry on this work, and by that time Congress will know more about the requirements of the Government; everyone in the country will know whether the conditions are such that the money ought to be expended for this purpose.

In saying this, Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that I believe in the building of good roads. I believe that that is one of the most important questions before the American people to-day, and I think millions and billions of dollars could be expended in the building of these roads; but let us at least use a little judgment in appropriating money out of the Treasury of the United States to be expended, perhaps, not before three or four years hence, and when we know nothing about the conditions which will exist in the country at that time. It is unwise, it is uncalled for, and it should not be done.

Again, Mr. President, I believe whatever amount of money is to be appropriated, if any is appropriated by this bill, should be for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919. As far as I am concerned, if the money is to be appropriated, I would rather see the \$50,000,000 taken from the next appropriation, that would be for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and added to the fiscal year 1919.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question for my own information?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I should like to know what appropriation was made for 1919 and how much has been expended?

Mr. SMOOT. The appropriations that have already been made amounted to \$75,000,000, and this bill provides \$50,000,000 more for the present fiscal year. I think very little of the \$75,000,000 that was appropriated three years ago is expended.

Mr. KING. It was my understanding that the amount appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, has scarcely been touched and that most of it is still available.

Mr. SMOOT. There is some of it available. But I will say that the \$50,000,000 that is provided for in the bill for the present fiscal year is immediately available and could be expended for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. KING. I understand that, but I was not sure about the other.

Mr. SMOOT. Under the existing law, if the States do not avail themselves of this \$50,000,000 by June 30, 1919, they have another additional year to do so; and as we want the appropriations, if they are made, to be such as to give employment to the people of this country at as early a date as possible, I believe that whatever appropriation is made ought to be made in the first instance for the year ending June 30, 1919.

All that was said yesterday upon this question could be repeated to-day, but there is no necessity for it. I wish that we could have Senators in their seats to listen to the discussion of these questions and know why the amendments are made.

Mr. President, if I stood here on the floor and spoke for an hour it would make no special difference as to the vote that will be taken, but I do want a record vote on this particular amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator mean the section?

Mr. SMOOT. No; the amendment I have just offered to strike out \$75,000,000. I hope the amendment that I have just offered to the amendment of the committee will be agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, in road construction it is necessary to have the plans several years ahead. The idea is to fix up a good system of road construction and improvement, and the engineers must lay it out. They must be connected with other roads, and unless you have a plan three or four years ahead, it is disconnected and not as systematic as it is with a three years' program. That is the reason why the committee decided that it was better to have a three years' program, so that it could be fixed up systematically and so that the engineers and the department could have a systematic system devised.

Mr. LENROOT. If the Senator will yield, I should like to ask him a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator where he thinks the money is coming from to pay this bill?

Mr. SWANSON. I am satisfied the Government will have plenty of money; but even if we must economize in other things—even if it is necessary to continue taxation—there is nothing that will add more to the wealth and more to the power of the country and more to the comfort of the people than road construction. It is an investment; it is not waste. It is not an expenditure of useless money. I believe there is nothing the Government could do—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. I will yield in a minute. There is nothing the Government could do that would be more beneficial and bring a better return than appropriations and expenditures made for road improvement. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. One remark the Senator made has interested me. Will he please indicate where we can economize in other things?

Mr. SWANSON. As soon as all the expenses of the war are over, with the increase of wealth, when we get down to an economical basis, I am satisfied that the Government can have a tax system that will carry road improvement without being onerous.

Mr. THOMAS. That is a very general answer to a specific question.

Mr. SWANSON. If there is anything the Government can spend money for that brings good returns, that brings good profits, that adds to the comfort of the people, it is road improvement.

Mr. THOMAS. If I may ask the Senator from Virginia another question, is the Senator going to support the proposed increase of the Navy involving an expenditure of \$700,000,000?

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator is entirely mistaken about the naval bill. The naval bill now pending in the House, as I understand, providing for the additional naval program, appropriates about \$400,000,000 approximately, the expenditure to extend over five or six years. The entire appropriation, as I understand, for this year is about \$750,000,000. A great deal of it is temporary, on account of the change to a peace basis from a war basis.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Virginia has not yet answered my question. Who will cut the appropriation down from \$700,000,000 to \$400,000,000? But I merely ask the Senator does he expect to support the bill?

Mr. SWANSON. I expect to support it should the condition be such that there is no disarmament or cessation of navalism in other countries. In that event, in order to save this country, we should have a Navy adequate to protect our great commercial interests and our liberty and our institutions.

Mr. THOMAS. Is the Senator in favor of reducing the appropriation?

Mr. SWANSON. I will discuss the naval bill when it comes here.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that; but the Senator stated that we ought to economize in some other direction; and I am in favor of economizing both in other directions and here. I was anxious to ascertain, if I could, from the Senator where we could begin this work of economy. That is the thing I have been hunting for the six years I have been in the Senate, but I can not find it.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand the naval appropriation bill has been reduced a great deal in the expenditure which it carries.

Mr. THOMAS. It has been reduced from \$1,250,000,000 to \$700,000,000, I understand.

Mr. SWANSON. It has been reduced a great deal more than that, and it has also been reduced from the estimates about two or three hundred million dollars. The appropriation is temporary on account of the changed conditions from war to peace. I have not examined the naval bill in detail so as to speak explicitly regarding it. I simply have the general impression. The bill has not yet come over to the Senate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I regard the third year of this appropriation as the most important of any year provided for in the bill. The department which is to put this bill into force and execution also holds that view. Why? If we are going to enter upon an extensive program of road construction in this country, it must be systematically entered upon, planned, and surveyed, and estimates must be made. State constitutions must be amended in some particulars. We have already authorized that in this bill, in order that all of the States may enjoy that portion of the appropriation to which they are entitled. The third year in this bill, as I have repeatedly said, is the most important of any. States have got to make their plans; they have got to make their surveys and estimates; they have got to provide for raising revenue. Many

States perhaps would hesitate about extensive preparations to be made to match the provisions in this bill if they were only to be applied or extended for two years.

The money which is to be appropriated will not be expended until the third year. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] says it is carried over to 1924, but he is mistaken.

Mr. SMOOT. I said it could be carried over.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not see how. There is nothing in the bill which authorizes it.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think the Senator wants to make that statement.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do make it.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator allow me to call his attention to what the bill provides?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will read from the bill. Let us see what the bill says.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me call attention to what the bill says. I think I can find it in a moment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I will read that portion of the bill to which I have referred, and that portion of the bill has not been amended. It was proposed to amend it, but the amendment went out on a point of order made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. So the original law as passed in 1916 is the law that controls this appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to say that I had the amendment here before me this morning when I was speaking.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I thought that had misled the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I was speaking to the amendment that I had before me.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But that went out; that is not in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. That amendment provided for the extension of the appropriation two years instead of one year, as in the existing law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That went out, and is not in the bill. I hope the Senate will carefully consider this matter. There is no economy—in fact, it is a waste, to my mind, to strike out the third-year provision of this proposed law. The States can not possibly make their arrangements economically and wisely to enter upon this extensive system of road improvement unless they have time in which to make their plans, their financial and other arrangements. If you cut them off right at the beginning of the third year, what happens? They have gone on for two years under the provisions of the law; they have entered upon road construction. Everybody, I think, understands how much interested the people of this country are in the question of improved roads and improved means of transportation from the farms to the depots and river landings and finally to the consumer. I do not think anybody need apprehend that under any circumstances we are to be criticized for liberal appropriations for this purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator let me ask him a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What amount under this bill will be immediately available?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Under this bill the amount which will be immediately available, according to the figures of the Secretary of Agriculture, who recommends this appropriation, is as follows: There will be immediately available for this fiscal year, under the provisions of this law, \$170,000,000. Why? Because \$70,000,000 of former appropriations have not been applied; the States have not made their plans and accepted the provisions of the law. Therefore that amount of money for two years remains unexpended because of war conditions, as the Secretary of Agriculture states. The plans were all adopted and approved, but the construction was held up on account of war conditions. Material could not be shipped, labor could not be obtained, and therefore road building during the last year or two, during the years which the war was going on, was practically suspended.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then there is \$170,000,000 immediately available?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If it will not interrupt the Senator, I should be glad to call his attention to the fact that a series of hearings have been going on before the Committee on Education and Labor upon a bill looking toward quite liberal appropriations to meet by employment on public works the threatened lack of employment in different parts of the country. The committee adjourned this morning, after another long hearing, without definite action; but we adjourned with the understanding that we would see how far this bill would provide authority to the use at certain places, perhaps, of part of this appropriation, even before it was met by the State. Could anything be done

without embarrassing or hindering this bill to facilitate the very prompt use of this fund where the lack of occupation for labor made it especially important?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think it would be wise to undertake to inject a provision of that kind into this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The bill pending before the Committee on Education and Labor carries an appropriation of \$100,000,000, to be used by a board to be designated in the bill, to meet, by providing employment on public works, conditions that may very possibly arise, and which I think we ought seriously to consider.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will say to the Senator that I think \$170,000,000, as provided in this bill, will be ample to meet that suggestion.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to add that it must not be overlooked that one-half of this money is to be paid by the States.

Mr. KENYON. One-half of the \$170,000,000?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. I wish to get right down to the question which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] has suggested. Can this work go on in the next few months? That is when this labor trouble is coming, and I am looking at it from that standpoint.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It can begin to-morrow, and, in fact, has already begun.

Mr. KENYON. It is necessary to have the States take some action in the matter, is it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; not many of the States will have to act, although some few will. I have just stated that the Secretary of Agriculture in his letter says that a very large number of these applications on the part of States have been approved, but have been held up on account of war conditions. They could not get the material; they could not get the labor. Now they are ready to go right to work and the money is ready under the old appropriation for these approved contracts.

Mr. KENYON. How many men actually can be put to work, does the Senator know?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know; but I will say that there are 391 projects already under agreement, where the States are ready to put up their share and the Government is ready to put up its share. That work will go on now because the conditions are such that it can be proceeded with. If we pass this bill labor can be obtained and the materials necessary to the building of roads can be obtained, because the railroad conditions have changed.

Mr. KENYON. How extensive are those projects? Are they large projects?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; not very many of them are. They are all in their nature local to the various counties and States.

Mr. KENYON. Can the Senator give any estimate of how many men will perhaps be employed on those projects?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have no definite figures as to that; but I would say unhesitatingly that under this bill, providing for an expenditure this fiscal year of \$170,000,000, at least 500,000 men, and perhaps more, can be employed on these roads. The benefit of these provisions is that the soldiers who are returning without employment are going to every State in this Union. They are not going to be discharged and remain in the cities of the East, but they are going back to the States where they enlisted, and they will be there trying to get employment. Under the provisions of this bill men who go back to Alabama or to Wisconsin or to any other State in the Union will be there ready to accept employment at liberal wages when this road construction begins, and it has already begun. As I have stated, 391 projects have been approved, and they are ready to proceed with the work. That is the benefit that will come from this bill.

I desire to repeat before I sit down that the provision of this bill as to the third year is the most important of all. If the provision for the third year is stricken out, the plans can not be made, the financial arrangements can not be made, and the State constitutions can not be amended, as some of them must be amended. This money will remain in the Treasury until the fiscal year for which it is appropriated; not a dollar of it can be expended until the time comes; and I hope the Senate will not consider for a moment the motion of the Senator from Utah to strike out the most important, to my mind the vital, provision of this bill. We had better strike out the first section.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The feature of this bill that appeals greatly to some of us is the first year's work, the work that can be done now. If the Senator had heard the testimony that has been presented to the Committee on Education and Labor, I believe he would be aroused to the necessity of furnishing work during the next six months to a great number of men who will otherwise be out of work.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It was suggested at our committee meetings that this bill in the provision for the first year's work would go far toward meeting this necessity. If I could, I would take the appropriation for the last year and add it to the first year, double it now, so as to be sure that we were taking steps which would give an opportunity to furnish occupation to labor where disorganization has arisen, their country having taken the men away from their homes and their occupations by the draft and put them in the Army.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator allow me to say just a word more?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We feared that they would be kept at the front all this year; but, thank God, they do not have to stay there, and now that the war is over let us not fail to realize that a duty rests upon us to provide for them as they come home by furnishing an opportunity to work along lines provided for in this bill. I think the opportunity is at least partially presented by this bill; I think they can do a great public service; they can accomplish results beneficial to the entire country, and at the same time we can meet our obligation to see that there is a chance for occupation to the men returning home whom we broke up their former relations to civil life.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the suggestions made by the Senator from Georgia. I could not tell, in response to the question of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], exactly how many men could be employed on road construction under the provisions of the bill for the first year, but there could certainly be employed a great number of men with the amount of money provided. The beauty of it is, Mr. President, that employment will be provided for them in every State in the Union. We are not proposing to go to New York or Philadelphia or Chicago or Boston to spend large amounts of money to give employment to the unemployed, but we are going out to every section of the country, in every State and every county where these men have returned after their discharge from the Army.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me a moment?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. It is estimated that over 50 per cent of expenditures for roads go directly to labor. The character of labor employed in such work, outside of the skilled engineers and road constructors, is not skilled labor, but is the usual kind of labor that in times of distress needs occupation and employment more than any other. If any measure could be devised to give occupation to the character of people who will be out of employment, road construction is generally understood to be the best kind of work for that purpose. It takes care of a class of people who are out of employment, and, in addition to that, the work is of permanent and lasting benefit.

Mr. THOMAS and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS. I thought the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. SWANSON. Not yet. As to the amount to be expended for the first year, there was some suggestion that the Senator from Alabama had exaggerated the figures. The estimate here is \$170,000,000, as he stated; that is, \$50,000,000 of Federal appropriations, to be supplemented by a like amount from the States, making \$100,000,000, to which should be added the balance now available from former and present fiscal years from State and Federal sources, amounting to \$70,000,000, making the total amount for the first year \$170,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the statement has been made that 500,000 men could be given employment under the first year's appropriation. I wish to call attention to the inaccuracy of that statement. Granting that \$170,000,000 will be available the first year, if the men engaged on road building are paid \$1,000 a year on the average, that would mean employment for 170,000 men. But it is admitted that only half of the amount goes to labor and that the other half is applied

to other expenses, so the most that could be employed would be 85,000.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Does the Senator object to the appropriation on that account?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I am only correcting the record; that is all.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I stated that I did not have the exact figures and did not know exactly the number of men who could be employed.

Mr. SMOOT. So that instead of 500,000 men who could be employed the first year, there would be about 85,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I presume the Senator from Utah has figured out how many men can be employed. I did not do that, and did not have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Does the Senator from Utah wish to enlarge the appropriation, so that it will give employment to 500,000 men?

Mr. SMOOT. I would rather do that for the first year than to appropriate money for the third year, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. VARDAMAN. There are two interests to be subserved—the people living in the country, who use the roads, and the people who are given employment in building the roads. If you can serve the country better by making a part of the appropriation available the third year, it seems to me there ought not to be any objection; not, I submit, because it may not give employment to quite so many men in the first year. We wish to serve the soldiers who will return to their homes without employment, but we also wish to serve the men and women whose labor produces the materials that feed and clothe the world, pay the taxes, and support the Government. In other words, I am interested in taking care of the farmers, whom I consider the substratum of all national prosperity.

Mr. SMOOT. I say that when the third year comes, and long before it comes, Congress will know whether they want to appropriate \$75,000,000 or \$150,000,000, or whether they are bankrupt, so that they can not appropriate anything. That is all.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have observed that many of the appropriations which are sought for find their excuse in the assertion that the money is needed to secure employment for returning soldiers. We are regaled here every morning, or some part of every day, by complaints that men who have jobs and want to fill them can not secure their discharges. We are told that jobs are hungering for returning soldiers, and the department is seriously criticized and sometimes denounced because those who desire discharges to return to employment can not secure them.

Mr. President, I was 15 years old when the Civil War ended. The press of the country at that time called attention to the reluctance of a great many discharged soldiers to work at all, to return to their ancient employments, or to renew the more prosaic and less attractive forms of civil pursuits; and that was true. It is an unfortunate fact that war begets the lust of adventure and of excitement and of restlessness in the blood of the young men who serve their country. It is difficult for them to lapse back into the lives which they led prior to the beginning of conflict.

I noticed a day or two ago in a New York paper that among the unemployed in New York were 15,000 discharged soldiers, most of them farm boys, who had determined thereafter to live in New York City. I am told by men engaged in the work of mustering out the soldiers that there is a widespread spirit of wanderlust, especially among the farm boys—and it is human nature; we can not blame them—who are not disposed to return to their ordinary pursuits, to the humdrum toil of life. They have got a taste of the world's excitement, and they desire to enjoy more of it.

A gentleman perfectly competent to speak said in my presence the other day that the colored soldiers of the South were on the streets of the cities, wearing their uniforms; that they did not want to work. Of course, that does not include all of them; but they felt—and there, again, it is a natural feeling—that having served their country, and served it well, they are now entitled to the enjoyment of a different life; and, of course, we are encouraging that by all sorts of proposed legislation. I have called attention to the fact that we could not even pass a revenue bill without providing for an appropriation of \$400,000,000 for extra pay.

A young citizen of my city came to see me within the week. He said he wanted to get his discharge as soon as possible because his old job was awaiting him. I told him that I had been informed that in my own city of Denver there were 7,000 to 10,000 soldiers looking for jobs. He said, "No; I have just come from there. They are not looking for jobs; they want

positions." He said, "There are plenty of jobs." And I know that the farms of this country are literally crying for help.

There are from 60,000 to 80,000 men on strike in the cities of Seattle and Tacoma. There are jobs that can be filled by returning soldiers, and ought to be. We may perhaps find ourselves in the position, I will not say of encouraging but of sympathizing, with organized strikes in the country while at the same time voting millions upon millions of dollars of the people's money to secure jobs for returning soldiers. I think that our principal task is going to be to find soldiers for jobs rather than to find jobs for soldiers.

I am not reflecting upon the patriotism or the enterprise of the young soldier. I am speaking, of course, of an exception to the general class; but it is wrong, Mr. President, to use the argument of a desire to give jobs to thousands of people for the purpose of getting these enormous appropriations out of a depleted Treasury.

Mr. President, the man whom God helps is the man who helps himself; and once we begin this paternal, charitable system of legislation, I do not know where we are going to end it. I contend that the men who stayed at home and who are detailed to work at home, in the city of Washington and in other cities, in carrying out that necessary supplemental task of supplying the Army with its sinews and with its supplies, are just as much entitled to appropriations, that we may now find them jobs, as others. The jobs, Mr. President, are here. The country wants every man. It can find a job for every man who wants a job; but we propose to say to these gentlemen, "We will get you jobs"; and a man who depends upon a condition of that kind for a job, and who accepts it, expects extraordinary consideration.

I have already called attention, in another argument that I presented to the Senate, to the extraordinary fact that under the provisions of this bill specific preference is given to soldiers and sailors, which is class legislation, which provides that the man who pays the taxes must be subordinated to the man who does not pay the taxes in the enjoyment of their expenditure.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. Just a moment. This should stand upon its merits. If the country needs and should have \$200,000,000, let us vote it; but do not let us camouflage our proposed appropriation by saying that it is necessary to give jobs to free, independent American citizens in a country of opportunity, where every man who wants to make a living and to earn it has abundant opportunity to do so.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. I think possibly the Senator has answered the question I intended to ask. It was this: Does the Senator believe that there is plenty of opportunity for work and plenty of work and plenty of jobs for those who are seeking them in the country?

Mr. THOMAS. As far as I am able to judge, yes. There are no jobs in New York City for 15,000 men who do not belong there and who will not go home.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will they not go home?

Mr. THOMAS. No; the newspapers state that they intend to make their future homes in these great cities.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Let me ask the Senator a question.

Mr. THOMAS. I can answer only one question at a time.

Mr. KENYON. Let me get through with mine. The Senator differs with the Labor Department of the Government with respect to this matter. Now, I agree with the Senator that this proposition of getting work for returned soldiers and all that is being made the vehicle to get great appropriations through.

Mr. THOMAS. There is no doubt in the world about it.

Mr. KENYON. That is true; and I do not believe in it at all; but I should like to think the Senator is correct in his view of the labor situation. The Department of Labor, in this testimony of which the Senator from Georgia speaks, has shown to that committee, by reports from the various cities—and I leave out this Seattle question and all of these strike questions—that the ratio of unemployment has been going up at a very alarming figure. There are not so many unemployed now as to be at all startling, but the ratio of unemployment is startling. For instance, we learn from reports from these centers that on December 13 there were 10,000 unemployed. That has gone up this week to 264,000, and they say there is not a job for every man seeking a job.

The holding back of investment, the holding back of building that has gone on during the war, has had something to do with

this situation. Men are not going ahead with building because material is so high and labor is high, and that situation has arisen in the country. I think it is a very troublesome situation. There have been held back by municipalities and States some three hundred millions of public works that already have been authorized. There is a great deal of Government work that has been authorized. Now, if we could go ahead with that, it would not make more public buildings, for instance, but the effort would be concentrated where the unemployment exists. Does the Senator feel that everything is all right; that there is no need along this line?

Mr. THOMAS. No; nothing is all right in this country at all times. If it were there would be nothing to live for. The Labor Department knows, and ought to know, much more about this situation than I do; but I know that in the city of New York, where there is a large amount of unemployment, there are also big strikes going on. Nobody wants to take the place of a striker. We all know, too, that the Labor Department is officered by those representing one species of labor, and that, as far as possible, the unemployed must, or is expected to, at least, identify himself with the organizations in order to get work through this board. I do not mean to say that that is universal; but, if my information is correct, it has characterized the operations of the board in some places.

But, Mr. President, I am satisfied—and this is not peculiar to this war; it is history; it is common experience; it is taking place in Great Britain, in Australia, in Canada, just as it is here; it is human nature—that men who have gone through the terrible and at the same time fascinating excitements of the war are reluctant, many of them, to reassume their civic duties and fill their old positions. I think in every city in the Union there are aggregations of men who have recently been in the Army who want jobs in the cities, while the country is crying and clamoring for help.

Mr. KENYON. There is no doubt about the country crying and clamoring for help.

Mr. THOMAS. And that the congestion in the cities is followed by starvation in the country. The problem before that board and before Congress is to induce men to go back to their old jobs, to go to farming, to go to blacksmithing, and so forth, instead of rushing into these cities and wasting their time in looking for jobs and attending the cheap theaters and other attractions of the cities.

Mr. KENYON. That is true; but, in the words of a great man whom the Senator did not think was a Democrat, it is a condition and not a theory that confronts us right now.

Mr. THOMAS. I know he was not a Democrat. I want to relieve the condition. I do not believe this will do it, however.

Mr. KENYON. I do not know. I hope the Senator is right when he says that there is a job for every man. I am afraid there is not, however.

Mr. THOMAS. There have been times, of course, when that was not the case, and there may be times now when that is not the case. I am willing to concede that; but is this the right sort of remedy?

Mr. KENYON. I do not know. What is the remedy? If there is not some remedy in carrying on public works, what is the remedy? The remedy is not to make speeches about it.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, making speeches is a remedy for nothing, especially in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. KENYON. That is the only way we remedy anything here, so far as I know.

Mr. THOMAS. Unfortunately, that is the only way in which we transact business here. The other House votes, and does not talk. We talk, and never vote; and, of course, I am just as guilty as anybody else, so far as that is concerned. It is difficult to outline the remedy at once; but I say primarily the remedy is to ascertain where jobs are—not who wants them so much as where jobs are. Let these employees ask the farmers of Iowa, the farmers and miners of Colorado—I know that there are mines in my State that need skilled men—and by that means ascertaining the job, then bring the man who is without it to that job, instead of, upon the assumption that we are catering to a greatly needed want, taking two hundred millions out of the Treasury of the United States for the purpose of making the people of our different States feel so much better because Uncle Sam's money is going to be distributed among them.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question at that point?

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

Mr. THOMAS. I wanted to yield the floor some time ago.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The learned Senator from Colorado always talks interestingly.

Mr. THOMAS. Interestingly and too much.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Interestingly and instructively. No; the Senator from Colorado can not talk too much to suit me. But I would like to suggest this thought, which has occurred to me and which I hope may throw some light on the subject. Primarily the purpose of this appropriation is not to give jobs.

Mr. THOMAS. No; but that is the argument upon which it is based, that it is needed at this time.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Of course, the honorable Senator from Colorado will not be carried off upon that idea. The appropriation is to build roads for the convenience and benefit of the people who live in the rural districts and for the convenience of the country generally. Good roads will cheapen the freight rates, the cost of carrying the products of the farms to market; good roads will facilitate social intercourse among the people, which will also enhance the value of the land and work for better living in the country in every way; good roads will improve the social life of the men and women who have to bear the burdens and the expense of government. Now, if you wish to make country life more attractive, if you would draw from the city to the farm men and women, if you would keep the boys reared in the country on the farm, you have got to make it possible for the farmer to visit his neighbor, to send his children to school, to carry his goods to market, and that will be made possible only by the building of good highways. You have got to bring him into the world, out of his heretofore forced isolation. I think the best investment this Government ever made, one that brings the largest returns to all the people, is the money invested in good highways, because, as stated above, good highways mean good schools; good highways mean better churches; good highways mean better live stock and improved farming implements; good highways improve educational facilities and elevate the moral tone of the community and in every way work for the upbuilding and betterment of society. They make farm life attractive when nothing else will, keep the boys from leaving the farm to go to the city, where they are often engulfed in the maelstrom of immorality and idleness. And I want to say, Mr. President, in conclusion, that when you benefit the agricultural element of this country you improve every other class of society, and you can not benefit one neighborhood in the United States or neglect the interests of one neighborhood without benefiting or injuring the entire Republic.

It is my judgment that the greater part of this money that is going to be spent on the roads will be paid to men now living in the country and soldiers who will return from the Army to the farm. Farmers in all probability will do the greater part of the road work. I do not indulge the hope that you are going to be able to induce people resident in the city to go to the country to do this road-building work. I hope they may go there. The work is healthy, moderate, and the remuneration will be ample, and the man who fails to take advantage of the opportunity thus furnished for employment, and remains idle in town, will prove himself to be an undesirable citizen.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator has repeated the argument that was made when this bill was presented by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. I referred to that the other day. There is a great deal in it. It is the argument which carried \$75,000,000 through the Senate and the House two years ago, a great part of which is not yet spent.

Of course, good roads are beneficial, but the Senator has not mentioned one thing which this and other appropriations are going to bring to the people, and that is bankruptcy, which, in my mind, is a poor equivalent for the benefits to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I do not think it will bring bankruptcy. I think this appropriation for roads is a good investment.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, this bill is only one of a number. The total appropriations to be made, pending, and which will be pending during the short life of this Congress will amount to thousands of millions of dollars; and there is just as much basis for the other appropriations at this time as there is for this one. Good roads have \$75,000,000 at this time, and ought not to be enriched by \$200,000,000, however desirable the benefits that will grow from it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, before I make any remarks upon this amendment, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether he knows if it is to be the policy of the Southern States to continue the employment of convicts in the States on these roads which are to be built by the Federal Government?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know of any State of the South that has ever employed State convicts.

Mr. THOMAS. My State employs them, and I hope it will continue to employ them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I hope so, too.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That has nothing to do with this question. Do they employ convicts on the roads in the Senator's State?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes; and that simply brings out the point I want to make in my opposition to this amendment. I think this talk about employing the returned soldiers on the roads is foolishness. In the first place, I do not believe any number of soldiers will be willing to go on the roads and work under the conditions which are demanded. These soldiers have returned from France where they have been under the care of the Government, and be it said to the credit of the War Department they have been well rationed. If they are to accept employment from the Government, or whoever contracts to build these roads, they must submit not to the military rations or fare but to the fare provided by the contractor, and he is going to make as much money out of the contract as he can. Consequently the living conditions and the food will not be of the same standard that the soldiers enjoyed while in the Army. Besides, it will compel the soldiers to go out to live in bunk houses, many of them under uncomfortable conditions, far from home, and what the soldier wants now is to go home and work near his home.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the Senator understand that this provision compels the soldiers to work on the roads?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No; I understand that it does not; that it is voluntary, but I say—

Mr. BANKHEAD. If they do not want to go there and live in bunk houses, they will not go.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I say to the chairman of the committee the conditions are such that it will not be attractive to those men. They want to go home and work near their homes. Many of those men have homes, and you can not take them on these roads and induce them in any wise to take that kind of employment.

Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to support any bill which will enable us to employ idle men in this country, but the reason why men are idle to-day is because the manufacturers can not pay the present rate of wages. They can not sell their goods at the present rate of wages, and they are compelled to shut down their industries. Besides that, the manufacturers of this country are unwilling to take any chances in buying raw material or engaging in any future contracts under the present system of taxation. They are afraid to take a chance as to the future.

That brings me to the point I want to make in regard to this bill. I do not want to oppose any measure which will give the States of the Union which have a small mileage of roads an increase mileage through any aid whether State or Federal. Good roads are probably the only medium through which the farming sections of the country and the productive areas of the country can be built up. I think my State alone has had a wider experience in regard to that, for we were the pioneer State in road building. Twenty years ago the State-road act was passed whereby the State aided the counties and the townships in building roads, and it brought great prosperity to the State. I think we were the first State which adopted that plan.

I believe it is a question of grave doubt whether the Federal Government should continue the paternalistic policy of these public improvements for the benefit of the States. There is not enough money in the Treasury to continue these tremendous appropriations. We have engaged in the extension of vocational education, and we passed the farm-demonstration act—I think it is the Smith-Lever Act—all of great benefit to the States and all needed; but the question now arises just as we are emerging from the war, when we do not know what our war debt is going to be, when we must necessarily raise another liberty loan of \$8,000,000,000, when it is doubtful whether we can raise that loan. On top of that the statement was made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]—I think on yesterday—that in the fiscal year ending June 30 we will need \$10,000,000,000 for governmental expenses. With all that in view I say the time has come, if we are practical, common-sense business men in this Chamber, when we have got to put our feet down on these public enterprises and developments, for a time at least.

The estimates of the Senator from Utah are not all the obligations which the Government will have to meet. I do not think he included in that the billion and a quarter that will be required to keep our faith with the farmers in the \$2.26 additional that we agreed to pay for wheat. It does not include the \$750,000,000 in the naval bill, an appropriation which the President says is vital to the negotiations for peace just as peace is dawning. There is a \$75,000,000 omnibus public-building bill; I understand, pending in the House of Representatives. There will be \$1,000,000,000 required to replace the source of revenue which the Government will be deprived of by reason of the pro-

hibition amendment, and we shall have a fixed charge of \$750,000,000 interest on our war debt.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is correct in stating that in my estimate, that was made on December 18 last, I did not take into consideration most of the items he has already mentioned, but I may add, if that is all the Senator is going to mention, there are a few more.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It is practically \$4,000,000,000. In addition to this tremendous amount there are other projects mentioned; \$400,000,000 for the development of the Mississippi and \$500,000,000 for the development of land under Secretary Lane's proposal for returning soldiers.

Mr. President, this has been the most lavish and extravagant era in American history, and just as we are now struggling to recover from the tremendous burdens of taxation imposed by reason of the war Congress is flooded with projects which are paternalistic in nature. If eventually it is to be the policy of the Government, we should have some systematic plan, not a slipshod catch-as-you-can plan, where a few States will benefit by it and other States will fail to benefit by it, but a system properly studied, a system of national highways, trunk lines running from coast to coast, East to West, North to South, so that every State will be equally benefited. If we are to enter upon a policy of Federal road building, that should be the system and method which we should adopt, not this careless method of appropriating to just a few States.

Mr. President, I shall oppose this amendment because I think it is unwise at this time to enlarge the expenditures of the Government and place great burdens of taxation upon the business and manufacturing interests of the country.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not oppose my amendment to the amendment?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will support your amendment because it reduces the appropriation, and I shall then vote against the appropriation of \$200,000,000.

I simply want to read, in closing, from the Democratic Campaign Textbook of 1912 a section of the Democratic platform, entitled "Economy in the public service." The Democratic platform says:

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic Government, and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

Again, in the Democratic platform of 1916, under the title "Economy and the budget," we find the following:

We demand careful economy in all expenditures for the support of the Government, and to that end favor a return by the House of Representatives to its former practice of initiating and preparing all appropriation bills through a single committee, chosen from its membership, in order that responsibility may be centered, expenditures standardized, and made uniform, and waste and duplication in the public service as much as possible avoided. We favor this as a practicable first step toward a budget system.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, although I have been very much interested in these amendments to the bill, and interested, too, in the discussion, so far I have said nothing in this debate. I wish to say this, Mr. President, that if the Democratic Party has violated its platform, as just read by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], in no other or greater way than it would violate it by standing for the present bill, and for that provision of the bill relating to Federal aid for good roads, I could easily excuse the Democratic Party, for, Mr. President, as I view it, the expenditure contemplated by this bill is not at all wasteful extravagance, the thing which the Democratic Party condemns in its platform, nor is it the paternalistic policy described by the Senator from New Jersey.

Under the broad power given Congress to establish post offices and post roads a great deal more may be done by Congress than merely designating a post-road route by declaring that it shall follow certain lines. The power to establish post offices and post roads must mean the power to construct and maintain also, because, though established, laid out, or defined, without the construction of the road the mere laying out or defining of the road might be wholly unavailing.

With that power, Mr. President, not only to establish a post road, but the power which must necessarily follow, namely, to construct and maintain a road, how much has ever been expended by the Government of the United States in laying out, constructing, or maintaining the post roads of the country?

I am not quite sure that I am correct, but my belief is that never a cent had been expended by the General Government or appropriated by Congress for the purpose of constructing and maintaining the Government post roads throughout the country

until it was appropriated under the bill passed in 1916, the present law. I think it fair and reasonable to ask the question whether the Government, in the construction of these roads, does not itself owe something to the people in the way of aiding in their construction as post roads and for the purpose of the carriage of the mails.

But, as I say, the Government, until the good-roads law in 1916, had never, as I recall, appropriated a cent for the construction or maintenance of its post roads. Under the law, and under the regulations of the Post Office Department made in pursuance of the law, routes have been designated, of course, and every railroad throughout the country is a post route under the law and under the regulations. But the Government has never expended any money in the construction of railroads or in other roads over which the mails have been carried by city or by rural carriage.

Mr. President, I am for this bill and this feature of the bill on the ground that it is not paternalism, and because it is in pursuance of a wise, wide, and beneficent national policy.

What are the ends of Government? I think one of the great ends is the welfare of the people. What is related to the welfare of the people? Their means of social intercourse, anything that may help them from an economic point of view, education, are all things that pertain immediately to the welfare of the people; and what better means of securing these ends, and thereby securing the welfare of the people, than a system of good roads throughout the country?

Mr. President, it is appalling sometimes when we think of the economic waste that arises out of a system of bad roads, the difficulties and the delays in getting the produce of the farmer to the market, the losses which farmers sustain in many sections of the country because of bad roads.

Communities in certain States of this Union are financially unable, because of their situation, because of their newness, because of their population, because of their lack of great industrial interests to help them, to construct a system of good roads, and when the Government lays out the post roads, since it has power and authority to construct and maintain them, it is but reasonable and natural that the people should say to Congress: "Build half of certain of these post roads of yours as they may be laid out, as the projects may be approved by the State highway commissions, and as they may be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Here are the proper safeguards to prevent waste and extravagance, Mr. President, in the expenditure of the money appropriated. You first have the State authorities passing upon the question, determining whether or not the route is feasible, whether it is needed, whether this post road should be made a good travelable, safe road. It is first passed upon by the State authorities, and then again by the Secretary of Agriculture, and after a survey, preliminary at least, of the route over which the road is to be constructed.

So, Mr. President, with this as our policy, with the underlying thought and need being the economic, social, and educational welfare of all the people of the country, why should not Congress appropriate one-half of the amount necessary to build, construct, and maintain some of the roads which the Government uses for the purpose of carrying the mails?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. STERLING. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I am, of course, in full accord generally with all the Senator has stated, but I wish to ask the Senator whether the establishment of post roads is not primarily of local benefit, and when the Federal Government pays the salary of the rural carrier, whether the Government is not contributing to a local benefit?

Mr. STERLING. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin in the respect that it is primarily of local or community benefit; but, Mr. President, because it does not excuse the Government itself in denying all aid in the construction of these roads.

Let me call attention, in passing, to the situation in my own State as compared with conditions in other States in the Union, with the conditions in those States from which the Senators come who are most strenuous in their opposition to the good-roads part of the bill. These Senators come from States where there is material in abundance for the construction of good roads. In most of the Eastern States, I think, they have the stone, they have the gravel, and they are near industries which produce other elements of material necessary for the construction of good roads. But out in South Dakota, where east of the Missouri River it is like one great farm, with no gravel of consequence, with little other road-building material avail-

able, the people themselves, without taxing themselves to death, are unable to build the roads. Build roads that are good roads for the rural carrier in the first place. Build roads that are good roads for the farmer to use in getting his grain and his stock to market. Build good roads that are necessary for the school children as they trudge their way from home to the country schoolhouse 1 mile or 2 miles or 2½ or 3 miles away.

Good roads will add to the value of the farms along which the roads run. The assessed valuation of these farms will be greater, and not only the States but the National Government itself will in the end and in turn realize the benefit of this increased valuation caused by the construction of systems of good roads through the States.

Mr. President, I have not mentioned one other feature of this bill which commends itself to my mind very much indeed, and that is the feature which provides that preference shall be given to the soldiers, sailors, and marines seeking employment. The Senators who most deplore the labor situation and who are pleased to point out from time to time conditions with which we will be confronted in regard to labor a little later on, seem to ignore this one great means by which labor might be employed. It will mean employment to thousands of men. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] refers to the fact that it will not be convenient for certain laborers because, perhaps, the employment will be too far away from home; but if they are in earnest in seeking employment, if they are in real need of employment, they will not hesitate to go to some place within their own State or a neighboring State where good roads are being constructed through the combined work of the Federal Government and the State.

Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has said in regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], an amendment which would strike out the appropriation for the third year for which the appropriations are to run. The bill would be greatly crippled, the beneficent purposes of the bill would, in a large measure, be destroyed if there should be stricken out the appropriation for the year 1921. I can not state it in any better way than he himself has stated it. The authorities in the several States will require the entire three years in which to make their plans for the building of the projects and for the carrying out of those plans.

Mr. President, as I think over this good-roads amendment, what it is meant for, the good it has already accomplished in the many projects that have been built and those under construction, and of what I believe to be the moderate amount sought to be appropriated by the amendment, I am heartily in favor of it as it stands. I shall vote for it and shall vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, there are many of us who are heartily in accord with the first two items of appropriation in this section, and it is very unfortunate if, in order to secure what are considered necessary appropriations, we are also compelled to vote for an appropriation that, it seems to some of us, can not be justified at this time. I shall vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah and I hope that it will be adopted.

The eminent chairman of the committee a little while ago stated that he considered this appropriation of \$75,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1921, the most important item of any of the three items of appropriation. He stated that, in his opinion, if any of the three items were to be stricken out of the bill, the first two items should be stricken out and the item now in question should remain. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the report made by the committee, and made by the chairman himself, presumably, so far as the report relates to this subject, with the exception of two or three lines, is devoted wholly to the first two items of appropriation and is based and justified upon the necessity of taking care of unemployment. Upon that ground this appropriation can be justified, and I heartily favor it. I would be willing to vote for \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30 next and the next fiscal year for the purpose of building good roads, because I believe that it would take care of the unemployment that now exists and that, I am afraid, is going to increase.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] stated that, in his opinion, there was no necessary unemployment. Mr. President, the facts that are coming to us from day to day and from week to week show beyond any question that unemployment is increasing in this country, and increasing with very rapid strides. That is entirely natural; it is to be expected.

In the first place, industry in this country to-day, Mr. President, is unwilling to go ahead for the future for two reasons: One is that industry does not know what the policy of this Government is going to be with reference to supervision, con-

trol, and restriction upon business. In the second place, a very large percentage of the production of this country normally is not for immediate consumption but is for consumption six months or a year from the time of production.

We have this situation in the United States to-day: The local merchant, believing that a fall in prices may follow, will not give his usual and normal orders to the wholesale houses to stock up his store. The wholesale houses do not get the orders, and the manufacturer is not getting any orders to-day for future production. So there must be during this transition period, during this period of uncertainty, a degree of unemployment. It is not the fault of anyone; it is a perfectly natural consequence.

Unemployment existing and increasing, I believe it is the duty and the obligation of the Federal Government during this period to do what it can to alleviate and to relieve that unemployment. It is very much better, Mr. President, to appropriate \$100,000,000 or \$200,000,000, if necessary, for the building of roads, thus relieving that unemployment, than to have soup houses established all over this land and for men to be compelled to look to charity or to starve. So the first two items in this section can be justified because they are necessary.

I believe that the policy of this Government ought to be to pay every just obligation that the Government has. Beyond that expenditures ought not to be made except for absolutely necessary public purposes; and the relief of unemployment may well be considered as a necessary purpose.

But when we come, Mr. President, to appropriate at this time, in addition to the \$125,000,000 that is contained in this amendment—and that I am in favor of—when we add to that \$75,000,000, to be used for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, how can it be justified in the present condition of the Treasury? Where are we going to get the money for these enormous appropriations? No Senator who favors the appropriation of this last \$75,000,000 has answered that question.

As I stated yesterday, the conference report upon the revenue bill will be before the Senate for adoption in a day or two. The conferees on that bill have agreed to a proposition coming from the other side of the aisle that during the year 1920 all of the taxes that can safely be imposed upon industries in this country, upon excess profits and upon incomes, together with the other provisions of the bill, will bring to the United States Treasury only \$4,000,000,000. You upon the other side of the aisle have said in that bill that we can get no more out of the profiteer; that we can not tax wealth any more than that. The difference between that \$4,000,000,000 and the expenditures that must be made and the appropriations that are now being made must come from where? That question has been asked a number of times. The chairman of the committee has not answered it; the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], who has just spoken in favor of this bill, has not answered it. It can be answered only in two ways. Aside from a considerable increase in revenue through a revision of the tariff, which presumably the President of the United States would veto when a Republican Congress sends a bill to him, there is no other way by which we can augment substantially the revenues of the Government and that is to reduce the exemption of incomes, so that every person in this land must bear these additional taxes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. So that there may not be an impression that all acquiesce in the public statement that the taxes under the revenue bill, the conference report of which will be presented to the Senate this coming week, will for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, raise \$4,000,000,000, I wish now to say that, if the bill passes just as it is printed, it will not raise \$4,000,000,000. If it raises \$3,250,000,000, it will be every cent that it will provide.

Mr. President, the proposition that that bill will raise \$4,000,000,000 is based upon an idea that the business for 1919 is going to be just as profitable as was the business for 1918; and there is not a man in the United States but knows that that will not be so.

Not only that, but I predict now that, with the relief provisions contained in the report, \$6,000,000,000 will not be raised by the bill this year. The amount raised will not much more than exceed \$5,000,000,000.

I wanted to make that statement in order that it may be taken for what it is worth. I have, however, studied the bill about as much as has any man in the United States, and I feel perfectly safe in stating that we are not going to raise \$4,000,000,000 by that bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Utah makes the situation just that much more serious. But assuming that the revenue bill will raise the amount that is estimated for 1920, namely, \$4,000,000,000, and the expenditures for that year amount to \$8,000,000,000, at the very least, where are we going to get the other \$4,000,000,000?

I do not think that the Republican side of this Chamber, that will soon be in control of legislation here, and the Republican majority at the other end of the Capitol are going so to revise these taxes that the burden will fall upon the great masses of people, and the man who earns \$400 or \$500 a year will be compelled to pay a heavy income tax. I do not believe that they are going to do that in order to meet the enormous appropriations that you are making. In my judgment, when 1920 comes and there is a deficit in the Treasury, the Congress of the United States will then say to the President of the United States, "Your administration is responsible for this condition; go out and borrow money in time of peace." You will have a bond issue in 1920 and you will sweep the Democratic Party from power when you do it. Of course, that is "a consummation devoutly to be wished" from a Republican standpoint; but I would prefer that there be a little sense of responsibility from a national standpoint concerning the expenditures of this Government.

Let me say in this connection, Mr. President, that complaint is very often made by Southern States against Republicans because they have sometimes called attention to what they term a sectional issue in this Government. It is true that the Republicans have called attention to the control of legislation by Southern States; but by the action of Southern States, as represented in both Houses of Congress, they are continually demonstrating that from that section there is very little responsibility from a national standpoint concerning expenditures, provided only the appropriations shall be expended in their own States.

A river and harbor bill might be proposed here, and there is scarcely any sum that might be appropriated in that river and harbor bill that would not receive almost the solid support of the Southern States, provided that they thought they got their share of the appropriation.

Mr. President, Senators have got to have some sense of responsibility to this country as a nation, as well as a sense of responsibility to their own States and to their own sections. Under this bill the \$75,000,000 carried by the amendment it is now proposed to strike out would benefit the State of Wisconsin undoubtedly to a greater extent than the taxes paid by the people of my State for the good-roads expenditure; but I should feel that I had no right to occupy a place in the Senate if I were to make the controlling factor of my action upon bills the question whether my State would get more than it paid under a given proposition.

I am in favor of good roads; I am in favor of the Government assisting with most liberal appropriations for good roads. If the Treasury were in a condition to permit it, I would not oppose the appropriation for the year 1921, but it can not be justified under present conditions, and appropriations for good roads at this time at all can only be justified because of the benefit that will also come to the country through alleviating the unemployment that exists and that will increase.

I am therefore in favor of the \$125,000,000 appropriated by the first two items of the committee amendment. I shall vote in favor of the amendment striking out the last \$75,000,000, and I hope that amendment will be adopted, because, believing as I do in the very great necessity of this \$125,000,000, I shall feel sorry to be compelled in order to secure that to vote for an additional \$75,000,000, which I do not believe should be appropriated at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. KENYON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	Kenyon	New	Spencer
Colt	King	Overman	Sterling
Dillingham	Kirby	Page	Sutherland
Fernald	Knox	Poin Dexter	Swanson
Fletcher	La Follette	Pollock	Thomas
France	Lenroot	Pomerene	Thompson
Frelinghuysen	Lewis	Saulsbury	Townsend
Gay	Lodge	Shafroth	Vardaman
Gore	McCumber	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Hale	McLean	Simmons	Warren
Harding	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Johnson, Cal.	Moses	Smith, Ga.	
Jones, Wash.	Myers	Smith, S. C.	
Kellogg	Nelson	Smoot	

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] are detained by illness.

Mr. FRANCE. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] on official business of the Senate.

Mr. SPENCER. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. NUGENT] are detained in attendance on the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I wish to announce, as no announcement has been made of it before, that I have been detained from the Senate since last Saturday on account of sickness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the pending amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the amendment reported by the committee.

The SECRETARY. In the amendment reported by the committee, on page 37, lines 10 and 11, after the numerals "1920," it is proposed to strike out "and the sum of \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921."

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, on July 11, 1916, there was approved the road act which had previously been passed by Congress. That act was passed before we entered the war. It had very careful consideration by Congress, and I think that Congress considered that we went as far as we ought to go in providing for ordinary peace-time expenditures in aid of road building by the National Government. I voted for that act.

The amendment that is now before the Senate provides that the sum of \$50,000,000 shall be appropriated in addition to the amount provided by existing law, and be expended under the terms of existing law as amended by section 5 of this bill, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, to be immediately available. It also provides that the sum of \$75,000,000 shall be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and also that the sum of \$75,000,000 shall be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921. This latter item is the item which the Senator from Utah by his amendment proposes to strike out.

I was very much surprised at the statement by the chairman of the committee that this is the most important item in this amendment, and that if this item is stricken out the purpose and object of the amendment of the committee will be nullified.

I had the impression, Mr. President, that the committee placed this proposed amendment in the bill in order to take care, to a very large extent, of any possible labor needs that might arise in the immediate future in connection with the readjustment of conditions that naturally grow out of the cessation of the war; and so I was very much surprised to hear that statement from the chairman of the committee. I favor the appropriation contained in the first two items of section 6, not for the primary purpose of building roads but to let the Government set the example for business enterprise to go on, and in that way furnish employment for the men coming home as well as those at home who probably will be out of employment. If the Government stops Government work, private enterprise can not be expected to proceed.

The Senator from Mississippi stated that the primary purpose of this provision is to build roads; and in very eloquent language he described the benefits that come to the country from building good roads. As I said, I did not understand that that was the primary purpose of this legislation. I recognize the great benefits that come from good roads. Nothing can do more to promote the happiness and comfort of living or do more to reduce costs than good roads. I believe in the National Government going as far as it feels that it ought to go to aid in the construction of good roads; but I feel that Congress, in the passage of the act of July 11, 1916, did go as far as it thought the National Government ought to go in normal peace times; and so I believed that the primary purpose and object to be served in the injection of this provision into the Post Office bill was to take care of the possible difficulties in connection with labor during the next year or two. That is the only basis upon which I can justify myself, under the conditions that

confront us now, in voting for these two items, and this was the ground stated for it when the bill was reported.

I can see nothing whatever to justify a vote for this \$75,000,000 for 1921. There will be ample time between now and then to determine whether or not we should make any additional appropriation for road purposes at that time. I shall not repeat what has been said as to the condition of the Treasury, or the condition of our revenues, or the obligations confronting this Government, or what may be the effect of increasing these obligations at this time and the consequent tax on business and enterprise; but no reason has been presented that appeals to my judgment justifying this appropriation of \$75,000,000 for 1921.

I do not consider this, however, from the standpoint of waste. I do not think expenditures for good roads are a waste. I think, rather, they are an investment; and if we were not confronted by the condition of things that confronts us now with reference to revenues and obligations and indebtedness of the Government, and so forth, I would be perfectly willing for us to obligate ourselves to invest \$75,000,000 in 1921, and possibly more. We have a bill now on the calendar of the Senate to cancel, in effect, \$15,000,000,000 of obligations that Congress obligated this Government to pay for carrying on the war. We did it promptly; we obligated ourselves to pay this money without hesitation, in order to insure the successful ending of the war. This money would very largely have been actually wasted. It would very largely have been expended for ammunition that would have been shot away; and, so far as any good is concerned, outside of bringing the war to a successful close, it would have been actually wasted and destroyed. Taking this into account, I can justify myself in voting for \$50,000,000 additional for 1919—I would vote for a larger sum—and even \$75,000,000 additional for 1920, for building good roads in this country. That will be a lasting investment; that will result in the future in far greater good than can be measured by the expenditure that we make. I would be willing, Mr. President, under the conditions that confront us, to take this \$75,000,000 for 1921 and put it on to the \$50,000,000 for 1919 rather than put it in 1921. I think we would have some justification for doing that. I believe that this \$50,000,000 in 1919 ought to be increased, because if we need any money to take care of the labor situation, we need it promptly. We need it without delay. There are proposals pending before the Senate and before Congress to appropriate \$100,000,000 and larger sums for the distinct and avowed purpose of taking care of the labor situation.

Mr. President, I have not had time to examine all of these proposals. I have examined some of them, and it seems to me that they would not serve the purpose that they are intended or urged to serve, for the reason that they do not provide any machinery for laying the foundation upon which this work can be carried out promptly. I think we have the machinery here. We have the road organization. It is already made upon the part of the National Government. It also exists upon the part of most, if not all, of the States; and, as the chairman of the committee stated awhile ago, as soon as this money is appropriated and made available it can be used upon projects that have been investigated, reported upon, and that are ready to be carried out. Employment can begin at once and the needs of the hour met.

I think the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] suggests that \$100,000,000 should be made available, to be expended when and where the Secretary of Labor shall certify that there is unemployment that needs the expenditure of this money.

Mr. President, you can not start upon the expenditure of money for building roads, for instance, until after your engineers have mapped out, laid out, and passed upon the plans to be put into effect; and that takes time. It has already been done here, and that is one reason why I am in favor of this provision—that it takes advantage of the organization already existing, of the plans already made, perfected, and approved. It insures a wise and economical expenditure of whatever money we may desire to expend. The Secretary of Labor has no machinery to lay out this kind of work. He could not begin it to any advantage. The Government can not afford to spend money everywhere there may be unemployment. There must be a project to which labor may come rather than taking the projects to labor.

I do not expect that this money will be expended—not very largely, at any rate—for labor that is now congregated in the cities. It has been suggested here that they are not going to leave the cities and go out into the country to work on roads. That is probably true. I am inclined to think that it is true; but wherever we may start this road building we will get a

certain amount of labor that otherwise would be employed somewhere else; and this is in line with the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado. We are going to make employment available instead of proposing to make the unemployed take some particular job. We are going to give the idle man no excuse for remaining idle; and I have very little sympathy for the man who is idle when jobs are calling for him and employment is awaiting him, even though it may not be the kind he especially desires.

Mr. President, I have introduced an amendment, proposed to be appended to the sundry civil appropriation bill, providing for \$50,000,000 to be used in carrying on and prosecuting irrigation works that have already been undertaken and on which work has been largely stopped during the war. I had in mind submitting an amendment something like this amendment also. I spoke to the chairman of this committee about it, and he advised me then that his committee was reporting something of this kind. I had in mind what I have just pointed out, that there is an organization already in existence and plans already prepared upon which we could expend the money. So, in connection with irrigation works, we have a great proposal by the Secretary of the Interior that would involve the expenditure of billions of dollars in order to make it amount to anything. It is presented to Congress upon the theory of furnishing employment for returning soldiers. Why, Mr. President, it will be years, under that plan and that proposal, before any work would be ready for them; so I introduced this amendment providing the appropriation of \$50,000,000 to be expended upon existing projects—projects that already have been surveyed, estimated for, approved, and in many cases actually undertaken.

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

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. For my own information I should like to ask whether the plan of the Secretary of the Interior, to which the Senator has just referred, is so Utopian, so unrealizable, that it is not available and may not be available for immediate use by those who need employment?

As I understood the Senator it called for the appropriation of billions of dollars, and the plan could not be put in operation for years. I am very much interested in ascertaining whether that is the character of plan which the Secretary of the Interior has formulated and which he is asking the country to adopt.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think that if the Senator will investigate it and examine it carefully, he will come to the same conclusion that I have reached, that in order to carry it out to the full extent it will involve the appropriation of billions of dollars and that it will be a long time before it can be actually undertaken to any appreciable extent.

Mr. KING. If there is such a stupendous plan as that, I do not think it will get very far in either branch of Congress; but my understanding was that the Secretary of the Interior had devised a plan which he intended to submit, if it had not already been submitted, which called for the expenditure of approximately \$200,000,000 for the reclamation of arid lands, as well as certain swamp and cut-over lands, and from which appropriation there would be drawn sufficient to enable those who desired homes to enter upon those lands and to make a start that would enable them to make a livelihood. I had not heard of the plan that called for the appropriation of billions.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, Mr. President, the provision presented does not call for billions. It calls for a hundred million; but there is not anybody that can study that plan for a little while, knowing the conditions throughout the country and what will have to be done, but that will know that that is only a drop in the bucket as to the expenditures that will be necessary to make it of any substantial benefit.

Why, Mr. President, it involves swamp lands and logged-off lands, and involves, before it can be put into effect, the acquisition of those lands by the National Government, because they are practically all in private ownership now; and before they can be made available for homes they must be reclaimed, and these logged-off lands must be cleared, too. I do not know what logged-off lands in other sections of the country cost to reclaim, but the expense in my section is from \$100 to \$150 an acre. It is all right to hold out the hope of furnishing to our boys homes on logged-off lands; but if there is any boy from the East who will go out and look at an acre of logged-off land in my section and say, "I want to go there and take up and build and dig out a home," he is not a man that is going to spend his time on that sort of land or in that sort of work. He has the courage and the stamina and the determination that will enable him to do something else far better for himself and the country. The Secretary's conception is a grand one. It does him great credit. If it can be worked out, it will be a great thing for the country. I will help work it out. I will

be glad to aid those seeking homes to get them. We will have to do something along the lines he suggests if we would have our remaining lands taken up and settled upon. This will take time to work out and carry out. It will not meet the emergency that confronts us.

I should like to see us do something along these lines. I should like to see us make our swamp lands available. I introduced a bill myself, a few years ago, to assist and aid in the reclamation of swamp lands, logged-off lands, and so forth; and I will join with our Senators and Representatives from the States where these swamp lands are, in trying to frame legislation that will result in the reclamation of these lands; and I think it can be very easily done. But those who seem to think that the same kind of legislation that will apply to arid lands will apply to swamp lands are mistaken. You can not enforce the same rules and regulations with reference to the reclamation of swamp lands that you can enforce with reference to the reclamation and irrigation of arid lands. The National Government can put its money into the reclamation and irrigation of arid lands, and it can enforce payment. How? Simply by shutting off water for the man who does not pay. But when you reclaim swamp land it is reclaimed, and you have no remedy of that sort to enforce the claims of the Government to reimbursement. I do not think it would be very difficult to organize districts under which liens could be enforced against reclaimed swamp lands for the money expended by the National Government; but I did not intend to go into that discussion. I will be glad to help frame legislation along these lines and for this purpose, however. I simply want to point out the fact that we have an existing road organization, we have an existing irrigation organization, that can be used at once, and that can use almost any reasonable sum of money that we can make available to carry on these very desirable works, and works that will form reservoirs for the employment of those who are needing work. As I said, I have introduced a provision for spending \$50,000,000 on irrigation works already approved or begun. The places are ready. Work can be begun at once. Employment can be offered to-morrow. This is no more than a loan. It will increase production, add wealth to the community, and bring comfort and happiness.

Some criticism is made here of the provision giving a preference to returning soldiers. Mr. President, I do not see any real, just basis for criticism of that. We do make a preference for the soldiers in many different lines. We exercised a preference when we took the soldiers to war. The Government exercised a preference when it selected these men who went to fight our battles; so it is not very much out of place, I think, simply to say that if a soldier presents himself and asks for employment, and another man presents himself at the same time and asks for employment, and you have employment for only one, you should give the preference to the soldier. He has earned it; he deserves it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Since the Government denied the soldier any right to select for himself when he was conscripted and sent to the war, I think it is very proper to give him the preference at the hands of the Government when he applies for work.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not think there is anything improper about it, I am sure.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Nor I, either.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not expect very many of the soldiers to ask for this preference. I doubt if very many of them will seek employment to work as day laborers upon these roads. I hope they may not have to do it; but if they do, although there are many worse things, then I can see very much justification for the little preference given here in this bill.

Now, Mr. President, my idea is just this: If we deem it wise to make additional appropriations for building roads or reclaiming arid or other lands in order to take care of a possibly distressing situation that is very likely to confront us, and I do think it wise, let us do it through the organizations that are already perfected and can carry on the work, and do it promptly, so as to meet the exigency of the situation; but let us not obligate ourselves for \$75,000,000 in 1921, years ahead. There is ample time to take care of the situation between now and then, and when the real necessities come up.

I hope that that item will be stricken out. I would not object to having this added to the amount for 1919. I really wish that amount were increased from \$50,000,000 to \$125,000,000. I think that would be wise. That would serve a good purpose.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I shall occupy the attention of the Senate but a moment. Reference has been made by honorable Senators several times to a remark I made a little while

ago about the primary purpose of this law being to provide for road building and not to give employment to soldiers or men coming back from the war. I wish it distinctly understood that it is my judgment and my desire that the Government ought to offer every proper encouragement and facility for the men coming back from the war to make a decent support for themselves. I do not think there is going to be any trouble for any man who desires work to find it. As has been so happily expressed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], the farmers are crying for farm labor. Not a day passes, Mr. President, but that I receive from 1 to 50 letters from my constituents in Mississippi urging me to use what little influence I may have with the War Department to get their boys out of the Army in order that they may come back and help to make a crop the present year. And let me say just here that if the boys are not permitted to go home pretty soon, they will not be able to make a crop during the year 1919. I think it an outrage, an injustice to the soldiers, and a misfortune to the country that the farmers' boys are not discharged and sent back to their homes.

Now, returning to the question at issue, may I say that it is a very happy combination of circumstances that the provisions of this bill will not only build roads for the people living in the country but will also furnish in road building employment for the unemployed. Two splendid purposes are effected.

The building of these roads will be a positive blessing to the tillers of the soil, who must in the end bear the largest part of the taxation which is to pay for all governmental expenses.

Mr. President, I hope the bill may not be changed by the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. The honorable chairman of the committee [Mr. BANKHEAD] has devoted a great deal of patient study to the construction of this bill. Under his leadership the committee has cooperated with him, and I fear if the amendment offered by the able Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] shall be adopted, it will destroy the symmetry of the bill and the good order of things which the bill establishes when it becomes a law. The effect of the passage of this bill is going to be very helpful and beneficial to the agricultural classes of this country. May I be permitted to impress upon the Senate that when you help the farmers of this country; when you make farm life less burdensome and more attractive; whatever may be done that adds to the fertility of the soil; increase facilities for carrying the products of the farm to the market and bringing from the towns things that the farmers have to buy—in other words, when you help the farmer you benefit every other class of society living beneath the American flag.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I shall not undertake to discuss this measure in any detail. I am extremely anxious that we should come to a vote on it and get it disposed of and go on with other business of the Senate. It is very important that we should dispense with all discussion that can reasonably be dispensed with and proceed especially with the enactment of the supply bills, and we have not any time to lose. I promise to take but a very few moments. I am in favor of the measure and in favor of the bill as reported by the committee, and I hope it will be passed.

I rose more particularly to make some reference to the closing remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. I scarcely feel that those remarks ought to be allowed to stand without comment and to pass unnoticed.

The Senator took occasion to refer to the position of the South in reference to legislation, and the representatives of the South, both in the House and in the Senate, he stated, were devoid of that proper sense of responsibility in matters of legislation. He went on further to say that these representatives of the South were in favor of any appropriation so long as they got their share of it.

Mr. ROBINSON. May I inquire of the Senator from Florida if that statement was made on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. FLETCHER. It was.

Mr. ROBINSON. By whom?

Mr. FLETCHER. By the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], as I caught his statement, and I am quite sure I do not exaggerate it in any way. That certainly was the substance of it and the impression that would be made upon any one hearing the statement.

I am disappointed in that sort of a statement being made here by the Senator from Wisconsin. I can understand how something of that sort might be said on the stump in the heat of a political campaign, for political purposes, but a statement coming like that goes beyond all bounds of propriety or of justice and is wholly unwarranted.

I can not help feeling, frankness compels me to say it, an utter contempt for that man in public or private life who would

array one section of this country against another or the people of one section against the people of another section. I have never classed the Senator from Wisconsin among those who would do that, and I do not now. I think he probably allowed his zeal in the argument he was making to go further than he really feels himself he was justified in going. I want to retain that respect which I have always entertained for the Senator, and I propose to do so if he will allow me, but I can not permit a statement of that sort to stand without some protest. Without going into any detailed discussion of that matter or of that idea I would like to put this inquiry: What proportion of this billion dollars that goes to the wheat growers of the country goes to the South?

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I was not present when the statement referred to by the Senator from Florida was made by the Senator from Wisconsin. I ask the Senator from Florida if he heard the statement which he has attributed to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes, I am sorry to say, I heard the statement.

Mr. ROBINSON. With the permission of the Senator from Florida, I desire to say that it is inconceivable to me that a Member of this body would make such a statement unless he had the deliberate purpose to insult a large number of the Members of this body.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Wisconsin intended that. I do think that his observations were such that they ought to be responded to and such as were unwarranted. In reference to the illustration which he made in submitting those remarks, to wit, the river and harbor bill, he said that was an illustration of the attitude of the South's representatives here, evidently meaning to say that so long as that bill carried appropriations which were satisfactory to the South there was no limit to the other appropriations the representatives from the South would favor and that might be carried in it, according to their view, without regard to the merits of the different items and projects involved in the appropriations. That is not a fair statement to make. It is not the fault of the South, it is not the fault of southern representatives; it is not a subject about which they should be criticized that there lies south of us the great Gulf of Mexico, the Mediterranean of the Western World, and on its borders are harbors and ports unequalled in any country. According to the great law of nature, water runs downhill, and therefore rivers pour into the Gulf of Mexico, and they happen to run through the South. According to that law of nature water flows to the South Atlantic, and therefore the navigable rivers of the country are largely found in that portion of the country, and it is inevitable if you are going to improve the rivers and harbors of the country you must go where the rivers and harbors are.

It therefore follows that there are provisions in the river and harbor bill which appertain to rivers and harbors and ports which lie in the South; but anyone can take the river and harbor bill and the items of appropriation and readily see, I will venture to say, that more than three-fourths of the amount carried by that bill is spent in other portions of the country than in the South, mainly in the North and East. It is not true that the South gets its undue proportion or even its just and proper proportion of the appropriations carried by that bill, and certainly it is not true that there is any disposition to vote unlimited appropriations in that or any other bill by the representatives of the South on condition that they get what may be considered by them as a satisfactory share of the appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will detain the Senate only a moment. I regard this road provision of the bill as the best piece of legislation that has come before Congress at this session. It provides simply that the present legislation on the subject of roads shall be extended. It requires States or subdivisions thereof to put up an equal amount that the National Government puts up for roads. It provides that it shall be done under existing machinery. It provides for the betterment of the entire country, because when we spend money on building roads we not only benefit the localities but we benefit the entire country.

Mr. President, for a number of years I have strongly advocated this kind of legislation. In the House, before I came to the Senate, I took a very active part in legislation of this character. I recall that in 1911 those who believed in this legislation were derided and laughed at as "dirt-road statesmen," but you will see that in the years that have passed since that time there has been quite a change in the public mind, and now practically everyone knows that there is no better legislation than

the kind of legislation embodied in this amendment, and none that means so much to the building up of our common country in a proper way.

It is peculiarly proper at this time, when we have millions of soldiers coming back home, many of whom will be without work. This will give them work, and the kind of work that will build up the country. It is not directed to any State or any part of the country, but it is applicable to the entire country, and it aids the State organizations in building up the country.

There is another statement I wish to make here in reference to this item. I wish to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the splendid work of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], on the question of roads in this country. He was a pioneer in this movement. I believe he was the author of one of the very first bills many years ago that was brought in to bring to bear the very best efforts of the National Government to build up post roads in this country. At the time he began it was not popular and it took him many years to finally get a bill enacted, but through his efforts and those of his associates, largely through his efforts, the present law was passed, a law that the people of this country have virtually unanimously indorsed. I doubt if one could find a single Member of Congress who would vote to repeal the present law. This is an enlargement of it. The Senator from Alabama has had a long and distinguished record in the House first and then in this body. His name is attached to much important legislation, but never in his career has he done such a splendid work for the entire country as he did in bringing forth from his committee this particular legislation, which will mean more to our entire country than all the legislation that he has been connected with in his long and splendid career.

For those reasons I hope the Senate will vote speedily on this bill. Let us pass it and make it a law. The country approves it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The question is on the amendment to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I shall take just a moment. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], in the remarks made by him, seemed to gather that in his judgment, from the remark made by me a little while ago, I reflected upon the integrity and honesty of Senators from Southern States. As the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] suggested, there was nothing of that kind in the remarks I made.

I was discussing the sense of responsibility for Government expenditures, responsibility from a sectional standpoint as compared to a national standpoint. From my observations during 10 years in Congress I felt justified in making the statement I did. I have nothing to retract. I do not for a moment question the good faith, the integrity, of the Senators from those States, but the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the past years since I have been in Congress at least will demonstrate the truth of what I said.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I should like to ask the Senator a question.  
Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Does not the Senator from Wisconsin think that now, at all events, we can all be merely Americans, and good Americans, and forget for all time the question of sectionalism?

Mr. LENROOT. Exactly, Mr. President; there is no man in the United States who is more desirous of that than I am, but it can not be done unless every Senator and every Representative, regardless of the section from which he comes, will treat his country as a nation and his primary responsibility to it as a nation rather than as a section.

Mr. TOWNSEND obtained the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to say, before the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] leaves the Chamber, that it seems to me that the two statements can not coincide or harmonize. In one statement he says that he does not intend to question the integrity and the patriotism of the representatives of the Southern States, but, on the other hand, he says that they have an utter lack of a sense of responsibility concerning matters of legislation.

Mr. LENROOT. No.

Mr. FLETCHER. The two statements can not very well stand together.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. That is not what the Senator from Wisconsin said at all. The Senator from Wisconsin said that sectional

responsibility comes first, in the judgment of the Senator from Wisconsin, rather than a national responsibility.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no patience with the spirit and attitude emphasized by the further remarks of the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will yield to me for a moment, I merely wish to say that that criticism is applicable to every section of the Union.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the public record, and the general estimate of the informed and intelligent, right-thinking people all over the country will prove that the representatives from the Southern States are just as broad-minded and as patriotic, and have just as clear a vision of national needs and as clear a conception of fiduciary responsibility as the representatives from any other portion of the country—North, East, or West.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay action on this measure and perhaps I ought not to say anything, but as a member of the committee and called upon shortly to vote upon this proposition, I desire to say just a very few words.

As the members of the committee understand, I am not enamored with this form of road legislation. I did not think the original proposition was the best way for the Government to engage in highway construction, but we adopted that plan in 1916, and it has to some extent—quite a large extent—been put in operation.

These road projects necessarily are projected into the future to a great extent. I think of all times the present is the worst to curtail or to attempt to curtail in any way the activities of the Government in public improvements. I do believe that inasmuch as we have, as the Senator from Washington has stated, a going machine, an organization for building roads, and inasmuch, further, as it is conceded that the general welfare demands that the Government must encourage those enterprises of a public nature which offer legitimate employment to labor and at the same time supply a public service, it seems wise to me to increase road building. This class of improvement was checked by the war, and now, in this period of reconstruction, the work should be renewed on a larger scale.

I believed and still believe that we ought to have a nationalized system of roads. I hope before another Congress expires we shall have before us a general scheme for building roads which will favorably appeal to a majority of Congress. But it is too late to enact new legislation in this Congress. I suggested a more comprehensive and scientific plan to the committee, but it could not be considered. To my mind it does not make much difference whether we cut out this \$75,000,000 for 1921 or leave it in, because if my hopes shall be realized we will change existing law before 1921 and be upon a sound basis for Federal road building.

But I submit, Mr. President, that this appropriation is as wise an investment as we can make now in these disturbed conditions, however difficult our financial situation may be. This investment will at once serve the people in one of the best manners possible and at the same time give employment to the people who require it. I think the appropriation will be used profitably. I hope the various State highway commissions will see to it that it is so expended that it will contribute to a national system, which I am sure this country must adopt sooner or later. I want the United States to build national highways, so far as it is able to do it, and assume responsibility for them. Let the States build the laterals, but have a system of national highways extending through every State, east and west, north and south.

I have not been pleased with the administration of this law in the Department of Agriculture. I think the money has not been as wisely expended as it should have been, but we are learning in the matter of road building. The States themselves are cooperating now, and every year makes them wiser in the matter of road construction, and I can not believe that very much of this money will be wasted. Therefore, Mr. President, while I am not heartily in favor of this system, because I believe there is a better one, nevertheless it being inaugurated and this being the present opportunity to render aid in this emergency of reconstruction, I feel it is wise to pass the bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment to the amendment. I, with others, shudder almost continuously when I think of the amount of money we are expending, but I do not know of any better way of spending money, if we undertake to furnish employment to the returning soldiers and others, than to take advantage of the machinery and plans like this State and Federal road building, already planned and in process, something that will afford employment, that can keep them from poverty or idleness, something that is helpful and will take them into parts of the country where they are

most needed in agriculture and other lines and relieve the congestion in the cities.

There are many of the States, especially in the North, in which little can be done in the winter, and while this sounds like three years—1919, 1920, and 1921—as a matter of fact it is simply two seasons. The third season is a matter of May and June, quitting in July, and leaves very little of that working season. So if we are to pass this measure at all I believe we ought to pass it with the \$75,000,000 proposed for this third expenditure.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WARREN. I yield.

Mr. KING. Probably with the reorganization of the Congress the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will be chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator may be called upon to prepare appropriation bills or aid in their preparation calling for at least \$10,000,000,000—possibly a little more—for the year 1920. Has the Senator thought of the avenues from which the funds are coming with which to meet it?

Mr. WARREN. For what purposes?

Mr. KING. For governmental purposes, for obligations many of which already have been created, for obligations which have not yet matured but which, as sure as the day follows the night, will mature, and which will have to be met by the Government. Does not the Senator think that it is about time to try to practice a little economy and quit trying to find plausible reasons to justify every sort of an expenditure under the sun?

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator consider that this is a rather forced plausible reason for the expenditure of money where we can employ the returning soldiers?

Mr. KING. I think the argument of the Senator has been a fallacious one and the reasons assigned in support of the appropriation are fallacious but plausible.

Mr. WARREN. I thank the Senator for his comment. I will say to him, with reference to my service upon the Committee on Appropriations, that that committee does not provide for the income of the country. It does not provide for the outgo except to appropriate money that has already been called for through legislation.

Mr. KING. Of course, the Senator, I understand, takes the same position as the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who said that the duty rested upon the Finance Committee to provide the money, and that the rest of the Senators—that was the idea—would spend it. I do not think the Senator ought to shirk a responsibility which must rest upon us all.

Mr. WARREN. The distinguished Senator from Utah nearly always finds a way to allege something wrong with appropriations necessary to run the Government. He has been quite successful in some of those attempts to defeat legislation, but I think he will have to bear with us this time and carry the bill through just the same.

When the Senator talks about my remarks being fallacious I enjoy that, as he evidently does, but I am in good earnest when I say that, if we are to spend any money at all in building these roads, we want to give those States an opportunity to make some use of it that have not so far obtained the use of it. The taking of this last year off leaves it simply with one full season. So far as that is concerned, the benefit to the States of the last \$75,000,000 is more valuable dollar for dollar than either one of the others.

When it comes to the matter of employment of labor, I hesitate to say, nevertheless I believe it is true, that we will need just as much in the way of public works and looking out for labor in 1920, and even in 1921, as in 1919, because other Senators know as well as I do that we have had a declaration from those who undertake to represent labor that there will be no reduction in their wages. We know from all quarters that the consuming public is not now buying anything except from day to day, because they expect lower prices. Hence the retailers have not been buying of the wholesalers; the wholesalers have not been buying of the manufacturers or producers; work in manufactories is slack; and the consequence is that business must hesitate somewhere until it can reorganize, and it will take at least two or three years for that reorganization.

Now, shall we employ our men to the best of our ability during the time; and if so, how? The Senator will not deny that the building of roads in this country is more needed than any other improvement in a public way or a local way. Now is the time for us to pass this bill. I am perfectly content to see the bill beaten, as I am to see other matters of public buildings or matters of improvement generally, if we are to cease all public work and all expenditures and let the business of the country go to the dogs; but if we are at all to consider the matter of labor, the matter of our workmen having employment, then

I want to take it, as the Senator from Washington has already said, where the tools and working machinery are present, where plans are already made, and everything is ready to engage labor at once.

I have no sympathy with the workingman who wants to stay in the city and would rather stay there and starve or partake of charity than to go into the country and work on a farm or work on roads. We talk very much about "back to the farm." What inducement are we offering to people to go back to the farm? Shall we erect buildings in large places to give employment to these men, to keep them from going into the country, or shall we do something in the way of improvement in the country, in the new parts of the country, where these men can not only be afforded daily, monthly, yearly labor, but where they will contribute something to the welfare of the country that all can use.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. WARREN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with what the Senator says, but I wish to ask him if it would not be very much better to furnish employment in this way to men who want it and need it than to furnish food to unemployed men?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I was very much alive 25 years ago, when we had Coxey's armies and soup houses and bread lines; I do not want to see them again; but I say to Senators in all earnestness, if we do not act wisely in providing in some way for the men who are coming home, for the men who are being discharged from the Army and those who will be discharged by manufacturers who can not pay out 100 cents and only get back 50 cents, we shall have those times over again, and perhaps worse.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, among the justifications for this appropriation is the one referred to by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]; that is, to give employment to the unemployed caused by the return of our soldiers to civil life. The Senator says that there are only two seasons in which this money can be used. I think he is mistaken in that.

Mr. WARREN. I spoke of the Northern States.

Mr. SMOOT. I say in any State.

Mr. WARREN. If I am not mistaken, this appropriation would end on the 1st day of July, 1921, two years from now.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. WARREN. I am speaking of the bill where it reads—

Mr. SMOOT. But it refers to the present law. The money can be expended under the present law, and that law extends the time.

Mr. WARREN. I am very glad it does.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, all I desired to do was to say that this appropriation as a whole can be expended for the season of 1919, it can be expended for the season of 1920, it can be expended for the season of 1921, and for the season of 1922. I believe it is unwise, Mr. President, for us to begin to make appropriations to take care of the unemployed in 1922.

Mr. WARREN. Am I to understand that there is anything in this bill which we now have under consideration that alludes to 1922?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. It says that these appropriations are to "be expended in accordance with the provisions of said act." That is the act of July 11, 1916.

Mr. WARREN. But that matter is not before us to pass on.

Mr. SMOOT. But the money is to be expended under that act, and that extends the appropriation a year. This is what it provides; and if Senators will look at it they will see that there can not be any question about that statement. I make it without hesitation. So, Mr. President, I say that it is unwise for us to appropriate money to-day to take care of the unemployment for the year 1922. It may be that before that time we shall have not only to spend \$75,000,000 or \$200,000,000, as the whole appropriation provides, but that we may have to spend many times that sum. However, let us not legislate until we are informed as to conditions.

Mr. President, as I look at the situation by which we are confronted to-day and consider the obligations this country has to meet for the years to come, I am appalled.

Mr. McKELLAR. We can repeal this next year.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I will say to the Senator that it can not be repealed, for I say that there never has been an appropriation made under conditions of this kind where it was ever repealed.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is right; and we shall not repeal it, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator says this is right. I disagree with him.

I am perfectly willing to increase the \$50,000,000 provided for this year in order that the unemployed may be given employment in the near future, and I am perfectly willing to take the \$75,000,000 provided for the fiscal year 1920, add it to the \$50,000,000 made immediately available, and let the \$125,000,000 be spent as quickly as possible.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah permit me to interrupt him?

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to end this controversy. The Senator from Utah says he is perfectly willing to add this seventy-five millions for 1920.

Mr. SMOOT. I say seventy-five millions, making it \$125,000,000, and cut out \$75,000,000—

Mr. BANKHEAD. For the third year—1921?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And add that to what?

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing to allow the language to read as follows—now, I want the Senator to follow me:

SEC. 6. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of said act, as herein amended, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and to be made available immediately, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of said act—

Referring to the act of July 11, 1916. In other words, it means that we should appropriate \$125,000,000; that it shall be immediately available, and with the view that it shall be spent upon the roads to take care of the unemployment in this country. I want to ask the Senator from Alabama if he is willing to accept that?

Mr. McKELLAR. If I understood the Senator, he does accept it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it the purpose of the Senator to make the appropriation for 1919 \$125,000,000, and then stop and make no further appropriations?

Mr. SMOOT. That is my proposition.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then, of course, nobody could accept a proposition like that, except the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator now understands my proposition. Of course, he was perfectly willing, as I see now, that we should add \$75,000,000 for this year, but he also wanted the other appropriation for the following year. Anybody who is in favor of this kind of legislation would accept a proposition of that kind.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah allow me to interrupt him?

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

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. The law which exists to-day runs to 1921. We do not extend the law; we simply increase the appropriations under existing law.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. SWANSON. If a system of road improvement were started, we thought it would be unwise to stop it abruptly. We have not tried to extend it to 1922 or 1923, over what the existing law provides for. This is simply to increase the appropriations for expenditure under the existing law.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, I want to be perfectly frank with the Senator, and I will say I think that when we begin the building of roads by the Government, it ought to be under a well-digested plan for the expenditure of the public money. I remember two years ago when the first proposition was brought before Congress in reference to this matter, I offered at that time a substitute for it, providing a general plan for road building in the United States. When the proper time comes, I intend to again offer that same amendment, providing for a road system. I have no idea that it will be accepted, for it takes no money out of the Treasury of the United States, but I wish to say that when I presented the proposition two years ago—and it is not any plan of mine; I do not want to take any credit for it; I have no right to receive any credit for it—it was not to be adopted because of the fact, it was said, that it provided a great big system of road building throughout the country, and that we wanted something immediately.

The plan two years ago was to appropriate \$75,000,000 as a temporary measure, and, of course, Mr. President, it is like all other temporary appropriations. They soon find their way into the regular appropriation bills; and the policy adopted in the temporary appropriations becomes permanent.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Utah has assumed that I was mistaken in my statement, and I am always modest enough to admit that I am mistaken; but I should like to have him show why I am mistaken; why he contends that this bill is appropriating money for 1922 for this purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill under section 5 extends the time one year by reenacting existing law.

Mr. WARREN. I am not speaking of what is in the Senator's mind. I am speaking of what is before us and what we are to vote on.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought I had previously explained it to the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Utah made no explanation that was satisfactory.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I can not give any other. The law provides an extension of one year.

Mr. WARREN. The bill alludes to the law of 1916; but there seems to be a difference between the Senator from Utah and others in regard to the law of 1916.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not give the Senator any other explanation than I have already given.

Mr. WARREN. Certainly there is nothing in this bill that carries the appropriation for 1916 beyond what the bill itself carries it. It can not be that way; and no explanation can cover it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, all I ask in my amendment is that the \$75,000,000 provided for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, be eliminated from the bill. That will still leave \$125,000,000 to be appropriated for this purpose. With the \$125,000,000 and the \$70,000,000, provided the States put up their share, there would then be \$195,000,000 to be expended upon the building of this class of roads, and I think that is going a long way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to the amendment of the committee. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think we had better have a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Kellogg	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Colt	Kenyon	Nelson	Smoot
Culberson	King	New	Spencer
Fernald	Kirby	Overman	Sutherland
Fletcher	La Follette	Page	Swanson
France	Leahoot	Pittman	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Poindexter	Townsend
Gay	McCumber	Pollock	Trammell
Hale	McKellar	Pomerene	Vardaman
Harding	McLean	Robinson	Wadsworth
Henderson	McNary	Sheppard	Warren
Johnson, Cal.	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Wolcott

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I wish to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] are detained by illness.

Mr. SPENCER. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. NUGENT] are absent attending the sessions of the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to the amendment reported by the committee. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COLT (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]. In his absence, I will withhold my vote.

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN]. In his absence, I will withhold my vote. If privileged to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. NEW (when his name was called). On this amendment I am paired with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I transfer the general pair I have with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOELLS] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KENDRICK. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the senior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. GAY. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] on official business.

Mr. MOSES. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN] to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and vote "yea."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I inquire if the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Montana to my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD], and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], who is away on official business. He is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

I also desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] on official business.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I wish to ask if the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] was called and if he voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the name of the Senator from Indiana was called, but he has not voted.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 40, as follows:

## YEAS—25.

Borah	Johnson, Cal.	McCumber	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	McNary	Thomas
Fernald	Kenyon	Moses	Wadsworth
France	King	Page	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Sherman	
Hale	Lenroot	Smoot	
Harding	Lodge	Spencer	

## NAYS—40.

Ashurst	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Kellogg	Pittman	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Kendrick	Polindexter	Sterling
Culberson	Kirby	Pollock	Swanson
Fletcher	McKellar	Pomerene	Thompson
Gay	McLean	Robinson	Townsend
Gore	Martin, Va.	Stafroth	Trammell
Gronna	Myers	Sheppard	Underwood
Henderson	Nelson	Simmons	Vardaman
Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.	Warren

## NOT VOTING—31.

Baird	Gerry	New	Shields
Brandegge	Goff	Norris	Smith, Md.
Calder	Hardwick	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Penrose	Walsh
Colt	Hollis	Phelan	Watson
Cummins	Knox	Ransdell	Weeks
Dillingham	Lewis	Reed	Williams
Fall	Martin, Ky.	Saulsbury	

So Mr. SMOOT's amendment to the amendment reported by the committee was rejected.

Mr. KIRBY. I propose the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 6 it is proposed to add the following:

*And provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for improvements whereon convict labor is employed.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, it has been urged that this appropriation is necessary largely because it will furnish an opportunity for employment to returning soldiers and sailors. There is at this time, as one Senator has suggested, an insistent demand in the country that the soldiers who have not yet finished their education and intend to resume their studies should be discharged so as to permit them to do so. There is a crying need for all soldiers who have been engaged in agriculture heretofore to be discharged immediately in order that they may resume their occupations before it is too late to make another crop.

Now, in regard to the amendment here proposed, a great many of these roads will be built by contractors. The contractor is interested in building roads at as little expense as he can build them properly for and in getting as much money as he can procure for the construction. I do not believe that convict labor should be permitted to be employed upon the roads that are expected to be built under the provisions of this bill in order

to give free labor an opportunity for employment. If the contractor is permitted to employ anyone whom he may desire, he will probably procure convict labor.

I do not think that a man who has been a good citizen in his community, in his State, and in his nation, who has not violated the law but who has helped to bear the burdens of the Government and of taxation, should be competed against by the convict, who has not done these things. The man who has violated the law, who has not been a good citizen, and who has made it necessary that he should be convicted and imprisoned should not be furnished an opportunity to be employed to the exclusion of the other man.

I move the adoption of the amendment and hope the Senate will act favorably upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. KIRBY. I call for a division, Mr. President.

On a division the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "marines," in line 15, page 37, it is proposed to insert the following:

But any other preference or discrimination among citizens of the United States in connection with the expenditure of this appropriation is hereby declared to be unlawful.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think that should come after the word "marines," at the end of the proviso. It makes the proper connection there.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Washington to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes seem to have it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I call for a division, Mr. President; and I will say a word about this amendment. We allow a preference here in favor of the soldier. I am willing to have that done; but I am not willing that Government officials or anybody else, in the expenditure of Government money, shall discriminate among citizens of the United States in the expenditure of this money otherwise than as to soldiers. That is, I am not willing that an officer of the Government shall say: "You can not work on this road unless you belong to some organization of some kind or character."

That is the purpose of the amendment.

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I have been requested by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] to call up an amendment which he has introduced to the bill, and I ask that it may be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 37, line 13, after the word "act," it is proposed to insert the following:

*Provided,* That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed for and in behalf of the Government of the United States to join in the construction of a tunnel or tunnels for the use of vehicles, animals, pedestrians, and vehicle-borne traffic under the Hudson River, between some point on the island of Manhattan, State and city of New York, and some point in Hudson County, State of New Jersey, pursuant to plans to be agreed upon by the parties aforesaid.

And for the purpose above stated the sum of \$6,000,000 is hereby authorized, \$1,000,000 to be paid out of the sum appropriated for the improvement of roads in the year 1919, \$2,000,000 out of the sum appropriated for the improvement of roads in the year 1920, and \$3,000,000 out of the moneys appropriated for the year 1921.

This money, however, or no portion thereof shall become available or payable until the States of New York and New Jersey shall within two years from and after the approval of this act have appropriated the sum of \$3,000,000 for the same purpose.

The United States Government is to be repaid for the money advanced for the construction of this tunnel by the paying of tolls on a basis to be fixed by the United States and the States of New York and New Jersey.

That the tunnel or tunnels constructed under this act, together with their approaches and terminals, shall be lawful structures and shall each be recognized and known as a post route, and is hereby declared to be a post route, and no charge shall be made for the transportation of the mails, the troops, and munitions of war of the United States.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, this amendment, proposed by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], is for what is known as the vehicular tunnel under the Hudson River. In the recent strike of the boatmen on the rivers and bays of New York there were 500,000 people who were prevented for two days from being able to go to their business from New Jersey and Staten Island to New York. The movement of troops and property was delayed, the mails were de-

layed, and there was a great deal of embarrassment by reason of this condition.

New York City is a great national asset. Seventy per cent of our troops and 60 per cent of the supplies for the Army and Navy left the port of New York. New York and New Jersey in 1918 paid nearly \$1,000,000,000 into the Treasury of the United States, a sum much in excess of all of the States west of the Mississippi River and four times the total amount paid by all the States south of the Mason and Dixon line.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know that I am opposed to the Senator's amendment, but I am utterly opposed to the comparison which he makes as to the amount which New York and New Jersey pay in comparison with the Western States. A vast amount of the income taxes, and so forth, of the Western States are paid in New York, but they are earned in the Western States. The great corporations of the West have their home offices in New York, and therefore the payments are made there.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Continuing, Mr. President, I will state that of the \$200,000,000 carried in this good-roads proposition, \$65,000,000, at least, will be contributed by New York and New Jersey, and the sum they will receive in return through this appropriation will be less than \$12,000,000. It is asked for by every business and manufacturing organization in New York and New Jersey.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I make the point of order against this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator want it to go back to the original one?

Mr. SWANSON. If section 5 is in order—

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the original amendment is not general legislation, this is not.

Mr. SWANSON. I beg to differ with the Chair. I submit that this one is and the other one is not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, the Chair will carry it back to the original one, if the Senator from Virginia wishes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to take it back and renew my point of order to section 5, if it can be done under the rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not saying that it can be done; but the Chair is saying that he will not take up a part of this matter and decide that it is general legislation, and not decide the whole thing to be general legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I renew the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To this amendment?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; and I ask that it be taken back to section 5.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is the situation of the Chair: The Chair believes that this legislation is general legislation, but it was decided by another presiding officer that it was not. The Chair therefore concludes that the best thing to do is to let the Senate settle the question for itself.

Mr. THOMAS. I will raise the point of order when the bill comes into the Senate.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, may I ask what the parliamentary situation is? Does the Chair rule the whole amendment out?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not done anything with it at all. The Chair is clearly of the opinion that the whole legislation is general legislation and ought to have gone out on a point of order; but it was not so decided, and if part of it is not general legislation then nothing is general legislation. A former occupant of the chair for the purposes of this bill having held that it is not general legislation, the Chair is not going to come in conflict with that ruling on this bill. The Chair refers the point of order to the Senate for determination.

Mr. THOMAS. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of whether it is general legislation.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, does an affirmative vote sustain the point of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. An affirmative vote sustains the point of order.

Mr. SWANSON. That is, to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COLT (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to the absence of my pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN], who

is absent. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a general pair with the Senator from Connecticut, which I transfer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] and vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Has the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. STERLING. I have a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina. I understand that if that Senator were present he would vote as I shall vote, and therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Has the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. THOMAS. I have a general pair with that Senator and therefore withhold my vote for the present.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] on account of illness.

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). Making the same announcement and transfer of my pair as on the last roll call, I vote "yea."

The roll call was completed.

Mr. OVERMAN (after having voted in the affirmative). Has the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have a general pair with that Senator and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. PENROSE. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

Mr. HARDING (after having voted in the affirmative). I note that the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] did not respond to his name. I therefore transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Alabama to the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the negative). I wish to inquire whether the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have a general pair with that Senator. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CUBBERSON] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I should like to understand clearly the significance of a vote "yea" or "nay" on this proposition. It is not clear to my mind, and I believe that some other Senators are in doubt as to the significance of the "yea" and "nay" votes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair refused to decide the question. The question is, Is the amendment in order?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. A vote in the affirmative signifies that it is in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think the question is altogether misunderstood, then.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I call for the regular order. The roll call can not be interrupted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, that is undoubtedly the rule; but Senators ought to know how they are voting.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, if I may say so, on an inquiry made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I make the point of order that under the rule the roll call can not be interrupted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is strictly true, and strictly the point of order ought to be sustained by the Chair; but surely—

Mr. LODGE. I think the rule ought to be either sustained or not sustained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Surely the Senator from Massachusetts does not want the Senate to be voting with a mistaken idea as to the point on which it is voting.

Mr. LODGE. Of course if the Chair does not enforce the rule, I have no remedy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well. The Chair will sustain the point of order, at the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, is a parliamentary inquiry in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. According to the rules, it is not. The roll call is proceeding. The Chair wanted to make it straight if he could.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I wish to change my vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to change my vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I voted under a misapprehension. I desire to change my vote—

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. There is some confusion on this side of the Chamber as to the parliamentary situation. I request that it be stated. The statement has been made here that the vote was upon the question of sustaining the decision of the Chair. As I understand, it is a vote directly on the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. ROBINSON. Well, what is the question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wanted to explain, but the point of order was made that there was a roll call proceeding and that no explanations were in order, and the Chair had to sustain that point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair may be permitted to explain the parliamentary situation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But at least, Mr. President, give us the subject upon which we are voting. Let the Secretary state it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I do not object to the request of the Senator from Tennessee. I rise merely to state that I do not think it is out of order to make a parliamentary inquiry and ask for a statement of the question that is being voted upon. That is what I desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair refused to pass upon the point of order which was raised, and submitted it to the Senate. The vote must be, therefore, as to whether or not the Senate believes that this is general legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, upon that statement I desire to change my vote from "nay" to "yea." [Laughter.]

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I desire to change my vote—

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, it depends upon the form in which the question is put as to whether it is general legislation. It seems to me the question is, Is this legislation in order? If we think it is in order, we vote "yea." If we think it is not in order, we vote "nay."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, the Senate can vote on it in that way. The Chair does not care.

Mr. SWANSON. The question is, Which way did the Chair state it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair stated it the other way, but the Chair thinks the Senator from Virginia has it right. That is what the Chair was trying to straighten out, but he could not; namely, Is the legislation in order?

Mr. SWANSON. That is all right. Those who think it is in order will vote "yea," and those who think it is not in order will vote "nay."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, with that statement, I desire to change my vote.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings under this roll call be vacated, and that the question be restated by the Chair, and a new roll call be held.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. Now, this is the question: Is the amendment in order?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, may the amendment be stated?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, my information was that the question submitted to the Senate was as to whether or not the amendment was germane to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not at all.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I mean, the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS. That was not my point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order was that it was general legislation.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question to be voted on is, Is the amendment in order?

Mr. OVERMAN. What amendment? The amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, as I understand?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I think it is scandalous for Senators to sit here and vote without knowing what they are voting on.

Mr. LODGE. When the Senator from Montana is through I will address the Chair. Mr. President, I was only going to say that the usual method, as I have observed it here, when a question of order is referred to the Senate is whether the point of order is well taken; in other words, shall the point of order be sustained? The question is on the point of order. I think I am right in that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the point of order, and the Chair stated it originally as the Senator from Massachusetts has done; but upon reflection the Chair, not having ruled and leaving it for the determination of the Senate, believes the question to be voted upon is, Is the amendment in order? That enables the Senate to determine the point of order.

Mr. LODGE. When a point of order is submitted the Chair either overrules the point of order or declares that it is well taken. Now, that decision is submitted to the Senate. If the Senate considers the point of order well taken it votes "yea;" if it considers that the point of order should be overruled it votes "nay."

The VICE PRESIDENT. It really makes no difference how it is phrased, so Senators know how they are voting.

Mr. LODGE. Not the least. I quite agree.

Mr. HARDING. May I ask the Chair whether the decision on this specific amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey on behalf of the Senator from New York applies to the general good-roads appropriation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does not. It applies only to this particular amendment.

Mr. LODGE. It applies only to the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to have the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington calls for the reading of the amendment, and it will be read.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], for and on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], submits the following amendment:

On page 37, line 13, after the word "act," insert:  
"Provided, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed, for and in behalf of the Government of the United States, to join in the construction of a tunnel or tunnels for the use of vehicles, animals, pedestrians, and vehicle-borne traffic under the Hudson River between some point on the island of Manhattan, State and city of New York, and some point in Hudson County, State of New Jersey, pursuant to plans to be agreed upon by the parties aforesaid."

"And for the purpose above stated the sum of \$8,000,000 is hereby authorized, \$1,000,000 to be paid out of the sum appropriated for the improvement of roads in the year 1919, \$2,000,000 out of the sum appropriated for the improvement of roads in the year 1920, and \$3,000,000 out of the moneys appropriated for the year 1921."

"This money, however, or no portion thereof, shall become available or payable until the States of New York and New Jersey shall, within two years from and after the approval of this act, have appropriated the sum of \$3,000,000 for the same purpose."

"The United States Government is to be repaid for the money advanced for the construction of this tunnel by the paying of tolls on a basis to be fixed by the United States and the States of New York and New Jersey."

"That the tunnel or tunnels constructed under this act, together with their approaches and terminals, shall be lawful structures and shall each be recognized and known as a post route, and is hereby declared to be a post route; and no charge shall be made for the transportation of the mails, the troops, and munitions of war of the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question as determined by the precedents of the Senate is, Is the amendment in order? That is the way the precedents read, though the Chair believes the Senator from Massachusetts is right. Is the amendment in order?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I shall vote, upon that statement of the question, "yea," believing that the amendment is in order, whether it is general legislation or not, because it is an amendment of an amendment which is general legislation. With the other amendment pending before the Senate, undoubtedly it can be amended by an amendment on the same subject. I desire to make this statement so as to make it clear that it does not indicate my opinion on the merits of the question. I expect to vote "nay" on the amendment when it is submitted.

Mr. SWANSON. I think the amendment is clearly in order, but I think it should be voted upon on its merits. I shall vote "yea."

Mr. SMOOT. Are we to understand that a vote "yea" means that the amendment is not general legislation and a vote "nay" means that it is general legislation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; if you vote that the amendment is in order you are deciding that it is not general legislation. If you vote that it is not in order, you are deciding that it is.

Mr. SWANSON. If we vote "yea" we decide that it is not general legislation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. SWANSON. If we vote "yea" we decide that it is in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I wish to make a suggestion. I suggest that we take a vote direct on the amendment. If there are enough votes to put it in the bill, all right; if not, let it be defeated.

Mr. POINDEXTER. In order that there may not be any misunderstanding as to my vote on this matter, I do not vote with the understanding of the matter stated by the Senator from Virginia. He stated that a yea vote would be that it was in order and not general legislation. I think, on the contrary, it is in order and is general legislation. The question, I understand, is whether it is in order.

Mr. LODGE. That is all.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand that the money proposed to be appropriated here is to come out of the \$75,000,000 provided by the committee for 1920 and the \$75,000,000 provided for 1921, and as long as that amendment is pending it seems that an amendment of this kind would be in order, whatever might be the result on the general amendment as amended. The Senator from New Jersey proposes to take money out of money already provided in the amendment and to use it for a specific purpose. I think it is general legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The roll will be called.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I know the roll call has been started, but I want to know what the question is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the amendment in order?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then my proposition to vote directly on the amendment was rejected?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let us vote!

OTHER SENATORS. Regular order!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will proceed with the roll call.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Because of my general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who is necessarily absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN]. In his absence I transfer my pair to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSELL] and vote "yea."

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). Again announcing the transfer of my pair, I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to the transfer of my pair, I vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, resulted—yeas 39, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Ashurst	Jones, Wash.	New	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Kellogg	Nugent	Spencer
Beckham	Kendrick	Penrose	Sterling
Fletcher	La Follette	Pittman	Sutherland
France	Lenroot	Poindexter	Swanson
Gay	McKellar	Pollock	Thompson
Gronna	McNary	Pomerene	Trammell
Henderson	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Underwood
Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Sheppard	Vardaman
Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Simmons	

NAYS—18.

Borah	Harding	Overman	Wadsworth
Curtis	Kenyon	Page	Weeks
Fernald	King	Sherman	Wolcott
Gore	Kirby	Smoot	
Hale	Moses	Thomas	

NOT VOTING—39.

Baird	Colt	Fall	Hardwick
Brandegee	Culberson	Frelinghuysen	Hitchcock
Calder	Cummins	Gerry	Hollis
Chamberlain	Dillingham	Goff	Johnson, Cal.

Knox	Norris	Saulsbury	Townsend
Lewis	Owen	Shields	Walsh
Lodge	Phelan	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
McCumber	Ransdell	Smith, Ga.	Watson
McLean	Reed	Smith, Md.	Williams
Martin, Ky.	Robinson	Smith, Mich.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas are 39 and the nays 18. So the Senate decides that the amendment is in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], but as he would vote the same as I would on this question, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to my colleague [Mr. BAIRD] and vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as on the last vote and vote "nay."

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and I am informed he is not in the Chamber. As I am unable to arrange for a transfer of my pair upon this vote, I shall refrain from voting. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). I desire again to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan] and that he is paired with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. My colleague is absent on account of illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Announcing the same pair and transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as before and vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded,

Mr. MCKELLAR. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SHIELDS] is absent on account of illness and that he is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE].

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]; and

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—12.

France	Kenyon	New	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Spencer	Wadsworth
Jones, Wash.	McNary	Sutherland	Weeks

NAYS—48.

Ashurst	Henderson	Nugent	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Smoot
Borah	Kellogg	Pittman	Sterling
Curtis	Kendrick	Poindexter	Swanson
Fletcher	King	Pollock	Thompson
Gay	Kirby	Pomerene	Townsend
Gerry	La Follette	Robinson	Trammell
Gore	McKellar	Shafroth	Underwood
Gronna	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Vardaman
Hale	Myers	Sherman	Warren
Harding	Nelson	Simmons	Wolcott

NOT VOTING—36.

Baird	Fernald	McCumber	Reed
Brandegee	Goff	McLean	Saulsbury
Calder	Hardwick	Martin, Ky.	Shields
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Hollis	Norris	Smith, Md.
Culberson	Johnson, Cal.	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Cummins	Knox	Penrose	Walsh
Dillingham	Lenroot	Phelan	Watson
Fall	Lewis	Ransdell	Williams

So Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN'S amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOSES. I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire to the committee amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 37, line 15, after the word "marines," it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided further, That any money expended by the United States Government in the construction of military roads in any State to and from (but not within) any cantonment, aviation field, or any property used for military or naval purposes, shall first be deducted from the amount apportioned to such State under this appropriation.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, it is well known that many miles of enduring concrete roads have been constructed during the last year and a half by soldier labor in the vicinity of camps, cantonments, aviation fields, and other military establishments which were set up. Those roads will all be serviceable for postal purposes and will all inure to the benefit of the States within which they were constructed. This amendment seems to be wholly in line with the equitable view which the Senate is taking of this measure as a whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I hope the amendment will not be adopted. The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I call for a division. The VICE PRESIDENT. All those in favor of the amendment to the amendment will rise—

Mr. PENROSE. I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], and so I withhold my vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement that I made before, I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD] and vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN] to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as on the last ballot and vote "nay."

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and so refrain from voting. If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as before. I vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded. Mr. PENROSE. I will transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], who I note has not voted, and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—28.			
Borah	Henderson	La Follette	Nugent
Fernald	Johnson, S. Dak.	Lenroot	Penrose
France	Jones, N. Mex.	Lodge	Pomerene
Frelinghuysen	Jones, Wash.	McNary	Smoot
Gore	Kendrick	Moses	Spencer
Hale	Kenyon	Nelson	Sutherland
Harding	King	New	Wolcott
NAYS—28.			
Ashurst	Fletcher	McKellar	Overman
Bankhead	Gay	Martin, Va.	Pittman
Beckham	Kirby	Myers	Poindexter

Pollock	Sherman	Sterling	Townsend
Robinson	Simmons	Swanson	Trammell
Shafroth	Smith, Ga.	Thomas	Underwood
Sheppard	Smith, S. C.	Thompson	Vardaman

NOT VOTING—40.

Baird	Gerry	McCumber	Shields
Brandeggee	Goff	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Gronna	Martin, Ky.	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Hardwick	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Colt	Hitchcock	Owen	Wadsworth
Cuberson	Hollis	Page	Walsh
Cummins	Johnson, Cal.	Phelan	Warren
Curtis	Kellogg	Ransdell	Watson
Dillingham	Knox	Reed	Weeks
Fall	Lewis	Saulsbury	Williams

So the amendment of Mr. Moses to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to this bill, on which I desire to submit some observations.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BORAH. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know what the program is to-night with reference to adjournment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I announced on yesterday, that I would ask the Senate to remain in session to-day to consider this bill, and if it should not be passed before that time I would ask the Senate to remain in session to-night in order to dispose of the measure. I am still of the belief that that ought to be done; but I find so many old-young Senators here who appear to be exhausted from the day's session that I am inclined to make this suggestion: If we can get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on this bill and all amendments thereto to-morrow at 4 o'clock, I shall be willing now to take a recess.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator means to begin to vote at that time, does he not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I mean to vote during the calendar day, and I will ask that after 3 o'clock—

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest to the Senator that he make it 4 o'clock.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will ask the Senator to wait a moment—that after 3 o'clock to-morrow all speeches shall be limited to 10 minutes. Is that agreeable?

Mr. LODGE. And that the vote be taken before the end of that calendar day.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And that we shall vote to-morrow before the end of the calendar day on the bill and all amendments thereto.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator make that 4 o'clock?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Why?

Mr. SMOOT. I think it would be very proper to allow the discussion to run until 4 o'clock, and then after 4 o'clock have the speeches limited to 10 minutes each and vote upon the calendar day, as has been suggested.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does not the Senator think that a 10-minute speech is enough from now on?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I realize that the Senator from Idaho wants to make a speech, and I want him to make it, because he is always interesting and is going to speak on an interesting subject, and I want him to take all the time that he cares to occupy.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho does not really want to make a speech; he wants to have the amendment proposed by him adopted, and if it can be adopted without a speech—if that will be an inducement—he will not make the speech.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think it can be adopted without the speech of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. THOMAS. And perhaps not then.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think that it would be proper to limit the speeches to 10 minutes after 3 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. The subject which the Senator from Idaho is going to bring up is a very important one, and I think he ought to have opportunity properly to lay it before the Senate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I agree with that; but I think the Senator from Idaho can probably do that in an hour, and he will have ample time before 3 o'clock if he begins in the morning.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I desire to offer a substitute for the road provision, and I want some time to explain it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is all true, and I want the Senator to have ample opportunity. Mr. President, I will change my proposition and suggest that we take recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow—

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that we can not do that because of a conference that is to be held to-morrow morning, which will prevent Senators coming here.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well. How would it do to limit speeches to 10 minutes after 3.30 o'clock?

Mr. SMOOT. That will be all right, I presume.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Do I understand, then, that it is agreeable that at not later than 3.30 o'clock to-morrow all speeches will be limited to 10 minutes, and that we will vote on the final passage of the bill and amendments thereto during the calendar day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The SECRETARY. Mr. BANKHEAD asks unanimous consent that not later than 3.30 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Saturday, February 8, 1919, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill, House bill 13308, an act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition, and that after the hour of 3.30 o'clock p. m. on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I move to strike out from the request as stated the words "without further debate." That is rather inconsistent with the allowance of 10-minute speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, it is generally understood what the proposition is, namely, a vote on all questions to the final passage of the bill itself by 12 o'clock midnight of to-morrow, and that after 3.30 o'clock to-morrow no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes on the bill itself or on any amendment. Is there any objection among the Senators present?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have no objection to the request as it has been stated by the Chair, but I have objection to it as read by the Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, the phraseology will be changed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask whether or not under that agreement we could vote, if the time came to vote, upon any amendment prior to 3.30 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Undoubtedly. If there is no objection upon the part of any Senator present, in accordance with the rule the Secretary will call the roll to develop the presence of a quorum.

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

Ashurst	Jones, Wash.	Myers	Simmons
Bankhead	Kellogg	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Kendrick	New	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Kenyon	Nugent	Smoot
Curtis	King	Overman	Sterling
Fletcher	Kirby	Penrose	Sutherland
France	La Follette	Pittman	Swanson
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Poindexter	Thomas
Gay	Lodge	Pollock	Thompson
Gore	McKellar	Pomerene	Underwood
Henderson	McNary	Robinson	Vardaman
Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Warren
Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Sheppard	Wolcott

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. Is there any objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which will be stated by the Secretary?

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Saturday, February 8, 1919, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill H. R. 13308, an act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 3.30 o'clock p. m. on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, as I understand the reading of the agreement, it says we shall proceed to vote without further debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On that calendar day, which will be up to midnight. By midnight the Senate must vote. It is in the regular form. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. At what time will we stop debate under that agreement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In time to give a vote. The Chair has been in that predicament once, and started the vote about five minutes before midnight.

Mr. POINDEXTER. With the understanding that it will not be more than 15 minutes before midnight, I shall not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will give the Senator from Washington all the chance he will need. Is there any objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

#### OIL AND GAS LANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. BANKHEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the adoption of a concurrent resolution authorizing the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] to sign the name of the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] to a conference report? The Senator from California is away, and the Senator from Nevada has a telegraphic communication from him, and we desire to have that consent given by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a concurrent resolution, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That Hon. KEY PITTMAN, as one of the Senate managers, is hereby authorized to affix the name of JAMES D. PHELAN, as one of the Senate managers, to the conference report on bill S. 2812, entitled "An act to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, gas, and sodium on the public domain," under oral authority and by telegram requesting such action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, Mr. President; I object to its presentation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall object to the presentation of it at this time.

Mr. PENROSE. I join in the objection.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to know something more about it.

Mr. PENROSE. I want to look into it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It is only a question of whether the Senator from Nevada can sign the report. The Senator from California is absent, and the concurrent resolution simply gives authority for the Senator from Nevada to sign his name to the report.

Mr. PENROSE. I object.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand an objection is made to that.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does the Senator insist upon the objection?

Mr. PENROSE. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made, and the concurrent resolution goes over.

DAVID E. GRAY.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up and dispose of House bill 1607. It is a very simple matter, but it affects my State considerably. If it provokes any discussion I will withdraw it. It is a bill for the relief of a postmaster at Greeley, Colo., whose post office was robbed some years ago and who needs to have this bill passed for the purpose of settling his accounts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill the title of which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1607) for the relief of David E. Gray.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of David E. Gray, postmaster at Greeley, Colo., in the sum of \$10,088.09, due to the United States on account of postage stamps and other stamped paper on account of losses resulting from burglary of said post office on July 1, 1911.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## CLAIMS AGAINST MEXICO.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senate seems to be in a good humor, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate resolution 399.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which will be stated by the Secretary.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 399, submitted by Mr. KING on January 29, 1919, as follows:

Whereas claims aggregating millions of dollars in compensation for damages to property and for personal outrages and destruction of life, suffered by American citizens in the Republic of Mexico, have been filed with the Department of State for presentation to the Government of Mexico; and

Whereas some years have already intervened between the commission of such damages and outrages and no progress is apparently being made toward the liquidation, settlement, and payment of such claims: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate whether or not said claims have been presented to the Government of Mexico, and what steps and measures are being taken to prosecute such claims and to liquidate and settle the same, and if said claims have not been presented, then to report to the Senate what steps and measures are contemplated to be taken with respect thereto and when the department will proceed with the same.

Mr. KING. The resolution has been unanimously reported by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

## MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR HUSTING AND THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE DAVIDSON.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I give notice that at the proper time I shall move for a session of the Senate on Sunday, the 23d of February, to be devoted to memorial exercises for the late Senator HUSTING and the late Representative DAVIDSON, of Wisconsin.

## RECESS.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, February 8, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 7, 1919.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

O Thou, who are supremely great and glorious, infinite in all Thine attributes, impart unto us that uplift of the spirit which shall strengthen our grip on the things which make for righteousness and broaden our views of life and its purposes, that we may go forward to larger achievements in the things whereunto Thou hast called us; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4743. An act for the relief of Francis Stewart.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 13353) to extend the provisions of the homestead laws touching credit for period of enlistment to the soldiers, nurses, and officers of the Army and the seamen, marines, nurses, and officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps of the United States who have served or will have served with the Mexican border operations or during the war between the United States and Germany and her allies.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 1847. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Wyoming National Forest.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED.

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

S. 4743. An act for the relief of Francis Stewart; to the Committee on Public Lands.

## NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Is it in order to move that the House go into executive session?

The SPEAKER. Of course it is, when you have got anything to go in on. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Well, it occurs to me that we have got something to go in on. We have an appropriation asked here of \$700,000,000 which we are asked to vote upon because of a communication which is said to have come to the Committee on Naval Affairs which could not properly be made public. Of course the responsibility is upon the House, not exclusively upon the Committee on Naval Affairs, in making this appropriation.

It occurs to me that in view of the fact that it is not advisable to make public this communication the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs might be willing to move to go into executive session, where the communication would be kept entirely secret.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think it would. I will say to the gentleman that I will show it to any Member of the House in personal confidence.

The SPEAKER. All this conversation is out of order. If the gentleman from Mississippi wants to make any remarks to the House, the Chair will recognize him for five minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I did not know until now that Members of the House could see this telegram or that it was open to all Members.

Mr. PADGETT. I have shown it to several Members.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes. I had heard that several Members had seen it, but the House has not seen it.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I will show it to you.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I can not see why the gentleman thinks it would not be kept secret if it were submitted to the House in executive session.

Mr. PADGETT. I have been on committees for 15 years, and we have been holding executive sessions, and everything that was done in executive session was published in the newspapers next morning. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Then, Mr. Speaker, if the House does not go into executive session and this communication is shown to every Member, every Member will know it. Of course, if they want to make it public they can do it just as well as if it were made known in executive session.

When I made the suggestion I did not know that the communication would be made available to the Members of the House. I do not make the motion to go into executive session, but I wanted to know if it would be in order if the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of his own motion would make the motion to go into executive session, so that the matter can be presented and we can know what the situation is.

Mr. PADGETT. The truth is I have told the House already the sum and substance of it as plainly as I could, except to give the language.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I yield the floor, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15539, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15539, the naval appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15539) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

## BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS.

Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks: For general maintenance of yards and docks, namely, for books, maps, models, and drawings; purchase and repair of fire engines; fire apparatus and plants; machinery, operation or repair, purchase; maintenance of horses and driving teams; carts, timber wheels, and all vehicles, including motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles to be used only for official purposes,

and including motor-propelled vehicles for freight-carrying purposes only for use in the navy yards; tools and repair of the same; stationery; furniture for Government houses and offices in navy yards and naval stations; coal and other fuel; candles, oil, and gas; attendance on light and power plants; cleaning and clearing up yards and care of buildings; attendance on fires, lights, fire engines, and fire apparatus and plants; incidental labor at navy yards; water tax, tolls, and ferrage; pay of watchmen in navy yards; awnings and packing boxes; and for pay for employees on leave, \$7,500,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, inspection, drafting, messenger, and other classified work in the navy yards and naval stations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for the purchase of passenger-carrying automobiles.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of inquiring as to the method the committee followed in arriving at the estimate of the appropriation of \$7,500,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir. There was appropriated last year \$10,500,000. The committee had very extensive hearings with the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and inquired into the purposes for which the appropriations were to be used. It is the general operating fund to carry on all the work of the navy yards and stations, and we concluded that \$7,500,000 was the lowest they could get along on.

Mr. STAFFORD. What were the component parts of the gentleman's estimate of \$7,500,000? I am directed by a member of the committee to page 275 of the hearings.

Mr. PADGETT. It is the general operating fund of the navy yards and stations.

Mr. STAFFORD. While the gentleman is searching for the details of his estimate, I wish to direct the attention of the gentleman and also the attention of the House to the fact that this appropriation bill of two years ago carried only \$1,774,000 for this item. Now, it is hard for me to understand how in two years the appropriations on a peace basis would jump from \$1,774,000 to \$7,500,000. That is some jump for the maintenance of the yards.

Mr. PADGETT. During the war and the last few years there has been a tremendous development and expansion in the yards, calling for enlarged activities. You will find it on page 273.

Mr. STAFFORD. That condition was rather present when we appropriated the money for this purpose during the fiscal year 1917.

Mr. PADGETT. No. In the last appropriation bill we appropriated \$10,500,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. But two years before we appropriated but \$1,774,000 for these identic purposes.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; that is true. But you must bear in mind that the enlargements of the yards have been many, many times over what they were in the year before that.

Mr. STAFFORD. But I make the statement that in no instance have they been fivefold; and even if they had been fivefold, the amount of this expenditure should not be proportionate.

Mr. PADGETT. There are many more yards and very much enlarged activities. The gentleman must bear in mind that the appropriations for yards and docks in the two years from March 4, 1917, are over \$300,000,000. Now that property has to be taken care of. It has to be maintained, it has to be repaired, the operations have to be supported.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are you not maintaining it up to a war basis?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; we are not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman give the information which I originally sought, as to how he arrived at this large appropriation of \$7,500,000, a jump in two years from \$1,774,000?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the chairman of the committee that, of course, it is a partial war basis, because all these yards will have to repair the ships that are being used for transport service and temporary service during the period of demobilization.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit? Does the gentleman mean to say these yards were not being used for repair purposes in the year before last, when we appropriated only \$1,774,000?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but in the year—

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any information as to how the committee arrived at \$7,500,000, or was it just a wild guess?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, the gentleman is getting excited.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not getting excited. I am waiting for information, but still have not received any.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman from Wisconsin has taken most of the five minutes himself.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I have not. I have waited for the chairman to give me information, and I am now waiting for the gentleman from Michigan to give me information. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes, and I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan to give me the information.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. The total appropriation, including deficiencies, last year was \$14,288,000, and the expenditures were \$14,311,654, making an additional deficiency of \$23,000 up to the present time; and instead of having to take care of a small number of ships, when the armistice was declared the number of ships was something like 2,000. Many of those ships are still in operation and will have to continue until we get back to an actual peace basis. The operations in the yards have largely developed and extended many times over, and this is the operating expense of all the yards and stations throughout the country; and as suggested by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], we are not on a peace basis yet. We are in a transition period, trying to get to a peace basis.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand that out of this appropriation the mechanics and other employees of the navy yards are paid?

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, no.

Mr. PADGETT. No; this is for the maintenance and upkeep of the yards.

Mr. BUTLER. Maintenance and repair.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression that that was the purpose, but the gentleman's general statement led me to believe that he intended to convey that it was for the pay of mechanics and help.

Mr. PADGETT. No; I said the upkeep and maintenance of the yards.

Mr. STAFFORD. If it is for the upkeep and maintenance, how should this appropriation increase fivefold just because there are additional ships to be repaired?

Mr. PADGETT. Because the number of ships is more than fivefold. We had about 2,000 ships. We have had a large development of yard expenditures.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; but in no instance fivefold.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not at the Philadelphia Navy Yard and not at the New York Navy Yard, not fivefold in any instance.

Mr. PADGETT. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the appropriation for yards is very great. In the last few years the expansion is over \$300,000,000. That property has to be taken care of. It has to be maintained. It has to be looked after. It has to be repaired. It has to be kept up. If you will look at page 1083 of the hearings, at the second hearing of Admiral Parks, you will see this:

Admiral PARKS. Now, in the navy yard at New York the bureau had an expenditure for 3 months of \$22,400, which would be for the 12 months in the neighborhood of \$110,000. The expenditure was for the 3 summer months.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is for that one yard?

Admiral PARKS. Yes, sir; for that one yard.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, run over in your mind and what would you estimate it to be for the whole naval service?

Admiral PARKS. Great Lakes in the \$12,500,000 had \$1,200,000, while a recent station report had \$1,000,000 estimated for coal, which was in excess of my estimate for the purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Admiral PARKS. They had \$2,000,000 estimated as their requirements from Yards and Docks appropriation maintenance, and I had \$1,200,000; the total estimate for coal is about \$1,400,000, leaving out the training camps.

The CHAIRMAN. For the year; something in the neighborhood for the year of \$1,400,000?

Admiral PARKS. Based upon that average for New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, then, you stated about labor, and you gave the proportion of the rise of labor. How much do you estimate in a general way for the item of labor under this appropriation?

Admiral PARKS. Aside from the classified employees, watchmen, telephone operators, pilots, etc., about \$3,000,000—\$3,000,000 or \$3,250,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, including the others, your classified employees are specified in the limitation of pilots and such employees as you have named. What do you estimate will be necessary for them?

Admiral PARKS. That to-day is \$3,031,040.12.

The CHAIRMAN. Those three items will make more than \$7,500,000. You expect to reduce that, don't you?

Admiral PARKS. To \$2,000,000 for classified employees.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you have got a number of other items that compose that, haven't you?

Admiral PARKS. Yes, sir; our water is another large item. I do not carry the quantities in mind very well, but one station that I have in mind right now has 2,000,000 gallons a day on a 12 cents per thousand rate.

He went into the whole matter in detail, and he stated that it would be with the greatest difficulty that he would get through on the \$7,500,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in further answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin, I want to call attention to the fact that this item includes the coal, oil, heat, light, fuel, everything going to the maintenance of all these various yards and docks. The bill in another place carries an appropriation of \$20,000,000 for the repair of ships that have been taken over by the Government during the war and which we have agreed shall be returned to the owners in substantially the same condition in which we obtained them.

A good share of this repair work will be done in the Government yards without doubt. So that this incidental temporary work which the Government finds itself under obligation to do greatly increases the expenditure necessary under this item.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. PADGETT. The investment of the Government in the various yards is something like \$475,000,000, and this is to maintain the upkeep of these yards based on that, and is, as I say, seven and a half million dollars.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The chief of this bureau, somewhere in the hearings, testified that repairs in the yards during the next year would be as great as during the period of active operations of the war.

Mr. STAFFORD. The seven and one-half million dollars is the revised estimate of the department?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes. They asked for \$12,500,000 originally for the period for which we are making the appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. That was predicated on the idea that the war would continue?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; and that we would even expand if the war had continued.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman furnish the House the segregated items of the expense which warrant this appropriation of seven and one-half million dollars.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I doubt whether it could be done. I doubt whether the amount to be expended in each yard—the maintenance, the upkeep, machinery, freight, amount of electric light, coal, the hauling and draying, and everything of that kind—could be fixed. That is probably not possible to do because nobody can tell exactly the expenses of operation of these great plants employing thousands of men, during the next fiscal year. But if you base it on 225,000 men for the Navy—my recollection is that the bill the gentleman refers to in 1916 carried \$1,750,000—

Mr. STAFFORD. I am referring to the bill of 1917, where the appropriation in the naval bill for this item was \$1,754,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Last year there was a deficiency, which brought it up to over \$14,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. But then we were on a war basis.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We are on a war basis still. I am trying to convey to the gentleman what he evidently desires to know, what there is in this bill which could not be found in the ordinary time of peace, and back when we had a Navy of 65,000 men—because that is all we had at the time the appropriation was made. You can check up the appropriation more or less on the increase in the number of men. I am not saying that the increase of this item would be in proportion to the number of men in the Navy, but it would be reasonably so; so you can tell somewhere within reason what the maximum amount would be. If when we appropriated \$1,750,000 we had only 65,000 men, you could multiply that by three and one-half and get somewhere in the neighborhood of what it would take for maintenance of the Bureau of Yards and Docks; and that probably would be too low because of the large number of ships that we must turn back to the owners. I think there are several hundred ships which must go back to the owners and which must be repaired and put in shape before they are returned. Exercising the best judgment we had, we accepted the estimate of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, because there was no other way.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Is the estimate for this item on the basis that these ships are to be taken out of commission?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We have a great many hundreds of every kind of ship taken over during the war. There were many small yachts, tugboats, and other small craft, and we agreed with the owners to return them at the end of the war in substantially the same condition as we received them. We carry an item of \$20,000,000 to carry on the work itself, but there will be a large amount necessary for light, heat, coal, and

everything incidental to the repairs of these ships, in addition to the actual repair of the ships. We are carrying the troops back from Europe and carrying supplies for the Army as long as the Army is in Europe.

Mr. PADGETT. This is not used for the actual repair of the ships, but the activities of the yards are increased and the expenses are very much enlarged because of the activities; this is for the upkeep for the number of yards we have in operation.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. This item is a very large sum to be appropriated for the maintenance of the yards and docks of the Naval Establishment. It has been very greatly reduced in amount by the Naval Affairs Committee. We felt that we had reduced it to the point where we had better halt. So that we might act with some intelligence we asked the Bureau of Yards and Docks to furnish us the amount of money that had been spent for the Navy on the land in the last 18 months, or up to November 4, 1918. That was through the war period, when we had to expand, and expand very quickly. The itemized statement shows that the expenditures during that period for the Navy on the land, including the expenditures in yards as well as for aviation stations, everything touching the Navy, amounted to \$332,904,263.63, an enormous sum of money, but none of us were willing to say that it had been extravagantly spent or uselessly spent.

The purpose in having this memorandum of expenditures furnished to us was to enable us to learn for the future how it will be possible, in order to maintain the Navy on a peace basis, to reduce some of these items. This is but the beginning. I do not think any gentleman on this committee ought to feel that the Naval Committee did not give this its earnest consideration, and as you go along in these different items making appropriations you will see how carefully we have scaled them down, indeed, sometimes quite wildly, our purpose being to get back as near as we could to an economic peace basis. Yet, at the same time we must bear in mind always that the Government has a great deal of property here. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] has told the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] that perhaps the Government property inside of these yards would be worth nearly \$500,000,000, and we have a lot of property outside of the yards. Therefore we must be careful to preserve it and keep it well, not with a view of being upon a war basis, but we have it on hand. What to do with it just at this time we do not know, but we must have enough money to preserve it carefully and properly.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In further answer to the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin, the amount carried in the bill of August 29, 1916, was \$1,174,000, and to that was added a deficiency of \$1,032,000, so that in that peace year, before we got into the war at all, we had \$2,206,000 appropriated for this item on a basis, as the gentleman will remember, of 65,000 men in the Navy. If you will multiply that by anything like three or three and a half, you will get a sum somewhere near the amount suggested.

Mr. BUTLER. We have done the best we could do. We have been hastened in obtaining these appropriations that we might assist the department in preparing itself for war.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I think that matter has been fully explained. I would like to ask as to the language on page 22, lines 10 and 11. Among the items in the paragraph is the following: "Machinery, operation or repair, purchase."

Mr. PADGETT. That means for the repair and purchase of machinery in the shops.

Mr. MANN. Why not say so, if that is what it means? Why not say "operation, repair, and purchase of machinery."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, that is what it does say.

Mr. MANN. I suppose it is so construed, but certainly that is not what it says.

Mr. PADGETT. That is the language that has been in there since I have been on the committee, some 14 years. There never has been any criticism of it. We did not change it.

Mr. MANN. Very well. I suppose the committee will never get to the point where it studies grammar while it is studying naval affairs.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice that this paragraph has to do with the purchase of coal and other fuel. In that connection I have a letter from Mr. John Moore, president of the Mine Workers' Union, which I would like to have read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is this a similar letter to that which was placed in the Record yesterday by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHAWWOOD]?

Mr. EMERSON. I do not know.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Ohio yesterday obtained permission to insert a letter—

Mr. EMERSON. This is a letter addressed to me personally.

Mr. STAFFORD. That letter was addressed to Gen. SHAWWOOD personally. I suggest that the gentleman withdraw his request until he can examine the first page of yesterday's Record, to ascertain if the same letter is sought to be inserted twice.

Mr. EMERSON. I withdraw it for the present.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent, Bureau of Yards and Docks: For contingent expenses and minor extensions and improvements of public works at navy yards and stations, \$150,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, may I have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. My colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN] desired some time in general debate. We were unable to give it to him. Would the gentleman be willing that he should speak out of order for five minutes now?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to use a little time of the House this morning to call attention to some conditions which I have already brought to the attention of the House in connection with the soldiers. Last December I introduced a resolution to investigate the Bureau of War Risk Insurance Department, and a meeting of the the Rules Committee was held and a hearing granted. Before that committee, besides myself and several Congressmen, Col. Lindsley appeared, and upon the statement which he made the Rules Committee deferred any action for a period of 30 days. My conclusion on that proposition is that I believe that the same reason exists for an investigation of that bureau now that existed at that time, and I insist that some attention be given to this question by the Rules Committee.

I have another matter here affecting the soldiers and their families in the same way. It has been called to the attention of the House by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and by others. It is in regard to the delivery of mail to soldiers on the other side. Yesterday Gen. Pershing sent a statement to this Government, to the War department, to the effect that mail was being delivered and that there was now no delay. This morning's mail brings to me a case which I desire to call to the attention of the House. It is a letter from a sister of a soldier who has mailed several letters to her brother, who is wounded. Another brother of hers was killed. These letters are in my hands at this time, and they have the following marks upon them. One letter was mailed at Honesdale, Pa., September 25, 1918, and was addressed to Sergt. Albert H. Morrison, Company E, One hundred and ninth Infantry, Twenty-eighth Division, American Expeditionary Forces, by way of New York. This letter has been returned, with the following written upon it in lead pencil:

Hospital—wounded. C. P. O. Tours, 10/21. A. W. L.

Then, in red ink, appears the following:

N. C. 11/23/18.

There are three of these letters that are picked out of many that have been received, and I desire to have read in my time the following letter.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, before that is done, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Not long ago I received a letter from a young man who is in France, a soldier from my district. I say a letter—it was not a letter, in that sense, for he had just taken the back of a small envelope that had been sent to him and wrote just a little note on the back of this envelope.

He said it was impossible for the boys over there to get stationery for them to write a letter back home. Now, that is another condition that exists over there with the boys to-day.

Mr. McFADDEN. Before this letter is read I would like to say that I called up the Casualty Bureau of the War Department this morning and I find that Albert H. Morrison has a gunshot wound of right arm and left side of upper lip. He is still in the hospital in France.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McFADDEN. I have only five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I just want to say, like the gentleman who has the floor, that I have received a large number of envelopes, the very envelopes, which went to France and came back, although properly addressed. Like the one to which he called attention, they were marked "Wounded, C. P. O.," and so forth. It is idle to talk about the soldiers receiving their mail when we all know they do not get it.

Mr. McFADDEN. That is the point I am endeavoring to make perfectly clear, that in spite of the fact that Gen. Pershing says these letters are being delivered they are not being delivered. The responsibility is somewhere, and it must be fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the letter in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

HONESDALE, PA., January 7, 1919.

Hon. L. P. McFADDEN,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: "Do your bit for the boys 'over there'" has been the cry for the past two years—and we've done it! The boys in the trenches and behind the lines have been nobly taken care of through the excellent work of the combined war charities—Salvation Army, Red Cross, Young Men's Christian Association, Young Women's Christian Association, Young Men's Hebrew Association, Knights of Columbus, Jewish Welfare Board, and kindred organizations. But what if a fellow has the misfortune to accidentally get in front of a stray bullet, which plows through his face, removing a few teeth—a trivial matter, to be sure—and otherwise musing up a perfectly good countenance to such an extent that he had to be taken to Base Hospital No. 86 to be "remodeled"? Of course, worse things could happen, and anyhow it's all in the game. But what I want to know is, is that the time to have this "humane treatment" suddenly cease? Do you call it doing the square thing for the boys who are making the world safe for democracy to refuse them all news from home? And you know what emphasis has been put on that touching little phrase, "Write to the boys," and the stress that has been put on the heart-rending plea to "Send news from home to the boys over there." All very well and good—not to say exceedingly enabling. But is it your idea of a good time to write, and write, and then write again, and continue to write until you've nearly ruined the point of your Waterman, and then, out of an otherwise unclouded sky, suddenly have a pack of letters addressed to Sergt. Albert H. Morrison, Company E, One hundred and ninth Infantry, Twenty-eighth Division, American Expeditionary Forces—yes—have the same letters that you wrote returned to you? A few mystic pencil marks scrawled across the envelope inform the world in general to this effect: "Hospital—wounded. C. P. O. Tours, 10/21. A. W. L."

"N. C. 2/13/18. Return to writer."

I'll explain. Sergt. Morrison is my brother. The only big brother I have now, as my other brother made the "supreme sacrifice" about three months ago while in the service. Our last letter from the brother who was wounded says, "Went you write? I haven't had a darn letter since I've been here." Rather tough, don't you think so? Not a word from the home folks, for whom the soldier boys are said to have such tender regard. All through neglect of our Government post-office employees. Where is this wonderful system, so boasted of, whereby every soldier is so catalogued that a mere glance is sufficient to tell the searching eye just what is what about that particular soldier? This miraculous "Open Sesame" to the history of this particular soldier—my brother—could tell them that he was wounded. Now, why, with perhaps a trifle extra exertion on the part of the investigator, couldn't the whereabouts of this wounded soldier be ascertained? A wounded soldier! Isn't that the one time when he would crave for news from home? And, of all times, that is the one when such wished-for letters are withheld. Instead said letters are merely inscribed, "Wounded—in hospital. Return to writer."

I think the world has a thing or two to learn before it reaches the supreme heights in its education along the finer lines of "humanity" if it considers it "humane" to withhold mail from a wounded soldier—intentionally! Most surely "Wake up, America," is a very apt expression.

Yours, very truly,

FLORENCE M. MORRISON.

During the reading of the above letter Mr. McFADDEN's time expired, and he was granted an additional minute.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC WORKS, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS.

Hospital construction: Naval hospital, Fort Lyons, Colo., \$275,000; contingent, \$225,000; in all, \$500,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph just read. I wish to inquire whether the hospital at Fort Lyons is now in existence?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, yes, sir; they have about 500 tuberculosis patients there.

Mr. STAFFORD. My attention has this minute been directed to the hearings, and I have just glanced at them. This is the only tubercular hospital for the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. This is the only one I recall; yes, sir; and the demands on it are increasing tremendously, and the Surgeon General, Dr. Braisted, stated it was full up now.

Mr. STAFFORD. And will continue to increase by reason of the fact of our enlarged enlisted force?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Boston, Mass.: Two 25-ton floating derricks, \$40,000; shore facilities for Commonwealth Dry Dock, South Boston, \$500,000; in all, \$540,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I rise largely to inquire as to what action

was taken on the resolution or act we passed in the closing days of the last session authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to purchase the dry dock at Boston and relieve the Commonwealth of Massachusetts from the responsibility of maintaining that dry dock and operating it for the benefit of the United States of America?

Mr. PADGETT. We provided for taking over and operating it, and this appropriation is in conformity with the provisions of that act, and it was stated at the time that the provision was made and the authorization was given here that there would be some part of the appropriation used in order to fit up some of the small shops in order to make the dry dock useful.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I recall the discussion when that item was under consideration it was represented that unless the Government took over the dry dock and relieved the Commonwealth of Massachusetts from its obligations to allow this dock to be utilized by our Government, at a payment, I believe, of \$50,000 annual rental—

Mr. PADGETT. That is the first contract they had.

Mr. STAFFORD (continuing). That there would be delay?

Mr. PADGETT. Great delay.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not remember that they said great delay, but there would be delay until the Legislature of Massachusetts in annual session could vote the necessary additional funds to put it in condition—

Mr. PADGETT. It is a little different; the Legislature of Massachusetts had already voted not to appropriate anything more and to fight out with the contractors the completion of the dock under their existing contracts, and that meant a litigation between the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the contractors for the dock which would delay very greatly the completion of the dock at a time when it was regarded as very essential and necessary during war times to have it completed as early as possible, and the Government purchased it and the work is going right on.

Mr. STAFFORD. Did the Government take over the contested lawsuit of the contractors?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. Did it relieve the Commonwealth of Massachusetts from its obligations under the contract?

Mr. PADGETT. No; the Commonwealth of Massachusetts assumed its liability and turned over to the Government its contracts to have it completed up to a certain time, and the contractor agreed with the Navy Department to expedite the work and put on additional shifts in order to complete it early this year, so that it can be in operation for an additional amount, I think, of something like \$250,000, if I remember.

Mr. STAFFORD. This dry dock up to the present time is not in a condition so that it can be used by the Government?

Mr. PADGETT. Not yet; it was not expected to be.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression from the statement made at the time the authorization was made in the special act that it would be completed soon after?

Mr. PADGETT. He said it can be completed some time in February or March, as I remember, of this year.

Mr. STAFFORD. What does the testimony show as to when it will be completed?

Mr. PADGETT. Let me see:

It is estimated that the \$500,000 asked for at the present time will take care of the following shore development: Structural shop, machine shop, pattern shop and foundry, woodworking shop, and a small storehouse.

Mr. BROWNING. How nearly completed is this dry dock?

Admiral PARKS. It is expected to be completed by February.

Mr. BROWNING. Ready for use by February?

Admiral PARKS. Ready for use by February.

The CHAIRMAN. Not fully completed but ready to use, as I understood it. The principal thing is the dredging.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am informed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] that they have been using the dry docks for some time for some purpose.

Mr. PADGETT. That was a limited use.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the reservation of the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa.: Dry dock, to complete, and the limit of cost is increased to \$4,700,000, \$1,200,000; paving, railroad tracks, sewers, water pipes, and general yard development, \$200,000; kapok mattress and life-preserver factory, \$100,000; in all, \$1,500,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. What is the necessity for this increase in the cost of this dry dock?

Mr. PADGETT. That is very interesting. Congress authorized the construction of two docks, companion or similar docks,

one at Norfolk and one at Philadelphia. They were to be very large docks; something over a thousand feet and about 40 feet over the sill. The limit of cost was fixed at \$3,500,000. At the time it was contended that the dock at Philadelphia could be built under economic conditions and cheaply.

Mr. WALSH. Three and one-half millions for each dock?

Mr. PADGETT. For each dock. The dock at Norfolk will be completed within the \$3,500,000, and is about completed. I had an invitation just a few days ago to come down there to a sort of celebration at the completion of the dock.

Mr. WALSH. Within the limit of cost?

Mr. PADGETT. Within the limit of cost.

Mr. WALSH. It ought to be celebrated.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, in Philadelphia, when the work got started and was moving along somewhat under way, the dredge boat sank in the dock, and that delayed very much the completion of the dock. There is a controversy between the contractor and the Government that in some way the Government is responsible for the sinking of that boat, in that it interfered in some way with the guarding around the dock, so that persons got in there and opened up some of the valves and let the dock sink. That is a controversy which the Government is disputing, but it delayed very much the completion of the dock.

After they had dug down quite a depth they found a stratum of soft mud and sand that the hydrostatic pressure of the water was pushing out from there, and the result of it was that the banks were caving in on either side, kept sloughing off and caving in; and, at a cost of something like \$150,000, they had to put some permanent walls around that and drive down cheap piling in order to prevent the walls from caving back to such an extent that it might injure the safety of buildings that were some distance from the dock.

Then the war being on, the Government came in through the different agencies—the War Board, the Labor Board, and some of these other boards. The Labor Board came in and raised the price of labor, and the contractor had to pay a great deal more for labor. The Government came in and commandeered the sand of the contractor, and he had to get additional sand at a very much greater cost at other places. They fixed the price on cement through one of the war boards. All of those questions came up, and it involved the controversy and a lawsuit, in which the Government does not admit its liability. So things are just held up. They did not go ahead. The dock should be completed. It is needed. And this is simply to go ahead and complete the dock and await the result of the lawsuit. What that result will be I do not know. Nobody else will know what will come out from the lawsuit between the Government and the contractors on their bond, and there is the liability of their securities.

Mr. WALSH. A part of the situation which was caused resulted from the War Labor Board—

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH (continuing). Coming in and fixing the price of labor?

Mr. PADGETT. They fixed general prices.

Mr. WALSH. Who was it came in and took away the contractor's sand?

Mr. PADGETT. The War Industries Board.

Mr. WALSH. The War Industries Board?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. So that, with the United States Navy Department at work constructing an important dry dock during a period of war, the War Industries Board came along and took away the sand in the immediate vicinity and required the contractor to procure sand elsewhere?

Mr. PADGETT. That is what I understand the situation to be.

Mr. WALSH. That is one of the elements that goes into increasing the cost of this \$1,200,000? Will the gentleman state—

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

Mr. WALSH. I desire to still further reserve the point of order on this paragraph, Mr. Chairman.

Will the gentleman from Tennessee state as to whether this War Labor Board increased the cost of labor in the Norfolk dock?

Mr. PADGETT. They fixed the prices of labor through these committees, and so forth, but the conditions at Norfolk were very different, I understand, and Norfolk had progressed so far in its development that it did not affect it to the same extent that it did at Philadelphia.

Mr. WALSH. And the contractor down there, I assume, was permitted to retain his sand?

Mr. PADGETT. I suppose so. I heard of no interference there.

Mr. WALSH. Now, are not the items for railroad tracks, sewers, water pipes, and general yard development, and so forth, a part of the original specifications for the construction of this dock?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. WALSH. It is something that was thought of afterwards?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. It is part of the development, but it is in that part of the yard where new ships have been built, a number of them, and building ways, where they are building and preparing to build the battle cruisers—those big ships—and this is required as an ordinary development there in the new portion of the yard. There are about 11,000 or 12,000 acres in that yard, and this is that end of the yard that is being developed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, in view of the very full explanation given by the chairman of the committee, I shall not insist upon the point of order, although I think it is poor policy to start in and increase the limit of cost on projects that ought to have been completed long ago, and probably would have been if they had not been interfered with by some of these independent war agencies that are working for the Government under this munificent policy of a dollar a year salary.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Will not the gentleman wait until we have read the next paragraph?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Washington, D. C.: West extension development, \$43,000; power plant extension, \$214,000; extra ducts and manholes, \$36,500; fireproofing storehouse No. 10, \$15,000; sewer, water, and paving extensions in eastern addition, \$50,000; railroad classification yard, \$36,500; dispensary, \$75,000; raising roof of open-hearth shop and additional crane, \$40,000; proof shop, \$250,000; outside distribution system, \$20,000; outside oil distribution system, \$20,000; in all, \$800,000.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. This is just for the development of the yard and the land we have already purchased.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am frank to say that upon this subject I have an open mind, but I am inclined to believe that the appropriations, and especially the authorizations provided for in this bill, are in excess of what we should authorize at this time. I will give my reasons briefly for my position. In the first place, I do not believe there is any country in the world better prepared to build ships than is the United States at the present time. I do not believe that if an emergency arose that would demand of this Nation a very great Navy for immediate use there is any nation in the world that could build ships as fast as we can and prepare for that emergency. Further, the program heretofore authorized can not be carried out within a few months, and at a time when we need money so badly to meet the necessary obligations of the Government I believe it is time for the Congress of the United States to stop, hesitate, look around, and see where we are financially and how much money we must raise.

I am going to give you, gentlemen, a few of the "extras" that the Congress of the United States is going to be called upon to furnish in the expenditures of this Government in the very near future, and it is astounding to me, as I know it will be to you.

Taking into consideration in this sum this program, \$746,000,000, there must be, and will be, appropriated for the construction of hospitals a large sum of money, conservatively estimated at \$30,000,000, in the very near future.

As to our interest account, which I give here—and I am going to ask permission to put in the Record a letter I have just received from the Treasury Department—showing all the authorizations and obligations of the Government and the amount of outstanding bonds, the date of their issue and the due date, and the amount of interest which each issue of bonds draws. On the 31st of December those outstanding obligations of the Government amounted in round numbers to \$21,000,000,000, and

we are going to be called upon soon to dispose of \$5,000,000,000 or \$6,000,000,000 more of Government bonds.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman said \$21,000,000,000 of indebtedness or bonds.

Mr. FORDNEY. Outstanding obligations—bonds, certificates of indebtedness, war-saving certificates, and so forth. I will give that in detail. I shall not have time to do it in my remarks, but I will put it in the Record. The interest account on this indebtedness is going to be about \$1,000,000,000 in the next 12 months.

Our merchant marine is going to cost us—and this estimate is very conservative—from the information I can obtain, \$650,000,000 this next year.

The "extra" for the war, over and above ordinary times, in discharging our boys now in the service, will be at least \$500,000,000, and possibly double that sum.

Our aircraft, although estimated in this report to be some \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000, does not include the proposed aircraft service for carrying the mails, and that undoubtedly will call upon the Government for an expenditure of \$50,000,000.

To my great surprise, the first 12 months of Government control of railroads has already furnished a \$755,000,000 loss, which must come out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the country, and before we relinquish the railroads to their owners that sum is going to reach from \$800,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000. I estimated this item here conservatively at \$800,000,000. It is now reported at \$755,000,000, at the end of 12 months of Government control.

The Government contracts that have been authorized and which are being authorized will in round numbers show up to be \$3,000,000,000. Let us cut that sum in two and say that our Government can settle on the basis of 50 cents on the dollar on those claims. That is \$1,500,000,000.

Our guaranty to the farmers on wheat, conservatively estimated, will be \$1,000,000,000 in round numbers, possibly more; perhaps a little less, and this guaranty must and will be carried out.

The war-risk insurance will require \$150,000,000. The European food bill that we recently passed carries an appropriation of \$100,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield as to the estimate on the war-risk insurance?

Mr. FORDNEY. Just in a minute. Then I will yield.

Extra clerk hire to Members of the House, \$500,000 in the next 12 months. It will exceed that sum.

The Employment Bureau is now asking before the Committee on Appropriations for \$14,000,000 for the next year, and the bonus provided for in the new revenue bill (which will come up to-morrow) to the soldiers—which is less than I wanted to make it, \$60 per man—will amount to \$255,000,000.

Now, gentlemen, those are some of the extraordinary appropriations or expenditures of money that the Congress of the United States will be called upon to collect from the people in taxes in the next 12 months, amounting to \$6,795,000,000. This does not include the ordinary expenses of the Government. It is true the tax law will collect, if the estimates are correctly made, in round numbers, \$6,000,000,000.

But, my friends, in the very near future we are going to be called upon to prepare and pass another revenue law in addition to this bill which comes up for consideration to-morrow. There are various ways to get the money; but let me call your attention to this fact, that all the money there is in the United States sums up in round numbers only about \$6,000,000,000, and we are going to be called upon for \$10,000,000,000 in round numbers in the next 12 months. We are not satisfied just to reach out and take all the money that all the people have but we want once and a half times the amount that they have, and we are going to make them dig it up somewhere and turn it into the Treasury of the United States. I caution you who represent the people of this country that we are going wild in governmental expenditures. We have been very extravagant during the war, but we will forget that extravagance, because to offset it we have won the war. Our coming to the relief of our allies in this great war at the opportune time broke the wolf's back, turned the tide, drove back the enemy, and caused them to come on their bended knees and beg for mercy. But where are we going to land in the expenditures of this Government, gentlemen, if we are not somewhat conservative? In my candid opinion the authorization asked for in this naval bill is not warranted to that extent at this particular time. I am in favor of having a great Navy if we need it, but to my mind the greatest inconsistency is the saying in one breath that we are bound to have a league of nations to prevent war, and say-

ing in the next breath that we must have the greatest Navy under God's sun.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. We are using every effort. Everybody is anxious to see some agreement arrived at by which we can prevent a recurrence of the greatest war the world ever knew. Every time some nation that is likely to threaten us builds a ship I want to see Uncle Sam build a ship, but are we threatened with such danger right now? If so, from what source does it come?

It is said that the President has sent a message over here which is confidential, which can not be given to the public. I may not be correct about that, but that is my understanding. I should like to know what there is in the mind of the President of the United States affecting the welfare of all the people that should be secret between the President and one or two men. What is it that he has in mind as a representative of the people that we are not entitled to know? At one time we were told that the President had information, and he himself made the statement from the Speaker's desk about the Panama Canal and said: "I can not give you that information, but if you do not grant my request I will not know what to do." All right, gentlemen of the House acquiesced, and we repealed the bill which provided for free tolls for American coastwise ships through our own Panama Canal. What his reasons were then I do not know. He never told me; he never told the public; but, in my candid opinion, we did our merchant marine the greatest injustice that it was possible for the Congress of the United States to do in matters of that kind by repealing that law. Now comes the President and states that for certain reasons which he can not make public he wants this great Navy authorized. Heavens above, what is it that is going on around that table in Paris where our peace representatives are gathered that you and I should not know? He stated publicly before he went over there that he would keep this Nation advised as to all his actions.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am wondering just exactly what it is that my colleague would recommend to the House. Would he recommend that we discontinue appropriations for ships heretofore authorized?

Mr. FORDNEY. I have the highest regard for my colleague and for his opinion in this matter. He is well informed about this subject; but I will say to him that I do not agree with this enormous authorization at this time.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What I am particularly directing my question to is whether or not my colleague thinks we ought not to make any appropriations for the ships heretofore authorized?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes; finish building the ships we are now building and finish the program; but as I read in your report you authorize \$290,000,000 for a building program of ships heretofore unauthorized.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to my colleague, however, that this bill carries no appropriation except for ships heretofore authorized.

Mr. FORDNEY. You are authorizing 10 great battleships.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There is no appropriation carried for anything not heretofore authorized.

Mr. FORDNEY. But if you authorize the construction of a ship Uncle Sam must pay for it if he builds it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. But I understood my colleague to say that he thought the amount carried in this bill was excessive, and there is no appropriation in this bill for anything except ships heretofore authorized.

Mr. FORDNEY. But if we authorize these 20 ships and the Navy Department enters into contracts for their construction we must appropriate the money to pay for them.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington. Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman include in his estimates of expense the \$100,000,000 for food for the starving people of Europe?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; I included that \$100,000,000.

I have here a statement of the bonds outstanding and the rates of interest provided; and the total issue of outstanding obligations of the Government on the 31st day of December was \$20,807,598,298. Besides that, some additional obligations have no doubt already been issued and must continue to be issued for some time to come.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does that amount include our loans to the allies?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes. These are the obligations outstanding. Of course, whatever bonds of the allied governments we hold should be deducted from this or considered as an asset, if ever paid. But, my good friend, the allies now are claiming that Uncle Sam should stand his proportional share of the cost of the war in proportion to population. I am opposed to that plan.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Will the gentleman put the figures he has given in the RECORD?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will, Mr. Chairman, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by putting in the figures I have mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will have that privilege.

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the gentleman's estimate as to the amount of expenditure for the War Risk Insurance Bureau did he take into consideration the amount of money the Government is obligated to pay on the insurance policies of these soldiers?

Mr. FORDNEY. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. That will run up into the hundreds of millions.

Mr. FORDNEY. I have only mentioned the extra obligations over and above the ordinary obligations.

Mr. STAFFORD. My recollection is that it is estimated to run up to six hundred or eight hundred million dollars.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Does the gentleman's figures include the pensions to soldiers during the next year? Was that in the gentleman's estimate?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I think I am correct in saying that will be in addition to what I have stated.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. As a Member of the House and as an American citizen I am obliged to the gentleman for the warning he has given to this Congress. He deserves the gratitude of the American people for having the nerve to stand up here and make the statement. I had hoped that this administration would have said to the Naval Affairs Committee, "Go slowly on the 1916 program." I voted for it in 1916, and I want to see it completed; but I hoped that we might be able to spread it out over five or six years.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] asked the gentleman from Michigan whether he would withhold the appropriation for the construction of the 1916 program. Much of our bill that we have reported is for that purpose; much of the money we asked for to complete the 1916 program. Would the gentleman have us—and I am not asking for the purpose of heckling my friend, but for his advice—would he ask us to withhold the completion of that program, or ask us to continue it along for a number of years until we can somehow without unduly pressing the people get the money to pay for it?

Mr. FORDNEY. I would not ask that the 1916 program be completed quickly unless it is necessary to protect ourselves against a warring nation somewhere in the world in the near future. We must economize, we must stop this extravagant use of money which we have spent so lavishly during the war. We ought to get back to normal conditions and to practice reasonable economy.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not wish to take up the gentleman's time and I am impressed with what he said. Nevertheless he does not help me. I have asked a number of gentlemen in this House to assist me in the performance of a public duty. I agree with the gentleman that if there is nobody to fight there is no necessity for preparing a Navy. The gentleman has the same view I have. If there is any great necessity for the expenditure of money, if it is imperative, we should spend it now, but if not,

we should postpone it. I am not able to understand, and therefore I joined with my colleagues on the committee, and while I want in every way to be economical and assist the American people to have something left in their pockets for the future years I want to complete the 1916 program, which I hope will be completed within five years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Michigan be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. I wish to ask a question in the line of the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. How many warships, how many battleships, have not yet been commenced which were provided for in the 1916 program, if the gentleman can answer?

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman from Michigan will pardon me, they have all been begun except four. They are supposed to all be completed within five years. The first one will not be completed within 18 months.

Mr. FREAR. Does this bill, covering \$747,000,000, cover the entire 1916 program?

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, no; about one-third of it.

Mr. FREAR. What will be the total cost of completing the 1916 program?

Mr. BUTLER. Completing the 1916 program will cost in the neighborhood of \$800,000,000 including the expenditures already made and to be made.

Mr. POU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POU. Did the gentleman favor the imposing of a tax on the people of the United States of \$8,000,000,000 in the bill passed by this House?

Mr. FORDNEY. I voted for that bill. I was opposed to raising such a large proportion of expenditure in direct taxes.

Mr. POU. But the gentleman voted for the bill.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. POU. And the bill carries \$8,000,000,000.

Mr. FORDNEY. As it passed the House, but it now only carries \$6,000,000,000, and next year the bill provides for \$4,000,000,000, and \$4,000,000,000 will not meet the necessary expenditures now being imposed on the Government. I have at all times tried to amend the bill and make it better, but have always voted for its passage, being the best I could get. We must go slow, or we must raise more money next year. That is what I want to impress on your minds.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. It is a fair statement that my committee duties have kept me out of the House, and will for some days to come, practically. I just gathered from the colloquy between Representative BUTLER and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] that it will be five years before the 1916 program will be completed.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; that is what was stated.

Mr. CANNON. And this bill carries appropriations to carry on that program?

Mr. FORDNEY. Not all of it, so the gentleman stated.

Mr. CANNON. But to carry it on for the coming year?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; as far as needed to meet the expenditures as that program progresses.

Mr. LITTLE. For one year?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. We are in the habit of appropriating from year to year for authorized projects. What I would be glad to know is this: If it takes five years to carry out this program, why authorize another program that is to cost how much?

Mr. BUTLER. Four hundred and fifteen million dollars is the lowest estimate I have heard placed upon it, and you gentlemen will be safe in putting on 15 per cent more. My observation warrants me in saying to the gentleman that it will cost 15 per cent more.

Mr. CANNON. That is the proposed additional program?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. It is to be taken for granted that Congress will be in session at least two times in the future under the Constitution. The question in my mind is, from every standpoint, what the necessity for authorizing an additional program when the present program can not be completed for five years? [Applause.]

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; but just let me answer that question, and I will then yield. I believe that the succeeding Congress

can be entrusted to do the necessary and the right thing when called upon. Why obligate the Government at this time by this great authorization? [Applause.] I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. With reference to the cost, there are 10 battleships, and the estimated cost on the present basis of material and wages is \$32,400,000 each, which would be \$324,000,000. The estimated cost of the 10 scout cruisers is \$88,000,000, or \$8,800,000 each, and those costs are predicated upon the present price of material and labor. I do not think it will be going up in the future. I think, if there is any change, that it will have to be cheaper. I do not believe that the present cost of material and labor can hold, so that the \$412,000,000 which those two make would cover the cost, and that would be distributed over a period of about seven years.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there to permit me to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question?

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

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it not a fact that we have asked for large increases over the estimated cost of battleships for 1916?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Because of the great increase in the cost of material and the increase in the cost of labor.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and that is what I am talking about.

Mr. BUTLER. Unless the economic pendulum swings backward we are likely to have to ask for more money in the future to complete this proposed program.

Mr. PADGETT. No; I think not. In 1916 the estimated cost was based upon the cost of labor and materials at that time, and they are being worked out under the present cost of labor and material. The cost of these is based on the present cost of labor and material, and if that goes down they will be cheaper.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman in reply—and I have taken so much more time than I had expected that I feel that I ought not to say much more—I have some confidence in the fairness and justice of the Republican Party. The Republican Party is coming into power in this House and in the Senate in a very few weeks, if Congress is called together into extra session. No one can deny that the Republicans during the terms of this war were loyal to the administration and supported it in everything asked for in connection with carrying on this war.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. I have always studiously and steadfastly refused to bring politics into this matter.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. PADGETT. But do I understand the gentleman to intimate or insinuate that the Democratic Congress must not legislate because it is a Democratic Congress?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no. Let me say to you that I am fearful, however, that the bringing in of this program at this time, in the closing hours of this Congress, when no single appropriation bill has yet passed the Senate, is going to call for an extra session of Congress without doubt. I doubt that you can get this kind of a bill through the Senate, notwithstanding the fact that it be passed here; and I believe this bill is going to do more to bring on an extra session of Congress, which I do not want, than any piece of legislation now before Congress.

Mr. PADGETT. Let us expedite it here and do our duty and not let that responsibility and catastrophe be chargeable to us.

Mr. FORDNEY. I believe you are expediting your bill. To put a bill through the House which carries an appropriation of three-quarters of a billion dollars in two days is expediting matters, if I am correct in my judgment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think it would help matters at all if we added to this bill a proviso that the expenditures for the increase in the Navy should not be operative until after we learn the result of the peace conference?

Mr. FORDNEY. My good friends, let me say that we do not know anything about this matter at present. We ought to know more. We ought to know more in a few weeks from our rep-

representatives in Paris as to what the needs of this Government are going to be. We have no information from over there now. We ought to have some information; we are paying for the information. We have men over there. God knows we have enough servants along to take care of the daily affairs; 51 cooks and waiters taken from the Biltmore Hotel, New York, on board ship that took our envoys over there. There must be somebody over there, and we ought to get some information. We have none. Why should we hurry now? Why not wait until we get some information from over the seas? [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a minute? Mr. FORDNEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. All the information that can be sent will not enable us to strike anything from this bill. If gentlemen who are in favor of prolonging the construction of the 1916 program see fit to take out of the end of the bill some appropriations we can save many, many millions of dollars.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say to my good friend in closing I am in favor of waiting until we know more than we know now before we authorize these 10 battleships and 10 scout cruisers, in addition to the present program. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I wish to insert here statements which I have just received from the office of the Secretary of the Treasury. I know it is information interesting to the public. Gentlemen, I thank you for your attention.

Authorizations for issues of liberty bonds.

The first liberty bond act (Apr. 24, 1917) authorized new issues of bonds of not to exceed.....	\$5,000,000,000
The same act authorized the issue under the terms of such act of the unissued bonds previously authorized as follows:	
For construction of Panama Canal (act Aug. 5, 1909), but including the unissued Panama Canal bonds authorized to be issued for the nitrate plant (act June 3, 1916), and for the Shipping Board (act Sept. 7, 1916), the amount of issued postal-savings bonds being deducted from the amount authorized, approximately.....	225,000,000
For extraordinary expenditures (act Mar. 3, 1917).....	100,000,000
For expediting naval construction (act Mar. 4, 1917).....	150,000,000
And in addition, authorized an additional amount to provide for payment of loan of 1908-1918.....	63,945,460
<b>Total authorization under first liberty bond act.....</b>	<b>5,538,945,460</b>
First liberty loan subscriptions allotted.....	2,000,000,000
<b>Balance bonds unissued under first liberty bond act.....</b>	<b>3,538,945,460</b>
The second liberty bond act (Sept. 24, 1917) authorized the issue of bonds (in addition to the \$2,000,000,000 issued under the first liberty bond act), not to exceed in the aggregate.....	7,538,945,460
And provided that of such sum \$3,538,945,460 should be in lieu of unissued bonds authorized by the first liberty bond act.....	
The third liberty bond act (Apr. 4, 1918) increased the authority for the issue of bonds to.....	12,000,000,000
The fourth liberty bond act (July 9, 1918) further increased such authority to.....	20,000,000,000
Issues of liberty bonds under second liberty bond act, and under such act as amended:	
Subscriptions allotted—	
Second liberty loan.....	\$3,808,766,150
Third liberty loan.....	4,176,516,850
Fourth liberty loan.....	6,989,047,000
	14,974,330,000
<b>Balance authority under existing law for issues of liberty bonds.....</b>	<b>5,025,670,000</b>

Interest-bearing debt of the United States Dec. 31, 1918.

Title.	Rate.	Outstanding.
<b>Permanent debt:</b>	<i>Per ct.</i>	
Consols of 1937.....	2	\$599,724,050
Loan of 1925.....	4	118,489,900
Panama's of 1916-1936.....	2	48,954,180
Panama's of 1918-1938.....	2	25,947,400
Panama's of 1961.....	3	50,000,000
Conversion bonds.....	3	28,894,500
Postal savings bonds.....	2½	11,258,890
One-year Treasury notes.....	3	14,365,000
Certificates of indebtedness (Pittman Act).....	2	104,737,000
First liberty loan of 1932-1947.....	3½	1,413,697,400
First liberty loan of 1932-1947, converted.....	4	1,201,383,500
First liberty loan of 1932-1947, converted.....	4½	1,373,118,600
Second liberty loan of 1927-1942.....	4	1,874,943,900
Second liberty loan of 1927-1942, converted.....	4½	1,273,573,450
Third liberty loan of 1928.....	4½	1,054,048,800
Fourth liberty loan of 1933-1938.....	4½	2,602,578,600
		16,682,285,250

<sup>1</sup> Subject to correction.

<sup>2</sup> Cash payments.

Interest-bearing debt of the United States, Dec. 31, 1918—Continued.

Title.	Rate.	Outstanding.
<b>Floating debt:</b>		
War savings certificates.....	<i>Per ct.</i>	
Certificates of indebtedness:	4	\$865,764,046
Tax series of 1919 (Aug. 20, 1918-July 15, 1919).....	4	81,952,591
Series T (Nov. 7, 1918-Mar. 15, 1919).....	4½	794,172,501
Series 4-F (Sept. 17, 1918-Jan. 16, 1919).....	4½	438,177,500
Series 4-G (Oct. 1, 1918-Jan. 30, 1919).....	4½	474,512,501
Series 5-A (Dec. 5, 1918-May 6, 1919).....	4½	613,438,000
Series 5-B (Dec. 19, 1918-May 20, 1919).....	4½	572,494,000
Miscellaneous.....	2½	184,802,000
	4½	
		4,125,313,045
<b>Recapitulation:</b>		
Permanent debt.....		16,682,285,250
Floating debt.....		4,125,313,045
		20,807,598,295

<sup>1</sup> Cash receipts for war savings stamps and thrift stamps.  
<sup>2</sup> Estimated outstanding Dec. 31, 1918. Subject to correction.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserved the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct the attention of the committee to the item now under consideration, which provides \$800,000 for new buildings at the Washington Navy Yard, a pretty large sum for a peace program. We only appropriated in last year's bill \$1,433,000. We have some very large projects suggested in this additional program—\$250,000 for a proof shop. What is the necessity for that, at least at this time?

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is aware they have very largely increased the activities at the gun factory here in Washington, called the navy yard, where we manufacture our guns, the large guns and smaller caliber guns, and there have been a number of new shops erected. This shop called a proof shop—here is a letter which says:

It is essential that there be constructed at the Washington Navy Yard at the earliest practical date a building for the assembling, inspection, and shipment of ordnance material. A one-story building of brick and steel approximating 180 by 200 feet is contemplated. It is proposed to locate this building in the eastern extension.

That is the part we purchased last. Mr. STAFFORD. Is it estimated \$250,000 will be required to erect a building 180 by 200 feet one story high?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir. Mr. STAFFORD. I should say, from my knowledge of construction, that is a very liberal estimate.

Mr. PADGETT. No; I think not, considering it is to be constructed of that size, that width, and so forth, with trusses, stresses, and so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. I repeat that from my knowledge of construction—and I have had some acquaintance in the past year when the prices were so high—that the estimate of \$250,000 for a building 180 by 200 feet is about twice as much as it could have been built in war time.

Mr. PADGETT. The original estimate was for a larger shop of \$500,000, but in talking the matter over the committee insisted that it did not want to appropriate so much as that, and they finally reduced it to the size here indicated in this letter and reduced the appropriation to \$250,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not obtain the information as to the purpose for which this new building was to be used.

Mr. PADGETT. We went into that very fully. In speaking of it they say:

That is to receive and inspect the ordnance before it is sent to the proving ground, to star-gauge and otherwise inspect it after it is returned and prepare it for shipment, and I think at least a half of that building should be provided for a peace establishment. I think the whole of it was absolutely necessary if war conditions had continued.

The first size of it was 400 by 300 feet, and then they reduced it, as I have stated, and cut the appropriation in half.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no proof shop there at present? Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the necessity for a dispensary for which you appropriate \$75,000 in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. The dispensary is a building to be used in the nature of a first aid in case of accidents and injuries that happen where there are 6,000 or 7,000 men working with heavy and dangerous machinery, and this is to provide some beds and things necessary to first aid the men who get hurt, to take care of them properly, and provide for them until they can be taken to a hospital or to their homes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reverting to the former subject, where is the work that is proposed to be undertaken in the proof shop now being performed?

Mr. PADGETT. It is being done in a building there that is being enlarged into a machine shop, as I understand, and a great deal of it is stored out in the open. If you were down in that yard you would see a great many of their large guns stored out in the open for long periods of time there, until they can be taken care of in the congested rooms that they have.

Mr. STAFFORD. They do not suffer by being stored in the open there?

Mr. PADGETT. They claim that they do. They paint them and oil them over, but they claim it is an expensive matter.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, on that item in the bill—"proof shop, \$250,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order upon the item of "proof shop, \$250,000."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know as to the merits of the point of order, as I am not a parliamentarian. The facts are that the Government purchased this land and has undertaken the construction and the enlargement of the means and the instrumentalities and the buildings needed to carry on the work of the manufacture, and repair, and production, and care, and so forth, of our guns. And this is one of the essential parts of that general scheme that has been provided.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this in process of construction?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; this is a new building.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if it is a new building, of course it is subject to the point of order. If it is in process of construction, the Chair understands it would be in order. If it is new legislation, it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. There has been no specific appropriation heretofore for a proof shop. This is the initial appropriation for that; but a proof shop is one of a series of buildings that are necessary to carry out and perfect the plant that was contemplated.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if it were in process of construction, the Chair, of course, would overrule the point of order; but it is a new project, even though it may be a part of the same general scheme. It individually is a new project, and the Chair thinks it would be obnoxious to the rule and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order as to the other items in the paragraph.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this war has worked some wonderful changes. For one thing, it has transformed our Secretary of the Navy from a bleating lamb to a roaring lion. A while ago we were told that woman suffrage was absolutely necessary to the winning of the war. I do not know in what way, unless it was proposed to draft women into the military service of the country. Now it is battleships. I do not know what it will be next, but I think the time has come when we should stop and take stock. We have got to commence to consider the people who are going to foot the bills.

Now, some of the Members on the floor of this House have said that this big naval program is merely a bluff, that its purpose is to whip the allies into line and make them come across on certain propositions now in discussion across the water. I am not going to take any chance on this being a bluff. If we appropriate money, it will be made available, and I know and you all know that every dollar that this Congress or any preceding Congress has ever authorized has been spent, and this will be spent.

Who are we arming ourselves against? Any of the allies? If Germany has not been sufficiently whipped, if she is still a menace, let us finish the job, but let us not go to work and arm against our allies unless we are given information that we now do not have. I think it is high time to think of the people who are going to foot the bills, and this legislation should not be enacted at this time.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. A moment ago you stated you did not know why women were given the ballot to win the war unless they were to be drafted into the military service. The gentleman does not want to leave the impression that the women did not play their part in this war?

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is conveying an inference that I did not mean at all. However, I am sure the gentleman does not mean to say that suffrage was a vital issue to the winning of the war?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. It was not my intention to say that. The gentleman made the statement that he did not know how

women could help win the war unless they were drafted into the military service.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, no; the women of this country rendered a great and noble service, but that is beside the question now under consideration. I am opposed to this legislation, and I hope that this side of the aisle and also that side will rally in opposition to this bill. This is no time for huge expenditures. We have got to get down and pare our expenditures to the marrow or this country will go bankrupt. Let us give more consideration to the taxpayer and less to mirages.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman referred to bluffing a moment ago. Does not the gentleman take it for granted that the allies know what we are saying and doing over here? Did you ever see a bluff effectual when the other fellow knew that you were bluffing?

Mr. KNUTSON. It is only a paper program, and they will realize it.

Mr. BUTLER. As a Member of this House, I want to help. The gentleman has a remedy. He should not speak in generalities but get down to figures, and tell us how we can help on this bill. I have indulged in generalities a great deal of my life, and I want to be a specialist.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman can help by voting "nay" on this proposition.

Mr. BUTLER. What proposition?

Mr. KNUTSON. On every proposition aside from the 1916 naval program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ascertain if we can not dispense with this discussion of the building program until we reach it later on in the bill. I suggest that it be not discussed now, but that we wait until we reach it, and then discuss it, thus avoiding going over it twice.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say to the gentleman, if he will allow me, if I need make any apology for my five minutes—

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, not at all—

Mr. CANNON. I do not know that I shall be present when the building program is reached.

Mr. PADGETT. I just wanted to provide for the future.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. When does the gentleman expect to reach that?

Mr. PADGETT. I want to conclude, if possible, before 7 o'clock to-night.

Mr. GARNER. Why not discuss it when we get to it?

Mr. FREAR. I want to see if we can get a statement clearly before the House of the answers to the questions asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] and others. I believe I have the facts here that will do it in a few minutes. It is right here before me, and then I think from it we will have a clear understanding of what the bill involves.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Tennessee a request to make?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of this House for more than 20 years, and I do not recollect of any case which has come to my knowledge during my membership of a secret proposition having been sent by anyone who held the distinguished office of President of the United States to any committee of this House, and in this instance, as has been stated, the committee were sworn to maintain secrecy, when they presented the Naval bill to the House. It seems to me it is a proceeding that we ought to consider very earnestly before we finally dispose of a bill of the importance of the Naval appropriation bill, providing for such a vast expenditure of money, for a long period of time beyond the life of the Sixty-fifth Congress. By our acts, if we authorize these expenditures, we place a heavy burden upon the taxpayers for many years to come. In my opinion, as we have the 1916 program for increasing the Navy uncompleted, and we are told that said program can not be completed until 1921, the question of the Navy's future can safely be left to the succeeding Congresses. Our successors will not lack the patriotism to properly provide for the Navy whenever necessity shall call for the increases suggested in this bill. President Wilson stated in substance to the Congress when he last addressed them:

I am going across the ocean because I believe it to be my duty. I shall, however, keep in touch with you. Whatever I know you will know.

I do not know but what the people generally may have some information through the newspapers, but certainly the Congress has not received direct information since the President sailed across the ocean, except that communicated to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Naval Affairs, and that committee inform us that they were sworn to secrecy before

the Secretary of the Navy would even impart the indefinite information which was confided to them.

I received to-day a newspaper published at Augusta, Ga., with a specially marked article. The newspaper containing the article is the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, and it was published on the 3d day of February. The Augusta Chronicle was established in 1785, and it is the South's oldest newspaper. I want to have this article read, and I ask that it may be read in my time, and that my time may be so extended that the whole article may be read. This article shows very plainly that "murder will out." The Committee on Naval Affairs will respect their oath of secrecy, but you can not keep everything quiet. In due time the facts will be exposed to the light of day. The article I have asked to have read will prove that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the article which he sends to the Clerk's desk may be read and that his time shall be sufficiently extended to permit the reading of the entire article. Is there objection?

Mr. PADGETT. I must object to taking the time to read it. I shall not object to inserting it in the RECORD.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I insist on its being read. I have not made a request of this nature to the House for some time, and I think I am entitled to that consideration. If the gentleman chooses to object, he can do so.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not care to object.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I ask to have it read. I think it is not an unreasonable request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request that the article referred to may be read in the gentleman's time, and that his time be extended sufficiently to permit the reading of the entire article? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### THE CASE OF GEN. WOOD.

The old saying, "murder will out," is being exemplified in the case of Gen. Leonard Wood, that big American and splendid soldier, who has been booted around by the War Department as if his country owed him nothing but a grudge.

It may be, of course, that certain "roller-chair warriors" and departmental heads in Washington owe Gen. Wood a grudge for having made bold to expose their incompetency and, almost single handed and alone, forced them to adopt certain preparedness measures; but the country at large has no cause to share this feeling of petty spite, and the country does not share it.

On the contrary, every American citizen, be he Democrat or Republican, who is at all familiar with the facts in the case, must resent the War Department's disgraceful treatment of Gen. Wood, which is, perhaps, without parallel in the history of the Army.

The Chronicle first called attention to the War Department's attitude toward Gen. Wood in May, 1917, soon after this country entered the war, and it then became absolutely necessary for the Government to enter aggressively upon the preparedness program that Gen. Wood had been urging upon it for years.

But, instead of putting at the helm this able soldier, then the ranking general of the Army and the one who, more than any other, or all of them combined, had long before foreseen and planned the necessary program for raising and training an adequate Army, what did the War Department do?

Why, it coolly—and, we have always believed, maliciously—decided to remove him from the most important post in the Army, outside of Washington, that of commander of the Department of the East, at Governors Island, and generously give him his choice of such minor posts as those at Manila, Honolulu, or Charleston, S. C., the latter carrying with it command of the newly created Department of the Southeast.

Fully comprehending the motive behind this War Department order, Gen. Wood, being the most active and constructive man in the Army at that time, had a natural desire to continue active at such a period in his Nation's history, so he declined to be shunted off to such far-away stations as Honolulu or Manila and accepted Charleston instead.

But even there he didn't propose to be sidetracked; for, indeed, it is impossible to sidetrack a man of Gen. Wood's caliber, as some of the men in the War Department might have known had they been even half his size in mentality and character. So instead of permitting the War Department to "bury" him at Charleston—as was, undoubtedly, the intention—what did this big American soldier do?

He started right in to make up and organize the South—at least, those States that were included in the Department of the Southeast. And in little or no time he got things to going; in fact, he succeeded in stirring up the South as no other man in the Army could have done. Instead of being "sidetracked" he soon made it clear that the War Department had in reality but furnished him with a new opportunity to display his wonderful genius for organization.

So much was this the case, that some people and some newspapers, unwilling to recognize the "motive" behind the War Department's action, tried to make it appear that the Charleston post was, really, intended as a "promotion"; that the War Department simply recognized in Gen. Wood the man for this particularly difficult work and used him accordingly—in reality a high tribute to him.

But this theory was soon dispelled by still another order from the War Department; this time removing him to Camp Funston, where he was put in charge of a training camp—just as he was succeeding in welding the South into a great military organization.

The Chronicle made bold at the time to call attention to the first of these War Department reprisals against Gen. Wood, but it was some time before the country at large began to take cognizance of the indecent treatment accorded him. Now, however, the whole thing is coming to light; indeed, it will not be surprising if, before very long, there is a congressional investigation of the whole affair—as, indeed, there should be.

An Associated Press dispatch, published in yesterday's Chronicle, ought, in itself, to furnish sufficient grounds for such an investigation; for certain officers of the United States Army, some 40 in number, have signed a sort of round-robin, in which they bring the charge that Gen. Wood, while on a brief visit to France—the only opportunity he was ever given to see the battle front—was treated almost as a "German spy"; and, further, that his treatment throughout has been the spiteful work of a certain clique. But let's read, again, what these officers say:

"When Gen. Wood visited the front he was treated more like a German spy than an officer of the United States. We have the word of several colonels that know him well for this. He was ordered back from his visit here without being allowed to visit the Italian front, or returning through England, as he was invited to do by Lloyd-George.

"Gen. Wood was the idol of the Army, officers and men alike, and was one of the most efficient officers, yet he was kept in a corner all the time. Who did it?"

Now, if the above charges are not true these officers are subject to court-martial, and they ought to be court-martialed; in fact, it is quite possible that they are subject to court-martial, anyway, for daring to tell the truth. For if Gen. Wood, after his great service to his country for more than 20 years, could be all but "banished" merely because he told the truth, because he told the country that certain people in Washington were asleep at the switch, because he told a Senate committee that the War Department "ought to be sandbagged" and this country aroused to the necessity for preparedness, certainly these 40 officers of lower rank ought to be court-martialed for calling the acts of this same War Department in question. As we hope they will be, for then the whole truth will come out as to Gen. Wood, which, however, isn't a matter altogether personal to Gen. Wood himself, for it involves the honor and integrity of the Army and of the Government, and that's where the public comes in.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this naval bill carries \$746,457,740 and is the largest naval bill ever presented to any country in the world in time of peace. It is five times as large as our average naval bill prior to the war just won. Under present conditions throughout the world every country, whether a victor or among the vanquished, is tax burdened, in many cases to the point of bankruptcy, while all are war weary and financially exhausted. All are seeking some plan of general disarmament, which was promised at the end of this war through a world-wide league pledged to guarantee a lasting peace. That was talked from every platform during the war. All the world was united to defeat Prussian militarism and make certain that peace. The war is won, the Prussian-Austrian-Turkish alliance is destroyed, the German fleet surrendered, her transportation system and ships delivered to the victors, and her army defeated and demobilizing. The only cloud on the horizon is that which comes through the press via "British wireless" just in time to help pass a waiting billion-dollar military bill—a fear of German military reorganization. A three-quarters of a billion naval bill is now asked because of some possible future rivalry with Great Britain, and over a billion dollars is asked for an army to provide against an uprising of the vanquished Huns and to help police the world.

Mr. Chairman, few people will be deceived by the strings which are always pulled by the same naval and military agencies whenever legislation is before Congress. This enormous naval bill before us, in my judgment, is indefensible in view of world-wide conditions; yet we are embarked on a 1916 naval building program that possibly may be justified until peace terms are signed. Possibly we can offer some excuse to the country for its support thereafter, although under present conditions of public finances a \$746,457,000 naval bill will be hard to explain to the already overburdened taxpayers. This bill is five times as large as our annual naval bills four short years ago, and we are told by the committee that our Navy now building is as large as the combined navies of the three greatest countries in the world aside from Great Britain. Yet, with the second navy in the world and a stupendous 1916 building program that will take five more years to complete, an amendment or further 1918 new naval building program, to reach over \$400,000,000 more, is also carried in this bill, so that in times of peace we have run war mad, with no prospect of sanity in sight. The naval and military bills before us, aggregating in appropriations and authorizations about \$2,275,000,000, carry double the amount, in time of peace, of all our Government appropriations combined four short years ago. Can any statement be more significant of present reckless expenditures?

Mr. Chairman, I wish to have the committee correct me if I am not stating the facts accurately in regard to the amounts carried in the naval building programs contained in this bill, because there has been considerable confusion in the minds of Members. This is an unprecedentedly large bill in times of peace, carrying five times the average annual appropriations, and the amounts have been discussed here within the last few minutes by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who sought the facts from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], who is a member of the committee. As I understand it the 1916 Navy building program amounts approximately to \$815,000,000. Last year there was appropriated and applied on this 1916 naval building program \$100,000,000, leaving a balance of

\$715,000,000 more to be appropriated by Congress to complete the 1916 authorizations.

Mr. PADGETT. There was an appropriation in 1916, and also an appropriation in 1917 on the 1916 program.

Mr. FREAR. How much did it amount to for both years?

Mr. PADGETT. I will have to look that up.

Mr. FREAR. Will the chairman of the Naval Committee correct me if wrong, because we want to get the amounts right in order to understand this bill.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is dealing with expenditures—

Mr. FREAR. On this 1916 naval building program.

Mr. PADGETT. Appropriations were made in 1916, 1917, and also 1918 on that program.

Mr. BUTLER. They have not all been spent.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think I can give the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] some information, if he will yield.

Admiral Taylor was before the Naval Committee, but unfortunately his statement was not taken down. He stated that it would take \$815,000,000 to complete the 1916 program; that to the best of his information there had been appropriated \$220,000,000. The only reason why he could not give accurately the amount that had been appropriated was that a part was appropriated to the Ordnance Department, and this bill carries \$170,000,000.

Mr. FREAR. This bill specifically carries \$179,000,000 for 1916 authorizations.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. One hundred and seventy-nine million dollars. So you can take those figures.

Mr. FREAR. Then with that correction the 1916 naval building program as adopted reaches \$815,000,000, and according to the statement just made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], based on the opinion of Admiral Taylor, \$220,000,000 in round numbers has already been applied upon that program, leaving a balance of approximately \$600,000,000 yet to be appropriated. The naval bill before us carries \$746,000,000 for all naval purposes. Of that amount \$179,000,000 is to be applied upon the 1916 naval building program, leaving a balance to be appropriated hereafter for ships carried in the 1916 authorizations of about \$420,000,000 through subsequent bills. That is entirely separate and in addition to the amount of approximately \$415,000,000 contained in the latter part of this bill, covering 20 more battleships and cruisers in a proposed new 1918 building program. Is that approximately right?

Mr. PADGETT. I think that is approximately correct. It is about \$400,000,000 instead of \$420,000,000. The gentleman has the figures there, but Admiral Taylor stated the amount at about \$400,000,000. That is substantially correct.

Mr. FREAR. It is over \$400,000,000. It is nearly \$420,000,000, as I have it here figured. My desire is to get the figures before the House which disclose that, in addition to the \$179,000,000 contained in this bill, we have over \$400,000,000 more to appropriate to complete the 1916 shipbuilding program, which will take five years more to build. Further than that, this bill before us contains a new authorization for \$415,000,000 for a new 1918 shipbuilding program. Briefly stated, this naval bill seeks to appropriate \$746,000,000 and to authorize over \$415,000,000 additional, or over \$1,160,000,000 in all, in times of peace. Again I repeat, I can not understand how the bill can be defended by anyone or how we can vote for it in its present form. Let me present another strange, incomprehensible statement offered by the leading Republican member of the committee who, on February 4, during the general discussion, said:

I think I owe something to myself and to my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. He asks me to state what influenced my mind at the last minute when this naval bill was under consideration in the committee room. \* \* \* The statement that moved me I will never disclose to anyone. \* \* \* Until the last minute I had resolved I would not vote for this building program.

Again quoting from the Record of February 4:

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] states to us he will vote for this bill, although against his judgment, and that it will not affect any European situation. Will he advise the House whether he wishes us to stand by his judgment, which is against the bill, or with his vote, which is to be for it?

Mr. BUTLER. I can not advise the House. I do not ask the House to vote for this paragraph (the \$400,000,000 authorization). I very much regret that I am unable to tell the committee of the reason that moves me to vote for it.

That is the only reason. A mysterious influence exercised from some source is here offered to sway us to vote for this enormous new \$400,000,000 naval construction in addition to \$746,000,000 also contained in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have voted for every larger naval program recommended by the Naval Committee, usually reaching two battleships annually, since I have been in Congress, and also during the war; but now that the war is over, when from the destruction of lives and property that has bankrupted the world

we now emerge with a Navy as large and powerful as the navies of France, Japan, and Italy combined, second only to that of Great Britain, I refuse to add this enormous tax burden of over \$1,160,000,000 carried in this bill, which authorizes 20 more great warships, to be added to the heavy burdens we have already laid upon the people of this country.

Criticisms may come from navy leagues, "security leagues," both of which have been repeatedly publicly discredited, and from naval construction interests, steel interests, publicity bureaus, and others who thrive on such appropriations. We are told it will take five years more and about \$600,000,000 to carry out the great naval construction program begun in 1916, which will make us equal to any three naval powers combined, apart from Great Britain. To that stupendous building program which is carried in this bill we are asked to add 20 more great battleships and cruisers at a cost of \$415,000,000 in addition to \$746,000,000 already carried in the bill, and for what?

Every intelligent man knows that within a dozen years, based on past experience, the battleships and cruisers of the past and of to-day will be obsolete, ready for the junk pile, but the billions of dollars expended on these numerous "building programs" that give profits to the few are wrung from a tax-burdened people who are beginning to inquire what has been done with their money.

I have opposed several comparatively small bills, involving in all less than one-third of this \$1,160,000,000 bill, and I can not consistently vote against comparatively small waste and then gulp down this indefensible measure. If our enormous naval appropriations are intended only to "bluff" some other country, as stated on this floor in debate, then it is well to remember that world conflicts are sometimes reached through "bluffing." England and Germany finished their bluffing race in naval construction when the German Navy was wiped out of existence, and England has now quit building in order to catch her financial breath. In times of peace such bluffing is dangerous and criminal waste and senseless when all other nations desire to quit the bluffing game.

Mr. Chairman, for several months the Secretary of the Navy has been quoted in the press as saying that this country must have the largest Navy in the world. No reason was given for his remarkable demand, which involves the expenditure of several billion dollars and a colossal naval program in order to exceed the British Navy. The Naval Committee brings in this naval bill with the Secretary's recommendation, which, we are told, carries the indorsement of the President, who for some reason has been persuaded to follow the Secretary's lead. Let me recall an incident. A river and harbor lobby has been holding its sessions almost within the shadows of the dome of the Capitol while this naval bill has been under consideration. Contractors, dredgers, and waterway enthusiasts always back up this organization that annually demands of Congress millions of dollars for useless projects, coupled with some that are meritorious, contained in the annual pork-barrel bill. After spending approximately a half billion dollars on our rivers and canals, which are practically deserted waterways, this same lobby at its meeting this week has urged an immediate expenditure of \$400,000,000 to further develop our inland waterways, according to sentiments expressed at these meetings, and the Secretary of the Navy, who addressed the lobby, was among the most vociferous enthusiasts, according to the press. Every student of the subject knows that our inland waterways are practically deserted excepting the Great Lakes, and have been practically deserted for nearly a half century, during which time we have been dumping a half billion dollars into these same hopeless waterways; yet the Secretary of the Navy, who asks \$1,160,000,000 in this bill for a colossal naval program, is the same Secretary who appeared before the river and harbor lobby, that is offering with equal reckless enthusiasm to spend \$400,000,000 on a hopeless inland waterway program that Congress will be asked to approve. I can not accept the judgment of our Naval Secretary in either case without some evidence of necessity for so doing, when the only effect is simply to benefit a few by piling up unjust tax burdens upon those whose Representatives we are.

Let me repeat that in time of war or threatened emergency I will support every demand for naval or military purposes, but in our hour of victory, in time of world exhaustion and of a demand for universal peace, the country is entitled to know why this extraordinary bill is offered. Germany's fleet has been destroyed. No danger is apprehended from that country or any other country in the world so far as we can learn. The United States has 52 battleships built or building in the program already adopted. Six battle cruisers, 8 armored cruisers, 23 other cruisers of the first, second, or third class, and over 1,500 other craft, little and big, are included in our Navy, which outranks any

combined three navies in the world outside of Great Britain. In addition to that great Navy, this bill authorizes 20 more ships at a cost of over \$400,000,000. Why?

Apart from the billions of dollars invested in this great Navy of ours, how are we to man these vessels with crews reaching into hundreds of thousands of men, and how are we to maintain a vast standing Army of over a half a million men which is provided in the military bill that is waiting us on the Clerk's desk?

Will the naval experts and the General Staff of the Army demand conscription to raise approximately 1,000,000 men to maintain the Army and Navy in times of peace during the years to come? We have said to the world we are a peaceful Nation and will set the pace for disarmament.

What did we mean when we made that statement?

The world viewed with grave apprehension the feverish efforts of Germany and Great Britain to outbuild each other with their navies less than five years ago. A certain result of that rivalry was war. With the help of America, Germany and her allies were vanquished, but have we learned no lesson from that strife of the danger of "bluffing" some other nation by threatening her with a bill like the one before the House?

Naval "experts" asked for \$2,644,307,406 for this bill. The Secretary of the Navy cut it down to \$975,903,621 with a \$415,000,000 further authorization. The committee brings in a bill for \$746,457,440 with the same authorization added.

Naval experts, it is safe to say, do not lie awake nights trying to figure how they will pay their taxes, but we are compelled to ask where is the money coming from to meet this enormous naval bill and the equally enormous military bill and other prodigious expenditures that are presented to the House day after day?

With over \$20,000,000,000 national indebtedness in 1919 and an annual interest and maintenance bill of several billions of dollars for many years to come, we are saddling billions of dollars more on the shoulders of a tax-ridden people annually—to what end?

I voted for every measure asked by the administration for the prosecution of the war. We all voted blindly, and could do nothing else when in war. Responsibility then rested with the administration for all expenditures. It now rests with us.

Hundreds of millions, wasted millions for aircraft that never were built; for cannon that never reached France; for useless ships built to win the war; for a \$50,000,000 waste, to use no harsher term, at Muscle Shoals, all appropriated by Congress to win the war. We did what every other country was doing, gave whatever the administration then demanded to protect our people from the enemy and to win the war.

We are no longer on a war basis, although naval and military experts seek to keep us there. Other countries have become exhausted. This Government has loaned them eight and a half billions of dollars, and the more we loan, the more we give, the more we spend, and the easier it comes to fritter away public money.

What justification can be offered for this vast naval program which the chairman of the committee and leading Republican Members refuse or fail to explain?

We seem to be caught in a whirling maelstrom of extravagance, wherein every department of Government hysterically struggles to assert its own importance through demands for unprecedented appropriations, with a result that the Sinbad burden which has been laid upon our people will descend to our children and to our children's children for generations to come.

If we continue the hopeless waste for extravagant schemes, including canals, canalizations of rivers, highways, public buildings, irrigation, water powers, flood protection, all added to the ordinary expenses of Government, reaching increased billions annually, we will soon be compelled to adopt the proposal of Menken, the National Security League organizer, and compel every man, however small his wage, to pay an income tax to help support the Government. Men protest on the floor of either branch of Congress against this wild financial debauch that is becoming more frantic during the closing days of the Sixty-fifth Congress, but the minority party can not escape its own responsibility by laying the blame upon the President or his subordinates or those sitting across the aisle in either House, because now that the war is over individual responsibility can no longer be shifted to other shoulders.

While this naval bill has been under consideration it was temporarily sidetracked for the \$6,000,000,000 revenue tax bill, which goes to the people as a reminder of what Congress is doing here. During debate on the conference report of the revenue bill, Mr. FORBNEY, Republican leader on the Ways

and Means Committee, gave warning to Congress and the country. He said:

The extraordinary appropriations of money that the Congress of the United States will be called upon to collect from the people in taxes in the next 12 months amount to \$6,795,000,000. This does not include ordinary expenses of government. \* \* \* Let me call your attention to the fact that all the money there is in the United States is, in round numbers, about \$6,000,000,000, and we are going to be called upon for \$10,000,000,000, in round numbers, in the next 12 months. \* \* \* I caution you who represent the people, we are going wild in Government expenditures.

That warning comes from one of the oldest and ablest men in this Congress; and, with his warning sounding in our ears, we are asked by administration officials in times of peace to pass a naval and a military bill that carry over two and one-quarter billion dollars for the coming fiscal year, or, as stated before, practically double the entire annual expenses of the Government four short years ago. After you have collected the \$6,000,000,000 in revenue taxes from the people and have sold them four or five billion dollars more of bonds in the April drive, how are you going to raise the balance necessary to meet the ten to twelve billion dollars of estimated expenditures reported to us by Mr. KITCHIN, the Democratic leader?

If we are willing to abdicate or abandon legislative powers and judgment at the instance of naval "experts," navy leagues, army staffs, great commercial interests, and other influences, secret and open, drunk with power, we must still accept the accompanying responsibility for such action, for that is ours, not theirs, to defend.

Another thought in conclusion. What is going to be the result of this impotent policy on the part of Congress, which reduces our legislative activities to the functions of mere rubber stamps? Mr. KITCHIN has just stated to the House while discussing the revenue bill that after all excess war profits are taken from war profiteers under the different revenue bill schedules, as revealed by official reports, that a snug balance of approximately \$12,000,000,000 will remain in the purses of these same war profiteers, due to the fortunes of war.

Our soldiers in France and their wives and parents back home have sent thousands of letters to Members of Congress in the aggregate showing that the pittance of \$30 per month given by Congress to those who risked their lives for us, and which money they allotted to dependents, has been held up by red-tape military methods. Presumably hundreds of thousands of cases have occurred where hardship and sometimes great suffering have resulted through inexcusable delay in paying the men who fight their dollar a day. While this has been the reward of sacrifice, the profiteers back home have been laying aside \$12,000,000,000 in war-time excess profits.

While our boys have been serving at the front and millions of others have been sacrificing at home to win the war the profiteers at home have been waxing strong and more arrogant than ever before. I sat by the side of two Congressmen in the House yesterday, both of whom by a coincidence have lost sons in France, while my own, with the occupation army, spent his holidays in a hospital in Germany. Members of the House who themselves served in the American Army in France or Italy, with distinction, let me add, have protested by their voices and votes against this prodigal, unparalleled naval bill in times of peace.

Every constituent at home who has contributed some member of his family toward winning the war is entitled to ask how sleek war profiteers have made \$12,000,000,000 over and above the taxes we have levied, while sacrifice has been the keynote in nineteen cases out of every twenty among our people. Every constituent has a right to ask what Congress and the administration have done during the war and since the war is over to relieve these intolerable conditions.

We are having public attention invited by the press of the country and by speakers upon the danger of Bolshevism. We have had pictured to us graphically the overthrown governments of our ally, Russia, and of our enemies, Germany and Austria, and dangers that beset other countries of Europe are known to us, dangers that are feared on this side of the sea, due to discontent caused by injustice.

Not 5 per cent of our people, it is safe to say, are tainted with Bolshevism, militarism, or unlawful greedism, however widespread may be discontent with conditions; but it should be borne in mind that of that 5 per cent who occasion discontent the larger part is not composed of hoboes or red-flag anarchists opposed to all forms of government, with whom our people have no sympathy. A large part of that 5 per cent of undesirables will be found in those whose enormous wealth, rolled up from the necessities of the people in war or peace, has been a constant source of irritation and whose unrestrained greed menaces our institutions. To those undesirables the war has contributed an-

other class, who would Prussianize this country through an autocratic control, which has been a moving cause for overturning governments abroad.

All these disturbing elements in our midst combined do not represent 5 per cent of the people who are law-abiding, patriotic, and loyal to their Government, but constant object lessons of greed, selfishness, and autocratic power are responsible for a discontent more deep-seated than any mere question of wealth and poverty. To hide our heads in the sand is an ostrich attitude that fails to serve any good purpose. Tax laws that enabled war profiteers to hoard \$12,000,000,000 of war profits are laws for which Congress is responsible, and all laws that permit unjust exactions or autocratic power in time of peace are laws for which we are accountable, and all extravagances or waste in public appropriations or expenditures are certain to bring discontent to those who pay the bills. Congress can not right all wrongs by law and our people know that and are too well satisfied with our form of Government to become affected by European social conditions, unless we create the same conditions here. Public extravagance at this time, brought about by bureaucratic influences, tending to commit this Government to a militaristic program, will provoke unrest and eventual distress. That is the course proposed by bills placed before us in these closing days of the session, and we will do well to set an example of economy for the people whose welfare we are permitted to influence through wise or unwise legislation. According to warnings I have quoted from leading Members of the House, whose warnings we will do well to heed, we are not doing that now.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. We have about three weeks of this session remaining. From time to time I have observed that there seems to be a disposition upon the part of certain Members of this House to come in on the floor and attempt to interrupt the proceedings by injecting into the proceedings of the House matters that have nothing to do with the bills under consideration. The point seems to have been reached where Members who are in charge of the bills on both sides of the House can not proceed in an orderly way on account of the fact that some Members are continually butting in with matters not before the House and which in the majority of instances do not much concern the Members of the House or the public, and demanding that time be granted them by the House to have these matters heard and to have editorials and matters of that kind read to the membership of this House. Those who are in charge of bills are placed in a little awkward position, because if they do not accede to the wishes of such Members they make the point of no quorum. It simply resolves itself into this: Certain Members of the House filibuster if they can not have their way about what is going on in the House. I want to say to gentlemen in charge of bills in the House that the next three weeks ought to be a very busy time, and, as one Member of the House, I do not propose to sit here and see gentlemen in charge of the bills grant permission to have things read and speeches made on matters that are not before the House for consideration. If they are not in a position to object, I am. I have nothing more important during the next three weeks than to sit here and do that, and I shall do it. Gentlemen, it is a shame that such should be necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman will undertake to keep a quorum in the House, will he?

Mr. LARSEN. No; I will undertake to keep these disturbers from interrupting the orderly proceedings of the House. I will try to do that much. I want to put the House on notice once and for all that during the next three weeks when there is business before the House that needs attention it must be attended to, or else I shall object to irrelevant matters. Now, that is a fair business proposition, as I conceive it.

Mr. PADGETT. While we are considering the naval bill, let me run the thing a little smoothly, please. I think we will make time by doing so.

Mr. LARSEN. That is all right; but gentlemen in charge of bills have been permitting men to discuss matters that have nothing to do with the bills and nothing to do with any issue before the public. I have a right to see that those granting the time of the House shall do it for a legitimate purpose. I have the highest regard for the gentleman in charge of the bill, and nothing I say is in reference to him specially. I am speaking in a general way. It is ridiculous that the business in this House can not be attended to in a businesslike way without somebody interrupting and bringing some matter to the attention of the House that the House is not interested in.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does not the gentleman think that if he adopts the policy he states he is liable to get the House in an attitude of mind where he is going to cause more obstruction to business than would otherwise happen?

Mr. LARSEN. I think the gentleman misunderstood the force of my statement. I said when there was a matter before the House demanding immediate attention. I realize that there will probably be times when the House will not be specially engaged in matters of importance and will not be pressed for time, and if so there will be plenty of opportunity for Members to be heard without interruption of business.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I want to make some inquiries about the item just read, and I will do so in a moment. I am very much entertained by the distinguished gentleman who just gave notice to the House that he would keep the House in order if somebody else did not do it. I have heard that kind of talk many times, and I never knew the man who made it to have nerve enough to carry it out.

Mr. LARSEN. I will promise the gentleman that this time he will see that the gentleman from Georgia has all the nerve necessary.

Mr. MANN. I do not yield to the gentleman. He is asking that the House be in order and he is not in order himself. Suppose he keeps in order for a few minutes himself and see whether he can keep the House in order.

Mr. LARSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Not yet. Now, Mr. Chairman, the man who pilots a bill through this House has to use some common sense. I have heard gentlemen on the floor of the House repeatedly tell how they would object to everything asked for, and yet I have known those gentlemen to sit here for a day, sometimes two days, sometimes three days, and object to everything, and then quietly disappear for the balance of the session. [Laughter.]

Now, I hope the gentleman from—I do not know what State he comes from—

A MEMBER. Georgia.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman from Georgia will keep his nerve, but he will not. I hope he will require the Democrats to keep a quorum in the House, but he will not. [Laughter.] I hope he will object to everything that is asked for the next three weeks that is not in regular order, but he will not. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Georgia said there would be time during the next three weeks when anything could be brought before the House; that there would be nothing special, but there will not be; there will not be a minute during the next three weeks when there is not some special subject before the House for consideration. Gentlemen on both sides of the House will continue to do in the future as they have always done in the past—interject something that is extraneous under the implied or actual threat of delaying the House if their request is not granted. And the gentleman from Georgia, who is so brave that he is going to expedite business, will, in the end, if he keeps his nerve, only result in delaying the transaction of business in the House. I hope he will get the experience.

Mr. LARSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LARSEN. Does not the gentleman think that he has been here so long and been imposed on so long by Members who wish to interfere with the business of the House, and has yielded so much that he has got in the habit and does not know how to quit it? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; I object oftener than anybody else in the House.

Mr. LARSEN. Then why should the gentleman object to my objecting? Does the gentleman expect that he is going to monopolize objections in the House? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I have the nerve to keep up the objections which I make. I hope the gentleman from Georgia will have the nerve now to keep this up for three weeks, but I am sure he will not.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Does not the gentleman think—

Mr. MANN. This is all extraneous; why does not the gentleman from Georgia object?

Mr. LARSEN. Because the gentleman is talking now on a sensible matter. While I admit the gentleman has wasted nearly five minutes, I am going to see that the gentleman from Illinois and other gentlemen in the House do not persist in taking up needlessly the time of the House for the next three weeks.

Mr. MANN. Why does not the gentleman object now?

Mr. LARSEN. That is all right; we will see.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee about this appropriation.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LARSEN. If the gentleman proposes to discuss the bill, I will not object.

Mr. MANN. I make no promises.

Mr. LARSEN. Then I object. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee about the appropriation of \$500,000 for the water-front improvement at the Norfolk Navy Yard? My recollection is that ever since I have been in Congress we have been making appropriations for these water-front improvements. Is there any end in sight?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I can not say that there will be a time when we will not be making some appropriation for that.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The gentleman from Illinois is out of order in that he is not discussing his motion to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out of the bill the language—

Water-front improvement, \$500,000.

This is like taking candy from children. [Laughter.]

Mr. LARSEN. I presume the gentleman refers to the \$500,000?

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not interrupt the orderly proceedings of the House by constantly "butting in."

Mr. LARSEN. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the bill.

Mr. MANN. I am discussing what is before the House.

Mr. LARSEN. I make the point of order that he is not.

Mr. MANN. Or what is seeking to bring itself before the House. I would like to ask the gentleman a question about this proposition.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, some years ago at Norfolk yards we bought what is known as the Smoley tract, on which they have erected this new, large dry dock we were speaking of this morning, which has just been completed. This is for the improvement of the water front on that new part known as the Smoley tract, where is located the dock and also the large buildings that we appropriated for in the last and the next to the last appropriation bill. The conditions there on the water front are very much crowded. At one time, when the committee visited there, we saw the ships berthed in some places three alongside, and this is to give additional berthing space for the ships, and that is one of the most important points of our whole Navy on account of the Chesapeake Bay and the Roads there.

Mr. MANN. Is this for dredging in front of the dry dock?

Mr. PADGETT. Some of it is in front of the dry dock, and then other of it is for the extension of a key wall alongside, and the dredging to get the depth, so that the boats can come alongside and berth.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Charleston, S. C.: Dredging, to continue, \$30,000; air compressors and auxiliaries, \$118,000; oxyacetylene plant, \$25,000; fire protection, \$50,000; in all, \$223,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. What is the necessity of spending such a large amount as \$118,000 for air compressors and auxiliaries?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the committee went into that very fully. The compressor, as I remember, that they had there broke down. They had been running it for quite a while.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the capacity of this compressor?

Mr. PADGETT. I think \$68,000 was the price paid for the first air compressor. In addition to that, there was purchased intercoolers, condensers, and so forth, at a cost of in the neighborhood of \$50,000, making the total of about \$110,000. Admiral Parks said it would cost about \$118,000 for the compressor and the necessary things to go with it, other than the boilers. The compressor broke down.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to ascertain the capacity of it, because it must have tremendous capacity if you are going to spend \$118,000 for it.

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then you are spending an extravagant figure.

Mr. PADGETT. No; it is not a large one. Those things are very expensive.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have some little knowledge about air compressors myself.

Mr. PADGETT. Let me read from the hearings:

Admiral PARKS. I find that I have just gotten in the bids on which to make contract for that electric generating machinery that was provided for in the last act, and I think that will be sufficient in the way of electric generating capacity. But the principal trouble at the Charleston yard has been on account of lack of air compressors. We got a compressor running in September, and it ran for about three days and went down. It required a lot of attention before it could be started again, and then somewhere about the 1st of October it got into operation again. Without that compressor they could not get air to the shipways for the riveting work on the destroyers—I think they are destroyers that they are building at Charleston, and I believe they have ways there for three.

The CHAIRMAN. They were building some of these chasers down there.

Mr. BROWNING. I was going to ask if they were building destroyers.

The CHAIRMAN. I remember that they were building chasers and a gunboat.

Admiral PARKS. I think there are three destroyer ways, but I do not remember positively about it. It is certainly desirable to have a duplicate air compressor. An air compressor is a machine that gives a lot of trouble if it breaks down, and it is liable to break down and requires a long time for repairs to be made. I think another air compressor would be an advantage.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not question that it is very desirable to have a duplicate air compressor should the one that is running get out of commission, because so much depends upon it and the work would absolutely stop.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was endeavoring to ascertain the capacity of the air compressor for which we are appropriating this large sum of \$118,000. It must be one of tremendous capacity if this amount is to be expended for it.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not extra large; but they have a good deal of activity there, and besides, what would cost \$118,000 now would cost before the war perhaps about \$60,000 or \$75,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order, although I did not get the information that I desire.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval station, Key West, Fla.: Station improvements, \$25,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 2, after the figures "\$25,000" insert:  
"Water system, including purchase of land, and the necessary rights of way, \$2,000,000."

Mr. PADGETT. On that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to read the reason for this amendment from the hearings, on page 965:

The establishment of such a base makes it necessary to have an adequate supply of fresh water. The naval experts figure the naval requirements alone at 552,500 gallons per day. The present supply consists of condensed rain water, costing \$7 per thousand gallons, the deficiency being supplied by tank cars hauling water from the Everglades, a distance of 128 miles, and costing \$3 per thousand gallons. The present consumption of the city, the Army, and the Navy averages 173,000 gallons per day.

The prospective rate of consumption makes the cost of the present method of supply prohibitive, to say nothing of its uncertainty.

The last State census of Key West is given as 18,495 and it is not reasonable to expect a municipality of such small proportions to undertake so big a project as that determined upon as the most feasible method for procuring an adequate supply for the city, the Army, the Navy, and such quantity as may be required by the Florida East Coast Railroad.

The plan proposed is to build pipe lines from some adequate source of supply, the cost of which, including pumping system and all other requisites to the reservoir, has been estimated at \$2,000,000. This work the Navy proposes to do, since it is and will continue to be the biggest user. The city of Key West has agreed to provide the reservoir and distributing system, estimated to cost \$400,000, and to operate the system upon completion. The Navy's investment in the project will be refunded in due course through a special rate on the water which it consumes.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the estimate is that the city of Key West will take about \$100,000 worth of water, the East Coast Railroad Co. is estimated to take \$125,000 worth, and the Navy about that much, and with others to use water it all figures up that the price paid by the users of this water will amount to about \$445,000 a year. Now, it is well known that there is no fresh water in Key West other than rain water. Water is carried there, in addition to rain water, upon barges and upon trains. It is utterly impossible to secure a supply of fresh water at Key West. They have bored there time after time in an attempt to do it, but they have never been able yet to secure fresh water. Now, this has been made a submarine base and a naval station, and a great many ships touch at Key West during the course of the year, and those ships have to be replenished with fresh water. It is utterly impossible to get it in

any other way. It does seem to me, as the Navy Department has recommended it, as committees have been appointed to investigate—some committee that the Secretary referred to here, after an exhaustive investigation, recommended it—it does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that it ought to be included in this bill. Key West, I will state, is not in my district, but Mr. SEARS, who represents that district, unfortunately is at home on account of the serious illness of his wife, and he requested me to offer this amendment, which I do in the utmost of good faith; and I sincerely trust that the committee will see proper to adopt it, because it is certainly very badly needed there; and I ask unanimous consent to extent my remarks in the RECORD.

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

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

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will in a moment. I want to state this project in the language submitted was submitted in the estimate of the Secretary of the Navy. The committee gave it a very full and thorough investigation, and there is a great deal about this in the hearings. It involves a project that costs the Government \$2,000,000 for a water system, and the project is to run a pipe line across land and across the arms of the sea 128 miles up into the mainland of Florida and bring the water down through pipes 128 miles to supply the city. It is also true that there is no fresh-water supply there, but after giving the matter very careful consideration the committee was not prepared at this time to recommend it. It ought to be looked into further. A project to appropriate \$2,000,000, to be expended for the establishment of pipe lines 128 miles long to bring water to a city, and then to cooperate with the city and the railroad, is a scheme that ought to be worked out more thoroughly than has been done, and the committee did not see fit to recommend it, and cut it out of the estimate, and I feel constrained to make the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not true that the Secretary of the Navy urged the adoption of this matter before the committee?

Mr. PADGETT. He did very earnestly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And is not it also true that some committee was appointed, not the Helm Board, but the Bureau of Operations, I believe it is, through a committee, investigated and recommended it?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know whether there was a board or not. The chief of operations, as I understand, wanted it as an adjunct to the operations which are going on there now.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to state to the gentleman that the Secretary says, on page 963—

It is recommended urgently by the Bureau of Operations and officers who had charge of operating the fleets during the war.

Mr. PADGETT. It has been recommended, as I stated, and I stated also there is no fresh water there except rain water. I have been there twice and looked into it, and it is a very important matter, but it seems to me a proposition involving an expenditure of \$2,000,000 to run a fresh-water line 128 miles, a part of it over land and the other through the arms of the sea—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Of course the gentleman knows a great many cities bring their fresh-water supply that distance and perhaps greater. It is not unusual to carry water that far.

Mr. PADGETT. That may not be, but it is unusual for the Navy to attempt to carry it that far for the benefit of a city.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Let me ask one more question. If it is true that the Navy have innumerable vessels that touch here, and this is the nearest point where they can be supplied with fresh water, and if it is true that the individual users, such as the city of Key West and the East Coast Railroad, and others, will in a few years repay the money, does not the gentleman think it is a project that ought to appeal to the judgment of the Committee on Naval Affairs and to this Committee of the Whole?

Mr. PADGETT. It may do that after it is further investigated, but I do not think that it is yet sufficiently developed to authorize it, and then the committee adopted this policy with reference to the entire public works under the Bureau of Yards and Docks. We cut out all new enterprises, all new enlargements and extensions, and have only reported those matters which we felt were absolutely necessary at the present time, and this came under the class of the policy we adopted in reference to all the other yards.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Can the gentleman give any information as to how a naval base came to be established at a point where fresh water was 128 miles away?

Mr. PADGETT. That base was established many years ago, and in many respects it is one of the most important bases that we have for that purpose.

Mr. WALSH. They have always needed fresh water there. I suppose this need has not arisen on account of any recent legislative action?

Mr. PADGETT. Ever since there was a city they have had to use either rain water or water stored in cisterns or bring it in barges, and since the East Coast Railroad was built they bring it down in tank cars.

Of course that is an inconvenience and it is also expensive. But to take up a project of the character of this, until it could be further developed and looked into, the committee did not feel justified in granting it. But Key West is a very important point, and all of the administrations have insisted upon it as very important. Mr. Meyer, when Secretary of the Navy, urged very extensive improvements there, which the committee declined to recommend at that time—not this one, but others—and every naval officer, I think, and all the different administrations have emphasized very strongly the importance of Key West for development.

Mr. WALSH. It would seem, in view of recent exceptional actions, there ought not to be any serious objection to providing for the Navy to be able to get water at Key West.

Mr. PADGETT. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii: Electric connections to dry dock, \$21,000; substation near dry dock, \$68,000; salt-water fire protection, \$35,000; fresh-water connections to dry dock, \$11,500; air connections to dry dock, \$8,000; toilet facilities for ships in dock, \$25,000; in all, \$168,500.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What is the meaning of the item "air connections to dry dock?"

Mr. PADGETT. It is to operate the pumpings there and the drilling, and so forth, by compressed air.

Mr. WALSH. By pneumatic pressure?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman whether or not that dry dock is completed?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. It is thought to be completed during the present spring or summer.

Mr. MANN. It has not failed, has it?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. It is proceeding now, they say, very satisfactorily.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know how much we have expended on the dry dock there up to date, altogether?

Mr. PADGETT. I think the limit of cost was about \$4,000,000.

Mr. MANN. The limit of cost was exceeded a good many years ago.

Mr. PADGETT. I am talking about what the limits have gone up to. It started down below \$3,000,000, I think, and it has been increased from time to time. They had great trouble there, you will remember.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I saw the place. I remember the contest here over it.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand it is nearing completion now, and perhaps is 85 or 90 per cent completed, and is regarded now in a safe and satisfactory condition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Depots for coal: For depots for coal and other fuel, Yorktown, Va., wharf, \$50,000; oil proofing reservoirs, \$150,000; in all \$200,000. Contingent, \$35,000; care and custody of naval petroleum reserves, \$10,000; in all, \$245,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What are "oil proofing reservoirs?"

Mr. PADGETT. You will remember that Congress appropriated for and authorized the purchase and construction of a large oil storage basin or place at Yorktown, Va., putting the storage under ground instead of above ground in tanks as heretofore.

Mr. MANN. How does that come under an item headed "Depots for coal"?

Mr. PADGETT. Depots for coal and other fuel.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. The heading is "Depots for coal."

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. When we used to burn coal exclusively in the Navy—

Mr. MANN. Is that an erroneous heading?

Mr. PADGETT. It is used for coal and also for oil, and both have been appropriated for under that heading. Now, about the proofing—

Mr. MANN. I hope the Committee on Naval Affairs will some time learn to keep up with the progress of the times and change a heading when there is reason for it.

Mr. PADGETT. The Treasury Department object to the changing of the name.

Mr. MANN. Does the Treasury Department object to our legislating?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; but they did send down here a recommendation, which Congress in the last session agreed to, changing the names of certain appropriations, in order to put them back to what they had been before. Now, we sometimes appropriate for a coal station, and next year we will appropriate for a fuel station.

Mr. MANN. Why do you not say "depots for fuel," then?

Mr. PADGETT. Well, that would be a good designation.

Mr. MANN. This is misleading. A heading is there for the purpose of giving information, but it lies, because it does not give the right information.

Mr. PADGETT. It has been there all these years.

Mr. MANN. Well, it used to be "depots for coal." Now it is mainly depots for oil.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. This particular appropriation is. Several years ago it was all coal, and then it was coal and oil.

Mr. MANN. Having been for coal 20 years ago, the department and the Treasury Department, or somebody, thinks it ought to say "coal" now. I suppose they will continue to say "coal" after coal is not used.

Mr. PADGETT. In those times I do not know what they will say, because they will be so far off before we quit using coal.

Mr. MANN. I do not know about that.

Mr. PADGETT. But they are using them for both now.

Mr. MANN. I know they are, and the heading ought to so state.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the pro forma amendment. What is this "Contingent, \$35,000"?

Mr. PADGETT. That is for the purpose of providing a fund for taking care of, in the nature of repairs, various coaling stations and the fuel-oil stations, and so forth, that we have scattered all over the country, where we can not designate them and they can not be estimated for. It is a fund for the repair and upkeep and maintenance of the coaling and fuel stations all over the country.

Mr. WALSH. And if they do not have this continued appropriation of \$35,000 they could not repair those?

Mr. PADGETT. They would not have a specific fund.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, they would not have a specific fund, but they have got other funds, have they not?

Mr. PADGETT. They have not any other that they have estimated for. It has been carried that way heretofore.

Mr. WALSH. May I ask the gentleman what is this "care and custody of naval petroleum reserves"?

Mr. PADGETT. Under the administration of President Taft large areas of land were withdrawn and known as "petroleum reserves" for the benefit of the Navy, and this is a fund to enable the Secretary to guard and protect and keep off intruders and persons from going in there and sinking wells and various things of that kind. It is to care for and protect these many thousands of acres.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, it is reservations?

Mr. PADGETT. It is reservations.

Mr. WALSH. It is not a branch of the service like naval reserves?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no. It is a land reservation.

Mr. WALSH. I have never heard of a land reservation called a "reserve." I thought the designation was "reservation." Do they have to spend \$10,000 a year to keep marauders off the property?

Mr. PADGETT. That is the amount we have provided for several years. I do not know whether it is all expended or not. But if it is not expended it goes back into the Treasury. It is not a continuing appropriation.

Mr. WALSH. I understand these are reservations from which they are getting no supply?

Mr. PADGETT. Not at present. There are many thousands of acres in these reservations.

Mr. WALSH. Is Yorktown, Va., the only depot for coal that has an oil-proof reservoir?

Mr. PADGETT. Let me explain that. That applies to many of these reservoirs. There are many of them. They are scattered over many acres of land. They are for the storage of oil for the fleet. When they were constructed at the beginning

of the war we were expecting to have to use Mexican oil, which is a heavy oil.

Now, we can get American oil, and that is a finer, thinner oil. The sides of these storage tanks underground leak out this thinner, lighter oil; it permeates and goes through the sides of the walls. This is to go over the walls with a coating thicker and heavier and denser, so as to prevent the leaking of the oil from these underground storage tanks. Those tanks are made of concrete and stone and things of that kind.

Mr. WALSH. So that the only part of this item which will be available for expenditure at Yorktown, Va., is \$50,000 for the wharf?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. This other is for various points throughout the country?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. They are designated. The estimate was sent down to the committee in a lump sum. That was the way it was done for many years, until a few years ago, when the committee began to separate it. It was sent down in a lump sum this time, and the committee has separated it into the different points.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws the reservation of the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval operating base, Hampton Roads, Va.: Toward water-front improvements and permanent improvements to station, including piers, bulkheads, filling, grading, etc., \$1,000,000.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

Mr. FOSS. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee where this operating base is situated. Is it the old Jamestown Exposition?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it is the old Jamestown Exposition, including Piney Point, that runs out to deep water there.

Mr. FOSS. How much money has been expended and appropriated on this?

Mr. PADGETT. I could not tell you. The great bulk of it has been expended under lump-sum appropriations that were made by the Committee on Appropriations during the war, but it is a tremendous big sum.

Mr. FOSS. We originally bought the land?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; that cost, as I remember, about \$1,400,000.

Mr. FOSS. Did that include the buildings that were on it at the time?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. We put those buildings in repair, and that has cost a large sum—much more than was originally estimated.

Mr. FOSS. The purpose, then, as I understand, was that it should be used as a naval training station?

Mr. PADGETT. It has been used as a naval training station and operating base and a place for the storage of supplies, so that ships coming up that narrow, congested river can go there and get their supplies and stores. They have many activities there.

Mr. FOSS. They have made it more than simply a naval training station?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, yes; it is more than simply a naval training station.

Mr. FOSS. Although the original idea was simply to make it a naval training station?

Mr. PADGETT. I think it was called from the beginning an "operating base," but the activities there have been very greatly enlarged. When the war came on it was enlarged. Nearly all kinds of activities are carried on there, because, as the gentleman knows, it is the principal operating base of Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. FOSS. How many men have they been training at the training school?

Mr. PADGETT. Quite a large number. I think about 12,000 or 14,000 were trained there at one time.

Mr. FOSS. The gentleman can not tell, then, offhand how much has been expended there at the present time?

Mr. PADGETT. I think I could give you some of it. The appropriations made to date for the general development of the operating base, Hampton Roads, are as follows:

Act of June 15, 1917, establishment and development of the station, including \$1,200,000 for the purchase of the land, \$2,800,000. That would leave \$1,600,000 for improvement and development.

Act of March 28, 1918, additional compensation for property taken over, \$53,072.25. That is where it went over the \$1,200,000 that was appropriated.

The act of July 1, 1918, toward water-front improvement, permanent improvement of the station, including piers, bulkheads, filling, grading, and so forth, \$3,000,000.

The deficiency act of November 4, 1918, carried \$1,174,556.68. That would make something like \$7,000,000.

Mr. FOSS. My impression was that the water was rather shallow there.

Mr. PADGETT. Part of it is. They had to build some piers out there, but they are building some bulkheads and key walls out in the water and dredging behind them, and by that method they will add something like 500 acres of land to the original purchase.

Mr. FOSS. How many acres were there in the original purchase?

Mr. PADGETT. My recollection is that it was somewhere in the neighborhood of 600 acres.

Mr. FOSS. Six hundred?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I notice for the hearings just read that it is planned to spend a total of \$17,000,000 on this project down at the old Jamestown Exposition grounds.

Mr. PADGETT. That is what they told the committee it would cost, but we have appropriated only \$1,000,000. As to whether that total amount will be appropriated in the future will depend upon Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is involved in such an extensive program that will occasion an outlay of \$17,000,000?

Mr. PADGETT. A good deal of it is for dredging and filling, which I referred to, and also the building of piers out to deep water; and then the construction of their storage facilities and the grounds for the training, and all those things, which make an increased expense.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is this base to be used for purposes similar to that at Great Lakes Training Station?

Mr. PADGETT. No; Great Lakes is strictly a training station. That is inland, and they train men there on the Lakes. This one at Hampton Roads is the great supply base and the operating base for the fleet. That is the finest large harbor that we have on the Atlantic, and the principal naval base is there; and they will keep there the great supplies of stores and materials and all of those things that are required for the outfitting of the ships, and things of that kind.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I remember when the Jamestown Exposition was held. It was not a financial success; and after it was over it was desired to sell the exposition site to the Government of the United States. Various attempts were made. I am under the impression that Congress several times declined to make an appropriation or an authorization for that purpose, and I have a dim impression that at one time we provided against money being used for that purpose; but I now congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, who has always advocated the purchase of this site by the Government of the United States. There is nothing like persistence. The people who had this land found it of no use on earth to themselves, I guess, and no other customer for it, I presume, though probably that would not be admitted, and they finally worked it off on the Government. Almost anybody who is persistent enough and keeps at it, trying first one body of Congress and if not successful trying the other, and if not successful there going to the Executive—almost anybody who keeps at it, trying to unload something on the Government, finally succeeds. If you want the Government to adopt a reform or dismiss an official or dispense with an office, that seems to be hopeless. If you want to get the Government to buy something, just keep at it and keep at it, and after a while the Government will buy it at a fancy price.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval Hospital, Puget Sound, Wash.: Quarters for nurses (female), \$40,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss for a moment the strikes in the Puget Sound country. Beginning as strikes in the shipyards, these have spread to many other industries.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think there is any strike in the navy yard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; and I hope there will not be; but I understand that the metal workers on ships of the

United States Emergency Fleet Corporation threaten not only strikes in the navy yard, but strikes generally in the metal industries of the entire Pacific coast, and perhaps throughout the United States. The Puget Sound shipyard strikes have been followed by sympathetic strikes, even down to the barbers, a general strike having been called, even though same was not authorized by the general organization of the unions.

The strikes were preceded by a series of Sunday street meetings and near riots. At these meetings the red flag was displayed and vicious talks of revolution and destruction were made. By whom? In many cases, Mr. Chairman, by men who owe no allegiance to the United States; by men who, in my opinion, should not be permitted to remain in the United States one single minute. After one of the recent Sunday riots in Seattle the authorities arrested 13 ringleaders and took their names. There was an array of Slavinskys and names of that sort.

Out of the 13 riot leaders, only 2 were Americans, of whom I said he wished he was not an American. The other 11 were aliens, and half of the remaining 11 were Russians. Think of it! Preaching revolution on the north Pacific, handing out literature labeled "Political democracy is an empty dream," and the like. From Russia they came, and to Russia they should be made to go. In Russia right now they can find more liberty than they know what to do with. We have laws on our statute books that provide for their deportation, and all aliens like them. If our Government officials will proceed under the Federal laws which we have enacted here in Congress, and deport those aliens who come here undertaking to tell how to run our Government and our affairs, we will have less trouble from these strikes. What kind of a socialistic government do these alien agitators desire to give us—the Russian kind, the German kind, or no government at all but anarchy and destruction, loot and plunder, murder and savagery? Why have not the deportations started? People can think of that as they are suffering from strikes which paralyze every activity in two great cities of the Pacific Northwest.

I have often wondered why it is that so many people in the United States are willing that these foreigners shall continue to come. How long can we permit them to come to preach from soap-box pulpits, telling us how to run our Government on an international plan? Why are they allowed to remain? If any of us should go to Russia, Japan, or any other country, and undertake to tell the people of those countries how to run their Governments and operate their affairs, we would meet with short shrift. It is time for the United States to get busy and do a little something on its own account for its own people. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Total public works, \$11,414,350, and the amounts herein appropriated therefor, except for repairs and preservation at navy yards and stations, shall be available until expended.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. What is the necessity of making these vast appropriations, totaling \$11,000,000, available until expended?

Mr. PADGETT. Congress has always made appropriations for public works, for Bureau of Yards and Docks, and other appropriations for this work, available until expended, because if you start a building you can not complete it in a year, and it might run from one year to another; they have always been made available until expended. That has been the general policy.

Mr. WALSH. As the result of that policy we have been called upon frequently to increase the limit of cost on these projects. If we give some indication that we are not going to be persuaded so easily to increase the limit of cost of these various projects, we might find some of them built within the limit, as with the case of the naval dock at Norfolk, the completion of which, I understand, is to be celebrated soon. Of course, in reference to the appropriations for the military branch, there is a constitutional inhibition against their being made for more than two years in advance. I do not know whether that would be construed to apply to the naval appropriations or not.

Mr. PADGETT. I did not quite catch the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. WALSH. I say there is a constitutional inhibition with reference to the appropriation for the military branch of the Government.

Mr. PADGETT. That does not apply to the Navy—only to the Army.

Mr. WALSH. I take it that it does not. But I think we ought not to put in a provision to make these appropriations available until expended. It seems to me that by doing that, by continuing it over a long period, Congress would have very

little control and jurisdiction over it and would likewise be in a position where it would not have very much information about it. The only difference, as I understand it, is that if this provision is not put in, when the next bill comes up they will have to come back and ask for a reappropriation, or a further appropriation, to complete the project.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but when they start out to make the plans and specifications the year may expire and then they would be tied up. The appropriation bills are indefinite as to the time when they are to become a law. It would no doubt result seriously to the economic and proper execution of the erection of public buildings.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I take it that a large share of these public works are constructed under contract, and it is not feasible to make the contract for public construction on a one-year appropriation. That is the reason under existing law for the covering-in act. I do not know whether the covering-in act would cover in all these appropriations or not, but the bill assumes that it would or else it would not make them available until expended. These things that are supposed in the main to be done by contract may require practically a year in which to formulate the contract and much more time to complete it. The appropriations are not covered back at the end of the time specified by the covering-in act.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that if we make an appropriation for a building that may cost a million dollars that can not be completed within the year, that unless we made the appropriation available until expended the authorities could not enter into a contract?

Mr. MANN. They could not enter into a contract unless we gave the authorization to enter into the contract. That we frequently do.

Mr. WALSH. The appropriations do that.

Mr. MANN. The appropriations authorize the making of a contract; that is true. They could make the contract within the year, but it is a very common thing to provide an appropriation with an authorization to make the contract for a much larger amount. But the amounts in this bill, probably in the main, would not warrant that, and it is desirable, I think, to permit the appropriation when made to be available for the completion of the project, so that they can make the contracts and proceed on the theory that they have the money. They could not make a contract beyond the authorization under existing law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a statement under the reservation of a point of order. I understand that if we authorize the construction and appropriate the money for any project, such as are included in this item, that the naval authorities have the right to contract for the construction within the year, and the money then remains available for two years additional. If it is contracted for within the time of the authorization of the appropriation act—

Mr. MANN. It remains available for the payment of obligations incurred within the year.

Mr. STAFFORD. And remains available for two years thereafter.

Mr. MANN. If the obligations were incurred during the year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be apropos to this discussion to read into the Record the covering-in act:

Sec. 5. That from and after the 1st day of July, 1874, and of each year thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause all unexpended balances of appropriations which shall have remained on the books of the Treasury for two fiscal years to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to permanent specific appropriations, appropriations for rivers and harbors, lighthouses, fortifications, public buildings, or the pay of the Navy and Marine Corps; but the appropriations named in this proviso shall continue available until otherwise ordered by Congress, and this provision shall not apply to any unexpended balance of the appropriation made by the act approved December 21, 1871, for expenses that may be incurred under articles 1 to 9 of the treaty with Great Britain, concluded May 8, 1871, which balance the act approved March 3, 1873, authorized to be expended to enable the President to fulfill the stipulations contained in the twentieth, twenty-second, twenty-third, twenty-fourth, and twenty-fifth articles of said treaty: *And provided further*, That this section shall not operate to prevent the fulfillment of contracts existing at the date of the passage of this act; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall, at the beginning of each session, report to Congress, with his annual estimates, any balances of appropriations for specific objects affected by this section that may need to be reappropriated.

Under the wording of that section this appropriation would be available for two years.

Mr. MANN. Available for two years for the payment of obligations.

Mr. STAFFORD. And if for specific objects it is continued available for all time, because it is one of the exceptions of the covering-in act.

Mr. MANN. As I said a while ago, I was not sure whether the covering-in act would apply to these cases or not. The matter is carried in the bill. If the covering-in act applies, I think the provision ought to stay in, as it is on all fours with the exceptions in the covering-in act.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will recall that about six years ago a resolution was brought in from the Naval Affairs Committee authorizing all of the unexpended appropriations heretofore voted for the navy yard at New Orleans, running into hundreds of thousands of dollars, and running back for many years, to be utilized for certain new construction. It is not good policy to allow these unexpended appropriations to remain authorized for all time and not to be turned back into the Treasury. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to make the point of order. I think that the act that has been read by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is plain as to what the covering-in requirement is. This is a provision to take this out of the general law relating to appropriations. I do not think, with two years within which they can make payment of the projects provided for in this bill, provided they are authorized, we ought to permit these appropriations to run along interminably. There ought to be some way of checking up from time to time, and the Committee on Naval Affairs ought to be in a position to ascertain. The gentleman was asked only a short time ago what was the cost of the dry dock at Pearl Harbor. He said it started in at about \$3,000,000 and they raised it a million dollars and it climbed up somewhat.

Mr. PADGETT. The limit of cost in the dry dock at Pearl Harbor was accounted for by the hydrostatic pressure of water coming up through the porous coral underneath, which lifted the whole works up into the air. When they pumped the water out of the basin of the dock it was the hydrostatic pressure which caused the trouble. That was the delay and the cause of the increase in the limit of cost.

Mr. WALSH. It was the hydrostatic pressure of the water at Pearl Harbor and the hydrostatic pressure of the mud at Philadelphia. Of course, there is always some reason for raising the limit, and sometimes the reason is more disappointing in some cases than in others. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. On what part?

Mr. WALSH. It is the whole thing.

Mr. PADGETT. It is on that part after the total?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts does not make the point of order against the words "total public works, \$11,414,350"?

Mr. WALSH. I think that might as well go out, as they do not add anything to the statute; but I do not care about them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order to that part of the paragraph after the figures "\$11,414,350."

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery: For tolls and ferriages; care, transportation, and burial of the dead, including officers and enlisted men who die within the United States, and supernumerary patients who die in naval hospitals; purchase of cemetery lots; purchase of books and stationery, binding of medical records, unbound books, and pamphlets; hygienic and sanitary investigation and illustration; sanitary and hygienic instruction; purchase and repairs of nonpassenger-carrying wagons, automobile ambulances, and harness; purchase of and feed for horses and cows; maintenance, repair, and operation of two passenger-carrying motor vehicles for naval dispensary, Washington, D. C., and of one motor-propelled vehicle for official use only for the medical officer on out-patient medical service at the Naval Academy, and of a motor omnibus for the transportation of convalescent patients and attendants at the Naval Hospital at Las Animas, Colo., to be used only for official purposes; trees, plants, care of grounds, garden tools, and seeds; incidental articles for the Naval Medical School and naval dispensary, Washington, naval medical-supply depots, sick quarters at Naval Academy and marine barracks; washing for medical department at Naval Medical School and naval dispensary, Washington, naval medical-supply depots, sick quarters at Naval Academy and marine barracks, dispensaries at navy yards and naval stations, and ships; and for minor repairs on buildings and grounds of the United States Naval Medical School and naval medical-supply depots; rent of rooms for naval dispensary, Washington, D. C., not to exceed \$1,200; for the care, maintenance, and treatment of the insane of the Navy and Marine Corps on the Pacific coast, including supernumeraries held for transfer to the Government Hospital for the Insane; for dental outfits and dental material, and all other necessary contingent expenses; in all, \$1,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. Will the chairman of the committee indicate to the House what is meant by the designation "supernumerary patients"?

Mr. PADGETT. Say that a man is sent as a patient to the hospital, and while he is in the hospital his term of enlistment expires. He is really no longer in the service, but they do not turn him out. They take care of him and treat him until he gets well or until he dies. He is regarded as a supernumerary in the hospital.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is quite a term to apply to a discharged sailor,

Mr. PADGETT. He is not discharged. They do not discharge him. They keep him there. His term of enlistment expires; they do not discharge him. They treat him all of the time until he is well or dies.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is also proposed in this paragraph to appropriate money for authorizing the purchase of cemetery lots.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; to buy a lot to bury a man in if he has nothing and there is no place to bury him.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is not an authorization to purchase large grounds for the burial of sailors who have lost their lives in connection with the European war?

Mr. PADGETT. Nothing of that kind.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice in the following paragraph authorization is provided for the transportation of the remains of the deceased sailors.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order that I may refer briefly to the case of Capt. Henry Harvey, who recently came to Philadelphia upon the steamship *Haverford*, the first troopship to run to the port of Philadelphia. Concerning Capt. Harvey, my friend Mr. P. F. Young, manager of the International Mercantile Marine Lines, has written me in substance that Capt. Harvey was the officer in charge of the White Star liner *Persic*, which sailed from Boston for London about August 25, 1918, carrying about 2,100 American soldiers, for landing at London or some other port to be designated by the authorities there upon arrival; that when about 40 miles northwest of the Scilly Islands the *Persic* was torpedoed. This was about 2.50 p. m. on September 7, 1918. Signals were at once passed with the British destroyers and other ships in the neighborhood, and the transfer of American troops to British destroyers or other craft was immediately started, with the result that all of the 2,100 American troops were safely transferred to British and other vessels at 4.45 p. m., a matter of less than two hours. Also, practically all of the equipment belonging to the troops was safely transferred and the troops were sent to a British camp at Salisbury Plains. So far as the *Persic* itself is concerned, Capt. Harvey handled the vessel in such a way that he finally brought her safely into Marys Roads, Scilly Islands, and the ship is still in existence and it is hoped will be in commission again at no distant date. My correspondent, Mr. Young, who keeps well posted in matters of this kind, advises me that Capt. Harvey for this persistently heroic service has been recognized in several ways by the British authorities; that they have conferred certain honors upon him; and Mr. Young rather laments the fact that no such honors have been bestowed upon the captain by any of the United States authorities. It is suggested that something might be done to give encouragement to officers of proven heroism, as in this case.

I do not care to introduce a special bill on this subject because of the numerous instances of heroism displayed by American officers and men during this war, but the captain deserves honorable mention.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman will bear in mind that just a few weeks ago the Senate passed a bill which had been passed by the House in a former session, and which has been approved recently by the President, authorizing the award of medals—congressional medals or medals of distinguished services, badges, and so forth—and I understand that is under consideration now for the purpose of giving the benefits of it to those who deserve it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am thankful to the gentleman for having made that statement.

Mr. PADGETT. This act just became a law recently, having been passed by the Senate.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman again for that statement.

Mr. BUTLER. The House passed that bill six or eight months ago.

Mr. PADGETT. It was during the last session, and it went over to the present session of the Congress in the Senate, and the Senate passed it recently, and I noticed in the papers the other day that it had been approved by the President and was being taken into consideration with a view of its execution.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I say I would not care to introduce a bill in this particular case because of the many other cases of heroism displayed by officers and men of the Navy and of the Army, and I am gratified to have made the statement that provision has been made to give special recognition to men of proven heroism in the war on land and sea.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bringing home remains of officers, etc., Navy Department: To enable the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to cause to be transferred to their homes the remains of officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps, of members of the Nurse Corps, of civilian officers and crews of naval auxiliaries, and of officers and enlisted men of the Naval Militia and National Naval Volunteers and the Naval Reserve Force when on active service with the Navy, who die or are killed in action ashore or afloat, and also to enable the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to cause to be transported to their homes the remains of civilian employees who die outside of the continental limits of the United States, \$700,000: *Provided*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be available for payment for transportation of the remains of officers and men who have died while on duty at any time since April 21, 1898, and shall be available until June 30, 1921.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item for the transportation of the remains of deceased sailors, marines, and civilians brings up the subject as to what the policy of the Navy is going to be in the transportation of the remains of those who died abroad during the European war.

Mr. PADGETT. The committee went into that both at this session and at the last. It is the fixed purpose of the Navy to return the bodies of everyone who died abroad and if practical keep up with that. The Navy has a much smaller proposition than the Army in reference to that, because their men largely are on ships, and when a man dies on ship he is brought back immediately. If they died over in France and they are buried there, they have to remain there until negotiations can be made with the French Government for the removal of the remains. The gentleman knows France has a law prohibiting the disinterment of bodies within a certain time after burial.

Mr. STAFFORD. The reason why I brought this up is because of the changed position of the War Department. At the very outbreak of hostilities we were informed that at the close of the war, when it was opportune in relation to transportation facilities, that the remains of all our deceased soldiers would be brought back at Government expense. That was the information I obtained from the Cemeterial Division, Quartermaster Corps. It was also supplemented by information from The Adjutant General's Office. Now, within a week or 10 days information comes to us through the Committee on Appropriations that it is not going to be the policy of the War Department to bring back the remains of deceased soldiers.

Mr. IGOE. When was that change made, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. STAFFORD. It surprised us. That was called to our attention in the Committee on Appropriations. After we had been given assurances by any number of departmental officials that it was the set policy to bring them back, now we learn the policy of the War Department is to be changed. I know the change of the position of the department surprised any number of members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PADGETT. May I interrupt the gentleman a moment? I will state I had been informed at the office of The Adjutant General by The Adjutant General himself that it was the purpose to return the remains of all soldiers who died abroad.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to confirm that by saying The Adjutant General himself in the legislative subcommittee testified to that, but recently it seems there has been a new policy adopted by the War Department reversing its former position.

Mr. PADGETT. He went further and stated that a family would not be permitted to bring them back on their own account, because the Government would bring them back for them, and that before they were brought back the families would be communicated with to ascertain definitely their wishes as to whether they should be buried in a national cemetery or delivered to the family at their home, and I had not heard anything to the contrary.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was stated originally that the remains of all the deceased soldiers would be brought back unless the immediate family should request that they should not be brought back.

Mr. PADGETT. That statement was made to me also.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope, if it is true, Congress will take such action as is necessary to insure the bringing back of the bodies of these soldiers whose folks desire that to be done. We have all had a good many inquiries from relatives of soldiers who died in France inquiring as to whether or not their remains would be brought back to the United States, and requesting that that be done. Now, I think after we have assured these folks on the statement of the War Department that that would be the case that not to do that would be an outrage upon those people in this country whose sons have died for their country.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman able to tell me whether the War Department is now bringing back the remains?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I understand they are not. And they have said in the communications I have had from them that they can not bring them back now on account of shipping conditions, but later on they propose to bring back the body of every boy who died in Europe if his friends desire. If not there would be appropriate action taken for the establishment of a national cemetery in France. Now, I think it would be a very, very bad thing if the Government and the War Department should decide they were not going to do this.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Adjutant General a few days ago informed me it was intended to assume that everybody wanted their relatives brought back unless there was advice to the contrary.

Mr. STAFFORD. How recent was that?

Mr. BARKLEY. Within the last week.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am surprised at the variance in the information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like just two minutes more. I think if the gentleman has information that it is going to be the policy of the department to do that, Congress ought to take prompt action.

Mr. MANN. To do what?

Mr. FOSTER. To assure the people of this country that the bodies of the boys are going to be brought back at such time as it can be done. Of course, we realize it can not be done now.

Mr. STAFFORD. At the last meeting of the Committee on Appropriations the information was conveyed to us by the chairman that he had received information from the War Department a few days before that the policy of the War Department was not to bring back the interred remains of the deceased soldiers. It struck us all with surprise, because we had been under the impression that the set policy of the department was to bring them back as soon as transportation facilities were afforded.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be a mistake for the Government not to do it. Relatives in this country of boys who have died in France feel that they want those remains brought back here so that they may be buried in the family lot in a cemetery near their home. Now, not to do that would be, I think, very bad for the country.

Mr. MANN. In some cases they want the remains brought back, and in some cases they would like to have the remains stay where they now rest, and I think in many cases they would like to have the Government own and take care of a cemetery over there where the remains could be placed and taken care of.

Mr. FOSTER. I think, with my colleague, that some of them want that, but if their preference is to bring them back the Government ought to bring them back.

Mr. MANN. I agree with that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for an extra minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. EMERSON. I understand that these soldiers were buried on the field as they fell behind the lines, and not in caskets or coffins, and with no protection but the uniform and blanket. Is that so?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not informed as to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to say the information is that it was absolutely impossible in the midst of battle to provide coffins, and they were buried in quickly provided graves, but the graves were marked as far as it was practicable.

Mr. FOSTER. I was talking with a soldier from France a few days ago who helped to bury some of the soldiers killed in battle. He said there was difficulty in identifying them, because they had to bury these boys at night, on account of the battle going on, and they took from their bodies the identification tags. They said when they came back to the lines and took those tags out of their pockets they found some of them blank. They do not know whom they buried in the graves, and until the bodies are finally taken up they will not know who were buried there.

Mr. EMERSON. The sooner they are brought back the better we can identify them.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word on this subject, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON] has expired. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MANN. Justice McCoy, of this city, many years a Member of this House, had a boy who was killed in France. He wrote a letter to one of the papers here in the city recently, the Star, I think—and I have a copy of his letter—in which he stated—and I will not be absolutely accurate as to the details, but the substance of it was—that he asked some friend to visit the place where his son was buried. That was done, and they found the grave was marked, but the marking was almost indistinguishable and would soon be entirely gone. He asked permission of the War Department to put some kind of a mark there which would stay, but was refused that permission.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. The statement was made in this connection that some of these graves were marked with paper tags.

Mr. BUTLER. I saw them.

Mr. MANN. And that was the only marking there was. The War Department put nothing else on and would allow no one to put anything else there.

Mr. HASTINGS. Why?

Mr. MANN. That is one of the mysteries of life to me. I do not know why.

Mr. HASTINGS. There was no reason given?

Mr. BUTLER. No reason given.

Mr. MANN. To bring home a coffin without a name being given they will not know where it came from. It is perfectly possible that they may in the future bring home a coffin under a name, but they will not know where it came from or who lies within it.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, there is in the Quartermaster Corps of the Army, under the direction of the War Department, a section called the "Grave Registration Service." I believe that is the technical name for it. At any rate it is a branch of the service whose duty it is to gather the bodies of the dead on the field of battle and elsewhere, to inter them as best they can be interred under the circumstances and to mark the graves so that they may be easily found and identified thereafter. It is done under a provision of law and the regulations of the War Department. Whether those regulations are carried out or not I can not say. The last time this matter was up before the Committee on Military Affairs it was taken for granted, when spoken of, that the originally announced policy of the War Department would be carried out. It has been stated and reiterated that the bodies of the dead will be returned to this country as soon as the war is over and transportation facilities are in such shape that they can be brought. It has been emphasized that this will be done certainly in every case where there is a request that it shall be done, and that the body will be delivered at the home of the parents or relatives of the deceased.

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

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Adjutant General, in this same conversation to which I referred a moment ago, advised me that the department was preparing to send out a letter to every parent or relative who had lost a boy in France, asking what their wishes were in reference to this matter, and that those plans would be carried out as soon as the shipping facilities were ample.

Mr. TILSON. That is in entire accord with the understanding of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CARAWAY. If the gentleman will yield to me just one moment, the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I think, is calculated to carry distress to the relatives of soldiers who died in France. I wanted to say this, that I think I saw the graves of thousands of them and they were all marked, and the markings were permanent. They would last for years, I think. I hope the gentleman's informant was mistaken—that they were marked with paper.

Mr. TILSON. It is the intention of the law, I am sure, that they should be durably marked.

Mr. MANN. I quoted a letter from Mr. Justice McCoy, who for many years was a prominent Member of this House.

Mr. CARAWAY. I understood the gentleman to say that the graves were marked with paper.

Mr. MANN. He said somebody else made that statement.

Mr. CARAWAY. I hope that the person who informed Justice McCoy was mistaken. I saw none of that kind.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Many of the Members, of course, have visited the battle fields of France, and I think those who have visited those fields will bear out the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas and contradict the statement of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. TILSON. A system of identification tags was devised whereby each soldier can be identified, and, as I recall, one of those tags is supposed to be buried with each body. Of course that can not always be done, but where the intention of the

law and regulations is carried out the bodies of the dead are buried as best they can be under the circumstances and marked as best they can be marked. Of course there will be instances where those things are not done. There are men who are careless about the proper performance of their duties, even the performance of so sacred a duty as the burial of the soldier dead.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of the Navy: Pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty and other duty, and officers on waiting orders, \$34,198,686; officers on the retired list, \$3,620,188; commutation of quarters for officers, including boatswains, gunners, carpenters, sailmakers, machinists, pharmacists, pay clerks, and mates, naval constructors, and assistant naval constructors, \$2,019,312, and also members of Nurse Corps (female), \$44,200; for hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government, and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them, or commutation of quarters not to exceed the amount which an officer would receive were he not serving with troops and hire of quarters for officers and enlisted men on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable, \$25,000; pay of enlisted men on the retired list, \$501,300; extra pay to men reenlisting under honorable discharge, \$3,250,000; interest on deposit by men, \$30,000; pay of petty officers, seamen, landsmen, and apprentice seamen, including men in the engineers' force and men detailed for duty with the Fish Commission, 181,485 men, plus 11,000 men in trade schools; and pay of enlisted men of the Hospital Corps, \$105,639,570; pay of enlisted men undergoing sentence of court-martial, \$1,866,600, and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint; and 20,000 apprentice seamen under training at training stations and on board training ships, at the pay prescribed by law, \$9,388,800; pay of the Nurse Corps, \$1,392,600; rent of quarters for members of the Nurse Corps, \$55,800; retainer pay and active-service pay of members of the Naval Reserve Force, \$31,763,256; in all, \$193,795,312; and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Pay of the Navy" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law as "Pay of the Navy," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That hereafter the Pay Corps shall be called the Supply Corps.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to offer some amendments reducing the amount on account of the offer made there.

Mr. MANN. Why do you propose to change the name of Pay Corps to "Supply Corps"? A little while ago you would not change the name of "coal yard" to "fuel yard," because you said it would not do to change a name, although most of the fuel was petroleum and not coal.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman's statement is stronger than mine. I said it had been done that way. The matter had not been called to our attention.

Mr. MANN. It was called to your attention then, and you still declined to change it. You said the Secretary of the Treasury objected to a change.

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary of the Treasury has recommended this because it suits better than "Pay Corps," because they do much more than merely pay. They furnish supplies and they buy and distribute supplies as well as pay. They furnish equipment.

Mr. MANN. Their main business is to pay out money, is it not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but they make purchases, too.

Mr. MANN. Their main business is paying out money. They must pay for all they buy. Besides buying things and paying for them, they pay salaries—compensation. Everybody knows what "Pay Corps" means, but nobody would know what "supply corps" means. I dislike to stand in the way of anything of that sort, but it seems to me to be a ridiculous proposition. We have had a Pay Corps for years. We have paymasters. They will want to call themselves "supply masters," I suppose, just because somebody had a nightmare one night and thought it would be a good thing to change the name. That is all there is to it.

Mr. PADGETT. It was submitted by the Secretary and recommended very earnestly by the Paymaster General. It is not a material matter, however, and if it should go out it would leave the other.

Mr. MANN. If there is any reason for it, I am willing to admit the reason, but I have not heard of any yet.

Mr. PADGETT. Here is what the Secretary says:

In connection with the hearing of the appropriation bill, it is suggested that the following language be substituted for "Pay Corps": "Hereafter the Pay Corps shall be called the 'Supply Corps.'"

This is in pursuance of General Order 163, dated October 15, 1915, which provides that "The Supply Department shall hereafter embrace all work now included, respectively, in the General Storekeeper's Department on shore and the combined Storekeepers', Commissary, and Pay Department afloat, the officer in charge thereof to be known as a supply officer." Pay is only a minor, though important, part of the supply

officer's daily duty, and the designation "supply corps" indicates more clearly the character of the duties performed by the officers of that corps.

Sincerely,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS,  
Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. GARNER. According to this letter, we have had it since 1915 anyway, whether the law authorizes it or not.

Mr. MANN. Very likely the law authorized the consolidation, I do not know.

Mr. PADGETT. It authorized the consolidation, but the name has been "Pay Corps" until now. It was in pursuance of that recommendation that the committee included this paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I think I am foolish for doing it, but I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I offer an amendment.

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

Mr. PADGETT. On page 31, line 8, I move to strike out "\$193,795,312" and insert "\$178,280,872."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PADGETT offers the following amendment: Page 31, line 8, strike out "\$193,795,312" and insert in lieu thereof "\$178,280,872."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the reason that I offer this amendment, and that I will offer others, is on account of the point of order being sustained against the item providing for the making permanent of the increased pay, which this appropriation embraced. This carries with it a reduction of \$15,514,440. It is based on the assumption that by the 1st of July, the end of the present fiscal year, peace will have been proclaimed, and under existing law the increased pay runs for six months after the proclamation of peace. Then after that six months it will be upon the basis of the provision of this bill, and that provision having gone out on a point of order, I thought I should move to reduce this amount accordingly.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman proposes to reduce the last item in the bill, which is merely an addition.

Mr. PADGETT. I know, but I am coming to the others.

Mr. MANN. I should suggest that the gentleman offer them all together.

Mr. PADGETT. In line 5, page 31, I move to strike out "\$9,388,800" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,328,800."

In line 24, page 30, I move to strike out "\$105,639,570" and to insert "\$92,285,130." That makes the separate items agree with the total.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 24, strike out "\$105,639,570" and insert "\$92,285,130." Page 31, line 5, strike out "\$9,388,800" and insert "\$7,328,800."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, including the one first reported.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. In conformity with the language providing for the 225,000 men, or where it did not designate them, there is a designation here which was overlooked, and in line 21, page 30, I want to move to strike out the words "one hundred and eighty-one thousand four hundred and eighty-five" and substitute the word "enlisted," so that it will read "enlisted men" instead of "one hundred and eighty-one thousand four hundred and eighty-five men."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 21, strike out "one hundred and eighty-one thousand four hundred and eighty-five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "enlisted."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, in line 22, on page 30, I move to strike out the words "plus eleven thousand," so that it will read "men in trade schools." The whole of it is determined by the former provision of 225,000 men.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 22, strike out the words "plus eleven thousand."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, on page 31, I move to strike out, in line 3, the words "twenty thousand," so that it will read "and apprentice seamen."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 3, strike out the words "twenty thousand."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman explain his purpose in trying to make the bill less specific, so that the House will not hereafter know the number of men for whom we are appropriating?

Mr. PADGETT. We do know. This provides for a temporary force of 225,000 men, including all the ratings, apprentice seamen and all, but it did not distribute them in the former paragraph with reference to providing for the temporary increase. Now, this increase here was on the original basis of 225,000, and by striking this out it leaves it temporarily governed by the 225,000, and then at the end of the fiscal year, unless there is additional legislation, it reverts to the 131,485, plus 6,000 apprentice seamen, plus the Hospital Corps, which is defined under the general law; and this is simply to make it conform to the 225,000, which by express words embraces all of the enlisted men of all ratings.

Mr. STAFFORD. With the elimination of the "plus 11,000" Congress will never hereafter know how many men are being provided for in the trade schools.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; because it is limited. For this present year it will not, but unless Congress legislates some more it goes back to the permanent establishment of 131,000, plus 6,000 apprentice seamen, plus the Hospital Corps, and Congress would have to authorize them if there were any more.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under that basis how many men will there be in the trade schools if we strike out the "plus 11,000" enlisted men?

Mr. PADGETT. There is no provision for that. That is under the permanent law, and they just designate the number of men that they need to go in there. This was with reference to the temporary strength, and provided an additional allotment out of the temporary strength.

Mr. STAFFORD. For years you have carried, have you not, a limitation on the men in the trade schools plus 11,000?

Mr. PADGETT. No; the 11,000 is only in this bill.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provisions, Navy: For provisions and commuted rations for the seamen and marines, which commuted rations may be paid to caterers of messes, in case of death or desertion, upon orders of the commanding officers, commuted rations for officers on sea duty (other than commissioned officers of the line, Medical and Pay Corps, chaplains, chief boatswains, chief gunners, chief carpenters, chief machinists, chief pay clerks, and chief sailmakers) and midshipmen at 68 cents per diem, and commuted rations stopped on account of sick in hospital and credited at the rate of 50 cents per ration to the naval hospital fund; subsistence of officers and men unavoidably detained or absent from vessels to which attached under orders (during which subsistence rations to be stopped on board ship and no credit for commutation therefor to be given); subsistence of men on detached duty; subsistence of officers and men of the Coast Guard and Lighthouse Services while cooperating with the Navy in so far as the regular appropriations for these services are insufficient therefor; subsistence of officers and men of the naval auxiliary service; subsistence of members of the Naval Reserve Force during period of active service; and for subsistence of female nurses and Navy and Marine Corps general courts-martial prisoners undergoing imprisonment with sentences of dishonorable discharge from the service at the expiration of such confinement: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to commute rations for such general courts-martial prisoners in such amounts as seem to him proper, which may vary in accordance with the location of the naval prison, but which shall in no case exceed 30 cents per diem for each ration so commuted; and for the purchase of United States Army emergency rations as required; in all, \$53,746,185, to be available until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. Will the gentleman inform the House as to the change from existing law, so far as the additional subsistence is allowed?

Mr. PADGETT. As I recall it at the present time, it is 68 cents for midshipmen in the academy.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the present rate is 50 cents?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I think it is 40 cents. The Hospital Corps is 50 cents under existing law, but my recollection of the midshipmen is that it is 40 cents.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain the reason for the increase of allowance for subsistence in the case of midshipmen?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; out of their allowance of \$600 a year they are required to pay a considerable contribution toward the maintenance of themselves in the academy. The 40 cents does not do it and the 68 cents will not do it. This was to give them the benefit of this rate at 68 cents to pay for the three meals a day, instead of 40 cents.

Mr. STAFFORD. How long has the rate of 40 cents prevailed?

Mr. PADGETT. I think since about two years ago; about the beginning of the war.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any information as to the actual cost of the rations per day throughout the year?

Mr. PADGETT. We are told that it is costing now close to a dollar for the three meals.

Mr. STAFFORD. I remember some report on the question showing the cost per ration, but I did not think it had gone up to so high a figure, except for the officers.

Mr. PADGETT. The superintendent advised us that it cost about a dollar.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee with reference to the subsistence for officers and men of the Lighthouse Service and the Coast Guard. The subsistence provided in this paragraph is only sufficient for this service, is that it?

Mr. PADGETT. That language was inserted on account of legislation putting the Coast Guard under the Navy during the war. It appeared in the bill for the first time last year, and I think the Lighthouse Service also. That language was inserted the first time last year because operating with the Navy it had to care for them.

Mr. WALSH. There are also officers and men in the Fisheries Bureau operating under the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think they operate with the Navy. The legislation, as I remember, took in the Lighthouse and the Coast Guard, but I do not think it took in the Fisheries. There are certain men in the Navy detailed to work with the Fish Commission, and the Navy operate some vessels of the Fish Commission.

Mr. WALSH. The *Albatross* and the *Fish Hawk*.

Mr. PADGETT. There are naval men detailed to the Fisheries Commission, but the Fisheries Commission does not by operation of the law come under the naval authority like the Coast Guard and the Lighthouse Service.

Mr. WALSH. The Navy has operated some vessels of the Bureau of Fisheries, and they have been turned over to them since we went into the war, and I think one or more vessels with the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Do the officers and men get an allowance for subsistence under this paragraph?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; they get the same as the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. What is the necessity, then, for this language, "officers and men of the Coast Guard and Lighthouse Service"?

Mr. PADGETT. So as to give authority to regard them as a part of the Navy. They belong in the Treasury Department in time of peace, and as soon as peace is declared they go back to the Treasury Department.

Mr. WALSH. The officers and men of the Bureau of Fisheries, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, belong to the Department of Commerce, but there is no authorization in this paragraph to give them any subsistence.

Mr. PADGETT. They do not operate with the Navy. Some of the men of the Navy are operating to help run the ships of the Fisheries Commission. For years they have carried a provision for men detailed with the Fisheries Commission.

Mr. WALSH. Is it possible that they have taken over the steamers but not the personnel?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know that the Navy has taken over any vessels of the Fish Commission. They operate them for the Fish Commission. They are not operating them for the Navy. They are putting men there to work for the Fish Commission.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman has in mind the steamers *Fish Hawk* and *Albatross*, which are naval vessels; one is, and I think both; they have been detailed to the Bureau of Fisheries.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And they have naval crews for them; but the sundry civil appropriation bill carries an item for one or two of them, but during the war, I think, there have been other vessels of the Fishery Service and, if I am not mistaken, one or more of the Coast and Geodetic vessels that have been transferred to the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. I have no information as to that. I could not give the gentleman any light or information on that, because I do not know.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman does not know, if the personnel are transferred, whether they are getting any subsistence or not?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know of any of them being transferred. I do not know that any of the fish men had been taken over by the Navy. I knew that the Navy was detaching men from the Navy to cooperate with and help the Fish Com-

mission, but I did not know that the Navy had taken over any of the Fish Commission's boats.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, before the Clerk proceeds to read I move to strike out the last word. This item provides for the commutation of rations of prisoners of courts-martial, and the preceding one provided for the payment of enlisted men undergoing sentence of courts-martial, to the amount of \$1,866,000. That seems a very large amount and would indicate that a very large number of men are provided for under court-martial sentence. Does the gentleman know how many there are?

Mr. PADGETT. No. There has been a very perceptible increase in the number. There has perhaps been also some increase in the percentage. I understand that since the signing of the armistice the percentage of the number of men deserting has been very much increased. Men have been deserting considerably since the signing of the armistice.

Mr. MANN. I was told recently that at one place down here there were quite a number of men of the Navy surrounded by a high fence, under guard, not permitted to go away, because at some place when an officer came in he thought the sailors or the men there were not sufficiently active in rising to salute him. Hence they had the whole bunch in confinement.

Mr. PADGETT. I have never heard of that.

Mr. MANN. They have nothing to do. They ought to have been discharged. There they were keeping them guarded behind a 10-foot fence, the statement was made.

Mr. PADGETT. I have never heard of that, and I can neither admit nor deny it. I doubt very much the accuracy of the information.

Mr. MANN. In that case I think I shall bring the information to the House some day and let the House see whether the Navy Department knows about it.

Mr. CLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I will state that right in front of my house, on the Shore Road in Brooklyn, there is a 10-foot fence, and they are in there very much as the gentleman says.

Mr. PADGETT. What are they in there for?

Mr. CLEARY. Simply resting there, waiting to be discharged.

Mr. MANN. Those I speak of are not at that place.

Mr. CLEARY. They are overseas men.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman from Illinois was speaking of prisoners.

Mr. CLEARY. Oh, the ones that I speak of are not prisoners.

Mr. MANN. If they are surrounded by a 10-foot fence and are guarded, what, in God's name, do you call them if they are not prisoners?

Mr. PADGETT. He did not say they were prisoners. They keep guards around all camps and stations, but they are at liberty to come and go.

Mr. MANN. Oh, but that is just it—they are not.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts: For fuel; the removal and transportation of ashes and garbage from ships of war; books, blanks, and stationery, including stationery for commanding and navigating officers of ships, chaplains on shore and afloat, and for the use of courts-martial on board ships; purchase, repair, and exchange of typewriters for ships; packing boxes and materials; interior fittings for general storehouses, pay offices, and accounting offices in navy yards; expenses of disbursing officers; coffee mills and repair thereto; expenses of naval clothing factory and machinery for the same; laboratory equipment; purchase of articles of equipment at home and abroad under the cognizance of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, and for the payment of labor in equipping vessels therewith, and the manufacture of such articles in the several navy yards; musical instruments and music; mess outfits; soap on board naval vessels; athletic outfits; tools, ferriages, yeomen's stores, safes, and other incidental expenses; labor in general storehouses, paymasters' offices, and accounting offices in navy yards and naval stations, including naval stations maintained in island possessions under the control of the United States, and expenses in handling stores purchased and manufactured under "General account of advances"; and reimbursement to appropriations of the Department of Agriculture of cost of inspection of meats and meat food products for the Navy Department: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for chemists and for clerical, inspection, storemen, store laborer, and messenger service in the supply and accounting departments of the navy yards and naval stations and disbursing offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed \$3,000,000; in all \$16,825,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This paragraph carries an appropriation of approximately \$17,000,000 for maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. It covers purchases of various kinds at home and abroad. To what extent does the Navy Department deal in foreign markets for such supplies as it needs?

Mr. PADGETT. I could not tell under existing conditions. I know that they have pursued the policy of purchasing at home all that they could get, but whether or not during the war they had to purchase anything abroad I do not know.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has no figures. Mr. PADGETT. No; I have not. Their policy has been to purchase at home, and they did buy large supplies.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have had some complaints about an apparent preference in the purchase of cigars and tobacco in foreign countries. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not. I imagine that where they purchased cigars that would be done by the men themselves and in what is called their canteen. They run that themselves and run it on a mutual plan, with a small profit, and whatever profit accrues goes to their recreational fund. That is not out of this fund.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In previous Congresses, before the war, the wisdom of making purchases in foreign countries was discussed upon the floor, and I think after the gentleman became chairman of the committee that he succeeded in defeating one or two amendments limiting the purchases to goods produced in the United States. If my memory is not at fault, that is a fact. However, we are now still at war, legislatively speaking, and it might not be well to offer an amendment limiting the purchases, even though the amount should be as much as sixteen or seventeen million dollars.

I would like for a few moments to discuss a question that may possibly be involved in that much-discussed telegram of the President urging the passage of this bill. The matter of embargoes may be a part of it. I do not know. I do know that numerous complaints are coming to Members of Congress—at least, I can testify on my own account—from American merchants, who contend that the situation abroad is gradually operating against them. Much has been said recently about the embargoes against imports levied by the British Government.

Since these embargoes went on and even before complaints have been coming forward as to the apparent encroachment of foreign-trade bodies and foreign traders upon the so-called foreign markets in which the American merchants and producers have been accustomed to participate.

Mr. PADGETT. Speaking of embargoes, it seems to get down to the philosophy of whose ox is gored. I have been receiving a lot of letters insisting that the embargoes on the importation of certain articles should be continued, and protesting against the discontinuing of embargoes on the importation of articles here. It is a question of how his interest comes in.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is one very peculiar circumstance, I think, that arose somewhere in the vicinity of the gentleman's own State, where an embargo was levied against the use of certain materials—cereals and the like—entering into the manufacture and production of so-called soft drinks, or beverages without a kick.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember about that. I get protests—and very vigorous protests—against the removal of the embargo on the importation of peanuts.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; I think that embargo still stands, but at the time the American embargo was levied against the use—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask for five minutes more.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. At the time the American embargo was levied against its own producers of materials entering into the manufacture of beverages there was no American embargo against the exportation of those cereals for the manufacture of beverages that did have a kick, with the result that while we were held of our own volition by a sort of semi-bone-dry arrangement in the United States we were permitting our foreign competitors to manufacture all the beer and liquor they cared to make, much of which they were selling to our American soldiers at a good profit. I understand the embargo now against the use of cereals for the manufacture of soft drinks in the United States has been raised, but I am of the opinion—

Mr. PADGETT. And there was a very effective embargo placed on the exportation of intoxicating liquors also.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; that is becoming very generally effective. It promises to be more dry, and a crop of candidates of various kinds is resulting therefrom. [Laughter.] But I am serious with the committee in suggesting that the reason for the President's mysterious message to the chairman of this committee urging the passage of this expensive bill may be found in this very matter of embargoes that one nation seems to be levying upon the products of another, and it may be that the President is wise enough and patriotic enough to

feel that if he had at his back the greatest navy in the world he might become one of the greatest protectionists in the world so far as American products are concerned. That may be in his mind; I do not know.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman uses the word "mysterious." There is nothing mysterious about it. I have told the House several times the sum and substance of the cablegram, which was that the President had not changed his mind on the building program and very earnestly and insistently recommended that the three-year building program should be carried out.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have every confidence in the gentleman's integrity in translating the presidential message, and I believe the gentleman would be doing his countrymen and his colleagues of this House a great service if he would present a photograph of the message, so that its literary qualities might be appreciated by his fellow men. But the gentleman up to date has refused to do that, though we have his word that he has given the substance if not the letter, the spirit if not the text, of the President's very important but somewhat mysterious note. Some American merchants are complaining at the present time that their trade abroad is being sidetracked, that they are not able to get shipping space, that every time they ask for it they run up against the Trade Board restrictions in the United States, which lead in the end to the British Embassy, which seems to have the power to put the veto upon applications for a license. What is the use of American merchants undertaking to obtain the trade of the world, what is the use of their endeavoring to compete with other nations, if they can not get their goods beyond the port, if at the American port they are obliged to get foreign sanction for the shipment of their goods? Here is a letter from one of my constituents; I will not read the name at this time, because the man's business is affected. He has applied in the ordinary way to all the United States agencies in Washington to obtain a permit for the shipment of cotton waste to be sold in Denmark. We have no quarrel with Denmark. It is an open-and-shut transaction between the purchaser there and the seller here, and the American merchant here wishes to complete his contract. He wishes to deliver the goods. He applied here in Washington to the War Trade Board, to those in control, and he is referred to the British Embassy, and he gets no space and his goods remain on the dock.

Talk about freedom of the seas! That begins to make you think that possibly our distinguished President over on the other side, who seeks to have a large Navy, may really be having something in his mind with regard to our rights upon the high seas. I do not know. The telegram is still unread, it is still nebulous to a certain degree, but nevertheless these conditions confront American merchants.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that I may have five minutes more.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Let me read a letter from the Metal Export Co. of America, 59 Pearl Street, New York City, dated February 3, 1919. Listen to this letter. It is written in the same vein as that of numerous other letters which I have received upon this subject. Is this what is going through the President's mind? Is he beginning to think that perhaps our trade lanes are being cut off? Are we facing some controversy with foreign nations which makes it necessary for the President to urge us to prepare to maintain our rights upon the high seas? Let us read this letter and think for ourselves. It says:

HONORABLE SIR: 1. What we have to say we wish to make short, emphatic, and to the point.  
2. We have five orders, totaling in value to about \$150,000.  
3. Destination, Scandinavia. All parties concerned have been O. K.'d by the War Trade Board.  
4. Credits have been opened, and funds are at our disposal against shipping documents.  
5. Credits will soon expire, and if goods are not shipped funds will automatically be returned to Europe.  
6. We have the goods on hand at high prices, and if we can not ship we will suffer a loss to the foreign firm's corresponding gain.  
7. We are unable to obtain export licenses, because our customers have been unable or unwilling to obtain their import numbers on account of purely local and political reasons in their own country.  
8. A foreign power is waiting with avidity to take these orders once the credits expire.  
9. As a loyal American citizen to a loyal American Congressman, shall a foreign power have the orders which we have won by personal solicitation or shall we keep them? If we are to keep them we must have a license from the War Trade Board. Who will help America besides us?

The writer is unreservedly at your service. The business had its origin in 1854.

Very truly, yours,

METAL EXPORT CO. OF AMERICA.

Here is an old established concern trying to do an export business, shut off because of foreign conditions. I have on my desk, amongst others, a letter from one of the largest automobile manufacturers in the United States, presenting to me a report from his sales agent over yonder in England. That agent states that he has gone through England and France, and he finds that it is now practically useless to try to sell an American machine in either of those countries. The gap following the war seems to have been closed, and they appear to be looking to their own restoration first. They propose to encourage home industry; they propose, in England and France, to do their own manufacturing; they propose to start their own mills; and if we are held up in our shipping and American products can find no bottoms because we are restricted by our foreign competitors in the matter of licenses, they will have the advantage in the markets of South America and of China and elsewhere. We should not be compelled to fall back and come in at the tail end of the race.

I do not know what the President of the United States has in mind when he sends his message for us to pass this enormous \$700,000,000 naval bill; but if he does have it in mind to become a protectionist or to put America first, or at most to give us an equal chance, I commend him for it. But up to date the telegram has not been read; we have not even seen a photograph of it. We have only the word of the chairman of the committee that he has given the bowels and substance of it to Congress. I would like, because I admire the President's style and diction, to see the telegram.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The chairman said just a moment ago he would show it to you. Step right over and get it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman think the telegram is in the President's handwriting?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Michigan challenges me to take 10 steps forward and obtain through the gentleman from Tennessee a sight of this document. Later on I may do so.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fuel and transportation: Coal and other fuel for steamers' and ships' use, including expenses of transportation, storage, and handling the same; maintenance and general operation of machinery of naval fuel depots and fuel plants; water for all purposes on board naval vessels; and ice for the cooling of water, including the expense of transportation and storage of both, \$15,000,000. *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 of the appropriation "Fuel and transportation, 1919," or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby continued and made available for use, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, in mining coal or contracting for the same in Alaska, the transportation of the same, and the construction of coal bunkers and the necessary docks for use in supplying ships therewith; and the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to select from the public coal lands in Alaska such areas as may be necessary for use by him for the purposes stated herein: *Provided further*, That, when, in the opinion of the President, the prices asked for the charter of vessels for the transportation of fuel are excessive, he is authorized to purchase vessels suitable for the purpose, and, if money is not otherwise available, to pay for them from the appropriation "Fuel and transportation."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Let the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] go ahead.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has reserved his point of order, and I ask the privilege of discussing it in my own way for two or three minutes. A while ago while discussing the matter of embargoes and the famous telegram sent by the President to the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of this committee, I paid a high compliment, as I understood it, to the integrity of the gentleman from Tennessee in giving to the House the substance but not the letter of the telegram. I was challenged in a pleasant way by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] to go forward to the gentleman from Tennessee in order that I might know what was in the precious document. I suggested it might be dangerous to do so, but yielding to my regard for the gentleman from Tennessee and to my own curiosity I took the 10 steps necessary, approached the gentleman from Tennessee with becoming dignity, was greeted with one of those genial smiles for which he is famous, and asked to see the telegram. In the pleasantest tones imaginable, those that have captured audiences here and elsewhere for many years, I received from his lips the response, "I will show it to you—some time." When! When, Mr. Chairman, may I again approach the gentleman from Tennessee with the hope and expectancy that that which I longed for may be granted?

I know that the gentleman from Tennessee and many of his colleagues upon the Committee on Naval Affairs, including the

distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], who may have seen this telegram, were recently attracted to the European battle fields. I am persuaded that they have shaken hands with the King of Italy; that they have visited the President of France at his palace; that they have toured the country, receiving the plaudits of a people everywhere grateful for what the United States was doing to win the war. I am told the chairman and members of the committee had the honor of entering Buckingham Palace; yea, of dining with the King. It is even said—and this is highly important—that they conferred with Lloyd George, the premier of England. They fraternized with foreign statesmen, with those who have much to do at this time with the destinies of the world; and now that our President has taken their place in the councils of the great on the other side and has seen fit, from his point of view, from his point of vantage, to send us this message, through the chairman, to get these \$700,000,000 out of the American people for a future Navy, I do not wonder that the gentleman from Tennessee, gathering unto himself wisdom and profiting by his foreign diplomatic experiences, has learned the art and the wiles of those who know how to give a soothing message while they conceal the meaning of their words. [Laughter and applause.]

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee why it is necessary, now that the war emergency is about over, that the President be given this authority to purchase vessels for the transportation of fuel, particularly when the Navy has large tracts of land in the petroleum reserves and, as I understood the gentleman, is soon to shift over its ships to an oil-burning basis?

Mr. PADGETT. As to that second proviso, I do not think there is any real necessity for it. I am perfectly willing to strike that out.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the second proviso at the top of page 35.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman from Tennessee inform the House whether the Navy has secured any coal up to the present time from the Matanuska Alaskan region?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. That provision was inserted in the bill last year. No part of it has been used on account of the war activities engaging all the attention of the department here.

Mr. STAFFORD. With the Navy adopting fuel oil for the operation of its ships, particularly on the Pacific coast, does the gentleman believe that the Matanuska coal region will be utilized to any extent by the Navy for the operation of its ships?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, yes. We have a large number of coal-burning ships. The later and heavier types are burning oil, but we have a large number of ships that are still burning coal.

Mr. STAFFORD. The railroad, I believe, has reached the Matanuska coal fields?

Mr. PADGETT. It is close to them, but they have not gotten quite to them.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand only the construction of some branch lines are yet necessary. I believe the main line has passed the Matanuska region.

Mr. PADGETT. They must go on a couple of miles farther to reach the coal region itself.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this is for fuel and transportation. The gentleman from Tennessee stated, I think, yesterday that it was necessary to keep a large number of the enlisted men in the Navy in order that they might be active in bringing home soldiers from France. I read in a newspaper the other day, I think, that a large number of naval vessels had been ordered to Cuba for maneuvering purposes.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. Those are ships of the dreadnaught type, 14, I believe, in number, with destroyers and submarines and things; but the cruisers and the old battleships are used for bringing back the men from France.

Mr. MANN. It is not practicable to use these large vessels for the transportation of troops from France?

Mr. PADGETT. I think they could be so used, but they are keeping up the activities of the Navy with them, and they are using what are known as vessels of the predreadnaught type, the smaller type of battleship, 15,000 and 16,000 ton ships.

Mr. MANN. Those large vessels have a considerable capacity for carrying marines on them, as I understand. Why is it not practicable to use them in bringing home the soldiers?

Mr. PADGETT. They might be used in that way, but they have got these others that they are using for that purpose in connection with troop transports.

Mr. MANN. Then, reduced to fact, these men are being retained in the Navy not so much for the purpose of being able to man the ships and bring home the soldier boys as to man the ships and send them to Cuba for maneuver purposes?

Mr. PADGETT. No; those that are for the naval ships and for the naval service strictly are kept in the Navy for the naval service, but a number of ships are being operated for the transportation of the troops, and they are kept for that purpose. But we can not abandon the ships of the Navy and can not deman them.

Mr. MANN. I do not speak as an expert, but I think it would be very feasible for these ships, instead of being sent to Cuba fully manned, to be used in bringing home the boys from France. Certainly they can carry as many as the other ships smaller in size.

Mr. PADGETT. They are using a good number of the naval ships, but they are not using all of them. They are using the cruisers, as I said, the old types of battleships, for that, but the strictly new ships are being kept for naval use and for naval training and for naval purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR.

Construction and repair of vessels: For preservation and completion of vessels on the stocks and in ordinary; purchase of materials and stores of all kinds; steam steers, pneumatic steers, steam capstans, steam windlasses, and all other auxiliaries; labor in navy yards and on foreign stations; purchase of machinery and tools for use in shops; carrying on work of experimental model tank and wind tunnel; designing naval vessels; construction and repair of yard craft, lighters, and barges; wear, tear, and repair of vessels afloat; general care, increase, and protection of the Navy in the line of construction and repair; repair and maintenance of vessels of the Coast Guard and Lighthouse Services; submarine chasers, patrol boats; incidental expenses for vessels and navy yards, inspectors' offices, such as photographing, books, professional magazines, plans, stationery, and instruments for drafting room, and for pay of classified force under the bureau; for hemp, wire, iron, and other materials for the manufacture of cordage, anchors, cables, galleys, and chains; specifications for purchase thereof shall be so prepared as shall give fair and free competition; canvas for the manufacture of sails, awnings, hammocks, and other work; interior appliances and tools for manufacturing purposes in navy yards and naval stations; and for the purchase of all other articles of equipment at home and abroad; and for the payment of labor in equipping vessels therewith and manufacture of such articles in the several navy yards; naval signals and apparatus, other than electric, namely, signals, lights, lanterns, running lights, lanterns, and lamps and their appendages for general use on board ship for illuminating purposes; and oil and candles used in connection therewith; bunting and other materials for making and repairing flags of all kinds; for all permanent galley fittings and equipment; rugs, carpets, curtains, and hangings on board naval vessels, \$37,500,000: *Provided*, That the limitations imposed by existing law relative to repairs to vessels of the Navy shall not apply to the expenditure of funds made available in this act: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, drafting, inspection, watchmen (ship keepers), and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and offices of superintending naval constructors for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed \$2,500,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Is this item of \$37,500,000 for the repair and completion of all vessels of the Navy which are being constructed under programs heretofore provided for?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; this is the general operating maintenance fund of the Bureau of Construction and Repair for ships that have been completed and put in commission. This is not the fund that is used for the original construction of ships. That is carried under "Increase of the Navy." This is for the upkeep and the maintenance of all the repair work on all of the ships that were in commission under the jurisdiction of the Navy, amounting to many hundreds of ships.

Mr. WALSH. What does this language mean?—

Completion of vessels on the stocks.

That does not mean that vessels have been put in commission before they were completed?

Mr. PADGETT. A vessel may be put in commission, and there may be some small items that come up afterwards in the way of additions or something to complete the entire ship.

Mr. WALSH. She would not be on the stocks, would she?

Mr. PADGETT. There may be something that the original contract does not provide for. For instance, the contract is made for the construction of a ship. That contract may not embrace everything that is necessary for it. For instance, they may leave out the electrical apparatus.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, a vessel would not have to be hauled out onto the stocks again in order to put in the electrical apparatus.

Mr. PADGETT. I know; but while it is on the stocks they may go ahead and do the work.

Mr. WALSH. She would not be commissioned before she was completed, would she?

Mr. PADGETT. Well, yes; before she was fully completed. We have had ships put in commission before they were completed in every respect.

Mr. WALSH. But they would certainly not put a vessel in commission while she was on the stocks?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. WALSH. This says:

For preservation and completion of vessels on the stocks and in ordinary.

Then it says:

That the limitation imposed by existing law relative to repairs to vessels of the Navy shall not apply to the expenditure of funds made available in this act.

That is the proviso that I think is subject to a point of order. But I was trying to ascertain if this does not include all the money available for repairing vessels in commission, \$37,500,000, of which \$2,500,000 shall be paid for clerical work—

Mr. PADGETT. Drafting.

Mr. WALSH. Drafting, inspection, and so forth. If it does not, what is the item that takes care of the repair of naval vessels?

Mr. PADGETT. The repair of naval vessels is all taken care of, as I understand, under this item here. The original construction of vessels is under the appropriations for the increase of the Navy. The repair and upkeep and maintenance are taken care of, so far as the hull is concerned, under this appropriation. So far as the machinery and the motive power are concerned, those are taken care of under steam engineering; but the construction of the hull and the original construction of the machinery are under the appropriations for increase of the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman state that when they start to build a vessel in one of the navy yards, when they have an appropriation of the required number of millions of dollars for that vessel, part of the equipment is taken out of the appropriation for steam engineering and another part of the construction is taken out of this item for the completion of vessels on the stocks?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I understand that none of this goes on the vessel in its original construction. That is taken care of under the appropriations for steam engineering and construction and repair under increase of the Navy, and also ordnance; but, where vessels are out in the service, this is for their general upkeep and maintenance, for the work in the yards and stations, and in the repairing of ships, and all of that work.

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

Mr. WALSH. Well, I reserve another point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I can not get the distinction. I know it is because of my own deficiency in not being able to comprehend the statements which the gentleman makes, but I can not understand why you provide under an item under construction and repair for the completion of a vessel on the stocks.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know why they use that expression, "on the stocks"; but this is for the vessels that are in the fleet and in the service. It is their general maintenance fund—their general upkeep and repair.

Mr. WALSH. Is a vessel taken out for repairs ever kept on the stocks for over two years?

Mr. PADGETT. Not that I know of.

Mr. WALSH. Then why do they need this proviso here relative to the existing law and the expenditure of funds made available under this act?

Mr. PADGETT. Right at the end of the year a vessel may go on the stocks for repairs—say, in June—and the repairs will run up until October or November of the next fiscal year. It may take seven or eight months. Take the case of the *North Dakota*, for instance. Her turbine engines had all to be taken out and new ones put in. It involved an expenditure of something like \$600,000 or \$800,000 to rebuild them. It took months. Now, that is all done out of this fund, and if you were to limit it to one year it would be very embarrassing.

Mr. WALSH. Where it is made for a specific purpose such as that, the existing law limits it to two years, as I understand.

Mr. PADGETT. They can obligate it during the first year, and if it is obligated it may be expended during the second

year; but it can not be obligated except in the first year. So here comes along a repair. Here is a fund for it, and the ship goes into dock, and the year expires. The ship is in the dock. You can not use that money, because it is after the 30th day of June. You could not obligate it; but if you had obligated it on the 29th of June you could go ahead and pay it out during the succeeding fiscal year.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I withdraw the point of order, though I know I am making a mistake in doing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF STEAM ENGINEERING.

Engineering: For repairs, preservation, and renewal of machinery, auxiliary machinery, and boilers of naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats, distilling and refrigerating apparatus; repairs, preservation, and renewals of electric interior and exterior signal communications and all electrical appliances of whatsoever nature on board naval vessels, except range finders, battle order, and range transmitters and indicators, and motors and their controlling apparatus used to operate machinery belonging to other bureaus; searchlights and fire-control equipments for antiaircraft defense at shore stations; maintenance and operation of coast signal service, including expenses of office of Director of Naval Communications and the purchase of land as necessary for sites for radio shore stations; equipment, supplies, and materials under the cognizance of the bureau required for the maintenance and operation of naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats; purchase, installation, repair, and preservation of machinery, tools, and appliances in navy yards and stations, pay of classified force under the bureau; incidental expenses for Navy vessels, navy yards, and stations, inspectors' offices, the engineering experiment station, such as photographing, technical books and periodicals, stationery, and instruments; instruments and apparatus, supplies, and technical books and periodicals necessary to carry on experimental and research work in radiotelegraphy at the naval radio laboratory: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and offices of United States inspectors of machinery and engineering material for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed \$2,000,000: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for the purchase of land for sites for radio shore stations shall not exceed \$10,000; in all, engineering, \$35,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what is the purpose of limiting the appropriation for the purchase of land sites for radio shore stations, \$10,000?

Mr. PADGETT. We have carried that limitation for many years, so that out of this appropriation, if they want to buy land for the establishment of shore stations, they shall not expend more than \$10,000.

Mr. WALSH. Is this the item under which the radio stations have been purchased by the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. The shore stations, but not the high-power stations.

Mr. WALSH. Under what item were the high-powered stations purchased?

Mr. PADGETT. Under the general power given the President and the lump-sum appropriation in connection with the Shipping Board and Railroad Administration.

Mr. WALSH. The Navy Department got in there somewhere.

Mr. PADGETT. I say under the power given to the President, as I understand.

Mr. WALSH. The \$100,000,000 emergency fund?

Mr. PADGETT. Either that or a lump sum given him in the deficiency bill.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to know if there is any language in this paragraph, or any proviso of limitation, which would permit the Secretary of the Navy to pay for radio stations—the plants which have been acquired for either shore stations or high-power stations which have heretofore been carried—

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I have an amendment which I intend to propose, and I also have the information from the Secretary of the Navy which the gentleman is seeking from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PADGETT. Let the gentleman from New Jersey give his information.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I will offer this amendment, to be read for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHLBACH: Page 38, line 20, after "\$10,000," insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the acquisition of radio stations, in whole or in part, for the transmission or reception of commercial messages."

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, in the latter part of the year 1916 the Navy Department caused to be introduced a bill in this House (H. R. 19350) to authorize the Navy Department to purchase or otherwise acquire the ownership of radio stations in the United States and to be given the sole right to maintain and operate them.

There were hearings held on the bill from January 11 to January 26, 1917. At the conclusion of the hearings the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which had the bill referred to it, refused to support the measure. That was the end of it as far as vesting authority in the Navy Department by Congress was concerned.

In the latter part of 1918 the Navy Department again caused to be introduced a similar measure to have the monopoly of the radio business in the country and acquire title to all radio stations in the United States. Hearings were held on the bill, and the committee, or some members of it, learned to their amazement that notwithstanding the refusal to sanction this ownership and operation of commercial wireless telegraphy the Secretary of the Navy had expended \$1,600,000 in the purchase of nine stations on the Pacific coast belonging to the Federal system, and ship-to-shore stations of the Marconi Co. on the Atlantic, paying for the Marconi stations \$1,450,000, or in all \$50,000 in excess of \$3,000,000.

Now, I refer to the hearings where Secretary Daniels on the stand, as to the authority under which these purchases were made and where the money came from, testified as follows:

Mr. EDMONDS. What I am trying to get at is this: You had no lack of power during the war to take over these stations and to utilize them in any way you saw fit? Is not that true?

As a matter of fact, the stations were entirely in the control of and operated by the Navy Department. The only thing purchased was the permanent title to the property for the Navy Department.

Secretary DANIELS. We had the power; yes.

Mr. EDMONDS. And then you exercised that power, you exercised it gradually, and then you exercised it finally by taking over every station and handling the entire wireless business of the country?

Secretary DANIELS. That is right.

Mr. EDMONDS. And at the present time you still have that power and can exercise it?

Secretary DANIELS. We have.

Mr. EDMONDS. And yet, at the same time, after this committee refused to bring out a bill to purchase wireless apparatus, you utilize the Government money to purchase this wireless apparatus and took over the commercial systems without the consent of Congress.

Secretary DANIELS. Not at all. We did not act in defiance of Congress because Congress had not done this. We did it because it was a good business proposition and because we had the funds appropriated by the Naval Committee to make the naval communication service more effective.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. You mean appropriated by Congress.

Secretary DANIELS. Appropriated by Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. You said by the Naval Committee.

Secretary DANIELS. I mean through the naval bill.

Mr. EDMONDS. Yes; but Congress did not have any intention to put you into commercial ownership of radio communication at that time. You did not explain it to the Naval Committee that way.

Secretary DANIELS. We explained to the Naval Committee that this money we desired was for use in perfecting the radio service.

Mr. HADLEY. I would like to ask the Secretary at this point what is the specific item in the naval appropriation bill which carried the funds for that payment?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair state the parliamentary situation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws the point of order and the gentleman from New Jersey asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment that was read presented now in regular order?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be reported for consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHLBACH: Amend page 36, line 20, after "\$10,000," by inserting: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the acquisition of radio stations in whole or in part used for the transmission or reception of commercial messages."

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I again refer to the hearings on the bill H. R. 13159. Mr. HADLEY asked:

I would like to ask the Secretary at this point what is the specific item in the naval appropriation bill which carries the funds for that payment?—

Namely, the \$3,000,000 for the commercial radio stations—

Secretary DANIELS. I have forgotten the title of it. It is in the appropriation under the Bureau of Steam Engineering, which has direction and control of all radio matters. Under that appropriation we buy a tower, and under that appropriation we put in radio stations wherever the Chief of Operations of the Navy and the General Board feel that we ought to have them.

Mr. HADLEY. Was the estimate itemized when it was before the Naval Committee?

Secretary DANIELS. I think it was not. I do not think it has ever been itemized in the radio matters at all; it has always been a general lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. WHITE. How much was the lump-sum appropriation?

Secretary DANIELS. Under the Bureau of Steam Engineering?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Secretary DANIELS. It was many millions of dollars. I can get the exact figures for you, if you desire.

It is \$35,000,000 in this bill. The situation is this: The Navy Department comes to Congress, and Congress, through its mouthpiece, in this instance the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, refused the department authority to obtain title to the plants necessary to carry on as a monopoly the business of wireless telegraphy for commercial purposes. After that refusal they obtained an appropriation, under the general lump-sum appropriation for Steam Engineering, for the extension of radio service under the Bureau of Operations, which any reasonable man would believe meant in connection with naval operations. They took out of that money \$3,000,000 and appropriated it to go into the commercial business of telegraphy by wireless without the authority of Congress, using money that was not intended by Congress for that purpose. For that reason I offer this amendment and trust that it will be accepted.

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

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. I understand that the Government has taken over some of these radio stations. Would the gentleman's amendment prevent that?

Mr. LEHLBACH. It would prevent taking over the other stations which the Navy Department is very anxious to get and which they intend coercing the present owners into selling if they can. They can take them absolutely by condemnation if we give them the legislation which has not been reported by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Even without that legislation, if the past is a precedent, if they can coerce the owners into voluntary or quasi-voluntary sale, they will buy them whether Congress authorizes it or not.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment again reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey a question. Does he think that will prevent the use of this money for paying for the radio stations they have already purchased?

Mr. LEHLBACH. If title has not passed, I think it will.

Mr. MANN. I do not care whether title has passed or not. I would like to see a prohibition against the payment of any sum unless Congress specifically authorizes it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. There were two purchases; one from the Federal system on the Pacific coast, nine stations. I believe they have been paid for. The contract for the purchase from the Marconi Co. was entered into a few weeks before the date when Secretary Daniels gave the testimony which I quoted.

Mr. MANN. The contract has been entered into?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes; some time in the month of December or the latter part of November. Whether it has been consummated or not, I am not informed.

Mr. MANN. I had prepared an amendment somewhat similar, to prohibit under this appropriation the purchase of or payment for.

Mr. LEHLBACH. That would be acceptable to me.

Mr. MANN. This prohibits the acquisition?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes. Of course, the Navy Department in construing the bill will construe it in conformity with its purposes, if possible; but ordinarily, I should think, prohibiting the acquisition of stations would prevent the payment for stations under an agreement to purchase which had previously been entered into but not yet consummated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. On Monday last I offered a resolution to investigate certain conditions which were alleged to be prevalent in the Army, both at home and abroad. That resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules, where it is at present.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LARSEN. I object to the remarks of the gentleman because they are not directed to the bill under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order that the gentleman is not addressing himself to the amendment or the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to withdraw his objection to that.

Mr. LARSEN. Does the gentleman mean to postpone it altogether?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. Let us get along as we are doing. We can handle it a heap better the other way. We have had

large experience with these matters, and no time will be gained by interposing objections in the way suggested by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have seen this time wasted and flitted away for the past several weeks, and, realizing that an extra session of Congress is likely to be called on account of these conditions, I feel it my duty as a Member of the House not to permit any Member, when an important matter is before the House, and we are proceeding with it, to come in here and interrupt the proceedings by injecting into the discussion extraneous matters. I have very high regard for the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL].

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman let me say to him that the experience of many years here shows that is not a time-saver?

Mr. SIEGEL. I do not think it either is or will be in this case.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present, if we are going to have—

Mr. LARSEN. If that is the way gentlemen on the other side retaliate, of course I am not responsible for that condition; all I can do is to look after one condition, and I do not propose, as far as I am concerned, by gentlemen insisting on a quorum, to be driven from a position I feel is correct. That is all there is to it.

Mr. PADGETT. I think the gentleman will find by experience here that does not save time. Let me ask the gentleman to withdraw it. I think we will make more time in that way than otherwise.

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

Mr. LARSEN. I will withdraw it for the benefit of the gentleman from New York, but I hope other gentlemen will not undertake it, because I shall object. I want to be as agreeable as I can, but, gentlemen, we have an important duty to perform in this House, and I think we ought to do it and get through with this business.

The CHAIRMAN. Both points of order are withdrawn.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Georgia would not have made the point of order if he knew to what subject I was going to refer. The New York Evening Telegram of yesterday published six columns of a story showing that 3,000 boys had been reported as having been killed in action, when, as a matter of fact, they had died in what the New York Telegram designates as the "vilest hole of France," on account of the conditions prevalent at this camp near Brest. The charge is not made by the Telegram alone. It is made by a high Army official who has returned to this country, and he has written this article which appears in this newspaper. It is of great interest to us from New York because it states, among other things, that "the men of the Twenty-seventh Division and a lot of other troops were put out in pup tents in the filthy, muddy fields, with the result that thousands of boys died from disease. No attempt was made to improve the condition of this terrible camp."

Further on the newspaper article continues:

No one can deny these facts no more than they can deny that up to August 1, 1918, 200 American boys had died there from pneumonia and disease, while from August 1 to November 30, 3,000 were buried under the filthy soil of Brest. Toward the end they were carried out by the truck loads and buried. These 3,000 young men had left their homes in the United States three weeks before declared to be physically perfect. The War Department has the names of these men who died in this way, yet in many instances they have been listed as having died in action.

The reason I am calling particular attention to this fact is that apparently the casualty list—according to the charge made by this high Army officer—has been falsified and the parents and relatives of these 3,000 boys have been told that they died in action, when as a matter of fact they died at the camp in Brest from the filthy conditions existing at that place. They were sleeping on the ground in water when they passed away from pneumonia, according to this officer. Now, if that charge is true, and this high Army officer makes this charge and further says the War Department records show that the charge is true, then it is about time that the Congress of the United States woke up to its duty, stopped talking, and got all the facts. In order to ascertain if that officer is here in Washington at the present time I telegraphed to the Telegram this morning and received the following answer:

NEW YORK, February 7, 1919.

Representative ISAAC SIEGEL,  
Washington, D. C.:

Evening Telegram pledged not to give identity of officer mentioned in Brest camp story. Can say that he now is in Washington and assures us that reports covering all matter given by him are on file with War Department, or should be there.

NEW YORK EVENING TELEGRAM.

As I have already said, this story covers six columns. The Telegram is going to run six or seven additional columns to-night and again to-morrow. It has an editorial here saying the conditions are most startling. It tells how bad the buildings were, how bad the hospitals were, and the men would not go to the hospitals. It tells of an epidemic of typhoid fever, there. It tells you how the men who left America physically well passed away within three weeks on the other side on account of these conditions without having an opportunity to fight when they went over there prepared to give up their lives for their country. They went there to offer their lives on the battle fields, but not to die, as this article puts it, "like rats in a hole, in a camp near Brest."

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. I will.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Did not the gentleman from New York recently make a trip to Europe?

Mr. SIEGEL. I did during July and August.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Did the gentleman find those conditions obtaining at that time?

Mr. SIEGEL. At that time there were certain complaints which—

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I am not talking about complaints; I am talking about what the gentleman from New York found when he was over there.

Mr. SIEGEL. I did not go to Brest.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Well, anywhere else did the gentleman find such conditions?

Mr. SIEGEL. Other places I found certain conditions that reflected both credit and some discredit.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. But did the gentleman from New York visit any of the hospitals?

Mr. SIEGEL. I did.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Did he find these conditions in those hospitals?

Mr. SIEGEL. Not at these hospitals; but the charge is made that these men had to sleep in the water.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I am not asking about what they charged, but I am talking about what the gentleman from New York saw when he was in France. Did he see any of these conditions?

Mr. SIEGEL. I was not at Brest.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Were you anywhere else?

Mr. SIEGEL. At certain other places conditions were not perfect.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Did the gentleman from New York, when he returned to this country, call attention of the War Department to any objectionable conditions that he did find in France?

Mr. SIEGEL. I called attention to them over there, and when I called attention to them they rectified them.

Mr. HICKS. I wish to say to the gentleman that there were two soldiers at my house last night, both having come back from the other side, and both having been in the camp at Brest, and they both reported the conditions the same as they have been reported to be at Brest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I object.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting this article, so that the House may see what this Army officer says are the conditions over there. He is supposed to be a general—

Mr. FOSTER. If it is an anonymous communication—

Mr. SIEGEL. He is not anonymous at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Tell us who he is.

Mr. SIEGEL. The New York Telegram says in this telegram that he is willing to testify before the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Give us his name.

Mr. SIEGEL. Let us produce him.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is he?

Mr. SIEGEL. He is in Washington now.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, of course the paper which contains the article has a great deal wider circulation than the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it will fill up the RECORD with its six columns of matter. I do not know that that would be expedient. The gentleman has directed attention to it, but if he thinks that the information—

Mr. SIEGEL. The article gives names of men and officers. I want to get at the truth, and we are sure to get it some day, if not now. I can not discuss the whole matter inside of 10 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

This paragraph carries \$35,000,000. Nevertheless, the matter which has been recently discussed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] is really far more important than this \$35,000,000. Millions count for little when we are considering the unnecessary sacrifice of the lives of our soldiers. Seeing, however, that there is objection to further discussion with reference to whether our soldiers shall be protected and their lives saved, I want to make some remarks on this particular paragraph.

I am pleased to observe that the Naval Committee was able to segregate \$10,000 out of this \$35,000,000. I have no doubt if they had been able to extract from the naval officials what they were going to do with this \$35,000,000 they would have divided this appropriation up. And yet I am somewhat at a loss to understand why out of \$35,000,000 neither the Naval Committee nor the officials of the Navy Department who were before them were able to get nothing itemized but a paltry \$10,000. We have suffered for a long time as a consequence of lump-sum appropriations. I never knew yet where we appropriated one-half the amount carried by this paragraph where there was not a large part of the appropriation expended for purposes that Congress would never have thought of sanctioning for a moment.

In the previous paragraph there is \$37,500,000 appropriated, of which the Naval Committee were able to segregate \$2,500,000. Now, that paragraph that carries the \$37,500,000 provides in express terms for the use of the money in the same way that this \$35,000,000 is to be used.

Of course, I understand one is one department and one is another, and the business of one department or one division or bureau is different from that of the other. But nevertheless the money could be used for the same purposes and thereby the expenses of one bureau overlap those of the other. Whenever we have lump-sum appropriations of the amount of \$35,000,000 or \$37,000,000, there will always be waste. Money will be spent unnecessarily. I hope that the day will come when all of this will be stopped and we will get down to some basis whereby we can tell what this money is going for. Now, no one can tell by reason of the statements in this paragraph how this money is going to be paid out. No one can tell within a million or two million dollars how much will be applied to certain purposes. Of course, the greater portion of the money provided in this paragraph will probably be applied toward new boilers and new machinery. But they can spend it in almost any way they want to, the same as under the previous paragraph they could spend a million dollars for furniture if they desire to do so. We ought to reach a period when, if the officials that come before the Naval Committee, the representatives of the Navy, are not able to tell what they want of this money, the appropriation ought to be refused. This is the course we should pursue in the future.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. On the 28th of January I inserted in the RECORD, on page 2248, a copy of an order which purported to have been issued by Maj. Gen. Buck, as the commanding general at Camp MacArthur, which in substance forbids commissioned officers to remain present at any social affair of any nature at which there are enlisted men or discharged soldiers wearing the uniform of enlisted men. The order is as follows:

OFFICERS ADVISED SOCIALLY—CAN'T MINGLE WITH ENLISTED MEN—BY COMMAND OF GEN. BUCK ORDER POSTED REGARDING ENTERTAINMENTS.

The following order has been posted at Camp MacArthur: Headquarters, Camp MacArthur, Waco, Tex., January 6, 1919, General Orders, No. 1.

1. The attention of officers of this command is called to the impropriety of attending social affairs at which enlisted men, or persons in the uniform of enlisted men, are present.

Hereafter any officer of this command who finds enlisted men present with proper authority, i. e., duly invited or permitted to pay their way in, at any social affair at which the officer is a guest, such officer will at once depart from such social affair, and if he finds persons in the uniform of enlisted men permitted to be present he will take the same action.

When an officer finds enlisted men present at any social affair without proper authority, he will take such steps as the occasion may warrant to cause them to leave, and will report any violation of regulations which may occur.

By command of Maj. Gen. Buck.

W. H. WOOLWORTH,

Major, Infantry, United States Army, Acting Executive Officer.

Official:

E. E. LAMBERT,

Major, Adjutant General's Department, Adjutant.

I took occasion to comment on that order, and am just in receipt of a letter from the Secretary of War, Mr. Baker, dated the 6th instant, in which he makes reference to the order of Maj. Gen. Buck, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, February 6, 1919.

MY DEAR MR. HUDDLESTON: My attention has been called to some remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28, based on an order issued by the commanding general at Camp MacArthur, Tex.

In order that you may be fully advised of the position of the Army with reference to orders of this kind, it is well that you should know that on January 18 the Chief of Staff directed the revocation of this order when it first came to his attention. On January 19 a telegram from the commanding general, Camp MacArthur, acknowledging receipt of instructions of January 18, stated that the order in question had been issued through error on January 6, and had been immediately revoked when it had come to his attention on January 8. I am,

Very sincerely,

NEWTON D. BAKER,  
Secretary of War.

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON,  
House of Representatives.

This letter is signed by the Secretary of War.

Now, I do not want to do Gen. Buck any injustice, and therefore I want this letter to go in the RECORD, with the order that was issued.

Now, I want to analyze the letter of Mr. Secretary Baker and his statement just for a moment. The report is that this order was issued through error and was countermanded by Gen. Buck two days later. The order itself recites that it was issued "by command of Maj. Gen. Buck." It is signed by Maj. Woolworth, the acting executive officer, and by Maj. Lambert, the adjutant of the division.

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

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Just in a second.

Mr. MANN. Tell us just what the order is.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I have read what it was. The order is the order of January 6, which forbids that commissioned officers shall remain at any social affair where an enlisted man is present, or any person in the uniform of an enlisted man is present. This letter states that Gen. Buck did not authorize this order. Yet the order on its face expressly and plainly says it was so authorized by Gen. Buck.

And now I want to ask the Secretary of War, What is he going to do about it? Here is an order issued by the camp adjutant and the chief executive officer of the division, which recites that it is issued by order of the commanding general. That recital is said by the Secretary of War to be untrue. Those officers are thereby stated by implication to have been guilty of falsification, and I want to ask what is going to be done about this?

A situation is presented that is still more serious than the one I pointed out, which I may say I did not consider of very great importance. But now we have a situation in which two important executive officers of the Army have issued an order, an unauthorized order, an improper order, an order which the authorities of the Army would have us believe is in violation of the general spirit of the Army and the attitude of the Army administration toward the enlisted man. These officers issued this order, this unauthorized order, and they recited in it—I do not like to call it a falsehood, but they state that it was done by the commanding general, when that was not a fact.

I want to know if somebody is not going to be court-martialed as the result? I make bold to say that I do not believe any such thing is going to be done. While I believe Mr. Secretary Baker has been thoroughly candid in his letter, I also believe that somebody has imposed on him, the Secretary; and this order has a history to it and circumstances surrounding it which are not explained in this letter.

I want to say one other thing: That order is of comparatively minor importance, but all of us who know the Army know how the enlisted man is treated by the officers. We know that there is an impassable social gulf between the enlisted man and the officer, and we know that this is recognized by every officer of the Army and every enlisted man. So why blink it and say that it is not there? Every soldier knows it, and everybody knows that, Mr. Baker apart, it is countenanced and recognized by the highest military authority. Everybody knows that this situation and spirit has the support of all the commissioned elements.

I want to say this, further: This matter of officers and men associating together on a basis of social equality is in itself more or less of a minor matter, but it is the symptom of a disease which is far more serious, and which reaches much deeper into our Army life than any mere question of social observances, or anything of that kind. It goes deeper than that. We find it in our Articles of War, which discriminate from beginning to end against the enlisted men and in favor of the men with commissions. We find it in the fact that punishments under these Articles of War are much more severe upon the enlisted man than upon the officers. If a man murders his neighbor, he is entitled to a trial by a jury of his peers—to a fair, open trial—but if he happens to be a private soldier and comes in

two hours overdue on a leave of absence, or happens to say something a trifle impolite to a commissioned officer or fails to salute him as promptly as he would like to be saluted, he is brought to trial—before his equals? No. Before his superiors, a class not interested in his class, before a class that is interested in keeping his class in subjection.

And we find that inevitably there grow up these abuses which I have pointed out. This is evidenced in a thousand ways. An enlisted man who goes down the street knows that he must salute every commissioned officer he meets. It is not a sign of respect. If so, why should not the commissioned officer salute first, for both are but men, and the officer should respect the enlisted man just as much as the enlisted man should respect the officer? If it is merely a matter of respect, why should it be fixed by ironclad regulation that the man must first show his respect. It ought to be a matter of mutual respect. No; the salute, when not given in the line of duty, is a sign of servility, and is intended to impress on the man who is required to give it first that he is the social inferior of the other fellow and has to pay him a respect that the other man does not have to show. If the enlisted man should fail to salute him, the officer may place him under arrest and may reprimand him on the spot. If the man resents this in any way, he is lucky if he does not get sent to prison for a long sentence. Did you ever hear of a private stopping an officer and reprimanding him for failing to salute him in return? I never did; but I have frequently seen officers ignore the salute of the private. Officers pretend that they do not like the saluting system. Why do they not stop it, then? The General Staff could abolish it to-morrow if they only wanted to and would say so to the Secretary.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to commend the gentleman for getting this order of Gen. Buck out of the way, and I want to ask him if he should not go further and get the other regulation out of the way that makes a distinction between the private soldier and the officer in allowing the officer to give social attention to our nurses in uniform and forbidding the private soldier to do likewise? [Laughter.] Ought not the gentleman to go further in that respect?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I would like to reconstruct the spirit of our Army as a whole and make it democratic, as befits a great and a free people, and I think it is the duty of Congress to take up this subject. The first thing that should be done is to repeal and reconstruct the barbarous Articles of War under which our armies are now governed. These Articles of War not only make punishments possible which are cruel and inhumane, but they foster the vicious caste system, which is the bane of the Army. I would like our Army so constituted and dominated by a truly American spirit, which would make service in it in lowest rank compatible with the sensibilities of the finest and proudest American boy.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not wish to reply generally to the statements of the gentleman from Alabama. I know, as we all know, that there exists among many officers in the Army the spirit which he has suggested; but I am not willing to admit or to have the statement go unchallenged that this spirit is universal and that there are no exceptions, because I know that is not an accurate statement. I know by personal knowledge that during this war commissioned officers have called their enlisted men together, lecturing them upon various topics of military importance, discipline, and so forth, and have explained to the men that the requirement that they salute was not intended and should not be considered by them as any manifestation of social inferiority, or as any acknowledgment of humility; that it was not intended for that purpose, the officer adding, "I know that is not the fact. I know I am no better than you are socially, and I do not claim to be. I do not want you to think I am; but this is a military regulation, intended for an entirely different purpose."

Now, there is one exception, at any rate, to the gentleman's general statement. The newspapers a year or more ago carried this story of a certain camp: Two commissioned officers of the National Guard were picked up by a lady in an automobile, driving either toward the camp or from the camp. Then she overtook two enlisted men and told the chauffeur to stop and she would pick them up. These young officers told her if she did that they would have to get out of the automobile; that they could not ride with enlisted men. Of course, recognizing their rights in the premises, she stopped and permitted them to exercise those rights, and let the officers get out and took the privates in. [Applause.] That story was carried in the papers, and I think very likely it was true. Thereupon the commanding officer of another camp—Camp Pike, in Arkansas—assembled his commissioned officers, took that story for his text, and told them that such conduct on the part of officers was thoroughly unjusti-

fiable and unjustified, that it was the manifestation of a spirit that should not exist in the American Army, and that he hoped no officer in his command would ever be guilty of such conduct. [Applause.] He said: "Frequently as I drive along from the camp or to the camp I come across enlisted men walking, stop my automobile, and take them in with me." That was a general officer, lecturing the commissioned officers of his division.

Subsequently I myself, time and again, saw commissioned officers riding in their automobiles stop on the road, pick up privates and ride with them, boys of their acquaintance, call them Jim and Tom, and the enlisted men called the commissioned officer by his first name. I saw that time and again myself. I saw the commissioned officers and the privates eat at the same table, not only in private residences but at hotels, on terms at that time of absolute social equality. So I think whatever may be the general spirit, whatever may be the spirit of the Regular Army officer, it should not be stated that that spirit is universal in the great Army which we have organized and with which we won the war.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That is, the commanding general was going around—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Gentlemen of the House, in the Army as everywhere else you see some gentlemen and you see some snobs. The gentleman from Alabama is talking about the snobs and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] is talking about gentlemen. They are both right. It is true in one part of the Army the boys are trained toward snobbery, but there are gentlemen among them, and many of them. I have here something that I think will interest the House a little. The other day I discovered that the officers up in the Great Lakes Training Station were very much averse to allowing privates who wanted to be discharged to receive assistance from any neighbor who happened to be in Congress. Anybody else could furnish any evidence he has. I spoke of this in the House on the 29th, and I am glad to see that the gentleman from Alabama got a response. If gentlemen will go at these things in a quiet kind of way, like the gentleman from Alabama and I do, they will often get results. [Laughter.] I have an order which followed of a couple of days after in the House which the Bureau of Navigation sent me. It does not entirely cover the situation, but it helps. It is headed "Navigation," and is dated "31 January, 1919":

NAVIGATION,  
31 January, 1919.

*Commandants of all naval districts:*

Reservists and men of Regular Navy who enlisted for duration of war who are undergoing training at training stations, training camps, and trade schools will be released on their own applications for such release. Commandants will issue necessary instructions. General instructions of Bureau of Navigation Circular Letters 225-18 and 3-19 remain in effect. Acknowledge. 10031.

BUNAV.

I suppose that is the Bureau of Navigation. As I understand this order, any boy enlisted for the war in the Navy who is in a training station, training camp, or trade school can be released on his own application. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES] and I each had a telephone from the bureau, in which we were informed that it also included all boys in the regular Navy who enlisted; but I find that they left out a comma. If they would say "who enlisted for duration of war," and use a comma, and then go on, I think it would mean that. I suppose that there was a little confusion raised over the fact that the comma is not there. I want to say that I think that is a very great improvement in the situation. The boys in these places can now get out. I think that the rules we run up against were made by men dressed in a little brief authority, who did not understand the situation; but when men of more breadth of character got the facts the order came. I think it possible to argue with them and present things in a simple way and be fairly treated. If the taxpayers pay their salaries, Representatives of taxpayers ought to be able to get a hearing for constituents. It is time that the Congress of the United States should have some respect for itself.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say to the gentleman that day before yesterday I received a letter from Admiral Blue, the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, giving at length the orders that were made, and I put them in the RECORD.

Mr. LITTLE. I had a little correspondence with Admiral Blue myself two or three weeks ago. I did not know just what his position was. I thought he was a doctor. I did not know him, but he wrote me pretty firmly, and I wrote him pretty firmly myself, and explained that he could not expect to enforce

rules like that and have very much affection for the United States Navy among the people. I suggested to him to quit monkeying with the buzz saw if he wanted the Navy to have the support of the Nation, and I am glad to hear that he adopted my suggestion. Admiral Blue seems to be a nice man when he gets his second wind.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think that the Washington street cars are a great leveler of rank?

Mr. LITTLE. I find it so; I find in them I am as good as anybody.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Is not there a string to all of these orders—they provide that if they can be spared by the commanding officer, and is not that the way they get out of a lot of things?

Mr. LITTLE. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that there is no string to the order that was issued for these stations. I wrote the commanding officer about a man, and inquired why he was not discharged, and he wrote to me a letter, which I got to-day, that the thing has been indorsed and sent up to a higher man, and suggested that I write the higher man, that it would do some good. That is fine. Congressmen like ROYAL JOHNSON, who entered the Army as a private, may soon attain such a social position they can attend a party and see lieutenants dancing. If that is the rule, I think when he gets my letter it may help him some. I do not believe there is any string intended, but little fellows who want to be clever and bull-headed probably make some trouble for themselves.

Mr. BURNETT. That is the trouble you will run up against.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LARSEN. I object.

Mr. MANN. I am glad to know that the gentleman is still here. Twenty minutes of time have gone by in discussion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Engineering Experiment Station, United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: For original investigation and extended experimentation of naval appliances, testing implements and apparatus; purchase and installation of such machines and auxiliaries considered applicable for test and use in the naval service, and for maintenance and equipment of buildings and grounds, \$160,000.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What was the question that the gentleman from Illinois desired to ask me?

Mr. MANN. It does not relate to this bill.

Mr. LITTLE. That does not bother me as much as the gentleman might think.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman asked whether there were strings tied to these orders, and I wondered. I had a case the other day where I was informed by an officer in charge at the department that a certain officer would be discharged upon his application. The officer made the application to his commanding officer and was told to go—that they would not let him out, and in effect the commanding officer said that the order of the officer in Washington did not cut any ice. The commanding officer said they needed him there, so they have had him transferred to some other place, and he is still in the service, notwithstanding the officer here in charge of the department ordered that he be released.

Mr. LITTLE. The only suggestion I can make is that that fellow is probably subject to a court-martial, and the gentleman ought to go at him.

Mr. MANN. I do not think he is.

Mr. LITTLE. If his superior ordered him to discharge the man he is.

Mr. MANN. I do not say that he ordered him, but he wrote me that he would be discharged. I did not notify the other officer of that fact, but the other day my friend came through Washington and said that his commanding officer had refused to discharge him, stating that he was needed in the service, and my friend finally stated further that his commanding officer then told him that he did not need him there, and he had been transferred to another place.

Mr. BURNETT. Was that in the Army or the Navy?

Mr. MANN. I will say now that that was in the Army.

Mr. LITTLE. I think probably that fellow disobeyed an order, and the gentleman should investigate it. I found a colored captain sent to our town by The Adjutant General to take a command. He found some other fellow there and a division of opinion arose about it. The colored officer was put under arrest and court-martialed, but when I called the

attention of the department to what seemed to me to be the regulations—and we had quite a disturbance about it for two weeks—when I presented to the War Department such knowledge as I had of the regulations, and the evidence went before the court-martial, they acquitted the colored man and ordered, I hear, a reprimand of the man who had him subjected to court-martial. If you find these things out and present the facts and go and tell the man who told you what happened, and ask whether he issued an order or is simply wasting time writing letters giving advice, I think you will get somewhere. If the order in this case was issued, then that man ought to be court-martialed. This House ought to have enough respect for itself and for its constituents to see that laws are enforced and justice done.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commissary department: For chief clerk and purchasing agent, chief cook and cooks, steward and assistant stewards, stenographers, typists, head waiters, and assistant head waiters, head pantrymen, bakers, butchers, and necessary pantrymen, butcher's helpers, baker's helpers, waiters, coffee-men, dish pantrymen, utility men, linemen, scullions, and other unskilled and unclassified occupations, wages to be determined by the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, and in no case to exceed \$75 per month, \$185,545.45.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. I think there must be some mistake in the language that is incorporated in this paragraph of the bill. I hardly think it is the purpose of the committee to provide that no person shall receive more than \$75 a month, as is provided in the last line of the paragraph. It limits everyone designated in the paragraph to that sum, while the chief clerk at the present time is receiving \$1,800 a year.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not intended for that.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is obvious that it was not so intended. May I inquire what was the purpose of the committee in eliminating the salaries to be paid to the respective employees designated here?

Mr. PADGETT. I will be very glad to explain that to the House. We were confronted to this condition, and I cite the actual occurrences: In the preparation of the last naval appropriation bill, and before that we had statutory employees on a per annum basis, whose compensation was fixed at so much per annum. We had men on a per diem basis who did the same work alongside of these statutory men, and their compensation was fixed by the wage board. While the House committee was making up the bill in the last session that was ultimately signed on the 1st day of July, the wage board had increased the compensation of the per diem men to a higher compensation than the statutory men.

They came before the Congress and said that their salaries should be increased. The committee reported an increase, putting them upon an equality with the compensation of the per diem men working alongside whose compensation was fixed by the Wage Board. The House accepted it and passed it. The bill went to the Senate, but while the bill was pending in the Senate the Wage Board met again and increased the compensation of the per diem men and immediately the statutory men went before the Senate committee and said that they must have another increase, because the Wage Board had increased the compensation of the per diem men and they must be made on an equality, and the Senate Committee reported it, the Senate passed it, and the House agreed to it in conference here, and there were two raises made under the seesaw proposition. When the estimates came down in December—now that was the bill which was signed July 1—we found that the Wage Board had met again and increased the per diem men, and the recommendation came in for an increase of the statutory men. We concluded that under this condition the proper thing to do and the wise thing to do was to put them all upon the per diem and whenever the time of reduction comes they will all go. If you have a reduction take place under the per diem, you know the difficulty of getting a reduction on the statutory when they are once fixed by statute.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it planned to put the chief clerk and purchasing agent, who is now receiving \$1,800 statutory salary, and the steward, who is receiving \$1,800, on a per diem basis?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; all of those who are mentioned in here go into that lump sum of per diem, like it was many years ago. When I first went on the committee they were put on a per diem basis. The representatives of the men came before the committee and urged that they be put upon a statutory basis, insisting that it would be a few dollars cheaper than the per diem. Congress adopted that and put them on the statutory basis. Now comes this seesaw that has worked them up, and we have put them back like it was upon the per diem basis, and hope that it will be a condition where, whenever the reduction comes, it can be taken care of better dealing with the whole than you can where you have the statutory man

with the statutory compensation to hold up the per diem men, as the per diem men under the wage board have been pushed up to the statutory men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask to be recognized for five minutes more.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Would the gentleman have any objection to having a limitation that no employee hereunder shall receive a salary in excess of \$2,000?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think any of them receive that much.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the statutory roll the maximum of two of these places is \$1,800, and yet with no limitation they might go up much higher than \$2,000.

Mr. PADGETT. If it is limited to this paragraph, I have no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. What disposition does the gentleman wish to make about the obvious error carried in the paragraph where it says that no one is to receive more than \$75 per month?

Mr. PADGETT. In no case to exceed \$75 per month "in cases of unskilled and unclassified employees."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order and offer the following amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Before offering that let me offer mine.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment for the time being.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, on page 41, line 2, after the word "month" insert "in cases of unskilled and unclassified employees."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 41, line 2, after the word "month" insert "in cases of unskilled and unclassified employees."

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 41, line 2, after the figures "\$185,545.45," insert: "Provided, That no employee hereunder shall receive a salary in excess of \$2,000."

Mr. PADGETT. Let me ask the gentleman to change the wording a little, to "That no person paid under the provisions of this paragraph."

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, well; I am perfectly willing to accept the suggestion. But "hereunder" would refer to those in the paragraph. It is the language customary in appropriation bills; but I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as changed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 41, line 2, after "\$185,545.45," insert:

"Provided, That no employee paid under the provisions of this paragraph shall receive a salary in excess of \$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

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

The Clerk read as follows:

For the employment of such additional temporary force of employees in the various departments of the Naval Academy as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy may be necessary to the transaction of official business on account of the existing emergency, \$150,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What is the existing emergency?

Mr. PADGETT. The emergency is simply this: That we have recently increased the number of midshipmen to five for each district, and the classes are very much enlarged. Then we made an appropriation extending Bancroft Hall, at a cost of about \$3,000,000. And the number of men there is increasing each year. They have not been able to get it down to a basis as to how many there should be, and this sum is to take care of that enlarged development and the number of men at the academy.

Mr. MANN. The words "existing emergency" have no reference to the war?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; it is on account of conditions at the academy.

Mr. MANN. That language has been carried in many cases as referring to the war, and probably was thought to relate to the war when it went into this paragraph a year ago. This has

nothing to do with the professors, I take it, or anything of that kind—the teaching force?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. This is intended to take care of a large number of employees in the various departments there at work on account of the enlarged operations of the school.

Mr. MANN. How does it require an additional sum of \$150,000?

Mr. PADGETT. Seventy-five thousand dollars of it is on account of the increase in the wages—on account of the cost of labor.

Mr. MANN. I take it that it is not.

Mr. PADGETT. That is what they stated to us.

Mr. MANN. This is for the employment of an additional force of employees necessary in the transaction of official business. What tremendous official business does the school have to transact?

Mr. PADGETT. On that very question and at that very place there the commander, in answer to a question that I asked him, said that they would have to shut up shop if they cut it out, as at least \$75,000 of it would be required to meet the new wage schedule.

Mr. MANN. This has nothing to do with the wage scale. Of course, I do not know what they use the money for. That is one of the peculiarities of the Navy and the naval bill. No one ever knows what the money appropriated is used for.

Mr. PADGETT. It says for the employment of such additional temporary force of employees in the various departments of the Naval Academy. It takes up the various departments, and it refers to these additional employees. The wage scale is very much higher than it was.

Mr. MANN. This is for the employment of an additional temporary force of employees. It has nothing to do with the regular force of employees, and they are only employees which the Secretary of the Navy considers may be necessary to the transaction of official business. What does that mean?

Mr. PADGETT. It means employees connected with the academy and with the departments down there in any form of work. It says, and the language is plain, it seems to me—

Mr. MANN. Does it mean an additional plumber?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. It is a queer use of language.

Mr. PADGETT. They use the word "employees." They would be employees. And it would have to be, not for the private employment of some man connected there—

Mr. MANN. We do not make any appropriations for the private employment of some man privately employed there. What is the use of saying that?

Mr. PADGETT. That is the reason they use the word "official," so that it would be for the official business of the academy.

Mr. MANN. That is silly, because you might use that in every item in the bill, then, that it is necessary, in order to keep them from throwing money to the birds, to say it shall be used for official business. The term "official business" has a meaning. It is not related to the fixing of a water pipe. I do not think the gentleman knows how this money is to be spent, and hence I do not desire to press him. No one can tell from the language of the bill what it will be spent for, but it will not be spent according to the meaning which anybody would read into the language of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, Naval Academy, exclusive of public works, \$1,566,385.05.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. What is the meaning of that phrase "exclusive of public works"?

Mr. PADGETT. Under Yards and Docks there are public works. Whatever they do, they can not get anything out of that. It has to be expressly provided for them under Yards and Docks; and if nothing is provided under public works of Yards and Docks no part of this money could be used for work of that kind.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws the pro forma amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of officers prescribed by law, on the retired list: For 2 major generals, 3 brigadier generals, 5 colonels, 3 lieutenant colonels, 40 majors, 4 captains, 1 first lieutenant, 2 second lieutenants, and for officers who may be placed thereon during the year, including such increased pay as is now or may hereafter be provided for retired officers regularly assigned to active duty, \$277,750.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do this so as to obtain information as to whether the additional officers provided for in this paragraph are those who are retired by reason of law?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir. That is not a fixed number. It varies. If a man goes on the retired list in pursuance of law he is taken care of under this appropriation. If he dies he is dropped out of a number, and if another man comes in he is added to it. It changes from time to time to meet the number actually on the list at the time the appropriation was made.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there any special significance in the large increase of the majors on the retired list from 11 last year to 40, as carried in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. No. I do not know what produced the number.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of enlisted men, active and reserve list: Pay and allowances of noncommissioned officers, musicians, and privates, as prescribed by law, and for the expenses of clerks of the United States Marine Corps traveling under orders, and including additional compensation for enlisted men of the Marine Corps regularly detailed as gun captains, gun pointers, mess sergeants, cooks, messmen, signalmen, or holding good-conduct medals, pins, or bars, including interest on deposits by enlisted men, post-exchange debts of deserters, under such rules as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, and the authorized travel allowance of discharged enlisted men and for prizes for excellence in gunnery exercise and target practice and for pay of enlisted men designated as Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks, both afloat and ashore, \$24,428,537.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire whether this appropriation should not be reduced, in view of the action taken by the committee last night in adhering to the present enlisted force as the permanent force of the Marine Corps?

Mr. PADGETT. We provided for the year for 50,000, and that remained in. It was only the increase of the permanent thing that was stricken out.

Mr. BUTLER. You will not save any money this year.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent, Marine Corps: For freight, expressage, tolls, cartage, advertising, washing of bed sacks, mattress covers, pillowcases, towels, and sheets, funeral expenses of officers and enlisted men, and retired officers on active duty during the war, and retired enlisted men of the Marine Corps, including the transportation of bodies and their arms and wearing apparel from the place of demise to the homes of the deceased in the United States; stationery and other paper, printing and binding; telegraphing, rent of telephones; purchase, repair, and exchange of typewriters; apprehension of stragglers and deserters; per diem of enlisted men employed on constant labor for periods of not less than 10 days; employment of civilian labor; purchase, repair, and installation and maintenance of gas, electric, sewer, and water pipes and fixtures; office and barracks furniture, vacuum cleaners, camp and garrison equipage and implements; mess utensils for enlisted men; packing boxes, wrapping paper, oilcloth, crash, rope, twine, quarantine fees, camphor and carbolyzed paper, carpenters' tools, tools for police purposes, safes, purchase, hire, repair, and maintenance of such harness, wagons, motor wagons, armored automobiles, carts, drays, motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes, and other vehicles as are required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official military and garrison purposes; purchase of public horses and mules; services of veterinary surgeons, and medicines for public animals, and the authorized number of officers' horses; purchase of mounts and horse equipment for all officers below the grade of major required to be mounted; shoeing for public animals and the authorized number of officers' horses; purchase and repair of hose, fire extinguishers, hand grenades, carts, wheelbarrows, and lawn mowers; purchase, installation, and repair of cooking and heating stoves and furnaces; purchase of towels, soap, combs, and brushes for offices; postage stamps for foreign and registered postage; books, newspapers, and periodicals; improving parade grounds; repair of pumps and wharves, water; straw for bedding, mattresses; mattress covers, pillows, sheets; furniture for Government quarters and repair of same; packing and crating officers' allowance of baggage on change of station; deodorizing, lubricants, disinfectants; for the construction, operation, and maintenance of laundries; and for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising at home and abroad, but impossible to anticipate or classify, \$4,500,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the funds received in payment for laundry work performed by post laundries shall be used to defray the cost of operation of said laundries, and the receipts and expenditures shall be accounted for in accordance with the methods prescribed by law, and any sums remaining after such cost of maintenance and operation have been defrayed shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost of operation of such plants is paid.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to direct the attention of the chairman to the fact that on line 16, page 50, the word "work" is not spelled correctly in the print that I have. What is the idea?

Mr. PADGETT. In my print it is correct, "Laundry work." They left off the letter "k" in the other print. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk be authorized to make the correction.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. What is the purpose of this proviso as to funds received in payment of laundry work performed by post laundries, that they shall be used to defray the cost of the operation of said laundry? Do I understand that the posts operate laundries and make a charge to the enlisted men for the laundry work done?

Mr. PADGETT. That is what it is for. A nominal charge is made. It is far cheaper than they can get it done outside for. It is a very nominal cost. Without the posts operating them they have to go out into the community and have it done there. The Government does not do their laundry for them. This is to allow them to do it at a nominal cost, and if there should be a profit it would be turned into the Treasury to the credit of the fund.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the Government do the laundry work for the men aboard battleships?

Mr. PADGETT. It does not.

Mr. WALSH. They have to pay that?

Mr. PADGETT. They pay a nominal charge. It is very little, but they pay it.

Mr. WALSH. I remember hearing some of the officers of the Marine Corps, when by reason of the kindness of the gentleman I was permitted to visit Quantico last summer, complaining very bitterly at the charge made at the laundry for the white duck uniform some of them had to wear. I do not know whether the marines themselves wore them or not.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know as to the officers, but we inquired of the men on the ships. They get their laundry at a very cheap rate on board ship, and we understand that at posts where they have laundries they charge a very nominal rate.

Mr. WALSH. It would appear from this proviso that these laundries are being operated upon a profit basis, because it takes care of the excess of receipts over expenditures.

Mr. PADGETT. Of course, it is impossible to operate a laundry at the exact cost. That is only to take care of whatever small profit there may be—just to designate where it shall go. It is not intended that the laundries shall make any profit.

Mr. WALSH. No; but if they make a profit for two or three months and turn it into the Treasury, ought they not to revise their schedule of charges, so that in future operations the men may get the benefit, rather than keep covering a profit into the Treasury?

Mr. PADGETT. That is what is intended to be done—not to operate at a profit, but where there is a profit to know how to dispose of it. It is not intended to operate it as a profit-making concern.

Mr. WALSH. So that the officer in control at some place where they have made a profit and turned it into the Treasury will not be held up as a shining example of efficiency, by reason of this proviso, because he has operated the laundry at a profit?

Mr. PADGETT. No; that is not intended.

Mr. WALSH. Thereby encouraging other officers to do the same thing.

Mr. PADGETT. No; the honor will be the other way—to make it as cheap to the men as they can, and at as small a cost, and at as near as possible to the actual cost of operation.

Mr. WALSH. How much was turned into the Treasury from the laundry operations last year?

Mr. PADGETT. There was not anything. There has been no authority for it heretofore. You will notice that the language above there includes "the construction, operation, and maintenance of laundries." That is new language that is put in there.

Mr. WALSH. I did not know but this had been done heretofore.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that at some of the posts they have been operating on a very small scale on a kind of mutual basis.

Mr. WALSH. A cooperative basis?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; a cooperative basis, or something of that kind. This is to give it a standing and status, so that the men can get their laundry work done under the very best conditions at the cheapest rate.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I renew the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. HICKS. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin renews the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hicks].

Mr. HICKS. While we are on this subject of laundries, if I may be permitted—and I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for allowing me to proceed—it may be of interest to the members of the committee for me to state, briefly, the attitude of the Army in this matter, because there is considerable agitation at the present time for free laundry work in the Army. We have at some of our large cantonments, I think, 10 or possibly 12 laundry establishments owned and operated by the Government. In these plants the men can have their laundry work done and are permitted to send an unlimited number of pieces, for which service they are charged only \$1 a month. Where these Army laundries are not maintained the Government makes private contracts, when it is able to do so, and then the men individually send their clothes to the laundries in accordance with the contract. In other places the Army has nothing to do with the laundry at all, and the men make their own arrangements outside of the camp. In many places this latter method has proved very unsatisfactory. The agitation going on for Government laundries is based on the fact that when men are compelled to do their own laundry work, or where they are compelled to pay for having it done at private laundries at a piece cost, the tendency is either for the men to send too few clothes to the laundry, thereby promoting a lack of cleanliness, or else, when they do their own laundry work, they do it in such a bad manner that their clothes are badly shrunk or are burned by being dried before an improvised fire; and the Army records show that we have lost thousands of dollars' worth of valuable underwear and clothing belonging to soldiers because of the insufficient laundry facilities, causing waste by shrinkage or burning. My own feeling in regard to this laundry question is that, as we supply the men with medical treatment, as we give them recreation, as we supply hospital treatment, as we try to encourage them in every way to develop their bodies and to keep their bodies clean, we should also see that their clothes are laundered without cost. It is all a part of hygienics, and I believe that clean clothing is just as essential to the welfare of the men as clean thoughts and clean living. I hope the time will come when the United States Navy will adopt the same policy toward the sailors as I think the United States Army is going to adopt toward the soldiers and supply to all men laundry service free of cost.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee at what period of time it is proposed to have the accounting to turn the surplus money back into the Treasury?

Mr. PADGETT. What surplus?

Mr. STAFFORD. You make a provision that any sums remaining after such cost of maintenance and operation have been defrayed shall be deposited in the Treasury. When will the surplus be turned back?

Mr. PADGETT. I imagine it will be current, at the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no period stated here. Does not the gentleman think it would be advisable to insert after the word "remaining," in line 20, "at the end of the fiscal year"?

Mr. PADGETT. I have no objection; that is what it means. This is for the fiscal year and they must wind up the business at the end of the year. They could not carry it over into another year because the fund is only available for that year. I have no objection to the gentleman inserting the language, but that is what it means, anyway.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order and offer the following amendment, to insert after the word "remaining," in line 20, the words "at the end of the fiscal year."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 50, line 20, after the word "remaining" insert "at the end of the fiscal year."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Total Marine Corps, exclusive of public works, \$78,561,358.28.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like the indulgence of the House just a moment. Earlier in the afternoon gentlemen on both sides of the House inquired about "the increase of the Navy," and at that time it appeared that we would not be able to reach it or take it up. I told them that we would not take up the increase of the Navy this afternoon, that it would go over. I understand from the Speaker that to-morrow he will recognize the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] to call up the conference report on the revenue bill. How long that will take I do not know. I want to ask the gentleman on the other side, Mr. BUTLER, if he would object or be willing for us to go ahead and read the balance of pages 51 and 52, which relate only to the increase of limit of cost of ships of the 1916 program, and then the committee rise when we reach the bottom of page 52? That would take us up to the new program. I am going to leave it to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUTLER. That is very generous of the gentleman. I do not like to assume the responsibility of prolonging the consideration of the bill unduly. Suppose we say this, if it is agreeable to the gentleman, that if they finish the consideration of the conference report before a certain hour to-morrow we will resume the consideration of this bill.

Mr. PADGETT. I am talking of what we will do now.

Mr. BUTLER. I mean to say that if we finish the discussion on the conference report of the revenue bill we will take up this. I do not know how much time will be consumed in the discussion of that conference report, but I think perhaps all the afternoon.

Mr. PADGETT. I think it will take all day to-morrow. That is my judgment about it, and this will very likely have to go over until Monday.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it the purpose of the chairman not to consider what is known as the presidential program or the new program until Monday; that is, that it will not be considered to-morrow or Saturday?

Mr. PADGETT. I could not say. Everybody will be here to-morrow on the other bill.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think the gentleman from Tennessee is absolutely right that the conference report on the revenue bill will take all day to-morrow.

Mr. PADGETT. I think it will, so that this will go over until Monday. I have no authority to say that if anything should happen that the conference report would be agreed to early we would not take this up, because we might have half of the afternoon or abundance of time to take it up. But I wanted to know if we could not dispose now of pages 51 and 52 and then rise. That will leave us up to the new program.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. On page 52 it speaks of the limit of cost of the vessels.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman's proposition was to discuss page 52. Is it not a fact that on line 9, for example, there is really nothing under way, for none of these ships are built, or any part of them, and with line 11 we find \$160,000,000 worth of ships, on which we have not, as I figure it, laid a stick. Does the gentleman intend to take that up?

Mr. PADGETT. The contracts have been awarded for four of them, and the other two have been designated to be built at the Philadelphia yards, and they are proceeding to build them, but they realize that at the present cost of labor and material the limit of cost will not complete them.

Mr. LITTLE. The mere fact that they have made a contract probably does not fix it so that they can not set it aside.

Mr. PADGETT. All of them are on a cost-plus basis. They could not get any contract for a lump sum. Nobody in the country would undertake it.

Mr. LITTLE. There are eight ships here, and he only mentions four that there are contracts for. Would not any above that be additions, like those on the next page?

Mr. PADGETT. This is simply to fix the cost under which they may proceed with the construction. It does not involve any additional appropriation.

Mr. LITTLE. If we do not appropriate it, they could not proceed with a lot of new ships. If they build, the taxpayers must pay.

Mr. PADGETT. It does not involve the appropriation of any additional money. It is only authorization.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that he have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Let us see if we can not arrive at some agreement. I do not want to deny the request made by the gentleman from Tennessee, but after talking with some of my colleagues here I find they desire very much to consider the present program along with the new one, and I believe that if we consider the two of them together we will expedite the business and finish the two of them in good time. Of course, the gentleman has it within his power to move to-morrow afternoon to go into the committee and consider this bill if the opportunity affords itself, and I would not ask him to agree not to do it.

Mr. PADGETT. I could not say when we would take it up, but it looks as though we would not take it up before Monday. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15539, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman whether he expects to go on with this bill to-morrow?

Mr. PADGETT. No; the Speaker expects to recognize Mr. KIRCHIN to call up the conference report on the revenue bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That was my understanding. If the revenue bill takes all day to-morrow this bill will go over until Monday?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. If for any reason the revenue bill should be concluded in time, we might move to-morrow afternoon to consider this bill.

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I ask the gentleman if he makes this request at the suggestion of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. PADGETT. Not to-day. The gentleman has asked me each day to make this request.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KIRCHIN] has been at home all day, I presume, preparing for the consideration of the revenue bill to-morrow.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It only occurs to me, unless the gentleman from North Carolina has some very good reason for beginning at 11 o'clock to-morrow, that it would not be advisable to do so, because there are a number of gentlemen who would like even to have that extra hour on Saturday morning to look over this bill.

Mr. PADGETT. I just assumed the gentleman wanted as much time as possible for his discussion, and if it would take all day it would give an additional hour for such discussion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] objects.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 8, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriations for national archives building, Washington, D. C. (H. Doc. No. 1772); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting copies of certain estimates for the relief of officers, and for other purposes (H. Doc. No. 1773); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting tentative draft of amendments desired to be incorporated in the appropriation bill for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920 (H. Doc. No. 1774); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

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

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. PRICE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7253) for the relief of F. M. Barfield, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1042), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

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

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

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 15744) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Warren, Ohio, two German cannon or fieldpieces, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15745) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ashtabula, Ohio, two German cannon or fieldpieces, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15746) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sebring, Ohio, two German cannon or fieldpieces, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15747) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Youngstown, Ohio, four German cannon or fieldpieces, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15748) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Niles, Ohio, two German cannon or fieldpieces, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15749) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Conneaut, Ohio, two German cannon or fieldpieces, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15750) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Windsor, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15751) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Rock Creek, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15752) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Mineral Ridge, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15753) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Geneva, Ohio, two German cannons or fieldpieces, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15754) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jefferson, Ohio, two German cannons or fieldpieces, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15755) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Niles, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A bill (H. R. 15756) donating a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the borough of Pennington, N. J., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRAND: A bill (H. R. 15757) to repeal Title VII of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPTER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 15758) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Madill, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15759) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of McAlester, Okla., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15760) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Talihina, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15761) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Durant, Okla., three German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 15762) to provide for the erection of a public building at Morganton, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRAY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 15763) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Bayonne, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15764) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the township of Elizabeth, in the State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 15765) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Lehigh, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARLAND: A bill (H. R. 15766) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Edgewood, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 15767) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Manawa, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 15768) declaring October 27 of each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 15769) to repeal the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 15770) to provide for the guarantees made to wheat producers for the crop years 1918 and 1919, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 15771) to donate two captured cannon or fieldpieces to the city of Wapakoneta, Auglaize County, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 15772) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Irvington, N. J., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15773) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Newark, N. J., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRUKKER: A bill (H. R. 15774) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Clifton, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOMINICK: A bill (H. R. 15775) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Seneca, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENTON: A bill (H. R. 15776) for the erection of a Federal building at Mount Vernon, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 15777) to provide for flood control on the Colorado River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: Resolution (H. Res. 556) directing the Secretary of War to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of all correspondence and other papers and memoranda relating to regulations for training registrants prior to their induction into military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorializing the Congress of the United States to cooperate with the Dominion of Canada in the enlarged canalization of the St. Lawrence River for the passage of ocean-going vessels into the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin relating to the tobacco industry and requesting the Federal Trade Commission to report on such industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 15778) granting a pension to Owen E. Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 15779) granting an increase of pension to John T. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 15780) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Dittenhafer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15781) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius McCafferty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Memorial adopted by the Friends of Irish Freedom of Newark, Ohio, asking recognition for the Republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Racine, Kenosha, Waukesha, Rock, and Walworth Counties, Wis., asking for repeal of postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Eugene J. Reitter, D. B. Worthington, and other residents of Beloit, Wis., asking that Congress create a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of citizens of Cambridge, Mass., protesting against postal zone rate law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Arlington, Mass., protesting against the postal zone rate law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of International Association of Engineers, Local No. 584, and citizens, favoring ownership by the Government (H. R. 10550); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Earl L. Scott, manager of Fox Theater, Black River Falls, Wis., protesting against imposition of 5 per cent tax on moving-picture film rentals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of La Crosse, Wis., indorsing House bill 10550 providing for national ownership and Government control of all railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of citizens of Woburn, Mass., in mass meeting assembled, demanding that the principle of self-determination shall be applied to all nations, great and small, mindful first of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Men's Club of Watertown Unitarian Church, January 15, 1919, demanding that steps be taken to organize justice among nations and prevention of war and the uplift of humanity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, protesting against legislation authorizing a State constabulary in Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of Rev. W. Greer McCrory and divers other members, friends, and adherents of the Henderson United Presbyterian Church, in Warren County, Ill., with reference to a repeal of the zone postal law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Ancient Order of Hibernians, of East Hartford, Conn., relating to self-determination of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of general committee of citizens of Waterbury, Conn., in re welfare of sailors and soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of 86 citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., for the enactment of a law providing for the Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Petition of State board of agriculture in session at Harrisburg, Pa., January 22, 1919, favoring a system of universal military training similar to that known as the Swiss; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOWN: Memorial of House of Representatives of Oklahoma, relating to the distribution of captured war relics; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Sapulpa Commercial Club, relating to the removal of restrictions on Indian lands and sale of same; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of board of directors of the National Federation of Construction Industries, favoring early return of the railroads to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEELY: Telegram signed by J. L. Stifel & Sons, Wheeling, W. Va., requesting that new revenue bill be not enacted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, telegram signed by Hon. J. E. Stevens, Wheeling, W. Va., requesting the nonpassage of the revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLK: Petition of Manufacturers' Association of Wilmington, Del., opposing the continuance of United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Papers in the pension case of Reuben Drinkwater (H. R. 15567); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of citizens of Creston, Iowa, indorsing House bill 10550, providing for national ownership and Government operation of all railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Petition of residents of Minnesota, demanding that Congress pass necessary legislation to carry out the terms of the President's proclamation on the guaranteed price of wheat for 1919; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 8, 1919.

(Legislative day of Friday, Feb. 7, 1919.)

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Smoot
Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Spencer
Borah	Jones, Wash.	Page	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Penrose	Sutherland
Colt	King	Pittman	Swanson
Culberson	Kirby	Poindexter	Thomas
Curtis	Knox	Pollock	Thompson
Dillingham	La Follette	Pomerene	Townsend
Fernald	Lenroot	Ransdell	Trammell
Fletcher	Lodge	Robinson	Underwood
France	McKellar	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Gay	McNary	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Hale	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Walsh
Harding	Moses	Sherman	Warren
Henderson	Nelson	Simmons	Weeks
Johnson, Cal.	New	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WORCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] are detained on official business.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I desire to state that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is till confined to his house by illness.

I wish also to state that the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is detained from the Senate by illness.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I desire to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] on committee work of the Senate.

Mr. POLLOCK. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

## CLAIMS OF ARMY OFFICERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting copies of certain estimates for the relief of officers, and for other purposes, which were submitted as part of the annual estimates for the Army appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1920, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WALSH. I present a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled for the passage of an act ceding to the State of Montana the military reservation located in Montana known as Fort William Henry Harrison, to be used as an adjunct of the State industrial accident board for a rehabilitation institute for the education and maintenance of persons injured in the industries of Montana and adjoining States.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas by act of Congress approved May 12, 1892, there was established in the State of Montana Fort William Henry Harrison, the site for which, consisting of 1,000 acres, was donated to the United States by the citizens of Helena, and in addition to which there has been acquired by purchase sufficient land to make up a total of 1,790 acres, which said site is described as follows, to wit: Mineral entry No. 1900, situated in the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 4 in township 10 north of range 4 west of the Montana principal meridian; the northeast quarter of section 9; the southeast quarter, the south half of the northeast quarter, the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter, the west half of the northwest quarter, and the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 10; the southwest quarter of section 11; the west half of section 15; the east half of section 16; the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter

of section 17; the northeast quarter, the east half of the northwest quarter, and the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 21; and the north half of the northwest quarter of section 22, all in township 10 north of range 4 west of the Montana principal meridian; and

Whereas there has been constructed upon the said site a large number of brick buildings of a permanent character, and there has been acquired in connection with the said site ample water facilities for irrigating and making productive said lands in the growing of grass, trees, shrubbery, vegetables, and other agricultural products, making a very attractive and useful piece of property; and

Whereas the said site and buildings have not been used by the War Department for the purposes for which they were acquired for a period of more than three years last past, and there does not appear to be at the present time any prospect for the immediate use of the said site for the uses of the War Department, and the buildings are decaying by reason of neglect and nonuse, and the grounds are becoming unsightly; and

Whereas the industrial accident board of the State of Montana, a department of the government of said State organized under the act of the legislative assembly of the said State providing for compensation to workmen injured in the industries of the said State, and providing for the administration of the workmen's compensation act, known as chapter 96 of the Session Laws of the Legislative Assembly of Montana for the Session of 1915, has recommended to the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana now in session the establishment of an institution for the reeducation and rehabilitation of those unfortunates who have been partially or totally disabled by reason of accidents from pursuing their usual vocations or professions, and thereby giving to these unfortunate victims of industrial accidents an opportunity of becoming useful citizens rather than dependents upon the bounty of the State; and

Whereas there is not located in any of the States of the Union an institution of such a character, and an opportunity is here offered for commencing under the most favorable circumstances an experiment which would make possible the vocational reeducation of large numbers of persons injured in the industries of the State of Montana and the adjoining States:

Now, therefore, the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled are hereby respectfully memorialized and petitioned by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislative Assembly of Montana, duly assembled, to enact a law ceding to the State of Montana the above-described site, known as Fort William Henry Harrison, consisting of the tracts hereinabove described, the buildings thereon, the water rights, and all of the appurtenances thereunto belonging or therewith enjoyed, to be used by the State of Montana for the uses and purposes above outlined; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Montana be, and he is hereby directed to transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the President of the Senate of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Montana in Congress severally copies of this memorial.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Woman's Club of New Castle and Damariscotta, in the State of Maine, praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Lithuanian societies and political clubs of Scranton, Pa., praying for the independence of Lithuania, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the city council of Quincy, Mass., favoring the granting to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines six months' additional pay, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Building Trades Employers' Association of Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation for an appropriation of \$100,000,000 to help solve the unemployment situation by furnishing financial aid to States and municipalities for use on public works, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented petitions of the faculty of Mount Holyoke College, of South Hadley, of sundry citizens of Lynn, Mass., and of the congregation of the First Congregational Church of Cambridge, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the establishment of a league of nations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14894) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 697) thereon.

## DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14516) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 698) thereon.

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A bill (S. 5557) to safeguard temporarily, by a license control of imports of potash, the interests of domestic potash