Also, petitions of I. C. Davis and 17 residents of Escondido; of Mrs. Mary Wilkerson and 1 other resident of San Diego; of Mrs. R. Haddon, San Diego; of D. C. Mendenhall, San Diego; of Mrs. H. E. Highle, San Diego; and of Mrs. E. Brown, San Diego, all in the State of California, protesting against Senate bill 645, to provide for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday, or any other like religious measure; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of George W. Vogler, of Ocean Beach, Cal., protesting against House bill 8348, making Columbus Day a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of San Diego Chamber of Commerce, Ed. F. Stahle, executive secretary, San Diego, Cal., favoring House bill 5806, providing for opening up the nearest ample supply of high-grade coal for the use of our Navy and merchant marine in southwestern Pacific waters; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, petition of the United Commercial Travelers of America, A. E. Clark, secretary, San Diego, Cal., favoring inspection of creameries; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Robert P. Reagan, A. H. Gould, E. Zenkner, Helen Zenkner, Gustav Kranz, Franklin P. Jacobus, G. A. Eaton, Marie S. Eaton, and Henry Lohman, all of San Diego, Cal., favoring strict neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of the Fifth Avenue Association on National Defense, urging prompt action on national defense as recommended by the General Board of the Navy and the General Staff of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, opposing the enactment into law of House bill 10405, grain grades act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of J. C. Batement and 7 other citizens of Hope, Mich., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Petition of citizens of Dixon, Ill., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAGEE (by request): Petition of R. N. Wallace and others, of Syracuse, N. Y., against House bill 13048, to create a juvenile court in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of 51 citizens of Ottawa, Kent, and Muskegon Counties, Mich., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Resolution adopted by the Ladies' Literary Society of Napoleon, Henry County, Ohio, favoring a movement to take the administration of Indian affairs out of politics and establish a nonpartisan commission for the administration of Indian affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petitions of 252 citizens of Seneca, 25 people of Oil City, 60 people of Oil City, 1,027 people of Oil City, Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Oil City, 40 people of Oil City, 12 people of Oil City, 50 people of Oil City, and 50 people of Oil City, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 620 people of Warren, Pa., opposing passage of House bill 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of citizens of Ohio County, W. Va., protesting against House bills 491 and 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of Woman's Club, Lodi, Cal., favoring bill for national park service and appropriation for Yosemite National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of citizens of Standish, Cal., against passage of compulsory Sunday-observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fernando, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of First Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Pasadena, Cal., favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of 43 citizens of Portland, Oreg., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STINESS: Petitions of 70 people of Portsmouth and 850 people of Providence, R. I., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Fearless Club, of Providence, R. I., favoring the bills in the interest of superannuated employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Rhode Island Chapter, American Institute of Architects, favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 92, regarding site for a central power plant in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of Washington Park Yacht Club, of Providence, R. I., protesting pending bills regulating the operation of motor boats; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: Petition of 43 citizens of Spencer, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *April 15, 1916.*

(Legislative day of Friday, April 14, 1916.)

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4889) to permanently renew patent No. 21053 with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 12481. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H. R. 14484. An act 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; and

H. R. 14576. An act 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.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) authorizing the Librarian of Congress to return to Williamsburg Lodge, No. 6, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Virginia, the original manuscript of the record of the proceedings of said lodge, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 8351. An act to accept a deed of gift or conveyance from the Lincoln Farm Association, a corporation, to the United States of America, of land near the town of Hodgenville, county of Larue, State of Kentucky, embracing the homestead of Abraham Lincoln and the log cabin in which he was born, together with the memorial hall inclosing the same; and, further, to accept an assignment or transfer of an endowment fund of $50,000 in relation thereto, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 12481. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Patents.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 14484. An act 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; and

H. R. 14576. An act 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.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

Mr. CLAPP. I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4889) to permanently renew patent No. 21053.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The amendments were, in line 6, to strike out "permanently"; in line 7, after "extended," to insert "for a period of 14 years from and after the passage of this act"; in line 9, after "Revolution," to strike out all down to and including "office," in line 12; and to amend the title so as to read "An act to renew patent No. 21053."

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. CLAPP. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum was disclosed when the roll was called last evening and a recess taken.

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

Ashurst	Gore	Oliver	Smoot
Bankhead	Gronna	Overman	Sutherland
Borah	Hardwick	Page	Tillman
Brandegee	Hollis	Pittman	Vardaman
Burleigh	James	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Sheppard	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Sherman	Weeks
Cummins	McCumber	Simmons	Williams
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	
Gallinger	Myers	Smith, Mich.	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON], and the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. TAGGART]. These Senators are paired. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. CLAPP, Mr. HUSTING, Mr. LODGE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. NORRIS, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. THOMPSON answered to their names when called.

Mr. BECKHAM, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. McLEAN, and Mr. BRADY entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will proceed to call the roll on the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], the yeas and nays having been ordered.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, before the roll call proceeds I wish to ask the author of the amendment a question, if I may.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not see how, when the roll call is proceeding, there can be any discussion of the question.

Mr. BORAH. I do not understand that anyone has answered on the roll call this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate took a recess on a roll call last night.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. HARDWICK. When a roll call discloses the absence of a quorum the roll call itself amounts to nothing; there is not a quorum present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the opinion of the Chair that in the present situation the roll call must proceed. The previous call disclosed on the vote the lack of a quorum. In accordance with an order made precedent to that time the Senate recessed at 6 o'clock until 11 o'clock to-day. The Chair believes that that leaves nothing in order except to proceed at once with the yeas and nays.

Mr. BORAH. I have no desire——

Mr. MYERS. I suggest that by unanimous consent the Senator from Idaho may be heard.

Mr. BORAH. I do not desire to do that. I was laboring under the impression that when the roll call disclosed the absence of a quorum that ended that part of the proceedings and that the roll call this morning would be a new proceeding.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I venture to say that the ruling of the Chair is in accordance with the custom of the Senate, and I think the Chair ruled exactly right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will proceed with the calling of the yeas and nays.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BECKHAM (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] and I withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], but on this bill I am privileged to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GRONNA. I inquire if the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. GRONNA. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I observe that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has not voted, and, having a pair with that Senator, I refrain from voting.

Mr. BRADY. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. He is not present, and I withhold my vote. I would vote "yea" if at liberty to vote.

Mr. BECKHAM. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

Mr. STONE (after having voted in the negative). I will have to withdraw my vote, having a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. HARDWICK. I am paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]; and

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—33.

Ashurst	Jones	Pittman	Thompson
Beckham	Kenyon	Poindexter	Wadsworth
Burleigh	Lippitt	Pomerene	Walsh
Chamberlain	Lodge	Ransdell	Warren
Clapp	McCumber	Sheppard	Weeks
Cummins	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	Williams
Gallinger	Norris	Smith, Mich.	
Husting	Oliver	Smoot	
James	Page	Sutherland	

NAYS—23.

Bankhead	Gore	Nelson	Swanson
Borah	Hardwick	Overman	Thomas
Brandegee	Hollis	Robinson	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	McLean	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Colt	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Works
Culberson	Myers	Smith, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—40.

Brady	Fletcher	Lane	Shafroth
Broussard	Goff	Lea, Tenn.	Shields
Bryan	Gronna	Lee, Md.	Smith, Ariz.
Catron	Harding	Lewis	Smith, Md.
Chilton	Hitchcock	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Clark, Wyo.	Hughes	O'Gorman	Sterling
Curtis	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Stone
Dillingham	Johnson, S. D.	Penrose	Taggart
du Pont	Kern	Phelan	Townsend
Fall	La Follette	Reed	Underwood

So Mr. WADSWORTH's amendment to the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah to the substitute reported by the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The amendment to the amendment is as follows:

On page 132, line 18, strike out the words "one thousand seven hundred and eighty-four" and substitute therefor the words "two thousand one hundred and four."

On page 132, line 19, strike out the words "two thousand five hundred and sixteen" and substitute therefor the words "three thousand one hundred and fifty-six."

On page 132, line 21, strike out the word "four."

On page 132, line 22, strike out the words "thousand one hundred and eighty-six" and substitute therefore the words "five thousand two hundred and twenty-five."

On page 132, line 23, strike out the words "twelve thousand five hundred and sixty-two" and substitute therefor the words "fifteen thousand six hundred and seventy-five."

On page 133, line 7, strike out the words "increase the number of" and substitute therefor the words "decrease the number of."

On page 133, strike out lines 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 and substitute therefor "sergeants to 1,784, the number of corporals to 2,516, the number of privates, first class, to 4,186, and the number of privates to 12,562, as reserves become available."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I shall not have time to discuss this proposed amendment very fully in the 10 minutes which I am allowed. The effect of it is to increase the number of the personnel of the Coast Artillery to the maximum provided by this bill instead of the minimum; in other words, to establish the maximum number at once instead of leaving it to the President to increase the number from the minimum to the maximum, as he may see fit.

It seems to me that the necessity of the amendment is perfectly obvious upon the consideration of some perfectly well-established facts. We have to-day coast fortifications upon the two coasts which have cost us $41,000,000; they are among the very best fortifications in the world. We have in those fortifications 530 guns and one hundred and twenty-eight 12-inch mortars; but we have not enough men in the service to man more than one-fourth of the guns. The opinion of the military authorities, as I understand, is that we should provide under this bill for manning one-half of the guns upon these fortifications, leaving it to the State coast artillery reserve forces to take care of the other half; but, as a matter of fact, there are not organized in the States to-day enough men to take care of one-fourth of the guns.

So, if we increase the number of men as my amendment proposes, namely, to 30,000, we shall still fall short of having enough men in the regular force and in the State militia to man all the guns. The increase which is suggested by my amendment will still bring it far short in percentage of the various increases which are now made for the other branches of the service. For example, the present Cavalry strength is 14,148. This bill provides a minimum number now of 25,000, which is an increase of 76 per cent. In the Field Artillery the present force is 5,541. The bill proposes the minimum increase to 18,039, or an increase of 225 per cent.

The Infantry at present numbers 35,339. It is proposed to increase that number to 85,952, or an increase of 143 per cent. The Coast Artillery at present numbers 19,019 and the minimum increase proposed by this bill is but 24,887, or an increase of only 31 per cent. If the amendment which I have proposed is adopted, it will increase it to 30,000, or an increase of only 57 per cent, as compared with an increase of 76 per cent of the Cavalry, 225 per cent of the Field Artillery, and 143 per cent of the Infantry.

It has always seemed to me that one of the most important branches of the military service is the Coast Artillery. In the first place, they serve in connection with the Navy in what may be considered the first line of defense if this country should be attacked from any foreign source. In addition to that, the coast artilleryman, in my judgment and according to my information, is the best equipped man for general service in any of the military forces of the country. He is not only trained as a coast artilleryman, but he is trained in such a way that he may be used effectively in the Infantry forces, he is trained in such a way that he can be used, of course, immediately in the Field Artillery, if it becomes necessary, and his training is of such a character that he can be utilized to operate a machine gun, the handling of which has come now to be a very highly expert branch of the service.

The effect, therefore, of the amendment is in reality to strengthen the entire land forces, because in time of need the men who form a part of the Coast Artillery may be utilized, as I have indicated, in any branch of the service. I very much hope that the chairman of the committee may see his way clear to accept the amendment.

Another thing that is accomplished by the amendment is that, without providing even then as many men as we need, we shall have provided for the immediate training of these 30,000 men; and the President is authorized, as he may be advised, to decrease the number from the maximum to the minimum, instead of, as under the pending bill, increasing from the minimum to the maximum. The effect of that is that whenever a man is retired from the maximum number, he immediately goes into the reserve, and is still available in time of need; in other words, the amendment allows the training of these men at once; which is a highly important matter. Then, as in the wisdom of the President the force may be decreased, these men immediately go into the reserve, so that there are always trained men who can be utilized in case of need.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator from Utah a question?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. As the bill now provides, it is left with the discretion of the Commander in Chief, the President, as to whether or not he will call for the minimum or the maximum number?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He may add to the minimum and increase it to the maximum.

Mr. BORAH. Up to the number which the Senator has fixed as the maximum?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Then the difference between the bill and the Senator's amendment is that the amendment makes it obligatory upon the President to make the increase at once?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes. I want the maximum force because, as I have said, even then we shall not be manning more than half our guns with the regular forces.

Mr. BORAH. What I am seeking to get at is this: Is not the number of men he needs in training a thing which can be left to the Commander in Chief?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it is better for us to provide for that, because it seems to me self-evident that we shall need the men. If they are not needed after they are trained, the President can say so, and they can then retire to the reserve to be utilized as I have indicated.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What is the total number of men in the Coast Artillery provided for by the Senator's amendment?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is 30,000.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. And what number is provided for at present in the pending bill?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The pending bill provides for 24,887, which is an increase of about 5,000.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, has the Senator from Utah concluded?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Then may I have the floor, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I would be heartily in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], or of any amendment of a similar nature, if it were not for one circumstance. I am somewhat embarrassed in knowing whether to vote for it now or not, if the Senator presses it to a vote at this time, simply for this reason: The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has a committee amendment pending proposing, if I understand it, to increase the minimum of the total personnel of the Army to 180,000 men, to which I have proposed an amendment increasing that number to 250,000 men. Of course, that involves certain increases of the units into which the forces are divided, and there is a provision in my amendment to provide for that so that it may be done without conflict or disorganization of the units.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah goes part way toward accomplishing the purpose which my amendment would accomplish; but inasmuch as the greater includes the less, and the ordinary rule in parliamentary practice, as I understand it, is to state the greatest number first and then if that is disapproved of to go on down to the lesser number, as the legislative body may decide, I think we would proceed more intelligently and more satisfactorily if we could defer voting upon the amendment of the Senator from Utah until we have voted upon the broader question involving the largest increase. I will ask the Senator if he can not take that view of it and withhold his amendment until the larger question has been submitted to the Senate? I can not offer my amendment now, as the Senator will see, because my amendment stands as an amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let me ask the Senator from Connecticut whether he thinks that the adoption of the amendment which I have proposed can in any manner interfere with the bringing about of what the amendment of which he is in favor seeks to accomplish? In other words, is it not a step in the direction of what the Senator wants?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. My ignorance of the details of the composition of the Army and the various branches into which it is divided makes me somewhat uncertain as to that. If the Senate should decide to raise the total personnel of the Army to 250,000 or to 200,000, I am unable to state to the Senator now whether in the process of adding that number of men to the Army the Coast Artillery would have the number which the Senator has

designated in his amendment or a much greater number. They might be able to get a greater number, for all I know.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That can take care of itself when the time comes; but I suggest to the Senator that the increase which I have suggested will be less than the proportion which would be allowed to the Coast Artillery under either of the proposed amendments, whether the increase be to 180,000 men or to 250,000 men.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If that is so, Mr. President, and if the Senator does not consider that a vote for the Senator's amendment binds the Senate permanently to the lesser number——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly not.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have no objection to its being considered now.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, unless I am misinformed, the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] proposes to increase the Coast Artillery division to the maximum recommended by Gen. Weaver, who is at the head of that branch of the Army, and upon that assumption I wish to say a word in its behalf.

I know very little at first hand, Mr. President, about the Artillery branches of the Army, but we are all impressed with the fact that the European war is largely a war of artillery. That branch of the service is the paramount one. Now, we are all, Mr. President, conjured every day to consider the defenseless character of our coast, the ease with which a landing force could despoil it, and the consequent necessity of speedy legislation tending to safeguard it.

So far as that is concerned, I do not regard this chatter as of much importance. It is merely a part of that general propaganda intended to frighten the people of the United States into a condition of hysteria and then capitalize it for the benefit of those urging an abnormal increase of the military and naval forces of the country; but, Mr. President, the fact is that we have a splendid system of Coast Artillery; our harbor fortifications are said by those who know to be the best in the world. We have expended millions of dollars in their construction at the most desirable places upon both of our coasts. We have, however, a very inadequate force to man that arm of the service, and, in the event of hostilities, we would at the outset find ourselves very seriously handicapped.

Theoretically, the plan has been to provide 50 per cent of the force necessary to man the guns upon our coast fortifications by the Regular Army, the remaining 50 per cent to be supplied by the National Guard in case of emergency. I have no doubt that that plan is a workable one if actually adopted; but, Mr. President, we have never supplied the Coast Artillery with the required 50 per cent. It seems to me to be an obvious fact that the erection of these fortifications and their equipment with the very best artillery of the day, while an important step, is a useless one, unless we supply a sufficient number of men to make this artillery effective in times of danger. Without "the man behind the gun" the latter is of no consequence, without the force that is effective to manipulate the guns, we might as well have sunk the money we have expended in their construction and erection in the bottom of the sea.

Mr. President, a force of men designed to man and to operate these guns can not be created in a moment. The service is a highly technical one; it requires training and experience; and I do not think I say too much when I assert that it requires a higher grade of training and experience than does any other branch of the military service. Yet we are supplying an inadequate force to perform this grave duty, and relying for 50 per cent of the required force in times of peace upon the National Guard, the remainder to be hurriedly assembled and used to complete the number of men furnished by the Regular force should occasion require. That is not good business; it is not common sense. This amendment is designed to meet a situation that is immediate, and which, if postponed, may possibly result in embarrassment, if not danger.

I hope, therefore, that this amendment will be adopted. I wish the chairman of the committee would accept it. It is the well-matured plan of that department of the Army; and I am sure those of us who listened to Gen. Weaver's statement to the committee regarding its necessity must have been convinced of the soundness of his position. If we are to have enough men to man these guns, if they are to be trained and educated so as to render effective service, now is the time to furnish them. I confess I would rather see a well-equipped, thoroughly efficient small Regular Army, if we are compelled to make a choice, than a large force neither well equipped nor well disciplined.

In the event of trouble, to hurriedly assemble the number of men needed for efficient service for these guns, and then to depend upon them for their successful operation, without any previous training, is to invite disaster. I predict, Mr. President, that if an emergency should arise requiring us to rely upon these fortifications, and the hurriedly assembled force behind them should be found inadequate or undisciplined, the censure deservingly cast upon us by popular opinion, and the indignation aroused because of such conditions, would justly center upon us the responsibility for disaster if that should come.

I think that this amendment should be accepted.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I agree entirely with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] that the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] should wait until the committee has submitted its amendments to the bill, and until we have decided what shall be the maximum strength of the Army. To adopt that amendment now means that if hereafter the limit of numbers should be raised to 225,000, this is fixed, and the others are enlarged out of proportion. On the other hand, if a motion is made and carried to reduce it to 140,000, as has been intimated, or 150,000, then this extra number of Coast Artillery reduces the other arms by just this increase.

The evils that have been heretofore complained of in the organization of the Army have largely arisen from piecemeal legislation. I have hoped, and fondly hoped, that after all this time has been spent, and all this evidence taken, and the committee have given it weeks and months of study, we might at least have enough confidence in those who have given their time to consider first the committee's bill, and enlarge or reduce it in proper proportion, but not do it in a piecemeal way.

I am not going to express the judgment that this amendment would increase this arm too much; but it certainly is out of proportion until we have decided on a larger number of men for the entire Regular Army of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WARREN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks that the committee bill furnishes a sufficient force, an adequate force, for our present coast fortifications?

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that, in my judgment—and I am frank to express it—we do not increase any branch of the Regular Army enough.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not speaking of the Regular Army, but of this particular branch.

Mr. WARREN. I decline to amputate the Coast Artillery from the Regular Army. Of course the educated rank and file of the Coast Artillery have duties to perform which those from the other arms can not well do; but the protection of the batteries, the work that is done to supply them, can be just as readily done by any other arm as the Coast Artillery.

The Coast Artillery is greatly scattered. We do not expect that every gun on every coast is going to be fired at once, and continuously, day and night. We have headquarters positions along on the coast and we have means of transportation which enable us to mass them at any one point. It strikes me that the number we have given for the Coast Artillery is a full proportion, in regard to the wants of the country, to that of the Regular Army and the balance of the force.

Of course, as the Senator knows, our coasts are many thousands of miles in length. I am unwilling now to go to the expense of furnishing three reliefs for every gun in every post all over the United States, because I do not expect that we are ever going to be attacked in that manner.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I quite agree that a simultaneous use of all of our Coast Artillery is practically unthinkable. Nevertheless I believe that if we are going to make a disproportion anywhere—and I am rather of the opinion that that will be the result after we get through our deliberations on this bill—we had better protect this, our second line of defense, and have the men there in sufficient numbers to operate the guns if the exigencies require.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I still insist that we had better treat this as a whole. I am not saying that we should not have this number or that I oppose having the number; but I do ask why action on the matter can not be delayed until we have fixed the maximum of our Army, as far as this body is concerned, so as to know "where we are at."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I submitted an amendment similar to the one under consideration to the chairman of the committee some days ago and asked that he have the committee give consideration to it.

I am in hearty sympathy with the amendment. I believe it ought to be adopted by the Senate. In order that the Senate may know just what the present bill as reported to the Senate does by way of increases in each arm of the Army, I want to call attention to the increases, and you will see that the percentage of increase in our Coast Artillery is only one-seventh of what it is in the Field Artillery.

In other words, Mr. President, the present strength of the Cavalry is 14,148. The bill increases it to 25,000. The percentage of increase is 76.

Our present Field Artillery strength is 5,541. The bill increases it to 18,039, which is an increase of 225 per cent.

The present strength of the Coast Artillery is 19,019. The bill increases it to 24.887, or an increase of only 31 per cent.

The present strength of our Infantry is 35,339. The bill increases it to 85,952, or an increase of 143 per cent.

Mr. President, if we accept the amendment, the percentage of increase for the Coast Artillery will only be 57. If we reduce the Army to 140,000, the lowest number suggested, then the increase of the Coast Artillery, if we adopt the amendment offered, will be less of an increase than in almost any other division of the Army.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

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

Mr. WARREN. Does not the Senator remember, however, that the Coast Artillery has been almost trebled, or perhaps quite trebled, since the other branches have been increased, which makes some difference in computing the percentages now? Furthermore, is the Senator quite sure that the addition of 10 regiments to 15 makes an addition of 76 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. Is the Senator speaking of the Cavalry?

Mr. WARREN. The Cavalry.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure——

Mr. WARREN. It is a matter of mathematics. The Senator can figure it out when he gets time.

Mr. SMOOT. I have figured it, and I have taken the figures which the bill provides; and I think if the Senator will figure it out he will find that the percentage of increase for the Cavalry is 76 and for the Field Artillery 225.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask another question? Does the Senator think we have increased the Field Artillery too much?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I am not objecting to that. In fact, I am perfectly willing to further increase it.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator think we are increasing any of the arms too much?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I am not asking for a decrease of any arm of the Army.

Mr. WARREN. Then may I ask one more question? Would it in any way endanger the amendment to let it rest until we provide what the maximum shall be?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have no objection, if the Senator offering the amendment does not object, to letting it rest and letting the committee pass upon it; but I claim this: If the Senate of the United States should vote ultimately for a reduction from a maximum of 180,000 in the Army to 150,000, then the Coast Artillery ought to be increased 5,112 men, as provided for by the amendment of the Senator from Utah, my colleague.

Gen. Weaver, in his testimony in the hearings, gives the reasons for this increase much better than I can, and, I suppose, just as forcibly as any other Senator can possibly do. I find the following in his testimony:

Gen. WEAVER. The point that I was next going to take up is that the 50 per cent required of the States should include about 711 officers and 17,329 enlisted men.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the State proportion?

Gen. WEAVER. Yes; to man one-half of the guns and mortars in the United States proper.

Senator DU PONT. They have never come forward, have they?

Gen. WEAVER. I am coming to that right now. Of the seven hundred and odd officers and the 17,000 men, the latest reports we have show that the States have at the present time supplied only about 400 officers and about 7,000 men, so that they are three hundred and odd officers and about 10,000 men short of their quota. As perhaps bearing upon all of the personnel questions that are up for discussion, I have a table here which gives what is required under the 50 per cent plan which I have just enunciated and that recommended by the War College Division of the General Staff, that recommended by the Chamberlain bill, that recommended by the Hay bill, that recommended by the War Department draft, and that now authorized by law. I think this would be of value, perhaps. It gives the personnel in tabulated form, side by side, and covers all the features of it quite fully.

I ask that any Senator who is interested in this particular question will secure a copy of the hearings and see those figures side by side, as given by Gen. Weaver. He will find the table on page 536 of the hearings.

Mr. President, I believe that the increase, as provided in the amendment, should be made in the first part of section 22, as reported to the Senate, and also the provision authorizing the President of the United States to increase the number should be to decrease the number, as provided in the amendment offered by my colleague. Whether the Senate wants to vote upon it now, or whether it goes over for the committee to consider, I sincerely trust that the amendment will be adopted, for I consider the Coast Artillery the second line of defense of our country, and it seems to me it ought to be strengthened by increasing the number, as provided in the pending amendment.

Mr. BORAH and Mr. STERLING addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the 10-minute rule the Senator occupying the floor must take charge of his 10 minutes.

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho or to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. I simply wish to ask the Senator from Utah a question.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

Mr. STERLING. That is, whether he can state specifically how much of an increase the minimum provided in the bill is over the present organization?

Mr. SMOOT. It is 31 per cent; and with the increase asked for by the amendment of my colleague, if granted, it would be 57 per cent over the present strength of the Coast Artillery.

Mr. STERLING. I see. Then take the first amendment suggested by the Senator from Utah, the Senator's colleague. The number—1,784 sergeants—is an increase of 31 per cent over the existing organization.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there may be a little difference in the increase in case of sergeants or privates; but taking the whole increase of 5,112 men, it is an increase of 31 per cent over the present strength of the Coast Artillery. If the Senator's amendment be adopted, then the increase over the present strength of the Coast Artillery would be 57 per cent, as against 76 for the Cavalry, 225 for the Field Artillery, and 143 for the Infantry.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator wishes that 76 per cent to go in, I think he will find it is 66 per cent, and I presume he will want to correct it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator if the present strength of the Cavalry is not 14,148?

Mr. WARREN. It is 15 regiments, and we are increasing it to 25.

Mr. SMOOT. I am speaking of the actual number of men that are in the Cavalry to-day; and that is 14,148.

Mr. WARREN. The actual number is in the same proportion. If you add 10 to 15, you have added 66 per cent. Ten is 66⅔ per cent of 15.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true if the Cavalry is full, but I am figuring on the actual number now in the service.

Mr. WARREN. It will not be full under this new plan unless war strength is called for.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it occurs to me that there is one good, strong reason in favor of this amendment, and that is in order that men may be drilled effectively for the Coast Artillery service they must be located where the coast artillery is. The training must take place where the guns are in order that the men may become accustomed to that method of Artillery service.

Now, while the National Guard can easily supplement our Infantry and easily supplement our Field Artillery and perhaps our Cavalry, it is more difficult to furnish men for Coast Artillery, for the reason that in the nature of the case the State militia has not the opportunity or facility to drill men in the Coast Artillery as they ought to be drilled in that service. In other words, to become effective artillerymen in the Coast Artillery the men must be brought right alongside of the guns in the batteries and receive their training there, because in no other way can they become competent drilled men to handle coast artillery; and you can see how difficult it is in many cases for the State militia to get such training.

Mr. WARREN. Does not the Senator know that the militia are in a great many cases in States along the coast, where they have artillery and, as a matter of fact, do drill with guns?

Mr. NELSON. That is true in some cases. With States on the border that may be true, but take it in all the interior States—take it in Minnesota and in Wisconsin and all those great States in the Mississippi Valley—I do not apprehend that there is any training of militia in the matter of Coast Artillery practice.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I am heartily in favor of this amendment, because, as I conceive it, it is the only way in which we can get trained, good men for the Artillery service.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I do not pretend to know very much about the details of this matter, but I can not agree with the Senator from Wyoming that we ought to put off what we do on this amendment until we determine the size of the Regular Army. I think the determination of what we should do in this case has very much to do with determining the ultimate size of the Regular Army.

I simply want to say that I think the suggestion made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] the other day is one that we ought to follow. The first line of defense in this country from our geographical situation is the Navy, and we ought to deter-

mine first what sort of naval defense we are going to have and then determine what sort of a land force we ought to have to support it.

Next to the Navy comes our Coast Artillery. It is the second line of defense. It is the first line of our land defense, and when it is determined we can more wisely determine our additional land force. It is on that theory I believe we ought first to determine what coast defense we shall have.

I am in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah, because I believe our coast defense ought to be brought up to a high state of efficiency and for the reasons very largely set out by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]. We have spent millions for these defenses already. The defenses so provided are not sufficiently manned. Without men they are practically worthless. The men to man them must be specially trained, and it is the best kind of preparedness to have these defenses properly manned. Instead of giving any opinion I may have in reference to that matter, I am going to read into the RECORD statements made by Gen. Weaver, who is certainly competent to give an opinion with reference to these matters. He is certainly an expert that those who depend especially upon expert opinion would be willing to follow. He is the head of the Coast Artillery, I understand. On page 363 of the hearings he says:

We have since educated the personnel along specialized lines, and it stands to-day, we believe, without a rival in the world for efficiency.

That goes to the qualification of the force we now have. There are a great many people in the country who seem to think we have a very poor personnel for our coast defenses, and his words ought to be quite reassuring.

In line with the statement made by the Senator from Minnesota as to the requirements with reference to men to man the Coast Artillery defenses, let me read what he says, at page 389:

There is another thought that I think you ought to have in mind, and that is this: When war comes the coast line becomes immediately the threatened line. There is no time to train men for this service. The attack might come before the declaration of war. If you will look into it you will see that it is a highly technical class of training that is required of the personnel; you can not improvise men for this service.

Then, for the peace of mind of those who are fearful as to the character of our coast defenses and who might not be willing to take the statement of the Senator from Colorado that they are the best in the world, I want to read what Gen. Weaver said.

Mr. THOMAS. I made that statement on the testimony of Gen. Weaver.

Mr. JONES. I understood that; but it did not appear in the RECORD, and some who think we ought to follow only expert testimony might not know this. I know the Senator from Colorado, as a member of the committee, could qualify as an expert, but some might not recognize him as an expert in this matter.

Mr. THOMAS. On the contrary, I know nothing about it except at second hand.

Mr. JONES. But a good many would not know that if the Senator had not so stated it. Gen. Weaver says, on page 395:

We have the best coast defense in the world.

That, of course, is the language of the Senator from Colorado, and I wanted to show that he had fully recognized expert authority for that statement.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Gen. Weaver, as I understand you, the only thing you want that is desirable now is an increase in the number of officers and men in your corps?

Gen. WEAVER. We have the best coast defenses in the world, and with the new constructions which are contemplated, I think they will be fully adequate.

Mr. MCKELLAR. And effective for any purpose of defense?

Gen. WEAVER. Any naval officer coming against our coast defenses would hesitate to come within the reach of our guns.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Now, as I understand it, the War Department recommends an increase of about 5,000 men and you recommend an increase of about 15,000?

Gen. WEAVER. About 11,000. That is my personal recommendation. I understand, of course, the general policy and the law, but I did not think I would be performing my duty to this committee or my duty at large if I did not indicate exactly what the deficiencies are.

Gen. Weaver, of course, recognizes the theory upon which Congress acts in reference to these matters, and that the recommendation of the department is often based upon the appropriation that they think probably can be secured, but he recognizes the importance of this to such an extent as to say that it is his duty to recommend what there ought to be, whether we provide for it or not. He knows what we actually need, whether we provide for it or not.

Mr. MCKELLAR. If we conclude to carry out your recommendations and give you the 11,000 men, then, as I understand you, you would have a perfect system of coast defense that you think would be adequate for any purpose?

Gen. WEAVER. Yes; and the United States would be performing what amounts almost to an agreement with the States, of manning its half of the guns. We can not with any good grace ask the States to man their half when the United States is not manning its half.

Mr. President, I should like to incorporate in my remarks without taking the time to read it a quotation from page 396 and also page 397 from Gen. Weaver with reference to this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Gen. WEAVER. The guns now mounted and those contemplated will give us an entirely satisfactory defense.

Mr. MCKELLAR. You do not take any stock in this idea that the ships of foreign nations carry guns of long enough range to silence your guns?

Gen. WEAVER. No. Of course, you understand, our guns were mounted along in the nineties, and they belong to that period. Since then guns of longer range have been developed, and there are now guns on warships that could stand off beyond the reach of our guns and fire at our batteries—not at the things we are protecting behind, but at the batteries—without our being able to reach them in reply; but when they fire at very long ranges their fire is not so effective, so we are not very much afraid of them.

In order to meet the new conditions we have a surplus of old guns, and we are mounting these on carriages that will give a high angle of fire. We will then be able to reach farther than can the enemy's guns.

Mr. MCKELLAR. At a range of 21 miles, say——

Gen. WEAVER. They could not attack us at long range and fire at us without getting within the range of our guns.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The fire from your coast defense guns is, of course, by reason of more accurate range finding, very much more accurate than their fire toward you?

Gen. WEAVER. Yes; our firing is quite accurate.

Mr. MCKELLAR. How accurate are you, General?

Mr. TILSON. Have you seen the figures presented by Mr. GARDNER on the target practice?

Gen. WEAVER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TILSON. In a general way, those are correct?

Gen. WEAVER. They are correct, yes. Our percentage was 37 per cent out of some 700 rounds. That is, we hit the target at an average range of 8,000 yards more frequently than once in three shots, which I think is very good.

Mr. GORDON. How does that compare with other nations?

Gen. WEAVER. We have not any complete data, but we know what their methods are. We do not hesitate to say they are not in the same class with us. Our practice this year requires firing at over 10,000 yards, and the reports up to date indicate that at that range we are getting 27 per cent of hits. That is one hit in practically three shots.

Now there [indicating a mark on a sheet of paper] is the size of a target as it appears to the eye at 10,000 yards. If you will put it on the table and try to put your pencil point on it, giving the hand a fairly quick motion, you will find it difficult to do as well as one hit in three trials. We are putting our projectiles on the target more accurately than you can put your pencil point on that mark.

* * * * * * *

Mr. MCKELLAR. I want to ask you, General, with our present condition, is our condition of preparedness for defense deplorable?

Gen. WEAVER. Except in the matter of personnel, it is not.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It is in excellent condition, with the addition of a few officers and men, such as have been recommended by the department and by you?

Gen. WEAVER. Yes, sir. My feeling is this: As I survey the field, I do not see how you can get more efficient protection in the first instance than can be obtained by providing for this personnel. We have all the material in place.

* * * * * * *

Mr. QUIN. You are familiar with the American Navy, of course. With the Navy as it stands to-day, could any foreign navy attack you?

Gen. WEAVER. It could not, unless it first defeated our Navy. They can not come here in numbers, except on a large number of transports convoyed by warships. Such a fleet of transports would never attempt to cross the ocean until after the great naval fight had been fought; that is, until after it had gained the command of the seas. There must be considered as antecedent to anything of that kind the decisive naval fight which determines the command of the seas.

Mr. QUIN. And if they did demolish our entire fleet, you could still entertain the gentlemen a good while, could you not?

Gen. WEAVER. The enemy could not bombard any of our large cities. Wherever we have fortifications they could not come.

Mr. JONES. According to Gen. Weaver all of our important coast points are adequately defended, if properly manned. Man them properly and the Navy will be left just that much freer to protect the unprotected coast line and prevent the landing of invading forces.

Mr. President, I have proposed an amendment—that is, I have had it printed—with reference to the travel pay of soldiers when they are discharged. I have had prepared a statement setting out the reasons for this quite fully by a gentleman who is thoroughly familiar with the facts and the viewpoint of the private soldier. In order that it may be available when the amendment comes up for consideration I ask that I may have the privilege of printing it in the RECORD, and I hope that Senators will find time to examine it before the amendment comes up for action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The purpose of this amendment to bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States is to add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. —. That hereafter an enlisted man when discharged from the service, except by way of punishment for an offense, shall receive 4 cents per mile from the place of his discharge to the place of his application for enlistment or the place of his enlistment, enrollment, or original muster into the service, at his option: *Provided*, That for sea travel on discharge transportation and subsistence only shall be furnished to enlisted men."

This will displace the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat., 575), pertaining to transportation of enlisted men of the Army on discharge, reading as follows:

"*Provided*, That hereafter when an enlisted man is discharged from the service, except by way of punishment for an offense, he shall be entitled to transportation in kind and subsistence from the place of his discharge to the place of his enlistment or to such other place within the continental limits of the United States as he may select, to which the distance is no greater than from the place of discharge to place of enlistment; but if the distance be greater he may be furnished with transportation in kind and subsistence for a distance equal to that from place of discharge to place of enlistment, or, in lieu of such transportation and subsistence, he shall, if he so elects, receive 2 cents a mile, except for sea travel, from the place of his discharge to the place of his enlistment."

The necessity for this action is first briefly summarized herein and then set forth at length and in detail.

The act of August 24, 1912, was passed in the belief that an economy could be effected by resorting to transportation in kind and subsistence without adversely affecting the service. Neither belief was well founded, it appears, for the estimated economy has not become actual for reasons which the act itself could not control, and the direct result of the operation of this act has been to lose to the service high-grade men whom it is desired should continue in the service and to repel better class men who otherwise would be attracted to Army service.

Transportation in kind with subsistence for enlisted men on discharge was tried out under the provisions of section 1290 of the Revised Statutes. It was not found to be an economy over 4 cents per mile, and the act of May 26, 1900 (31 Stat., 210), discontinued transportation in kind and substituted the payment of 4 cents per mile to the soldier at the time of his discharge. Four cents per mile has been the approximate cost of second-class travel and subsistence for many years. One item of expense might increase or another decrease, but the average remained the same.

The average cost to the Government of second-class tickets plus upper berth in tourist car where operated, with added cost of 50 cents per meal during the time of travel, throughout the United States is 3 cents per mile. If to this is added the difference in cost between second-class and first-class rail tickets and that between tourist and Pullman sleepers, where tourist cars are not operated, the cost per mile will be greatly increased. If we add to this the expense properly chargeable to it, of official and clerical cost of issuing transportation requests, accounting and settling therefor, the present expense to the Government under the act of August 24, 1912, will aggregate the 4-cents-per-mile rate originally paid, and which, in the interests of an improvement in the service, it is desired to restore.

The operation of the act of August 24, 1912, has been very objectionable to the enlisted men of the Army, and its adverse effect upon the better class of enlisted men, who are the most entitled to consideration, has been to cause them to lose confidence in the service and the promises of the Government to such extent that they not only leave the Army service themselves but advise their friends and associates not to enter it. The result has been to lower the morale and decrease the efficiency of that branch of the service, because of the increasing difficulty of getting men of the better type for Army enlistment.

The provision for mileage on discharge for the Navy enlisted men is 4 cents per mile, as proposed to reenact for the enlisted men of the Army. Marines are paid off under Army Regulations; and the most striking comparisons of the effect of the 4 cents per mile of the Navy with the transportation in kind of the marine is thus afforded, leading to the not unmerited charge of class legislation. A sailor of the Navy is enabled to reach his home on discharge within his travel allowance. The marine is left stranded short of his actual destination, with the necessity of raising money to enable him to pay fare to his home from the point where transportation in kind furnished by the Government terminates.

DESIRABLE RECRUITS NOT PLENTIFUL.

It will require but casual investigation to develop and emphasize the fact that men of desirable characteristics, with qualifications for service, are not attracted by the alluring posters and advertisements of the Army recruiting officers or by the blandishments of the recruiting sergeant on watch outside in sufficient numbers to justify the belief that it would be possible, except in the event of actual war or imminent possibility thereof, to secure, in addition to present authorized requirements, within the time limit prescribed anything like the number of men called for in defense measures now being considered by Congress who could even physically stand the tests applied to applicants for enlistment in the land forces of the United States.

CONDITIONS IN THE YEAR 1915.

The Adjutant General will doubtless confirm that, except for such brief periods as that now existing, when temporarily there is possibility of immediate active service, there is an increasing difficulty in securing the required number of young men of right type and character for Army enlistment. His report of the work for 1915, as published, records that in order to secure 48,813 enlistments required to fill existing gaps in the service it was necessary to examine 179,019 applicants, of which number 130,206 were rejected for failure to come up to the requirements.

UNDESIRABLES ELIMINATED AFTER ENLISTMENT—50 PER CENT OF NUMBER SERVING THROUGH.

The report of The Adjutant General further records that during the year 1915 the number of men discharged from the Army by reason of "Expiration of term of service" were 27,986; that during the same period there were discharged for disability, sentence of courts-martial, or by order, 9,451 men; and that the number of desertions from the colors were 4,457. It is apparent therefore that the number of men who were physically unfitted for service or whose mental or moral attitude rendered them unsuitable as soldiers, and who were either eliminated in the manner described or who eliminated themselves by desertion during the year 1915, after the United States had incurred the expense of recruiting and endeavoring to train them, aggregated 13,908 men, or very approximately 50 per cent of the number of men who finished their period of service with the colors, with "Service honest and faithful."

NO REFLECTION ON RECRUITING OFFICERS.

This showing for the year 1915 is no reflection on the character of work performed by recruiting officers. They have no scale upon which they can accurately weigh the mental and moral tendencies of individuals. It is, however, a most striking commentary on the average of character of applicants for enlistment at Army recruiting offices under present inducements for service. It is a source of constant wonderment to those who know the enlisted men of the Army intimately that with practically nothing but the leaden existence of routine to offer as inducement, recruiting officers have been able to cull for the service so many men of sterling worth and quality from the mass of questionable humanity—the flotsam of society—which in desperation proffers itself for Army enlistment.

LONG-SERVICE MEN HIGH-GRADE MEN.

It has been my privilege to recently receive the opinion of a man who is a close student of human nature and who has had opportunity to observe and study the Army at close range for more than a decade. From the angle of a decided interest in the welfare of the enlisted man, he has been able to penetrate the mask of their reserve, be the recipient of their confidences, and permitted to sympathize with them in their troubles. I know therefore that he is competent authority and that his views are worthy of every consideration, and I have therefore no hesitancy in accepting his statement with every confidence that his opinion is correct and his estimate well founded when he says that "Men of the Army who are well along in the second or later enlistment periods are usually men of high grade, far above the average. Men who are not in the Army because of its pay or emoluments or for any other reason than that the Army has afforded them in the past the outlet for tendencies and characteristics which those of us who have had opportunity to observe all admire in the men who are rated as 'good soldiers' by their officers."

DO EXPERT WORK OF EXCELLENT CHARACTER.

These men are of the type that "make good" in civil pursuits. They are filling positions in the service requiring expert knowledge of mechanical, electrical, and civil engineering and occupying other places requiring technical knowledge of specific subjects. With the possibility of retirement ahead of them after years of faithful service, they estimated that their sacrifice of personal opportunity in civil life would, in measure, be minimized, and so followed their bent and molded their wills to the discipline of the service, and were satisfied with what it offered, and had a keen satisfaction in the performance of their work until the legislation of recent years unsettled their belief in the ultimate intent of the Government to fulfill its promise, including retirement, held out as inducement at the time of their first enlistment.

GOOD MEN LEAVING THE SERVICE.

Unfortunately for the service, many men of this class and type—the thinking men of the ranks—through lack of confidence in the future, engendered by recent enactment of Congress, which have limited, scaled down, or cut out entirely privileges enjoyed by the Army as a right for years past, have reached the conclusion that no one in particular is interested in the welfare of the enlisted man, and that he had better "cut" the service before it is too late in life to establish himself properly on the "outside." Men of this class are truly the "man behind the gun"—the mainstay of the service—and the Army can not afford to lose them, for as they leave, under present conditions, their places are taken by men less desirable, and the morale is accordingly lowered and our national security correspondingly lessened, which view is concurred in generally by officers of the line serving with troops.

"CLASS DISTINCTION" NOT BAR TO BETTER TYPE ENLISTMENTS.

It has been suggested that the greatest bar to obtaining proper enlistments is "class distinction" within the Army. That is not true. Furthermore, "class distinction" was not created and is not maintained by the Army, but by the people, and it will necessarily continue until we, the people, effect an entire change of front in our attitude toward the enlisted men of the service, individually and as a class.

THE REGULAR ARMY SOLDIER A VOLUNTEER IN EVERY SENSE.

We fail to give due consideration to the fact that the citizen of the United States who, in time of peace, gives to his country a "service honest and faithful" as an enlisted man in the Regular Army, that he may become properly trained for the exigency of war, or as the more certain preventative thereof, is in every sense of the word a "volunteer" and as much entitled to credit and the plaudits of the crowd as that other citizen whose patriotic emotions at the time of his country's need prompt him to offer himself at such time for purely temporary service.

THE REGULAR VOLUNTEER MAKES THE GREATEST SACRIFICE.

It is the regular volunteer who makes the greatest sacrifice on the altar of his country, but we are apt to consider him as a "mercenary," a mere hireling, devoid of all patriotic impulses, who should be satisfied with the worst we have to offer, and we hold him in contempt and the term "soldier," one of opprobrium, until such occasion as has recently arisen in Mexico, when we temporarily realize that it is the regular volunteer who is called upon to bear the brunt of engagement and who cheerfully and bravely does his duty with commendable enthusiasm and who yields up his life that the authority of our Government may be upheld and the lives and property of our citizens respected.

HE HOLDS OUR TEMPORARY COMMENDATION.

And then, eager to do him honor, we term him "hero" and follow his mortal remains to their last resting place and strew fragrant flowers upon the "colors" with which we drape his bier. He gave his life for his country. But we soon forget and resume our wonted attitude of distain toward the soldier as a class, largely because of his willingness to serve us faithfully for the meager pay and allowances we so grudgingly grant. And we compare the cost to us of his voluntary service with that of other countries of a compulsory service, which affords the individual no option from military duty nor right of protest against the wage he receives therefor—a system, however, which we are unwilling to adopt for ourselves.

EFFICIENCY REDUCED AS RESULT OF RECENT ENACTMENTS.

We have in recent years curtailed the pay of the enlisted man, abridged his privileges and lowered his self-respect in the interests of a false and futile economy, which, while it has not materially decreased the expense incidental to the enlisted personnel of the Army, has decreased its efficiency out of all proportion to other benefits, actual or theoretical, and, as was stated by a noncommissioned officer serving in his eighteenth year, the result of such legislation has "tended to fill our Army with men of mediocre qualifications, not to be depended upon in time of stress."

SMALL ARMY MUST BE EFFICIENT.

Doubtless some slight importance may attach in the minds of some to "class distinction" as preventing the enlistment of desirables. It should be remembered, however, that "class distinction" will not be lessened by making the lot of the enlisted men less desirable, neither will such action stimulate enlistments of men with capacity for special service, the kind and type of men whom it is essential we should have as the nucleus of a proper defense for our country, and the more espe-

cially in that we are inclined to limit the regular volunteers to a comparatively small force.

ADVERSE LEGISLATION RESPONSIBLE.

Investigation as to the causes which prevent securing the full quota of enlistments from the desirable class will reveal that the chief difficulties are the direct or indirect outcome of legislation of recent years, aimed at the enlisted man as a class, and that subsequently thereto practically every young man of stamina who had completed his first term of service and returned home became a self-constituted committee of one to warn his friends against the Army.

RECRUITS FROM COUNTRY COMMUNITIES MOST SATISFACTORY.

The greater percentage of satisfactory recruits, as pertains to physical qualifications and true patriotism, are those secured from rural communities remote from the large centers of population. Hardly a community of this character but has in the past furnished one or more recruits for Army service. The young man of good standing in a community of this character, who returns home after discharge with a category of just causes for complaint, based on his own experiences with the Government in its failure to keep faith with him, will successfully prevent the securing of further recruits for the Army in that immediate vicinity. Firmly imbued with the idea that he has not been accorded a "square deal" in the final settlement of his contract with the Government, other unimportant things become magnified in his consideration of them, and he becomes the press agent of adverse conditions as relates to the Army, and with endless detail portrays its disadvantages, and the young men who are his associates, possessed of that longing for military service which is inherent in every red-blooded youth, hang upon his words and accept his advice to "tackle the Navy, but let the Army alone."

THE OBSTACLES TO PROPER RECRUITING.

Thus are built up for the recruiting officer obstacles to recruiting men entirely efficient, which are insurmountable under a normal peace condition, and which help to lower the average of the quality of men available for the Army under any voluntary enlistment plan and involves a wasted expense in recruiting and attempting to train men of low grade who are sooner or later rejected as unfitted for service, greater than the estimate of saving expected by the legislation which has resulted in the adverse attitude of the better class of enlisted men toward the Army.

GOOD MEN SHOULD BE RETAINED IF POSSIBLE.

Nearly every desirable man who leaves the Army at the end of his first enlistment period lifts his right hand and promises himself "never again," and yet those are the only type of men this country can afford to enlist. Men who are strong, virile, clean-lived, and who were attracted to the Army by the fact that it appeared to offer opportunities for the development of activities for which they were exceptionally well suited by habit of life and disposition of mind.

NAVY REENLISTMENTS, 85 PER CENT; ARMY REENLISTMENTS, 34.30 PER CENT.

With but a comparatively small Regular Army, the importance of retaining the most desirable men in the service will become apparent. You can not successfully train reserves otherwise. The smaller the Regular Army the greater the necessity for efficiency.

The Chief of the Bureau of Navigation of the Navy, in his annual report for the fiscal year 1915, comments that as the result of favorable legislation for the benefit of the enlisted men of the Navy, reenlistments for the year had risen to 85 per cent of the number of men who were by reason of the character of their discharge, entitled to reenlist.

The report of The Adjutant General of the Army records that Army reenlistments were 34.30 per cent, which includes the reenlistment of 2,600 privates, attracted by the bonus pay of $45, the equivalent of three months' pay, granted only the privates who had finished their first enlistment period and who reenlisted within three months thereafter. Investigation from every angle reveals the fact that Navy legislation as relates to the enlisted man has been of a character to attract the better class of men, while the Army legislation has repelled men of the better type as they came to a knowledge of its operation.

THE SOLDIERS' COMPLAINT.

The underlying causes responsible for the attitude of the better class of discharged soldiers toward the Army are concrete and easily defined. They have for the greater part to do with legislation which adversely affected their pay allowances, and about which they were in no manner consulted. This legislation which segregated the enlisted men of the Army from other defense units as the object of presumable economies, and which also adversely affects the Marine Corps, as the enlisted men of that organization are governed by Army regulations in such matters, covers a period of years and culminated with the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat., 576).

I will make no attempt here to catalogue all the grievances of the enlisted man, but desire to direct attention only to those which have been particularly instrumental in bringing about the condition which has tended to negative the earnest work of recruiting officers in their efforts to secure for the Army a high grade of recruits.

CURTAILMENT OF PRIVILEGE OF SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT ON REENLISTMENT.

The enlisted man's privilege of assignment of reenlistment to certain organizations, with the right to be forwarded at Government expense, was curtailed in the interest of economy and limited to applicants who had been last discharged as noncommissioned officers, and where the travel did not exceed 1,000 miles. He did not seriously object to that. His innate sense of justice prompted him to realize that it was a legitimate economy.

NO OBJECTION TO DISCONTINUING CASH PAYMENT FOR SEA TRAVEL.

When by act of May 26, 1900 (31 Stat., 210), the cash payment of mileage for sea travel to and from our island possessions was eliminated and replaced by transportation in kind and subsistence he considered that to be a legitimate economy. He could not comprehend why the Government had been willing to pay him 4 cents per mile for the sea travel and then bring him home in a transport in addition. The right type of enlisted man is fair-minded, and his idea of a "square deal" is that it should be square for both parties.

DOUBLE TIME TOWARD RETIREMENT FOR FOREIGN SERVICE ELIMINATED—FOREIGN SERVICE PAY ON "RATINGS" ELIMINATED.

We changed that provision of law under which an enlisted man serving outside the continental limits of the United States was awarded two years toward retirement for each year of such service by eliminating the "double-time" allowance, and at the same time we took from him that portion of his "foreign-service pay" as formerly allowed on "ratings," such as "observer," "gun pointer," etc. There was for these curtailments but a rumble of discontent.

CONTINUOUS-SERVICE PAY DECREASE.

We decrease the amount of his "continuous-service" pay by changing the period of enlistment with the colors from three to four years, without making provision to equalize the allowance over the longer period, which robbed him of one year's "continuous-service pay" every fourth year, which added another cause for mistrusting our ultimate intent.

TRAVEL ALLOWANCES FORMERLY SUFFICIENT TO ENABLE DISCHARGED SOLDIER TO REACH HOME.

Under all provisions of law, from 1802 down to the year 1912, a soldier on discharge had been granted travel allowances sufficient in cash to enable him to travel comfortably from the place of his discharge to his home, or at least to the place where he had applied for enlistment and been enrolled, provided only his discharge had not been by way of punishment for an offense.

THE WORDING OF THE LAWS.

The laws governing travel allowances during the period mentioned are quoted as follows:

ACT OF 1802, MARCH 16.

Act approved March 16, 1802:

"Whenever any officer or soldier shall be discharged from the service, except by way of punishment for any offense, he shall be allowed his pay and rations, or an equivalent in money, for such term of time as shall be sufficient for him to travel from the place of discharge to the place of his residence, computing at the rate of 20 miles a day."

This section was repeated in the acts of January 11, 1812, and January 29, 1813, was continued in force under the general provisions of section 7 of the act of March 3, 1815, and is contained in a modified form in sections 1289 and 1290 of the Revised Statutes. Section 1290 relates to enlisted men, and is as follows:

SECTION 1290, REVISED STATUTES.

"SEC. 1290. When a soldier is discharged from the service (except by way of punishment for an offense) he shall be allowed transportation and subsistence from the place of his discharge to the place of his enlistment, enrollment, or original muster into the service. The Government may furnish same in kind, but in case it shall not do so, he shall be allowed travel pay and commutation of subsistence for such time as may be sufficient for him to travel from the place of discharge to the place of enlistment, enrollment, or original muster into the service, computed at the rate of one day for every 20 miles."

ACT OF MAY 26, 1900.

The act of May 26, 1900 (31 Stat., 210), provided—

"That hereafter * * * as enlisted man when discharged from the service, except by way of punishment for an offense, shall receive 4 cents per mile from the place of his discharge to the place of his enlistment, enrollment, or original muster into the service; that for sea travel on discharge, to or between our island possessions, * * * transportation and subsistence only shall be furnished enlisted men."

ACT OF MARCH 2, 1901.

The act of March 2, 1901 (31 Stat., 902), provided that—

"* * * An enlisted man when discharged from the service, except by way of punishment for an offense, shall receive 4 cents per mile from the place of his discharge to the place of his enlistment, * * *. That for sea travel on discharge * * * transportation and subsistence only shall be furnished to enlisted men."

ACT OF JUNE 12, 1906.

The act of June 12, 1906 (34 Stat., 247), provides that—

"For the purpose of determining allowances for all travel under orders, or for officers and enlisted men on discharge, travel in the Philippine Archipelago, the Hawaiian Archipelago, the home waters of the United States, and between the United States and Alaska, shall not be regarded as sea travel and shall be paid for at rates established by law for land travel within the boundaries of the United States."

THE 4-CENT MILEAGE ALLOWANCE FOR TRAVEL A LEGITIMATE ECONOMY.

It is matter of common knowledge that the rate of 4 cents per mile was arrived at and decided upon by Congress as a matter of legitimate economy which worked no hardships on enlisted men at the time of their discharge from Army service. The provisions of section 1290 of the Revised Statutes for the payment of "travel pay"—which was pay at the regular rate—one day for each 20 miles, in the case of noncommissioned officers, provided a travel allowance in excess of actual requirements to enable him to reach home in average comfort.

4 CENTS THE MINIMUM OF ACTUAL COST OF ECONOMICAL TRAVEL.

The 4-cent rate per mile, under the provisions of the act of May 26, 1900 (31 Stat., 210), represents, it is understood, the commutation of the allowances for subsistence, and the base pay of the private soldier, as computed under the provisions of section 1290. However that may be, under all varying conditions of cost of travel, and of subsistence on trains en route, the 4 cents per mile has, from 1900 to the present time, represented approximately the lowest possible cost per mile of economical second-class travel, which included sleeping-car accommodations and wholesome meals, sufficient in quantity, en route.

SUFFICIENT TRAVEL ALLOWANCE A RIGHT FROM TIME IMMEMORIAL.

A sufficient travel pay to enable him to reach his home in average comfort had been the right of the enlisted man from time immemorial. It had been equitably calculated to be 4 cents per each mile of distance from the place of his discharge to the place of his enlistment. The Government had entered into contract with him that in return for a "service, honest and faithful," for a period of three years, we would, in addition to other things, pay his transportation at such rate via the shortest usually traveled route.

TRAVEL ALLOWANCE CURTAILED.

By act of Congress of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat., 576), we arbitrarily decreed that thereafter enlisted men discharged from the Army, except by way of punishment for an offense, should be furnished with "transportation in kind" (which was estimated and placed in the record, though not in the act, as consisting of a second-class railroad ticket, an upper berth in a tourist car, and 50 cents per meal during the actual time estimated to complete the journey), or he might elect to receive 2 cents per mile in lieu thereof.

ENLISTED MEN CONFIRMED IN BELIEF THAT CONGRESS NOT THEIR FRIEND.

When we did this the cup of the woes of the enlisted man of the service overflowed, and the growing suspicion that the "Government had no use for a man who enlisted in the Army" which had been forming in his mind, became a certainty, proven to his entire satisfaction by the course of events. As it appeared to him, he had kept his agreement to the letter, while the Government had broken faith. No amount of plausible argument could move him from that conclusion. He accepted the settlement because there was no alternative. His resentment was none the less apparent, and this crowning act to the accumulated grievances of the enlisted man, because of our neglect of his interests, was the most potential factor in molding the opinions which have prevented recruiting for the Army the desired number of men of the class essential to its continued maintenance at a high standard of efficiency.

ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, PARTICULARLY OBJECTIONABLE.

Any doubt as to the conditions here stated or their relation to the recruiting question will be dispelled by inquiry directed to the enlisted men of long service. Individually and as a class they do not hesitate to express that the act of August 24, 1912, as relates to the payment of mileage is the most objectionable as well as the most unjust legislation that has ever been aimed at the enlisted men of the Army and Marine Corps. The better posted of the men, especially those assigned to accounts, believe that there is no saving to the Government in the furnishing of "transportation in kind" and subsistence over the former method of paying 4 cents per mile, and that seems borne out by investigations.

The wording of the objectionable enactment of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat., 576), is as follows:

"Hereafter when an enlisted man is discharged from the service, except by way of punishment for an offense, he shall be entitled to transportation in kind and subsistence from the place of his discharge to the place of his enlistment, or to such other place within the continental limits of the United States as he may select, to which the distance is no greater than from the place of discharge to place of enlistment; but, if the distance be greater he may be furnished with transportation in kind and subsistence for a distance equal to that from place of discharge to place of enlistment, or, in lieu of such transportation and subsistence, he shall, if he so elects, receive 2 cents a mile, except for sea travel, from the place of his discharge to the place of his enlistment."

RECRUITS ENLISTED AT CENTRAL DEPOTS.

As a matter of recruiting efficiency, the admirable plan was adopted of carrying all applicants for Army enlistment to central recruiting depots, where more thorough physical, mental, and medical tests of applicants could be made, in order to eliminate the greatest possible number of undesirables prior to actual enlistment. Men so collected were recruited at points sometimes 300 miles remote from the recruiting depots, but were not enlisted until they had passed the final examinations at the recruit depots.

ENLISTED MEN NOT RETURNED TO PLACE WHERE ACCEPTED, OR EQUIVALENT DISTANCE.

As the provision of the act of August 24, 1912, was for the issuing of transportation in kind for a distance equal to that from the place of discharge to place of enlistment only, it becomes apparent that men who enlisted in the Army or Marine Corps were confronted with the possibility, and not only the possibility, but the actual fact, of being left stranded a matter of several hundred miles short of the point where application had been made for enlistment, necessitating the raising of additional funds to enable him to get back as far as the point where the Government had received him for enlistment.

CORRECTED BY DECISION OF COMPTROLLER OF TREASURY.

This practice was followed, in conformity with the act of August 24, 1912, from the date of its passage to February 26, 1916, when the Army Regulations were to have been amended in accordance with the decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury to the effect that the place where a man was accepted for enlistment should be regarded as the place of his enlistment within the meaning of the laws governing the payment of travel allowance on discharge.

PROVISION INSUFFICIENT TO PAY EXPENSES TO ACTUAL HOME.

It is seldom that a man is enlisted in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps at the place which is actually his home. He must, therefore, in most instances, arrange for additional railroad fare and expenses over that provided by the Government at the time of his discharge.

NAVY TREATMENT BETTER THAN ARMY AND MARINE CORPS IN TRAVEL ALLOWANCE.

The enlisted man of the Navy, who receives 4 cents per mile of travel, can, by skimping his stomach or going without the comforts of a sleeping car for the entire journey, as the result of such economy save enough from his travel pay to pay this additional cost of transportation and subsistence. For the enlisted man of the Army or of the Marine Corps to reach his home, beyond the point of his acceptance, it is necessary for him to deplete the meager store of cash he has saved during his enlistment period from what was left of his pay after necessary expenditures had been made from it.

Enlisted men of the Army whose travel pay on discharge is limited to a cash commutation of 2 cents per mile can never be brought to a realizing sense of obligation for our having denied them the reasonable minimum amount of travel and subsistence allowances paid in other branches of the Government service—the 4 cents per mile—which would have permitted them the option of route and destination, with saving sleeping car fares by doubling up together or sitting up, which would in part at least, have paid for the additional cost of reaching their homes. Men discharged on the North Pacific coast since August 24, 1912, have been obliged to pay varying sums running up as high as $25, to enable them to reach their homes from the point where the transportation in kind furnished by the Government terminated.

OPERATION OF ACT UNFAIR TO MARINE.

When two men enlist at the same time and place, serve on the same ship, are discharged at the same time and place, and, as under the present laws, one of them, the sailor from the Navy, is given 4 cents per mile, which enables him to reach home if economical, and the other, the marine, is left stranded short of his destination, could we "Tell it to the marines" with such convincing argument that they would believe that the treatment accorded the marine in the matter of mileage allowance on discharge was on a par with that accorded the enlisted man of the Navy?

FOUR-CENT ALLOWANCE SHOULD BE RESTORED AS AN ACT OF JUSTICE.

We have been fair to the enlisted man of the Navy, and we have received a wonderful equivalent in efficiency and esprit de corps born of contented service. Let us be equally fair to the enlisted men of the Army and Marine Corps, at least in this one particular, by restoring the travel allowance on discharge, to the minimum allowance in other branches of Government service, 4 cents, and thus aid in building up all arms of our defensive system by improving the quality of the enlisted personnel.

AN ECONOMY INTENDED BY THE ACT.

It was the evident impression of Congress that by the change in the manner of granting transportation on discharge to enlisted men a very considerable economy would be effected, and this impression was based on statement showing specific examples of estimated cost to the Government of second-class transportation, which included the deductions for land grant west of Chicago, upper berths in tourist cars, and $1.50 per day for meals, with no time allowance for late trains and missed connections. For points east of Chicago the statement was based on second-class fares which have been since eliminated, passenger fares in that territory having been raised by authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

ECONOMY EXPECTED FROM LAND-GRANT DEDUCTIONS.

It was originally proposed that transportation only to the point of enlistment should be furnished. As all the western recruit depots were located at points which enables the Government to take advantage of land-grand deductions, had that arbitrary plan been followed by Congress a saving on that account might have resulted. This plan was eliminated before presentation to Congress and an attempted equity substituted, which provided for the furnishing transportation to any point of equal distance, and not infrequently, therefore, since the act became effective, the cost to the Government has been in excess of the 4 cents per mile originally allowed.

TOURIST SLEEPERS NOT ALWAYS AVAILABLE.

In the consideration of the provisions of the measure, it was assumed that the Government would only incur the expense for second-class transportation and tourist sleepers. Due consideration was not given to the fact that tourist sleepers are only available between certain limited points, and often only on certain days, and that in entire sections of the United States no tourist sleeping cars are operated.

FIRST-CLASS TICKET AND STANDARD BERTH TO BE FURNISHED WHERE TOURIST NOT AVAILABLE.

General Orders No. 14, War Department, issued February 19, 1913, contain instructions for the guidance of officers issuing transportation in kind to enlisted men on discharge. They are based on decisions of the Comptroller of the Treasury interpreting the meaning of the act of August 24, 1912, in the matter of transportation in kind and sleeping-car berth, and reads as follows:

"1. When discharged soldiers elect to take transportation in kind and subsistence to place of enlistment they will be entitled to the following allowances to such place, viz:

"(a) Transportation rail, second class if available; if second class not available, first class.

"(b) Sleeping-car accommodations, touring-car berth if available, and upper berth if practicable; if not, a lower berth. If tourist car not available, an upper berth in standard sleeper may be furnished if practicable; if not, a lower berth. No sleeping-car accommodations will be furnished in any instance when a night's journey is not involved or when the distance does not exceed eight hours' travel."

THE COST OF STANDARD BERTH ELIMINATES POSSIBILITY OF ECONOMY.

It will be observed, therefore, that there are many routes of travel over which discharged soldiers select transportation, via which it would be impossible to furnish tourist berth. In such cases it is necessary to furnish first-class railroad ticket and standard Pullman berth, the cost of which is greatly in excess of the estimates which considered only second-class railroad tickets and upper berths in tourist sleepers.

COST TO GOVERNMENT WILL APPROXIMATE ORIGINAL 4-CENT ALLOWANCE.

Under increased cost of passenger fares in various parts of the country since this law became effective, it will undoubtedly be ascertained that the average cost to the Government of second-class transportation, an upper berth in tourist care, and $1.50 per day for commutation of rations, as actually furnished in discharged soldiers, will aggregate 3 cents per mile. If first-class transportation and standard sleeper is furnished in all cases where second class is not available, account lack of tourist-car service (which precatice is not followed at all points), the cost to the Government will be greatly augmented. If we add to these estimates the cost of issuing the transportation requests for railway and sleeper tickets, and the additional clerical force employed in the various departments in accounting and making settlements in connection with such transportation requests, it will be found that it will so nearly equal the 4 cents per mile originally paid, and still paid in the Navy, as to leave no doubt as to our duty to "restore the land marks" by providing the payment of 4 cents per mile, and thus place all enlisted men of our defense system on exactly the same footing in the matter of a cash transportation on discharge that will enable them to reach their homes in a befitting manner.

APPARENT ECONOMY DUE TO CHANGE IN METHOD OF APPORTIONING RECRUITS.

The published reports of the cost of travel allowances to men on discharge for the year 1914, the first year of the operation of the present law in which the full figures were segregated, indicated an apparent less cost per capita than for the year 1912, which would seem to indicate an economy. The economy will for the greater part be accounted for by change in practice, which resulted in the payment during 1914 of shorter mileage allowances on discharge than during 1912. Men who were discharged on the north Pacific coast, for example, during the year 1912, had been recruited from points as far east as Columbus, Ohio. Practically all of them were from the recruit depots of Columbus Barracks, Ohio, and Jefferson Barracks, near St. Louis. Subsequent to 1909 The Adjutant General formulated better methods of apportionment, which resulted in great economy in the matter of travel pay on discharge, in that posts were supplied from recruit depots when practicable, which reduced the average haul on both recruits and discharged soldiers. Under this arrangement, men who were discharged in 1914 at north Pacific coast points were recruited largely at Fort McDowell, Cal., and Fort Logan, Colo., with none further remote than Jefferson Barracks, Mo. This was a perfectly legitimate economy, approved by enlisted men as well, which eliminated in many instances from one-third to two-thirds the actual mileage haul, and effected a saving of the

cost of transportation for an equal mileage haul at the time of discharge.

ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, CLASS LEGISLATION.

The act of August 24, 1912, is class legislation, as pertains to the subject of transportation of enlisted men on discharge, in that it discriminates against enlisted men of the Army and Marine Corps as compared with the Navy, in the interests of a proposed economy which has not become actual. Its effect has been to breed a feeling of discontent within the ranks of the enlisted men that has finally resulted in such adverse advertising of the Army among civilians generally that the difficulty of securing desirable recruits in time of peace has become one of the chief arguments used against providing for any considerable immediate increase in that branch of the service.

ENCOURAGE THE RIGHT KIND OF MEN TO ENLIST.

It is of vital importance that the "man behind the gun" shall be of the highest grade obtainable. We put into his care and keeping property costing hundreds upon millions of dollars. Why should we not exercise the same care to encourage the enlistment of the right type of careful, conscientious men to look after the details of its proper preservation that we would exercise in the employment of men to handle our personal property or business interests?

TRANSPORTATION IN KIND TRIED AND DISCARDED BY ACT OF MAY 26, 1900.

Let me direct attention to the fact that under section 1290 of the Revised Statutes the Government had the option of issuing transportation in kind and subsistence to soldiers on discharge in lieu of a commutation thereof as provided in the statute. It was not at that time found to be an economy, and was made a "dead letter" by practice before it could seriously affect the attitude of the enlisted men of the service, and through this medium the efficiency of the service itself. After due investigation by Congress the option of transportation in kind, with subsistence, was eliminated by the act of May 26, 1900, which fixed the travel allowance of a soldier on discharge at 4 cents per mile, except for sea travel, an undoubted economy with respect to land travel over the cost of transportation in kind plus cost of accounting and making settlement therefor.

IMPORTANT AS PROVIDING A PROPER DEFENSE UNIT.

The Regular Army represents our first line of defense on land. It is incumbent on us, therefore, to take such reasonable action as will invite to the service the type of men of whom heroes are made when the necessity for action arises. The mere principle of this question of travel allowances on discharge and the invidious comparison with other branches of the defense service have produced the condition described.

We have tried out the act of August 24, 1912, with results as set forth, a sure indication that it has failed in the accomplishment of the purpose intended by Congress. Let us therefore right this wrong to the enlisted men of the service by following the precedent of the act of March 2, 1901 (31 Stat., 902–903), and make it a provision of law:

That hereafter an enlisted man when discharged from the service, except by way of punishment for an offense, shall receive 4 cents per mile from the place of his discharge to the place of his application for enlistment, or the place of his enlistment, enrollment, or original muster into the service, at his option: *Provided*, That for sea travel on discharge transportation and subsistence only shall be furnished to enlisted men.

Mr. BRANDEGEE and Mr. WEEKS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut has already spoken on the amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If the Chair will pardon me, I asked the Senator from Utah a question in his time. I do not care to be recognized, particularly if some one else wants the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Connecticut not only interrupted the Senator from Utah with a question but he talked four minutes on it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It was in the time of the Senator from Utah.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, the bill which we are considering is an Army reorganization bill. One reason why it is necessary to have an Army reorganization bill is because in the past we have proceeded in a piecemeal manner increasing one corps and not increasing another, so that there has always been a lack of homogeneous action. Possibly the committee has not acted wisely in this case, but I think the result of this deliberation is that we will have a homogeneous military force of the size provided if the bill is passed in the form in which the committee reports it.

It is always hazardous to accept amendments on the floor of the Senate, because very frequently they do not even carry out the purpose and wishes of those who present them. As an example, take the amendment which we adopted yesterday relating to the dental force. It was amended by the Senator who offered the amendment, but before doing so I happened to look up in the Army Register to see what the result would have been in the case of promotions for which his original amendment provided. I found that a dentist, for example, would become a major in one-half the time that a Cavalry officer of the Ninth Cavalry, now serving in Mexico, would become a major. In other words, it would have exalted the dentists in comparison to the fighting force in the proportion of 2 to 1.

It is not necessary to utter any approval of the high character of our Coast Artillery, either of matériel or of personnel, and it is not necessary to make any denial of the desirability of having a sufficient force, as I understand what the Chief of Artillery desires. It is the policy of the department that there shall be sufficient officers and men in this force to completely man our coast artillery in our foreign possessions and furnish one-half of a sufficient force to man the coast artillery in continental United States; and this bill furnishes, if the States provide what they should, sufficient for that purpose, if my understanding is correct.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. May I ask the Senator a question? The present number provided by the bill is 24,887, and all of the authorities agree that it requires 30,000 men to man one-half the guns after taking care of the insular possessions. About that there can not be the slightest doubt. Then the State artillery reserve is 10,000 short of taking care of the other half.

Mr. WEEKS. If the Senator is correct in that statement, I would not object to the adoption of the amendment; but my understanding was that we had provided enough for the one-half force, but the State had not provided their proportion. They have done so in the case of the State of Massachusetts. We have a thoroughly qualified Heavy Artillery regiment which is ready to supplement the regular force so that every fort on the Massachusetts coast could be full manned with forces that are now there.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. WEEKS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I call the Senator's attention to page 536 of the Senate hearings, where a table is printed in the testimony of Gen. Weaver. Gen. Weaver says——

Mr. WEEKS. I shall be glad to look at that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would like to have that go into the RECORD without reading.

Mr. WEEKS. I ask that it go into the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Senator DU PONT. They have never come forward, have they?

Gen. WEAVER. I am coming to that right now. Of the seven hundred and odd officers and the 17,000 men, the latest reports we have show that the States have at the present time supplied only about 400 officers and about 7,000 men, so that they are three hundred and odd officers and about 10,000 men short of their quota. As perhaps bearing upon all of the personnel questions that are up for discussion, I have a table here which gives what is required under the 50 per cent plan which I have just enunciated and that recommended by the War College Division of the General Staff, that recommended by the Chamberlain bill, that recommended by the Hay bill, that recommended by the War Department draft, and that now authorized by law. I think this would be of value, perhaps. It gives the personnel in tabulated form, side by side, and covers all the features of it quite fully.

* * * * * * *

Coast Artillery organization as required, as now authorized by law, and as proposed in Chamberlain bill, Hay bill, War Department draft, and the War College Division, General Staff.

REQUIRED UNDER 50 PER CENT PLAN.

Major general	1
Brigadier generals	5
Colonels	25
Lieutenant colonels	25
Majors	76
Captains	365
First lieutenants	367
Second lieutenants	367
Total officers	1,231
Sergeants major, senior grade	32
Sergeants major, junior grade	65
Master electricians	42
Master gunners	64
Engineers	73
Assistant engineers	207
Electrician sergeants, first class	100
Electrician sergeants, second class	100
Firemen	109
Radio sergeants	96
First sergeants	267
Supply sergeants	267
Mess sergeants	
Sergeants	2,136
Corporals	3,204
Cooks	534
Mechanics	534
Musicians	534
Privates	21,483
Total enlisted, exclusive of bands	29,847

Mr. WEEKS. What I wish particularly to say, Mr. President, is that all these amendments in my judgment should be considered by the committee. The argument that has been made by the senior Senator from Utah about the proportional increase should have no bearing whatever on what should be done for any part of our Military Establishment. We have, for example, increased the militia forces something like 210 per cent.

It is my judgment if a large part of the money that is provided to pay these forces were used in the Regular Establishment we would get a very materially better net result, but because we are increasing the National Guard in greater proportion than we are increasing the Heavy Artillery or the Infantry or the Cavalry should have no weight whatever in in-

creasing this particular branch of the service. What we should have is such a force as is recommended by those who are in responsible authority. When we take any other course we are likely to make mistakes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I take it for granted the Senator has read the testimony of Gen. Weaver, in which he states that it will require 30,000 men to man the guns and also that he has figured just exactly what the bill provides for, and the Coast Artillery falls short of that by 5,112 men.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, that has just been called to my attention by the junior Senator from Utah. I would be glad to look that matter up, but my understanding is that when I voted for this particular proposition there were sufficient men if the States would furnish their proportion to supply the requirements of the Coast Artillery. If that is not so, I shall be glad to increase the number, but I think we ought to know definitely in committee and from the Chief of Artillery rather than to vote without sufficient knowledge on the floor of the Senate.

We are going to have exactly this kind of a proposition from every branch of the service. I know some of these active young officers who are importuning Senators to do this and to do that. Many of them have been before the committee. They have a perfect right to do what they are doing, but if we are going to depend and act on their testimony without taking into consideration the whole scheme as a broad one, then we are not going to have left a homogeneous military bill when we have placed it on the statute books. There should be careful consideration given in the committee to any such amendment as this before it is adopted.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I hope the amendment suggested by the Senator from Utah will not be adopted. This matter did receive the very earnest consideration of the committee in connection with the other branches of the service. As has been so plainly stated by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], in the reorganization of the Army the committee has attempted to give it homogeneity and to make each branch of the service fit into every other branch.

It is hardly a proper way to estimate these increases in any branch of the service by percentages. In the legislation that has taken place from time to time, usually in the form of riders on appropriation bills, some particular branch of the service might have been under the reorganization scheme enlisted up to its full force. Therefore there need not necessarily be an increase in that particular branch. So the committee in undertaking to get at a proper standard for each of these branches has fixed the number of men for the Coast Artillery.

Let me call the attention of the Senate to this fact: Under the law as it is to-day there were 170 companies in the Coast Artillery Corps, embracing a total enlisted strength of 19,321. The committee in the reorganization plan raised the number of companies from 170 to 263. Gen. Weaver was satisfied with that increase in the number of the companies. The only objection he makes now, and it is substantially the objection that is made by the Senators who argue for an increase, is that the personnel was not large enough. The companies are sufficient, Gen. Weaver says, but the personnel ought to be increased.

We have increased the personnel, the enlisted strength, from 19,321, as at present constituted, to 24,897. That is the peace strength; the minimum strength. That is the estimate made under the terms of this bill. The maximum strength is 30,009 men, practically the number the Senator from Utah insists should be embraced in this bill. In other words, the Senator insists now that the Coast Artillery Corps should be increased to war strength without any regard to the other forces of the country, and as to what the needs of the other branches of the service may be. If there is going to be an increase here to place the Coast Artillery at its maximum strength, then the number must be taken from some other branch of the service to make that number good.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is it not true that it will require the 30,000 men to man the coast fortifications—to man the guns on the coast fortifications—to the extent of 50 per cent?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will just read the Senator the report. I do not like to be interrupted, because I have only 10 minutes, and I want to get this matter before the Senate as clearly as I can. If the Senator will refer to the report of the Chief of the Coast Artillery for 1915, he will find, on page 4, the following:

Defenses constructed and appropriated for.	Officers.	Men.
Regular Coast Artillery required for all mines, guns, and mortars in canal and insular ports	291	6,800
Regular Coast Artillery required for all mines and for one-half of the guns and mortars in the United States	940	23,047
Total Regular Coast Artillery required	1,231	29,847
Militia Coast Artillery required for one-half of the guns and mortars in the United States	711	17,329
Grand total, Regulars and militia, required	1,942	47,176

Under the Senator's plan of increase you practically cut out one-half of the National Guard, and we have provided for an increase in the National Guard. We have fixed the Coast Artillery so that it will be brought up to the maximum strength and be given all the men that Gen. Weaver asks for. But Gen. Weaver has been very insistent that this should be maintained at its full strength all the time, and the committee has considered that proposition. They have gone into it fully and undertaken to coordinate all of these different branches of the service.

Mr. President, I want now to call the attention of my friend from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], who is a member of the committee, and who differs with the committee about this proposition—and, I am sorry to say, on many other propositions involved in the bill—to the fact that the Coast Artillery Corps is not a coast defense; it is a harbor defense. There are 27 Coast Artillery districts in this country. Take Oregon, for instance—and I am familiar with the situation there. We have a Coast Artillery company at the mouth of the Columbia River. It defends the mouth of the Columbia River, and yet there are a dozen places along the coast that are entirely unprotected. Therefore, there is no coast defense, so far as those places are concerned. An enemy could land at Coos Bay; it could easily land at other points and go inland if they desired to do so. In the final analysis the harbor defenses that I speak of must be defended from the rear against an invading force by a mobile army. So if there is going to be an increase it is more essential to increase the mobile army than it is to increase the permanent stationary force. I differ very radically from Senators who think that the Coast Artillery is a coast defense. It is a harbor defense, and some of the officers of the Army have very plainly shown that in some instances the tendency of it is to weaken the mobile army, because if there is an invading force—I do not know that we are going to have an invading force—but if there is, the mobile Army, in the last analysis, must go forward and defend the Coast Artillery defenses.

Mr. President, the object of this amendment is to place the Coast Artillery Corps at full strength until a sufficient reserve is created, when the strength will be reduced, instead of providing that it shall be at reduced strength, as is the rest of the Army, and so to create a reserve and fill it up in time of emergency.

The Coast Artillery is not the second line of defense. The Navy is the first line of defense, and, it seems to me, that the second line of defense is the mobile army. All the function that the Coast Artillery Corps plays in defense is to protect not the coast line but the particular harbor where it is stationed.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, before the Senator from Oregon takes his seat I desire to ask him a question. I call the Senator's attention to the testimony of Gen. Weaver, from whose report the Senator read, at page 536 of the record before the Senator's own committee and under the column headed "Under the 50 per cent plan," and I ask him whether in detail he has not estimated the different officers and men that are required, and if that estimate does not total 29,847 under the 50 per cent plan?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is exclusive of the militia force.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, certainly; exclusive of that force; but that is required to man one-half of the guns of continental United States. The 24,000 men for which the Senator's bill provides will not man one-half of the guns.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I read from Gen. Weaver's report, which was made in 1915. The Senator is reading from a statement made by Gen. Weaver before the committee. I do not know that there is any radical difference between the two statements, for I have not had time to compare them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know that there is any difference; but the fact is that Gen. Weaver did state in positive terms—and he gives the details which justify the statement—that under the 50 per cent plan 29,847 officers and men are

required. That is entirely aside from the number furnished by the State artillery reserve.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is at the maximum strength.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not care what it is called; but it requires approximately 30,000 men to man one-half of the guns upon the plan recommended by the service.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I call the Senator's attention to the report which was filed by the committee at the time the bill was presented. On page——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, like the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], I represent in part one of the Pacific coast States, and my people, of course, are interested in sharing in whatever defense may be provided by this legislation; but the Senator from Oregon is perfectly right in saying that the so-called coast defenses are not coast defenses at all. In order that there should be protection to the State of California, you would have to have a line of coast defenses from one end of the State to the other to be effective. Troops can be landed almost anywhere on the Pacific coast; at least along that part of the coast fronting the State of California. I do not know how it may be farther up the coast; I am not familiar with the coast in that locality; but any money that may be expended, in addition to what is proposed, to increase the coast defenses in California would amount to very little; it would probably be throwing money away if it is intended for that purpose. For that reason, because it would not be beneficial in any practical sense, I am opposed to the amendment which will increase the burden of taxes in order to maintain a so-called coast defense that would be practically useless, except to protect the harbors or points where coast defenses for the protection of cities have been provided.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] subject to amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Then I send to the Secretary's desk an amendment to the amendment, and desire to make some remarks upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the proposed amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], the following:

Provided, That the increase in personnel hereby provided shall not take effect until approved by the General Staff of the Army.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, after making a few remarks, I may withdraw the amendment, but I desire to say while I have the floor, that, although I may not press the amendment to a vote, I do think that in a technical matter of this kind, involving questions of strategy, involving questions of the probability and the proportionate probability of the use of the various arms of our service, it is very desirable to have the opinion of the educated and technical men, on whom we have spent the Government's money for the purpose of making them efficient along this line.

While in a general way I am in favor of increasing all the branches of the service, and to me personally it is perfectly plain that it ought to be done, I do not think though I am unadvised about it officially, that the Coast Artillery Corps needs strengthening any more than do the other branches of the service.

I expect, if this amendment comes to a vote, that I shall vote for it. I believe that the additional personnel herein provided could be taken away from the guns, if they were not at the points of danger, and could be made available in the mobile line of the Army at other points.

But, to illustrate the position in which it puts those of us who are not technical men, nor experts versed in the art of war, here is a two-page amendment purporting to strike out "1,700" and to insert "2,000" on such and such a line of the bill and attempting to scatter amendments in various places, the amendments being indicated only by lines and numerals. Nobody can tell, without reading the amendment in connection with the substitute reported by the committee, what it does; nobody here knows, without complete explanation, how many additional corporals, how many additional sergeants, and how many additional privates it provides for, or how much it would increase the total. I hardly think that is an intelligent way to prepare a great measure like this, involving the national defense. I wish that amendments such as this could be referred to the committee and the experts of the War Department summoned before the committee to give testimony about them.

Mr. President, the Coast Artillery is a very necessary branch of the service; but if this country were to be invaded, it is not to be assumed that the invader would select the strongest points and the best defended places for the purpose of making a landing. There has been a very interesting suggestion advanced, which would tend to make the coast-defense system a mobile defense instead of a stationary one. I have heard the plan very highly spoken of by some officers of the coast-defense branch of the service. It involves the mounting of guns upon cars, which could be moved from point to point where their presence might be demanded. It seems to me it is a proposition worthy of the serious consideration of the department and of the committees of Congress. There could be built at very small expense concrete emplacements at various strategical points on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and the guns could be moved there, with the skilled gunners, at any time a given point was threatened. It can be done; I am quite sure the plan is feasible; and it would save millions of dollars to this Government in comparison with the present plan of continuing to erect permanent emplacements and maintaining permanent guns. Such a plan would enable us to be prepared to defend different points with a much less personnel than would be required under the other system. However that may be, I simply cite it, because it occurs to me that it is difficult for us to act upon proposals of this kind offered on the floor, which may operate in ways that we can not foresee. However, as I have said, I am so strongly in favor of doing something that will make our Army available for the purpose for which I understand it is organized and maintained that, so far as I am concerned, I shall not oppose the amendment of the Senator from Utah, but, on the contrary, if it comes to a vote, I shall vote in favor of it. I now withdraw the amendment which I sent to the desk.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Question!

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to make an inquiry as to the parliamentary situation. Is there an amendment now pending?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] to the substitute reported by the committee is now pending. The question is on that amendment.

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

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

Mr. BRADY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] and vote "nay."

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made upon the last roll call as to the transfer of my pair, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS].

Mr. COLT (after having voted in the negative). I inquire whether the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. COLT. Not knowing how he would vote on this amendment, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. He is paired with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

Mr. WALSH (after having voted in the negative). I announce that my colleague [Mr. MYERS] is absent from the Senate on official business.

I notice that the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] did not vote. I have a pair with that Senator. I transfer it to the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and will allow my vote to stand.

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

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]; and

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

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Ashurst	Hollis	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Borah	Husting	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	Johnson, Me.	Oliver	Smoot
Burleigh	Jones	Page	Sutherland
Clapp	Kenyon	Poindexter	Thomas
Cummins	Lodge	Reed	Wadsworth
Hardwick	McCumber	Sherman	

NAYS—30.

Bankhead	Gronna	Pittman	Thompson
Chamberlain	Hughes	Pomerene	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Kern	Ransdell	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	La Follette	Shafroth	Walsh
Culberson	Lane	Sheppard	Warren
Curtis	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	Williams
Gallinger	Norris	Stone	
Gore	Overman	Swanson	

NOT VOTING—39.

Beckham	Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Md.
Brady	Goff	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Broussard	Harding	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Sterling
Catron	James	Owen	Taggart
Chilton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Townsend
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Phelan	Underwood
Dillingham	Lee, Md	Robinson	Weeks
du Pont	Lewis	Saulsbury	Works
Fall	Lippitt	Shields	

So Mr. SUTHERLAND's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. REED. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

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

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all of section 108 as proposed by the committee, found on page 188 of the bill, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 108. Pay for National Guard officers.—Commissioned officers on the active list belonging to organizations of the National Guard participating in the apportionment of the annual appropriation for the support of the National Guard shall receive compensation for their services (except during periods of service for which they may become lawfully entitled to the same pay as officers of corresponding grades of the Regular Army) as follows, not to include longevity pay: Captains and officers above the rank of captain, $500 per year; first lieutenants, $300 per year; second lieutenants, $250 per year. Regulations, to be prescribed by the Secretary of War shall determine the amount and character of service that must be rendered by officers to entitle them to said pay: *Provided*, That only line officers and officers of the staff corps and departments on duty with organizations of the line shall receive pay.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope I can enlist the earnest thought of the Senate for a few moments to this amendment. Stated very briefly, the situation is this:

The House, in its bill, provided pay for all officers of the militia up to the rank of captain, and beyond the rank of captain pay for all officers in active duty, the pay beyond the rank of captain being limited so that it could not exceed $500 per year, being the stipend paid to captains of militia. The Senate amendment strikes out the provision which provides for any pay for militia officers above the rank of captain. The effect of the Senate amendment is this:

First, that the officers of the militia above the rank of captain in the line and in active service obtain no pay whatsoever.

The secondary effect is that of course the officers, when mustered into the service, will be subject to a disability.

Mr. President, I understand that the reason actuating the Senate committee in striking out the pay of officers above the rank of captain was that they had conceived the idea that the officers above the rank of captain perform no actual work. That, Mr. President, is an absolute mistake of fact. There is no man who has ever served in the militia who does not know it to be a gross error of fact. The cold truth about the matter is that the captain of a company or the lieutenant of a company acting in the line generally is obliged to employ only about the same amount of time as the ordinary private, perhaps an additional hour or two a week; but the regulations to-day are such that they require from the majors, lieutenant colonels, colonels, and the general commanding so many reports and so many duties that these men put in from four to five or even ten times the amount of time required of the captain of a company.

I placed in the RECORD on yesterday the absolute evidence of this fact. There has been nothing placed in the RECORD or stated upon the floor to the contrary, and I affirm it to be a fact that these officers above the rank of captain do a great deal more work than the captains or lieutenants of companies.

The evidence is in the RECORD, as I have stated. It is positive and it is clear, and the regulations governing the militia absolutely impose upon these higher officers duties which make heavy inroads upon their time. The general in command of the National Guard of my State is an accomplished lawyer, and I do not at all exaggerate the fact when I say that he gives to the National Guard nearly one-half of his time. There is a colonel in my State, a man of wealth and large affairs, who actually sleeps at the armory, who employs stenographers to attend to his military correspondence at his own expense. He spends hundreds of dollars of his own money every year. He does this in order to maintain his organization at the highest point of efficiency.

Recently regulations have been adopted which require all officers of the National Guard to undergo the most rigid examinations and further require them to attend schools of instruction which are held by Army officers.

Mr. President, disguise it as we may, the effect of the Senate amendment is to kill the efficiency of the National Guard. You might just as well expect to keep up a voluntary organization without any head as to expect to maintain the National Guard at a point of high efficiency and yet deny any compensation to those officers who must constitute the brains and the energy that keep the National Guard going.

I want to illustrate: The commanding general in my State—and I do not claim that he is better than the commanding generals of other States—regularly visits the headquarters of the regiments of that State. He examines reports daily. He employs a stenographer whose business it is to keep up correspondence. He has done this largely from his own pocket. If he did not do as I have stated the organization would disintegrate. An organization in every instance is bound to disintegrate if there is not a head for the organization.

Mr. President, these militia organizations at the present time, if never before in the history of this country, ought to be carefully conserved and looked after. We may need the militia within 30 days; and the militia organizations, if they go out officered by their own officers, will go to a man. They went in my State 100 per cent strong in the Spanish War. They have been our safeguard at every crisis of this country's history.

I do not know how much time I can occupy in reading, but I want to call attention to the fact that in the War of 1812, as stated in Senator LODGE's history, the organization of the Regular Army—

was markedly inefficient and the service most unpopular. The chief officers were Revolutionary veterans who had outgrown their usefulness, and their incompetency led to several disasters in the early stages of the war.

Speaking of the militia, he had this to say with reference to the Battle of Niagara:

The campaign on the Niagara frontier was renewed under the direction of Gen. Jacob Brown, an able commander of the New York Militia.

And that was one of the few battles of the War of 1812 our soldiers won.

The same author adds:

Throughout the war great reliance was placed on the militia, and it may be truly said that this branch of the service bore the brunt of the contest and contributed far more to the success of the war than did the Regular Army.

Of course in the War of 1812 it was the militia under Jackson that finally won the great fight that gave luster and glory to what had otherwise been a most disastrous war upon the land.

I have not time to read excerpts from the same work on the War with Mexico. Substantially the same conditions existed in that war as in the War of 1812.

The same author states that in the Civil War the first call of the President was for 75,000 of the militia of the States to serve for three months to suppress the rebellion; that "the response of the Northern States was prompt and generous"; and that "two days after the publication of the proclamation the Sixth Massachusetts passed through New York on its way to Washington."

It is a further fact that Gen. McClellan, although a West Point graduate, had gone out of the service, was commissioned by the governor of Ohio as a major general of militia. The author of this history states:

He set to work at once to organize and equip the troops, and was thus engaged when he received instructions to go to the aid of the West Virginia loyalists.

The same author states that in the Spanish-American war—

The various National Guards were prepared for mobilization at a moment's notice. Scores of provisional regiments were raised and offered to the governors of the various States, so they could be called out as soon as the expected call for volunteers occurred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to speak for 10 minutes on the bill. I have that privilege.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. REED. I do not want to cavil with the Vice President; but as I read the unanimous-consent agreement, it provides for 10 minutes on the bill and 10 minutes on an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; but how would the Senator from Missouri expect the Chair, with a bill running as this bill is, to know or keep any record as to when a Senator is speaking on the bill or when he is speaking on an amendment? The Chair is not responsible for the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. REED. I do not expect the Chair to do anything more than to charge to me the 10 minutes I have taken, and if I now speak 10 minutes on the bill I can not again speak on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will leave it to the determination of the Senate. Is it the judgment of the Senate that Senators may, while amendments are pending, speak on the bill? [Putting the question.] The noes seems to have it. The noes have it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, all I have to say about it is that I can not help—and I say it respectfully—regarding it as a plain denial of the rights reserved under this unanimous-consent agreement. Under it any Senator has a right to speak 10 minutes on an amendment, and that ends his right to speak on that amendment; but there is in the unanimous-consent agreement an express provision that any Senator can speak 10 minutes on the bill, and under the rules of the Senate a Senator has the right to employ his time when and how he pleases.

I have presented the matter as well as I can, however, and I have nothing further to say.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not want to take advantage of any Senator. The Chair believes, however, that the plain unanimous-consent agreement is that the speaking goes on upon each amendment until the bill is finally in shape for passage, and then that each Senator may speak 10 minutes upon the bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, some days ago the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] made some question as to the figures which were included in the report of the committee as to the cost of the National Guard. I have called upon the Secretary of War for a statement in reference to that matter; and I desire to print in the RECORD, for the convenience and information of the Senate, the letter I addressed to the Secretary of War, his answer thereto, and the reports made in conformity with the request of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, that will be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

APRIL 3, 1916.

Hon. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

MY DEAR SIR: The figures given in Tables XI and XII of the report of the Senate committee on the bill S. 4840, reported to the Senate (S. Rept. No. 263, pt. 1), have been questioned on the floor of the Senate as to their accuracy, and a study of the detailed tables on which these general tables were based leads to the belief that there was some data not given therein which should have been included. Will you kindly have the data checked and supply me with new data, showing the information asked for with regard to the Organized Militia and the Volunteers in paragraph 7 of my letter of March 4, 1916; that is, "An estimate of the annual appropriations for each supply department during each of the next four years to supply the annual contingents of the National Guard and the Volunteers with the full equipment and other material now issued to the Organized Militia, considering both forces as coming to full authorized strength in the fourth year and not counting on any reserve material that may now be accumulated"?

Also a separate estimate of the annual current cost of the Organized Militia and of the Volunteers, exclusive of the data asked for above.

I understand that the item of pay for the National Guard for field exercises during summer encampments was not included in the estimate of the Quartermaster Department, and that there was some mistake in the estimate of the Ordnance Department.

In the estimates I am now asking for I wish that both forces be estimated for as though they were regular forces, and that the cost of the bill should be figured by each of the departments under all the items that will be necessary to put the bill into full operation.

I have seen a copy of the memorandum on which the departments made their estimates, and if they will follow exactly the same procedure as outlined therein, adding to the first year's increment of the Volunteers and to the third year's increment of the National Guard one division of Infantry, the resulting figures will be, for the four years, approximately 260,000 for each mobile force, or approximately the total number provided for each. There should be added to each of the second, third, and fourth increments of the National Guard 40 companies of Coast Artillery at 80 men per company.

Yours, very sincerely,

———.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 7, 1916.

Hon. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In compliance with your request of the 3d instant, I send you herewith the new estimates prepared by the Division of Militia Affairs, Quartermaster General, Surgeon General, Chief of Engineers, Chief of Ordnance, and Chief Signal Officer.

Very truly, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

(Inclosures.)

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF WAR.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
April 8, 1916.

The tables furnished by the staff bureaus, which tables are herewith, have been examined in this office and, so far as can be seen, appear to be correct. It is to be noted that the table submitted by the Quartermaster General, headed "Summary of cost of the Regular Army, National Guard, and Volunteers, Senate bill 4840, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session," covers such items of cost as pertain solely to the Quartermaster Corps.

H. P. MCCAIN,
The Adjutant General.

APRIL 10, 1916.

Hon. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

DEAR SIR: I am returning herewith certain estimates of the Quartermaster Department asked for in my letter of April 3. An inspection of them shows that there is some mistake, inasmuch as the cost of the volunteer force is almost as large as that for the National Guard, whereas it is known that the armory pay alone for the National Guard is somewhere in the neighborhood of $18,000,000, where there is no such item for the volunteer force. In addition to that the volunteers are charged with several million dollars for transportation, horses, etc., which do not appear in the estimate for the National Guard.

Inasmuch as the question of cost is a very important one, I wish that you could have an estimate made up for the National Guard covering exactly the same items that are included in the statement of cost for the volunteer force.

Yours, very sincerely,

———.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 13, 1916.

Hon. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
Chairman Committee on Military Aaffirs,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of the 10th instant, I send you herewith new tables prepared by the Quartermaster General, who states that the estimated cost of the National Guard is greater than as heretofore reported, for the reason that it includes necessary expenses, such as transportation of the troops from home stations to summer encampments and return to home stations, hire of wagons and teams for each organization during period of encampment, hire of mounts for all organizations for which mounts are authorized, purchase of water, removal of garbage, etc., and pay of troops during 24 days of summer encampments, which were not included in previous reports.

Very truly, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Statement of annual current cost and cost of permanent equipment for the National Guard as provided in Senate committee amendment to House bill 12766, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, submitted in compliance with letter from chairman Senate Committee on Military Affairs, Apr. 3, 1916—Covers a total of 17 Infantry divisions, 2 Cavalry divisions, and 243 companies of Coast Artillery—Total force approximately, 278,000.

Appropriations.	First year.	Second year.	Third year.	Fourth year.	Fifth year and thereafter.
Quartermaster Corps:					
Pay—					
Armory pay	$10,930,218.00	$12,944,272.00	$16,250,540.00	$18,618,641.00	$18,618,641.00
24 days summer encampments	3,315,770.72	3,920,687.72	4,927,688.99	5,648,059.05	5,648,059.05
Total pay	14,245,988.72	16,864,959.72	21,178,228.39	24,266,700.05	24,266,700.05
Subsistence at 30 cents per man per day for 24 days	1,116,712.80	1,323,864.00	1,656,576.00	1,895,457.60	1,895,457.60
Regular supplies: Fuel, forage, stationery, soap, candles, matches, and other supplies	312,232.00	509,261.00	792,220.50	1,012,140.35	1,000,000.00
Incidental expenses: Employees, veterinary supplies, telegrams, horseshoes, etc	60,671.28	81,902.50	113,304.60	146,900.00	146,900.00
Horses: Cavalry, Artillery, and Engineers, hire of	939,552.00	1,301,832.00	1,830,560.00	2,040,350.00	2,040,350.00
Transportation of the Army: Hire of teams and transportation of troops	1,492,447.55	2,386,459.00	3,790,431.00	5,109,400.00	5,000,000.00
Water and Sewers: Toilet paper, incinerating refuse, removal of garbage, purchase of water	405,580.16	560,320.00	795,350.00	1,016,600.00	1,000,000.00
Clothing and equipage	1,145,227.40	1,020,749.60	2,420,540.00	2,600,000.00	2,600,000.00
Total, Quartermaster Corps	19,718,411.91	24,049,347.82	32,577,210.49	38,087,548.00	37,949,407.65

Statement of annual current cost and cost of permanent equipment for the National Guard, as provided in Senate committee amendment to House bill 12766, etc.—Continued.

Appropriations.	First year.	Second Year.	Third year.	Fourth year.	Fifth year and thereafter.
Ordnance Department:					
New equipment	$15,348,000.00	$15,469,000.00	$10,723,000.00	$7,825,000.00	
Heavy artillery	2,956,000.00	2,956,000.00	1,478,000.00	739,000.00	
Current cost	2,626,000.00	3,495,000.00	4,364,000.00	5,018,000.00	$5,018,000.00
Corps of Engineers:					
Current cost	132,400.00	247,400.00	311,060.00	355,460.00	355,460.00
New equipment	602,000.00	575,000.00	318,300.00	222,000.00	
Signal Corps:					
New equipment	1,465,428.00	1,468,050.00	1,138,805.00	858,298.00	
Current cost	150,000.00	673,000.00	1,197,000.00	1,578,000.00	1,865,000.00
Medical Department:					
New equipment	90,716.00	91,420.00	122,559.00	95,022.00	
Current cost	30,830.00	63,212.00	93,876.00	138,492.00	162,500.00
Total annual cost	43,119,785.91	49,087,429.82	52,323,810.49	53,916,820.00	45,350,367.65

Statement of annual current costs and cost of permanent equipment for the volunteer force provided in Senate committee amendment to House bill 12766, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, submitted in compliance with letter from chairman Senate Military Committee, dated Apr. 3, 1916—Covers a total of 17 Infantry divisions and 2 Cavalry divisions, approximately 263,000 men.

	First year: 5 Infantry divisions.			Second year: 9 Infantry divisions.		
	Permanent equipment, not including mounts or means of transportation.	Per diem cost of equipment and supplies other than permanent.	Total cost, including permanent equipment and 30 days' training.	Permanent equipment, not including mounts or means of transportation.	Per diem cost of equipment and supplies other than permanent.	Total cost, including permanent equipment and 30 days' training.
Quartermaster Corps: [1]						
Pay of Army		$64,807.99	$1,944,239.70		$117,052.04	$3,511,561.20
Subsistence of the Army		19,968.30	599,049.00		35,968.30	1,079,049.00
Regular supplies	$25,150.00	7,883.75	261,662.50	$22,635.00	14,240.35	447,330.50
Incidental expenses		1,680.60	50,418.00		2,353.02	70,590.60
Horses, Cavalry, Artillery, and Engineers		17,510.00	525,300.00		31,518.00	945,540.00
Transportation of the Army	500,301.25	23,210.00	1,196,601.25	924,519.25	41,778.00	2,177,853.25
Water and sewers		9,234.71	277,041.30		16,622.48	498,674.40
Clothing and equipage	2,218,961.25		2,218,961.25	1,997,065.12		2,396,478.15
Aggregate per diem cost		144,295.35			259,532.19	
Total quartermaster cost, including 30 days' training	2,744,412.50	4,328,860.50	7,073,273.00	2,944,219.37	7,785,965.70	10,730,185.07
Ordnance Department:						
New equipment			17,178,000.00			13,706,000.00
Heavy Artillery			2,217,000.00			2,217,000.00
Current cost			1,307,000.00			2,400,000.00
Corps of Engineers:						
Current cost			101,540.00			183,020.00
New equipment			507,700.00			407,400.00
Signal Corps:						
New equipment			1,503,941.00			1,203,154.00
Current cost						492,000.00
Medical Department:						
New equipment			162,817.60			130,614.00
Maintenance						55,460.00
Total annual cost			30,051,271.60			31,524,833.07

	Third year: 13 Infantry divisions; 1 Cavalry division.			Fourth year: 17 Infantry divisions; 2 Cavalry divisions.		
	Permanent equipment, not including mounts or means of transportation.	Per diem cost of equipment and supplies other than permanent.	Total cost, including permanent equipment and 30 days' training.	Permanent equipment, not including mounts or means of transportation.	Per diem cost of equipment and supplies other than permanent.	Total cost, including permanent equipment and 30 days' training.
Quartermaster Corps:						
Pay of the Army		$176,927.91	$5,307,837.30		$237,764.94	$7,132,948.20
Subsistence of the Army		54,569.40	1,637,082.00		73,032.60	2,190,978.00
Regular supplies	$29,928.50	23,223.57	726,635.60	$34,958.50	32,435.84	1,008,033.70
Incidental expenses		3,359.47	100,784.10		4,874.14	146,224.20
Horses, Cavalry, Artillery, and Engineers		53,225.00	1,596,750.00		74,932.00	2,247,960.00
Transportation of the Army	1,403,658.25	73,406.00	3,605,838.25	1,868,935.25	105,034.00	5,019,955.25
Water and sewers		25,074.30	752,229.00		33,526.12	1,005,783.60
Clothing and equipage	2,370,599.81		2,370,599.81	2,553,736.27		2,553,736.27
Aggregate per diem cost		409,785.65			561,599.64	
Total Quartermaster cost, including 30 days' training	3,804,186.56	12,293,569.50	16,097,756.06	4,457,630.02	16,847,989.20	21,305,619.22

[1] The figures herein are based on "Tables of Organization," and differ from figures originally submitted, due to the addition of 1 division of Infantry.

Statement of annual current costs and cost of permanent equipment for the volunteeer force provided in Senate committee amendment to House bill 12766—Continued.

	Third year: 13 Infantry divisions; 1 Cavalry division.			Fourth year: 17 Infantry divisions; 2 Cavalry divisions.		
	Permanent equipment, not including mounts or means of transportation.	Per diem cost of equipment and supplies other than permanent.	Total cost, including permanent equipment and 30 days' training.	Permanent equipment, not including mounts or means of transportation.	Per diem cost of equipment and supplies other than permanent.	Total cost, including permanent equipment and 30 days' training.
Ordnance Department:						
New equipment			$15,490,000.00			$15,490,000.00
Heavy Artillery			2,217,000.00			1,478,000.00
Current cost			3,612,000.00			4,819,000.00
Corps of Engineers:						
Current cost			269,750.00			355,650.00
New equipment			433,650.00			429,450.00
Signal Corps:						
New equipment			1,486,725.00			1,486,725.00
Current cost			886,000.00			1,375,000.00
Medical Department:						
New equipment			149,098.00			149,098.00
Maintenance			99,828.00			149,778.00
Total annual cost			40,741,807.06			47,038,320.22

The amounts under "Permanent equipment" cover new equipment for each increment with 10 per cent of the value added to cover losses, wastage, etc.

Annually after fourth year:

New equipment	$4,400,000
30 days' training	16,800,000
	21,200,000

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, in reference to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], I hope that amendment will not be favorably acted upon. I am not going to discuss the merits or the demerits of the officers of the National Guard; but I have been a member of the National Guard myself, and served as captain for three or four years, and I know from personal experience that the officers who do the work of training of the National Guard are the captains, lieutenants, and first sergeants.

It is true that there are times when the higher officers, such as the majors, the lieutenant colonels, the colonels, and sometimes higher officers, do perform service; but almost all of the training of the National Guard is in the armories, where they can not organize into battalions or regiments or divisions; so that in the very nature of things, whatever work the higher officers may be called upon to do is in the nature of office work. It is not the work of training that the captains and lieutenants do.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I should like to be courteous to my colleagues, but——

Mr. REED. It involves a question of fact about which I want to ask the Senator. Does the Senator mean to say that these higher officers of the National Guard do not hold schools of instruction for the other officers night after night?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They may do it occasionally.

Mr. REED. And make out reports that take hours of time every week?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They may do that occasionally, but that will be the exception and not the rule.

Mr. REED. It is not the exception in my State.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator's State may be sui generis in that respect, but in many States they do not do it, and the work of training these young men is done by captains and lieutenants. We provided for pay of those men. The Senator has adopted the figures which the Senate committee has reported, but I say for captains and lieutenants the figures are higher than the House provides, for the House provides for the pay of captains and lieutenants and higher officers as well. A smaller amount is provided for the pay of captain and lieutenant than is provided in the bill of the Senate committee.

Mr. President, the committee took under consideration this whole question. We have appropriated, as will be seen by the reports which I have already filed, and which have just been printed, $45,000,000 a year for the National Guard. This is larger than the figures that were in the first report that was filed by the committee. The figures have been made and filed with the committee in answer to a letter that is published in compliance with my request just made. So $45,000,000 per annum approximately is appropriated for the National Guard after the end of five years.

Mr. President, if we provide for pay of officers above the grade of captain, it adds nearly a million dollars to the expense of the National Guard, and the committee has not seen fit to increase the expenditure as large as that, because it did not feel that the Government would be getting a sufficient equivalent for the amount of money expended.

There has been no personal feeling entering into this matter. The committee have felt that, having made this immense appropriation for the purpose of trying to federalize and make a dependable force of the National Guard, the patriotism of the men and officers ought to help a little without pay, as has been done in the past. What animated the committee was, first, the question of the men being paid who did the actual work of training; second, the question of economizing in matters that did not seem to be essential to creating a more efficient and dependable force in the National Guard.

I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will vote down the proposed amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, some days ago I offered an amendment to the bill having the same purpose in view, and I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

The Senator from Oregon has referred to conditions in Missouri as being sui generis. I beg to differ from him. I know something of what is being done in Ohio on this subject, and I know that the officers above the rank of captain are devoting a vast deal of time to the various companies which are under their control. That has been the experience in Ohio for many years; and while the Senator from Oregon speaks of the necessity for economy, I agree with him in the general proposition, but I can not agree with him in the suggestion that when a man rises to the rank of a captain he shall be entitled to $500 per year for his services, and when he gets above the rank of captain that, though he may be devoting as much time to the work of the military organization as the captain himself, he shall not be entitled to any compensation whatsoever.

If it is a question of economy that we are looking after, it may be that there might be wisdom in reducing the amount which is to be paid to some of these officers; but certainly there is no justice in providing that captains shall be entitled to $500 per year and those with rank above shall not be entitled to any compensation. A colonel, for instance, has a number of companies to look after. They may be located a distance of 50 miles or more from his place of residence. He is obliged to take the time to visit these different companies and to give attention to their work of organization, discipline, and training. I know of colonels, particularly in the Ohio National Guard, who are devoting their time and service to the National Guard, to the exclusion almost of their own private affairs.

That being so, it seems to me that we are doing nothing more than right if we adopt the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD without reading, because I do not want to take the time in my time to read it, what is known as the Bulletin of the National Guard, dated April 10, 1916. The portion of it which I desire to have inserted in the RECORD is marked by lead-pencil marks, so that it will not be necessary to insert the editorial matter, or, rather, the news comment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

[From New York Times, Thursday, Apr. 13, 1916.]

The bulletin, which is dated April 10, says:

"Bulletin to the National Guard Association: The following information is furnished regarding the progress of the military bill in the Senate:

"Two of the amendments suggested by the executive committee of the National Guard Association have been considered. The first was an amendment to section 6, providing for a National Guard section in the General Staff, to consist of five National Guard officers, etc. This amendment was passed. The second proposed to strike out section 56, known as the Volunteer Army section of the bill, but embracing the continental scheme as originally proposed by former Secretary of War Garrison. This amendment was defeated. The friends of the National Guard who undertook to strike out this section from the bill still feel that this may be accomplished. The bill is now being considered by the Senate, acting as a Committee of the Whole. Later the bill will come before the Senate for formal consideration and to confirm the action taken by the committee. It is then proposed to again move to strike out section 56. The first vote was so close and there were so many Senators absent who would have supported the proposal to strike the section out that it is felt that reverse action may be still obtained.

"As you are probably aware, the present Senate bill provides pay for only captains, first lieutenants, and second lieutenants of companies. The Senate committee advanced the suggestion that as these were the only officers who actually drilled when not in the field and on full pay, and that as the pay for enlisted men was made upon the basis of drills, pay need not be provided for other officers. Unfortunately this view, which seems plausible to the uninformed, has been accented by many in the Senate who are friendly to the National Guard. The fact is that this provision accords with many other provisions of the Senate bill and the ideas of those who have guided the preparation of the Senate bill, which is that the National Guard should not be encouraged or even permitted to furnish officers for higher grades than those of the company.

PROVIDES PAY FOR OFFICERS.

"We first proposed to our friends that effort be made to substitute section 76 of the Hay bill for sections 108, 109, 110, and 111 of the pending bill. This would be very much preferable to the adoption of the provisions of the present bill. Senator REED, of Missouri, will, however, introduce a substitute section for section 108 of the Senate bill, which will read as follows:

"'SEC. 108. Pay for National Guard officers: Commissioned officers on the active list belonging to organizations of the National Guard participating in the apportionment of the annual appropriation for the support of the National Guard shall receive compensation for their services (except during periods of service for which they may become lawfully entitled to the same pay as officers of corresponding grades of the Regular Army) as follows, not to include longevity pay: Captains and officers above the rank of captain, $500 a year; first lieutenants, $300 a year; second lieutenants, $250 a year. Regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War shall determine the amount and character of service that must be rendered by officers to entitle them to said pay: *Provided*, That only officers (line) or officers of the Staff Corps and departments on duty with organizations of the line shall receive pay.'

"This provision would be very much more favorable to the National Guard than would section 76 of the Hay bill, for, while the pay to officers above the grade of captain would be the same, the higher and other officers are included who would not draw pay under the Hay bill, but who should do so. It will be noted also that the provision authorizing the Secretary to make rules as to the duty to be performed by officers to entitle them to pay does not permit such rules to reduce the pay below the rate named, while under section 76 of the Hay bill the following phrase, which occurs, viz, 'Regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of State shall determine the amount and character of service that must be rendered by officers to entitle them to the whole or specific parts of the maximum pay hereinbefore authorized,' is undoubtedly intended to provide a means by which the regulations to be prescribed may be so fixed as to make it impossible for field or other senior officers to obtain the full pay authorized for their grades.

"It is recommended, therefore, that your Senators be urged to support the amendment to section 108 of the Senate bill which will be offered by Senator REED, of Missouri, as being more fair and equitable to the National Guard and still providing no higher rate of pay than contemplated under the Hay bill.

"By the rule adopted Saturday afternoon the consideration of the military bill went over until Wednesday next at noon. The general debate will then continue until Friday, when a 10-minute rule will apply to all speeches and one speech to each amendment. It was agreed that the final vote on the bill and all amendments will be taken Tuesday, April 18.

"It is trusted that all receiving this bulletin, and particularly the adjutant generals of the States, are regularly receiving the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and thus keeping advised as to the debate on the bill. It is recommended that this be done. The attitude of Senator CHAMBERLAIN toward the National Guard, as brought out in the debate, has been somewhat surprising, but is explained, perhaps, by the influences with which he has been surrounded during the preparation of his bill. The National Guard representatives here have been attacked in a most unreasonable manner on the floor of the Senate by Senator CHAMBERLAIN and others, which has not been a pleasant experience, but has not had the effect of scaring us away, as was doubtless intended.

"The biased metropolitan press has endeavored to make much of this talk of a National-Guard lobby, and continued references to the charges made by Senator CHAMBERLAIN occur. To meet this your committee has addressed a letter to Senator BLAIR LEE of Maryland, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Saturday, April 8, and copy of which is inclosed. The publication of the substance of this letter in State papers is recommended, so as to overcome the ill effect of the lobby charge, as it remains unanswered.

"It is very important that there be a few National Guard officers here after Wednesday who can go direct to their Senators with proposals or recommendations which we may find it necessary to make.

"For the executive committee.

"J. CLIFFORD R. FOSTER,
"*Chairman.*

"For your information.

"GEORGE ALBERT WINGATE,
"*Member Executive Committee.*"

VIGOROUS DENIAL OF A LOBBY.

After he had urged the guard leaders to be in Washington and approach personally their Senators, Gen. Foster sent the letter to Senator LEE denying lobbying. The letter said:

"The charge that the National Guard is represented in Washington by a lobby, and that it is seeking by improper means to influence the action of Congress with regard to pending military legislation, would not, perhaps, call for comment if the statement had emanated from a less important source. As that charge has been made, it seems proper that this committee make a statement with regard to that matter. Inquiry suggests itself as to what constitutes a 'bold' or 'insidious' lobby.

"We may, without disadvantage, I think, compare the activities of the National Guard committee with those of other organizations interested in the same legislation. What the 'bold lobby' of the National Guard has done has already been stated. Here are some of the things it has not done:

"Those composing it have not sought to interview or called upon any Senator or Representative except when specially invited to do so.

"No printed matter has been gotten out or circulated.

"No headquarters is maintained, no publicity agent is employed, and no propaganda put forth."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] has just called attention to the fact that the officers of the National Guard in his State devote a great deal of attention to the service of the National Guard at much sacrifice of time and practically without compensation. I think according to reports on file they have been fairly well compensated thus far.

I find according to the report of the War Department that at the Ohio national rifle match, 1911, $13,892.07 was expended on the State rifle team, all of whom were officers.

In the period from July 22, 1911, to September 23, 1912, an officer, a colonel, drew pay to the amount of $1,411.18.

In the period from July 1, 1911, to September 15, 1912, another officer, also in the same State, a colonel, drew pay to the amount of $1,610.95.

In the period from July 30, 1911, to September 1, 1913, a third colonel in the State drew pay to the amount of $1,299.37. So these large amounts out of appropriation or apportionment to the State of Ohio for that year practically went to the officers, and there is no report as to any portion of this going to the enlisted men.

I call attention to some other disposition.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. Does the Senator mean by that statement that this money has been misappropriated?

Mr. BORAH. Since the Senator asks the question it requires a candid answer. Yes; that is just exactly what I mean.

Mr. POMERENE. That is a pretty serious charge, if it be true.

Mr. BORAH. I make it without any hesitation whatever. The record of the War Department will show that this nearly $8,000,000 which we have been appropriating for the National Guards has been shamefully and disgracefully wasted, and some of it has actually been embezzled.

Mr. POMERENE. If that be so, there is a remedy for all such wrongs as that, and we have here——

Mr. REED. What about the War Department?

Mr. POMERENE. Has this been done with the knowledge of the War Department and has the War Department taken no steps to correct this evil, assuming that the evil exists?

Mr. BORAH. I do not know where the responsible line is as between the War Department and the National Guard. It is wholly immaterial to me for the purpose for which I am presenting this. I know a certain large amount of money, $8,000,000 a year, has been apportioned to the States of the Union for the benefit of the National Guard, and if the Senator from Ohio and other Senators will examine into what has gone with the $8,000,000 a year they will hesitate to put $50,000,000 into the same place. I have not come across in my public service a more indefensible waste of the public money than the official records disclose as to this National Guard fund under the Dick law.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, it seems to me that we have auditors in the War Department, and if any of this money has been wrongfully expended there ought to be some manner——

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to proceed, because I think I can give the Senator some information which will cause him to reflect upon this matter a little. I have felt all the time that we were proceeding in this matter recklessly and without the facts before us.

Camp of instruction, Alabama, 1912: Troops in attendance never in excess of one regiment; duration, 20 days. Amount paid to members of staff departments of its State who were not members of the regiments participating, $2,822.12.

Camp of instruction, Delaware, 1912: Troops in attendance, 4 companies. Total payments to officers, $1,937.81; to enlisted men, $625.60.

Camp of instruction, Mississippi, 1912: Enlisted men participating were never at any time in excess of 200; total payments to officers of staff departments only, $1,999.45. Duration of encampment, 20 days.

Total funds disbursed in Montana during latter part of 1911 to end of 1912 was $11,893.77. Of this amount $9,754.47 was paid to officers and $694.44 to enlisted men.

Texas, 1911: A general officer drew Federal pay to the amount of $1,286.93.

In Arizona, the amount of Federal funds expended from July, 1911, to June 30, 1912, was $8,414.40. Of this amount $2,070.96 was expended for officers' schools and $4,998.93 for the State rifle team, of which 12 out of a total of 18 members were officers. During this period only six enlisted men received pay from Federal funds.

Alabama: Total Federal funds devoted to expenses—including pay—of rifle team in 1911, $12,669.28, of which $9,881.28 was paid to officers and $489.39 to enlisted men. At camp of instruction in 1912 the total pay of officers was $3,317.47; enlisted men, $544.70; civilians, $1,762. At this camp the total sum of $5,624.17 was paid for the instruction of 48 officers and 99 enlisted men for a period of 22 days.

In Texas the quartermaster embezzled $30,000. There are other similar instances. The records of the War Department further show that there is now a total shortage of property issued to the National Guard of $1,352,761. In many States the shortages are so great that if charged against the appropriation there would be nothing going to the States. This large amount is wholly unaccounted for—lost, wasted, and in some instances embezzled. Now, in the face of these facts we are restless to give them fifty millions instead of eight millions.

Mr. POMERENE. Do I understand the Senator to say that these expenditures were illegal?

Mr. BORAH. Technically they might have been within the law except the instance where there was a plain, open, and notorious embezzlement and the man left the country. What I mean to say is the manner in which this fund has been disposed of, the manner in which it has been taken charge of by the officers and used by the officers exclusively, in the manner the record discloses, is perfectly shameful, and it can not be defended upon any theory on earth except a political exigency. As a matter of the conscientious use of public money, it is, in my judgment, most reprehensible.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator what the report was from which he was reading?

Mr. BORAH. I was reading figures and facts disclosed by the reports and records of the War Department, subject to the call of any Senator who wishes to see them.

Mr. POMERENE. Has there been any effort made by legislation or by the administrative department to correct these irregularities?

Mr. BORAH. I do not know, Mr. President, and I am not now seeking to fasten the particular responsibility. I am looking after the man who got the money when I am asked to transfer some more money to him. I am asked to appropriate in this bill from forty to fifty million a year for the benefit of the same class of men who have thus recklessly, wastefully, shamefully spent millions already. When I am asked to do that, I look up the record and I find the record as given. Now, others may do as they please, but I will feed no such waste as this.

Mr. POMERENE. If there have been any irregularities, of course, they should be corrected. I was addressing my remarks to the provision of this bill. If there has been any money wrongfully expended in the past——

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator will have to defend his officers in his own time. I think it is a job that can not be done in 10 minutes and divide the time with me.

Mr. POMERENE. I shall be very much surprised if there is any officer in the Ohio National Guard who has violated the law in any respect whatsoever.

Mr. BORAH. I have no doubt the Senator will be surprised. It is wholly immaterial whether there was a technical violation of the law or not. We are here under the guise of national preparation purporting to appropriate large sums of money from the already overburdened taxpayers upon the theory that this organization, this institution, is an elementary part of national defense, when we have here the record for the last eight years under the Dick law, which shows that they have been wastefully and shamefully appropriating to themselves practically in effect the money which has been given to them. I do not say a technical crime has been committed, but morally it is intolerable. I say it is time that this body should stop to reflect, that in preparing this country for war we are not giving the people of this country what they suppose they are getting by the dollars which they will have to pay. We are filling this bill from beginning to end with pure political appropriations from the Treasury of the United States, and we could not do it, we could not proceed a step, if it were not under the guise of national preparation. You could not bring the bill here which we have for the National Guard in time of peace when the people had their attention riveted on it. You could not proceed with it to a successful end as you are about to do now. You are taking advantage of the people's interest and wastefully using the money not for preparation but for politics.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time is up.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, my own view is that the National Government should not pay anything to these officers, except when ordered out by the Government or doing work required by the Government; that they ought to stay practically as they are now with reference to their relations to the State and Nation. Whether this is good politics or bad politics, if it is right we should not fear to do it. If a proposition of that sort is submitted, removing the effort in this bill to change the status of the guards, I shall vote for it, but in the meantime I move to run the figure "2" through the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. Where he has $500, I move it be made $250; where he has $300, I move it be made $150; and where he has $250, I move that it be made $125.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, tirades against the National Guard coming from any source, however dignified, will not wipe out the great fact of history that the National Guard have in every instance responded when called upon; that they have served with efficiency and bravery; that from the members of the militia have come officers who have served with honor and distinction in every war in which our country has been involved. Neither does intemperate attack avoid the truth, always apparent, that we must have some organized force in the country outside of the Regular Army unless we are ready to increase the Regular Army so that it will number from 250,000 to 500,000 men.

I challenge the figures of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. I have not had an opportunity to examine them, but I say if those figures are true in the sense they were employed by the Senator, then somebody in the Regular Army ought to have been long ago court-martialed for permitting the misappropriation and misuse of funds. I say that if those figures fairly represent the case, then some of the civilian officers of the Federal Government ought to be dismissed for having failed to perform their duty.

I apprehend there may have been a thief in the National Guard. So, sir, there have been thieves in the Regular Army. There have been thieves and scoundrels in the pulpit. There have been some men in the United States Senate who were sent to jail. I am unwilling that reflection should be cast upon a body of men who are giving their time and labor, up to this time, without pay unless, at least so far as my voice shall go, I repudiate the aspersions thus cast upon honorable men.

Mr. President, we all know what the battle line is here. There is scarcely an officer in the Regular Army who does not want the Regular Army increased to an enormous extent. There are but very few officers in the Regular Army who would not willingly kill off every attempt to create a citizen soldiery. What they want is the professional soldier. What they want is a vast permanent military establishment. What they demand is increased pay for themselves and that the money shall go to an organization of which they are life members. They also want the opportunity for rapid promotion, as has been suggested by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN]. Perhaps all this is but natural. I have no desire to be harshly critical. I have no doubt they proceed in good faith.

Mr. President, it is easy enough to understand why the pay for militia officers above the rank of captain is cut off in this bill. A lobby organized among the Cavalry officers of the Regular Army selected two of its own men to come here and look after the interests of the Cavalry, and those two men are named in the report of the chairman of this committee as "the military advisers of the committee." The evidence of the truth of my charge I put in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I make just one correction there? I know the Senator wants to be fair. Maj. Connor has never been in the Cavalry, but in the Engineer Corps.

Mr. REED. I was in error as to Maj. Connor. I was speaking from recollection and confused Maj. Connor with another. I am glad the Senator from Oregon called attention to the error.

Now, Mr. President, I know that the chairman of the Military Committee meant to do the right thing, but I say that when that committee was advised by men who were interested in destroying the National Guard it is well to look

carefully into the committee's work. When we say to every officer of the National Guard, "If you go one step above the rank of captain, you shall not have a cent of pay, and you shall be put in such a position that when your organization is ordered into active service you will be relegated to the rear," we kill the National Guard. The military experts who believe in a Regular Army and not in a National Guard knew that when they got that kind of provision put into this bill. If the bill passes as it is, you have killed off the only civilian army we have. I mean when I say civilian army the only military arm organized among civilians that constitutes an army of strength at this hour.

I appeal to Senators: If our troops in Mexico should be cut off to-morrow, if they should be surrounded and in danger of slaughter, whether they would not expect the President to call out the National Guard, whether they would not expect the National Guard, inefficiently equipped as it is now, unsustained as it has been in the past, to be on the trains within 24 hours moving to the border of Mexico. I say they would be there to a man. I do not claim that they would fight as well as Regulars at first, because they are lacking somewhat in training, but they would be there with their bodies, with their stout hearts, with their high courage, and inside of four months of time they would be the equal of the Regular soldiers, and they would be the equal because they are, on the average, superior in point of intellect and general training to the enlisted man of the Regular Army.

I hope we are not by this bill going to destroy our present army of real trained citizen soldiers and render doubtful, if not impossible, the existence of such an army in the future.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think it is very unfortunate to have the National Guard presented here as the enemy of all other branches of the military defense of this country. I have a great respect for the National Guard. I have great respect for the National Guard of my own State. They have sent me no letters or telegrams asking me to vote out the provisions for the volunteers. They have sent me no letters or telegrams of any kind asking me to do anything to injure the other provisions of the bill for supporting the defense of the United States by land. They desire, if they had their own way, to be completely federalized and mustered into the service of the United States. They are an excellent National Guard. I have the profoundest respect for them. They are now and always have been for the national defense just as they were when the Sixth Massachusetts forced their way through Baltimore to defend the Capitol of the United States.

I am very grateful to them, Mr. President, because they come forward and are ready to defend the country. I am very grateful to the young men who go to the Plattsburg camps; I am very grateful to the men who are ready to volunteer and give their time that they may be able to come to the defense of the country whenever they are needed.

But, Mr. President, we have also a Regular Army which has been made the subject of wanton attack here on this floor. I for one am now and always have been very grateful to the Regular Army.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has shown from official reports that the money spent under the Dick bill has been largely given to officers of the militia while the enlisted men have had little or nothing. He has not charged that it was spent illegally. He simply shows that it has gone. And what is the reply? That these figures are due to some wickedness of the Regular Army.

Then, Mr. President, we have also heard cheap sneers about gold lace and all that sort of thing. When I hear such unworthy flings at the Regular Army I am reminded of Kipling's lines, which everybody knows, probably, written some time ago about the British soldier, where he said:

Then it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' "Tommy, 'ow's yer soul?"
But it's "Thin red line of 'eroes" when the drums begin to roll.

Who is fighting your battles now in Mexico? The Regulars. Who is holding your border in Mexico? The Regulars. Who has never failed you on any battle field? The Regulars. Who led your armies in the Civil War to victory on both sides? The Regular officers; the graduates of West Point.

Mr. President, when Senators talk about aspersions on the National Guard I, for one, think we have had enough of aspersions on the Regular Army. I am grateful to them. I honor them. I respect them. When we are providing for the national defense is it not possible that we should be fair to every branch of the service? Is it not possible to deal with the National Guard without slandering the Regular Army? They are Americans, too, although scattered over the continent. They have no votes and no politics, and they are doing their duty to-day as they have always done it. Can we not discuss this bill without attacking the American soldier who is fighting our battles and giving his life for us at this very moment?

Mr. THOMAS. I shall take advantage of this discussion to say for the National Guard of my State that no member of it, either officer or private, has corresponded with me either to solicit my support of or my influence against any part of this bill or any other bill. I think that is most creditable and patriotic, and I believe much of the acrimony of this debate would have been avoided had the guard in other States followed the example of my own.

It is not my purpose, Mr. President, to reflect upon the National Guard nor the Regular Army, nor indeed upon the motives of my associates in supporting or opposing the amendments to this bill; but I am opposed, especially since the exhibit presented here by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], to increasing disbursements to the officers of the National Guard from the Federal Treasury. I think the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] was exactly right when he declared the proper policy was to pay them nothing. The theory of compensation in military affairs—the true theory—should be to pay the man who is required to give all of his time to that business. Necessarily he must look to the Government for his livelihood. We, therefore, support the Regular soldier and pay him a salary. We also pay the Regular officer a salary. This is as it should be, and beyond it we can not safely go.

The militia, Mr. President, both privates and officers, is made up of the citizenry of the country. Military training and military organization are episodes in their lives. It does not comprise their occupation. The generals and the colonels—certainly the generals of the National Guard—receive salaries from their States. It is my impression also that the officers of lower rank, certainly in some of the States, are likewise compensated. These gentlemen are in other vocations of life. They do not and should not depend upon these salaries for a livelihood.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] stated a few moments ago that some of the officers of his State who are to be provided for by the amendment now under consideration, sometimes neglected their own affairs in order to give proper attention to their military duties, which, of course, presupposes that they have private affairs. We made a mistake, I think, in providing Federal compensation for any of these officials. If we had adhered to the old rule, the only logical rule, of compensating only the men who give all of their time to military duty and whose vocation is along military lines, we should not have been confronted with the pending dilemma; but do not let us solve it by increasing the public burden.

We have made heretofore due provision for the officers who, speaking generally, do the actual work. There may be exceptions. Why should we increase the burdens of this bill to the extent of a million dollars a year by providing salaries for those who hold higher commands in the National Guard and possess other and ample means of livelihood?

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have been opposing the provisions of this bill, the objects of which are to federalize the National Guard. I have done it because I think it is in plain and open violation of the Constitution of the United States.

The National Guard of my State is made up in large part of some of our very best citizens. I am not intending by any course I am taking here, or by anything that I may say, to attack the National Guard as such. My own judgment about them is that they are a State organization, and that their duties should be kept strictly within the State.

I have no doubt in the world that if the National Guard of California were called upon as provided in the Constitution, they would respond promptly, and to a man, and that they would make excellent soldiers. They are patriotic citizens, who are acting in good faith as members of the National Guard, and they would respond to any legitimate and proper call to the service of the United States. I believe that they should be kept within those limits; and it is for that reason, and for that reason only, that I have opposed some of these provisions, and expect to continue to do so as such amendments are offered.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], important as it is, sinks into insignificance when compared with the importance of the charge made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. As I understand, he says that the appropriations that have been made by Congress from year to year since 1908 have been, by the officers of the National Guard, shamelessly misappropriated and misspent. If they have been shamelessly misappropriated and shamelessly misspent, the officers who are responsible for that course are dishonest men, and they ought not longer to receive the confidence of Congress or of the people.

If these men, who have been intrusted by the authorities of their States with the performance of these high duties, have

betrayed their trust and have stolen and misappropriated—because in moral effect there is no difference between the words "stolen" and "misappropriated"—they ought to be brought to account, and no single dollar should be committed to their care if the charge made by the Senator from Idaho is sustained. That is his view; it is his opinion that because these thousands of officers throughout the United States have been misappropriating the money which has been given into their care by Congress, therefore they should not be given more money; that having dealt unfaithfully with $8,000,000, they ought not to be given the opportunity to deal unfaithfully with $45,000,000.

Without at all questioning the sincerity of the Senator from Idaho or the accuracy of the report he has in hand—for I have not seen the report—I do not believe that the officers of the National Guard are dishonest. There are, I assume, the same frailties among the officers of the guard that you will observe in the Senate of the United States or in any other body of men; but I do not believe they are dishonest men. If the money has been expended as provided by Congress, they have but performed their duty. I am not familiar with the way in which it has been expended. If it has been expended in violation of the command of Congress, then they are dishonest men, and I think we could not do better than to halt this bill at this point and ascertain whether or not the officers of the militia of the United States are the kind of scoundrels that may be inferred from the report that has been read.

I know some of these men—a few of them it is true. I know those in my State, and a higher-minded, more intelligent, more faithful, more unselfish body of men never devoted themselves to the public service than the officers of the National Guard. I am shocked beyond measure to hear the charge that has been made against them.

I am not asserting that any of the tables that were given by the Senator from Idaho are not true; I do not know. I have simply had no opportunity to learn. It is the first time in all my experience that I have ever heard the officers of the guard charged with dishonor or with dishonesty; and I think we ought to know whether they have taken the money of the country and have spent it for purposes other than those directed by Congress. I do not believe it. Other Senators here will know of their own guard. I know of the National Guard of Iowa.

I will stake my whole life upon the fidelity with which the adjutant general of the State of Iowa, under the command of the governor, has spent the money which has been intrusted to his care by the Secretary of War or by the Secretary of the Treasury. It will be most unfortunate if this bill is considered and disposed of upon the hypothesis that the officers of the National Guard are not good citizens of the United States.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa a question before he takes his seat. Is there not a board in the State of Iowa similar to the board which we have in the State of Colorado, which passes upon all of the expenditures made by the officers of the National Guard, and do not those expenditures have to receive the approval of that board which, in the State of Colorado, is the governor of the State?

Mr. CUMMINS. There is such a board in Iowa. The governor of the State is the commander in chief of the army in Iowa, and he, together with the executive council, passes upon the accounts of the adjutant general. The adjutant general is a sworn officer of the United States; he becomes the disbursing officer of the United States, and expends all the money that is appropriated by the Federal Government for the use of the National Guard in Iowa.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Then, if these expenditures were wrong, it would involve even the governors of the States, would it not?

Mr. CUMMINS. It would in our State. I do not know how it would be in other States.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It would in the State of Colorado; I am sure of that.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am just a little surprised at the course this debate has taken. The question for consideration before the Senate is, Shall the plan which has been proposed by the Senate Military Committee be so modified that officers of the National Guard over and above the rank of captain will be entitled to receive the same pay that a captain receives, or will they be compelled to render their services gratuitously? That is the question which is before us. We have been dealing a good deal in crimination and recrimination in this debate. Charges have been made against certain Senators, because they happened to differ from certain other Senators, that they are perhaps playing to the galleries or taking their position because of the political effect that it may have. I for one deny the charge and resent the insinuation.

It is stated that $8,000,000 are appropriated annually for the National Guard. I have not yet had the time to investigate in order to ascertain exactly what the figures are. I am told that the original Dick bill provided for an appropriation of $2,000,000 per annum, and I have that bill before me. I am also told that, in addition to this sum, by subsequent legislation another appropriation of $2,000,000 was made, making the total appropriation for the National Guard $4,000,000. I do not say that that is correct, but that is the information I have on the subject.

And now my good friend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] refers rather scathingly to some of the officers of the Ohio National Guard. I know personally a good many of those men. They have never come to me—not one of them—in any other spirit than that in which I should be approached by any man who was interested in any piece of legislation which was occupying the attention of the Senate. I challenge the correctness of the statement which has been made, that any one of these officers has been guilty of any violation of the law. I shall not have a plea of guilty entered for any one of them because he has been indicted.

These men are of good reputation in their respective communities. They are men of the best character, who have been intrusted year in and year out with responsible positions in connection with the National Guard in the State of Ohio as well as in private life. If they have been guilty of any wrongdoing, I have no word in defense to make for any offense committed; but I submit that the Senate of the United States should not decide a question of legislation here, because, forsooth, there may be some one somewhere who has got some money to which he may not be entitled.

In Ohio, as I am told, the private in the National Guard is paid $1 per day, whereas the Federal authorities pay 43 cents per day. I am not here to condone any wrongdoing, if there has been any; but I am not here to sit in silence when an accusation in very general terms is made against the entire National Guard, even if there may be some wrongdoing on behalf of one or more members of the National Guard.

I have not said one word in disparagement of the Federal Army, neither shall I; and I am not going to indorse the statements which may be made in wholesale fashion against the National Guard. Burke, I believe it was, said, "You can not indict a whole nation"; and, good lawyer though my distinguished friend from Idaho is, he can not indict the entire National Guard because of some wrongdoing, whether it be on the part of officers in the Federal Army or on the part of officers in the National Guard. If there has been wrongdoing, it is time for a house cleaning. Let us not be controlled in our legislation now because there may have been some violation of law, some indiscretion in administration it may be; but let us bend ourselves to the purpose of adopting legislation here which may be for the good of the entire country, without attempting to cast reflections either upon the National Guard or upon the Army or upon Senators who may be taking one side or the other of this question.

I do not question the motives of any Senator who has spoken on either one side or on the other of this measure, and I shall not do so; but it seems to me that the debate can pursue a peaceful and orderly course without dealing in any crimination or recrimination.

Mr. BORAH and Mr. STERLING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator from South Dakota wish to speak?

Mr. STERLING. I want to address the Senate for a few moments.

Mr. BORAH. I will yield if the Senator desires to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from a constituent of mine who evidently had misunderstood my position in regard to the National Guard. I think he saw by the RECORD that I had voted for section 56—that section of the bill providing for the volunteer army—and, without looking or inquiring further, he came to the conclusion that I was opposed to the National Guard; and so he says in his letter:

> I write to express my hearty appreciation of your vote against the National Guard.

I wish to quote a part of my reply to the gentleman who thus misunderstood my vote. I wrote to him as follows:

> I fear you do not quite understand my position in this matter. I did not vote against the National Guard, but did vote for the volunteer-army provision in the pending Army bill. Some of the National Guard people were opposed to the volunteer-army plan, but not all by any means, and I have heard no word of protest against the volunteer army from any of the National Guard officers or men in South Dakota. My opinion is that the National Guard can be made a most effective military force in the event of war, and in case of the mobilization of

the armed forces of the United States I would be in favor of giving the National Guard first place after the Regular Army.

Now, Mr. President, I feel that I would be derelict in duty unless I made some protest against the wholesale charges made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] against the National Guard as I know it and as I know the men composing it. They have not been in evidence here during the pendency of this legislation working against the volunteer army. It was my good fortune to have as a law partner for 10 years the present adjutant general of my State. We are on the most friendly terms, but he has not written me one word against the volunteer army. On the other hand, I have a letter here from a former adjutant general of my State in which, while he speaks most approvingly of the provision for the volunteer army, he does not say a word to detract from the National Guard of the State as now constituted.

I think I know something of the National Guard in my State and of the spirit which has animated the enlisted men and the officers of that organization. I never have heard one charge of wrongdoing against them or one hint or suggestion that there had been any misappropriation of funds apportioned to the National Guard in my State. I know, Mr. President, that these officers and these men have sacrificed both in time and money to keep up the National Guard so that it might be an effective instrument in the hands of the Federal Government, if ever the Federal Government should need its services; that the animating motive, for the most part, as has been expressed by others in this Chamber, for enlistment on the part of officers and men in the National Guard, has been the thought that at some time they might be of service, not particularly to the State in the enforcement of the laws of the State, but that they might be ready for the service of the Federal Government in case of need.

The Senator from Idaho makes a general charge about the relative amount of money received by the officers and the enlisted men of the National Guard; but, Mr. President, that does not go to show or to prove for a moment that the officers have appropriated money that belonged to the men, and which did not belong to the officers. There is no showing here, nor do I think that the Senator from Idaho can show, that the men have ever failed to receive all the Federal money which belonged to them under the law.

I regret, Mr. President, very much to see these attacks upon the National Guard. My contention is that, as between the volunteer army and the National Guard, the National Guard, because of its older organization, because of its spirit, because of its longer training, would be the more efficient of the two in case of actual or threatened war; and, for that reason, I have favored a distinct provision in the pending bill to the effect that, in case of a call for the armed forces of the United States for service, aside from the Regular Army, the National Guard should have first place in mobilization and in service in the field.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, we have a National Guard in the State of Idaho, so called—"State militia" is the proper name and the name under which it has always gone until the desire arose to federalize the State militia. My personal relation with the State militia of my State is not unfriendly at all; in fact, I have been in very intimate communication with them for the last seven or eight days. I know a number of them, and I presume, in a casual way, I know them all; but I know a number of them intimately. I could do the same thing as the Senator [Mr. STERLING] who has just taken his seat and as other Senators have done, for, so far as I know, the personnel of the National Guard or the State militia of my State is above reproach. I do not know of any one of them that I would distrust personally, and I have no personal feeling in this matter at all. I could engage in the same fulsome eulogy on "our boys" which we have heard here ad nauseam. But that would not change my belief that the State militia as a military force is ineffective; neither would it change the facts now on record as to the manner in which the "Dick fund" has been wasted. I do not believe, in the first place, that we can do what we are attempting to do legally, and, in the second place, I do not believe that under the kind of training which they are given they will ever make soldiers in the sense that we will need soldiers if any real peril should come to us.

Mr. President, the Senator who has just taken his seat [Mr. STERLING], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] say that I have made a general charge. I have done nothing of the kind; I have made a specific charge. I have called attention to specific figures, to specific years, to a matter of record. It is not a generalization at all; it is not an attack upon men in such a general way that they do not know what the charge is which I have made. I have stated that the money which has been appropriated under the Dick law has been shamelessly used; has not been used in such a way as it should have been used if the men who were using the money had been the taxpayers who were paying it. Now, instead of these able Senators referring to general charges I invite their attention to a specific public record and ask them do they approve this record?

For instance, you have 18 men in a camp for a few days; 12 of them are officers and 6 of them are enlisted men. They draw several thousand dollars. Six hundred and some odd dollars go to the enlisted men and eight or nine thousand dollars to the officers. That is not technically a crime, but morally it is; and I assume full responsibility here upon the floor of the Senate, until these figures are corrected and made to appear untrue according to the reports of the War Department, for the statement that it is a shameless use of the public money. I challenge Senators to the record and ask them for their defense. It will not do to go off into eulogies. I have given you certain figures. Do you deny them?

If the Senator who has just taken his seat and the Senator from Iowa want to attack the Senator from Idaho, let them disprove the figures which I have given here to the Senate; let them show that the record from which I have quoted is an error, and that it is not a fact. When they shall have done so, I am not too proud or too cowardly to apologize upon the floor of the Senate and before the people for having misled, to a certain extent and for a limited time, some of my associates upon the floor. I have improvised nothing; I have relied on the public archives. And I think Senators would do more credit to their intellectual candor if they would seek to deal with the record facts rather than regret wholesale charges. If the charges are wholesale it is because the wasting of the money has been wholesale. I say to you the deeper you delve into the last eight years the less you will feel disposed to expose the facts here upon the floor of the Senate; the more you follow the details as to the money lost, the money and property wasted, lost, and embezzled, the less you will care to have the matter discussed in detail here upon the floor of the Senate.

You say to me that this is something new to you. It should not be anything new; it is a matter of public record. It has been called for and furnished to me, and I present it here on the floor of the Senate.

Now, my friends, I do not think we can wholly escape responsibility by saying that some civil officer has been guilty of misconduct if these men have not been prosecuted. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] expresses regret that the Senator from Idaho has made these charges; it would do more credit to the able Senator if he would express regret, rather, that the records exist. Would the Senator have the Senator from Idaho conceal the record facts? We have a responsibility ourselves, and we are appropriating large sums of money under conditions which, in my judgment, in view of the past are unwarranted. I am perfectly willing to state all the facts I know concerning the proposition and to take the responsibility, whatever it may be, for it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. REED. The Senator has referred to the large amount of money expended at some military camp where there were only 18 men, 12 of whom were officers. Does the Senator want to leave the impression with the Senate that that is a typical military camp; that that is a fair example of the kind of camps that are held; that it is not a fact that generally there are hundreds and frequently thousands of these men in camp?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to indulge in invidious comparisons, but I do think there are a few States which have commendable State militia. From my investigation I have ascertained that there are three or four States where there seems to be no cause for criticism. It seems to me that they are doing their duty, and they are not at all subject to criticism, and I have not criticized them. I have made no such general statement. I have called attention to specific instances, and named the State and named the year and named the time, and there are more of them—plenty more of them. I have not named them all. But there are exceptions to that, and I do not know that the State of Missouri would suffer if the facts were presented here—I do not believe that it would—or the State of New York.

Mr. REED. The question I am asking is not that. The Senator spoke of this one instance of a camp with only 18 men present. I wanted to ask him if he wanted the Senate to understand that that is the ordinary military camp, and whether it

is not true that in these military camps there are hundreds, and frequently thousands, of men mobilized?

Mr. BORAH. In some of the States that would be true; but taking it as a whole, about 50 per cent of the State militia attend these camps throughout the country.

Mr. REED. About 50 per cent?

Mr. BORAH. About 50 per cent.

Mr. REED. That runs it into hundreds or thousands itself, and answers my question. Now, I want to ask the Senator this further question: He speaks of no money going to the privates. Is not that true because there has not been any provision in the law for the payment of privates at all?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as I understand, this money goes directly to the officers of the National Guard. It is distributed to them and, of course, it depends largely upon their honor and upon their sense of right and of their relationship and duty to the enlisted man as to what they shall do for the enlisted man.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator pardon another question?

Mr. BORAH. In just a moment. But there is not any defense on earth in morals—there may be technically, but there is not any use in trying to cover it over with nice language—there is not any defense in morals to the record which is disclosed here as to the manner in which great numbers of the officers of the National Guard use this money.

Mr. REED. I want to ask the Senator if it is not true that an analysis of these figures will show that this money which was paid to certain officers was in fact used for the mess for the men and for the expense of putting up tents, and that it simply appears charged to the officer, whereas it was expended for the benefit of the camp? I want to ask if that is not the probable explanation of all of it?

Mr. BORAH. That would be an explanation which the Senator could make, but whether it is based upon facts or not I leave to the Senator to say. I could imagine the Senator from Missouri defending a man charged with embezzlement and making that a very successful defense.

Mr. REED. Oh, no, Mr. President; if the Senator will pardon me, what I mean is this: Here is money appropriated for the benefit of the National Guard, for the benefit of a camp. They go into camp. The food is bought to feed the men. The money actually goes through the hands of the quartermaster. It is therefore charged to the quartermaster; but he did not take it and use it or embezzle it. He employed it for the purpose of feeding the men in camp.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. REED. I am sorry; I think I have imposed on the Senator's time.

Mr. BORAH. Is my time up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator ought to be allowed at least to answer that question.

Mr. HUSTING. Mr. President, I have listened to this debate for a couple of weeks, and I regret to say that most of the discussion has seemed to revolve around the question of whether a given course of action is a favor to one branch of the Army or the other.

I have not taken any part in this discussion heretofore; but because of the character of the debate one who sits in his seat and merely votes is put in a position whereby his vote upon every one of these questions, in the light of the debate and the questions that are raised and the charges and countercharges bandied from one side to the other, stands as taking part in the indictment of the Regular Army and championing the militia, on the one hand, or countrariwise, standing as a champion of the Regular Army and indicting the militia, on the other.

When section 56 was up we were told that that provision was aimed at the National Guard; that if that were passed it would mean that those who helped to pass it were taking part in the destruction and annihilation of the National Guard. I voted to retain section 56 in the bill, believing that under all the circumstances and conditions now obtaining it was a good and proper thing to do. Now we are called upon to vote upon a measure whereby, if we vote in favor of this amendment, we are to be charged with aiming a blow at the Regular Army or unduly championing the cause of the National Guard.

I rise merely to say this in my own behalf for the sake of explaining votes that have already been cast and for the purpose of explaining votes that are going to be cast. As far as I am concerned, I am going to try to vote, and have tried to vote, in the light of what appears to be the best thing for the United States. I do not think we should vote for a measure because it is a sort of favoritism to the National Guard. The question, it seems to me, ought to be whether it is good for the United States. On the other hand, a vote ought not to be cast because it is a good thing for or an evidence of favoritism to the Regular Army, but because it is a good thing for the country. I wish no vote I have cast or that I will cast on the amendment and passage of the pending measure to be considered an indorsement of the charges made against the Army or the National Guard. I do indorse the good things that have been said of both the National Guard and the Regular Army. I should like to have my vote construed only as my expression of opinion or judgment of what I believe is the best for the country. I hope I may be able to vote upon the pending measure with the thought only of the country and entirely divorced from the idea of favoring or, on the other hand, of discriminating against the Regular Army or the National Guard.

I want to say, as far as the National Guard of my State is concerned—and it does not need any defense at my hands, because I think it stands as the foremost organization of its kind in the United States—that I have never received a letter or a telegram from any member of it, nor was I ever interviewed directly or indirecly by any member of it, in behalf of any measure coming up before this body; nor have I received any criticism from any member of the National Guard for voting to retain section 56 in this bill. I want to say that the National Guard of Wisconsin is a splendid body of able and patriotic men and officered by men of great ability and zeal.

While it is true that the Senator from Idaho does not indict the National Guard of Wisconsin, yet his charges are so broad that unless specific organizations are exempted from them his criticisms might well lie against the National Guard of Wisconsin. I for one want to place upon the record my repudiation of anything said by the Senator from Idaho which in any way might reflect on the National Guard of Wisconsin.

It may be true that the Senator from Idaho gave specific instances of misconduct on the part of officers of the National Guard, and did not intend any reflection upon Wisconsin's guard, but if such specific instances have any relevancy to the issue here involved the only relevancy that I can see is that those charges against the National Guard were meant to apply as an argument against the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. In other words, I understood the criticism to be expressed in the Senate for this purpose and no other—that because of any specific instances of misconduct on the part of some officers of the National Guard the Senator drew the inference that such misconduct was typical of the action of other members of the National Guard, and therefore—and I think the Senator from Idaho said so—no money should be voted for this organization. I can see no force in the charge unless the Senator meant in a general way to charge mismanagement and misconduct on the part of the National Guard.

All that I have to say about that is this: If the officers of certain organizations of certain States have misconducted themselves, other States, where officers have not misconducted themselves, but who have made splendid records for the organization, should not be put in the same class, or be punished or penalized because the officers of other organizations did not do their full duty. In other words, I do not know why an officer in the Wisconsin National Guard who has done his duty in every respect should be put in the same category with officers of the guard or some other State who, the Senator claims, have not done their duty. If there are any such—and I do not know whether there are or not, I believe and hope not—I say that a member of the National Guard of Wisconsin should not be put under the same cloud that has been cast over some other, nor should such officer in any way suffer or be penalized for what somebody else in some other State—with whose misconduct he had absolutely nothing in common—has done or expected to do in the premises.

In regard to this amendment, I assume that the committee in its wisdom thought it best to pay from the Treasury of the United States those of the rank and below the rank of captain in the National Guard a certain sum of money. Assuming that that is a good policy—and I say I am not sufficiently informed upon that subject to know whether it is good or not, but I am willing to take the committee's word for it; they have studied the question—I say, then, that I have not had sufficient information to satisfy me that those above the rank of captain should be required to donate their services gratis in the Army any more than any other soldier should do so.

We know these men. I know that in my State they are not rich men and they can not afford to serve gratis any better than any other soldier can in the Regular Army or the militia. I can not understand the fairness or justice in saying, because we want to be economical, that therefore we will pay some and expect the others to carry the load by doing their work for

nothing. In other words, I can not see the justice or fairness of saying to some men, "We have got enough to pay everybody until we get to you, but when we get to you the Treasury is exhausted, and you will have to serve without pay." I can see no logic in the argument that we can vote money to pay soldiers for services in the National Guard until their efficiency raises them above the rank of captain and then "reward" their faithful and efficient service by cutting off their pay. I do not think you can attract soldiers and rouse their ambitions by such treatment as that.

I say, assuming it to be a good policy to have captains and those below in rank in the guard paid by the United States, there can be no good argument advanced or any good reason given why men promoted above a captaincy should not receive at least the pay of the rank from which they have been promoted.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the pending amendment, but I do wish to put into the RECORD a bit of information which I know the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] would want me to put there. I am sure he has no desire to misrepresent the conduct of the National Guard of Ohio.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HARDING. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. Permit me to say that I not only have no desire to misrepresent them, but I have not misrepresented them. It is a matter of fact, a matter of record. If the record is wrong, that is another proposition; but I have not misrepresented anybody, because I have read the record.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I perhaps was not happy in my choice of words. There are times when a partial truth may be stated and still convey an unjust impression. I do not question the accuracy of the statement made to the Senate by the Senator from Idaho, but the Senate would be lacking in information if I did not put into the RECORD a brief bit of information which ought to accompany his statement.

As I understand it, the pay of the officers of the National Guard is the same whether they are paid under State or under Federal authority, or out of State or Federal funds. So in the State of Ohio, where we have a very fine organization of the National Guard, we pay the officers out of the Federal allowance, because it is eminently fair to do so, and it makes no difference in the expenditure; and by that process we conserve our State appropriation for the guard, and, under the State law, we are enabled to pay the enlisted men a higher rate of compensation.

In other words, under the law of Ohio an enlisted man in the guard gets at least a dollar per day for his services in camp. Under the Federal law his compensation is, at the very highest point, only 48 cents per day. So, by applying the Federal funds to the payment of officers and applying our State funds to the pay of the enlisted men we are enabled to pay the enlisted men more than twice what would ordinarily be paid. As the result of that policy, I think we have in Ohio the finest section, or one among the finest sections, of the National Guard in all the United States. I think I can say, and I am proud to say in this connection, that the guard is so well organized in Ohio that if a national need were to be expressed this day the officers of the guard of Ohio could mobilize 8,000 men for the service of Uncle Sam within 24 hours.

I think it ought to be said, too, in this connection, that in all the years I have known the National Guard in Ohio there has been no suspicion of any manipulation of funds. There has been no scandal in the management of the guard. I can recall, only three or four years ago, there was a determined effort on the part of a certain faction of the citizenship of Ohio to put the National Guard out of existence. It was seriously proposed to withdraw the $90,000 per year that we appropriate of State funds for the maintenance of the guard. Unfortunately for many of the citizens of the State, we were visited that year by a very disastrous flood in the Scioto, the Muskingum, and the Miami Valleys; and in the trying situation that attended it we found there was but one organization in Ohio capable of ministering to the distress and satisfying the anxiety of the people of our State. The splendid work of the guard under those trying circumstances so modified public opinion in the State of Ohio that we would not now sacrifice or now neglect that organization under any circumstances.

I did not mean to speak of that, however, Mr. President. I only wanted the Senate to know that the reason why the payment of Federal funds does not show in its application to the enlisted men in Ohio is solely because out of our State funds we can pay the enlisted men a higher rate of compensation than we could out of Federal funds; and the payment of the officers out of Federal funds makes no difference to either the State or the Nation.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, it is seldom that I differ from my distinguished colleague on matters of national policy or regarding laws that should be enacted by the Congress, and our difference of opinion relative to the pending measure, and especially that part of it affecting the National Guard, is simply a different viewpoint as to the results that will be obtained by enacting this measure into law and thus placing the National Guard in closer touch with the Federal Government. Those who know my colleague as well and favorably as I do must realize that any arguments he advances regarding this or any other question are inspired by patriotic motives and honesty of purpose.

I believe the National Guard can be made more efficient and more useful under the provisions of the bill we are now considering. I will not discuss this bill at length, owing to the fact that I have been ill and unable to give as much thought and consideration to the same as I had hoped to do and I have felt that under the circumstances I would not attempt to discuss the bill, contenting myself with what little assistance I have been able to render in the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. However, I feel that I should say a few words relative to some of the provisions of the bill, and especially relative to the National Guard. As a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs I have been furnished with all of the testimony taken at the hearings before the committee, and with the reports made by both the Senate and House committees. I therefore feel that I have reasonably good knowledge of the provisions of both the Senate and House bills. Neither of these bills is perfect, but I believe that the Senate bill lays the best foundation for a proper preparedness for national defense.

It is admitted by everyone who is advised as to the real conditions that our country is to-day totally unprepared for war, or for defense in case of invasion, and it seems to be the wish of a very large majority of our people that these conditions be remedied and that we prepare for adequate national defense. At the same time it is well known that the citizens of this Nation will never permit our Government to become top-heavy in a military way. All the people desire is safe and sane legislation along lines that will place our country in a position to defend her citizens and her rights at a reasonable and equitable cost, and the people of this country are not objecting to a reasonable defense course but, on the contrary, are willing to give of both money and personal service whatever the real exigencies of the situation may require.

There are just about as many different opinions as to what should be done in this regard as there are different Members of the Senate and House, but the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate in the work it has done has been guided in the preparation of its bill by the advice and counsel of the best military talent we have in the United States. In reporting the bill to the Senate the chairman of the committee says:

> The committee has been guided in the preparation of its bill by the advice of practically all the most prominent officers of the Regular Army and National Guard, in addition to that of eminent civilians who have interested themselves in the subject of preparedness. In addition to this the committee had before it and considered the tentative drafts of the so-called Hay, Chamberlain, and War Department bills, selecting therefrom whatever was thought best and most applicable to the Nation's needs, and the bill as now reported is believed to represent, as far as practicable, the consensus of opinion of the best available judges on military matters.

I think this statement covers the ground very fully, and while the bill, as I have stated above, is by no means perfect, yet it lays the foundation and paves the way for an Army large enough for the reasonable defense of our country and not so large as to permit us to drift into militarism.

World conditions have changed so much within the last two years that it is absolutely necessary for our Nation to adjust itself to these changed conditions. I believe that for adequate defense we will need a regular standing Army of 250,000 men, all of the National Guard force provided for in the Senate bill, and the encouragement of the training-camp movement in every possible way. Instead of having petty jealousies between the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the training camps, let patriotism prevail and let us work in harmony as a united Nation not for aggression but for the defense of our country on land and sea.

As executive of my State I came in close contact with the personnel and practice of our National Guard. There never lived a more patriotic, self-sacrificing, and efficient body of men than I found the National Guard of Idaho to be, and I believe it is only fair to assume that the same conditions exist in every State in the Union. By federalizing the National Guard and bringing them in closer touch with and under greater control of the National Government, with uniform discipline, their scope of usefulness will be extended and increased and they will

become one great national force, so far as constitutional limitations will permit. With regard to these constitutional limitations, it is very evident that there is a very wide difference of opinion among men learned in the law as to just what these constitutional rights and limitations are, and, while not a lawyer, the report from the Committee on Military Affairs of the House contains a statement from the military council of the State of Missouri which to me is a conclusive argument in favor of the federalization of the National Guard and justifies the action taken by the Committee on Military Affairs of both the Senate and House, and I ask to have this statement inserted at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that may be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

POWER OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ORGANIZE, DISCIPLINE, GOVERN, AND USE THE NATIONAL GUARD UNDER THE CONSTITUTION.

I. POWER OF CONGRESS TO PRESCRIBE THE ORGANIZATION, ARMAMENT, AND DISCIPLINE OF THE MILITIA.

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States reads as follows:

"Congress shall have power: To raise and support armies; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

Section 2 of Article II:

"The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States."

Section 10, Article I:

"No State shall, without the consent of Congress, * * * keep troops * * * in time of peace."

The Constitution contemplates two classes of land forces. One a full-paid force of professional soldiers, commonly denominated the Regular Army, and the other a force consisting of all other able-bodied male citizens, trained or untrained, who could be called upon to defend the country and enforce its laws in any emergency requiring a larger force. This latter force consists of all citizens liable to military duty but who follow peaceful avocations and devote their time to civilian pursuits. This great body, constituting the real physical strength of the country, is termed the militia. The untrained portion of it is called the unorganized militia, and that part of it which is organized is called in the several States the National Guard. It will be noted that the right to organize, arm, equip, and maintain a militia is not one of the reserved rights of the States, but that the organization, armament, discipline, government, and use of such force for national purposes is vested solely in Congress. The power of Congress to organize, arm, and discipline the militia and to govern such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving only to the States the appointment of the officers and the authority of training according to the discipline prescribed by Congress, is so clearly declared in the Constitution that it would seem the meaning of the constitutional words require no explanation. If there be those who have doubts upon the subject, let them read the case of Houston *v.* Moore (5 Wheat., l. c. 21), in which Mr. Justice Washington, speaking for the Supreme Court of the United States, said:

"Congress has power to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and it is presumable that the framers of the Constitution contemplated a full exercise of all these powers. If Congress had declined to exercise them, it was competent to the State governments to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining their respective militias in such manner as they might think proper. But Congress has provided for all these subjects, in the way which that body must have supposed the best calculated to promote the general welfare, and to provide for the national defense."

And again, on page 16:

"The manner in which the militia is to be organized, armed, disciplined, and governed is fully prescribed; provisions are made for drafting, detaching, and calling forth the State quotas when required by the President. The President's orders may be given to the chief executive magistrate of the State or to any militia officer he may think proper; neglect or refusal to obey orders is declared to be an offense against the laws of the United States, and subjects the offender to trial, sentence, and punishment, to be adjudged by a court-martial, to be summoned in the way pointed out by the articles and rules of war; and the mode of proceeding to be observed by these courts is detailed with all necessary perspicuity."

If any doubt could be entertained as to the sweeping powers of Congress under the Constitution to organize and discipline the militia, this decision forever sets such doubts at rest. The power to prescribe the organization means that Congress may not only require the various units to be the same as those of the Regular Army, but it can prescribe the number of officers and men in each unit and their physical and mental qualifications. Congress can require that the physical qualification of officers and men shall be the same as that of the Regular Army; it can provide that all officers of the National Guard shall be examined touching their mental and military qualifications, and the standard may be made the same as that required for commission as officers in the Regular Army. The effect of this would be practically to give the State merely power to nominate, because with power in Congress to fix the standard this standard must be met. Congress has power to prescribe the system of disciplining the militia. The discipline can by law be made the same as that of the Regular Army, and the States must train the guard in accordance with this system of discipline. A careful reading of this clause of the Constitution and of the construction placed upon it by the Supreme Court in the case of Houston *v.* Moore (5 Wheaton, 1) makes it clear that Congress has unquestioned power to organize the militia according to any system it desires and to discipline it according to any system of discipline it sees proper. And while to the States is left the selection of the officers, this does not, of course, affect the control of Congress over the militia, even in time of peace, nor does it impair its efficiency; certainly not when such officers can be required to meet the standard of efficiency required by the Federal authorities. Senators and Representatives in Congress are lawmakers for a national body, and yet their fidelity and efficiency for the national good can hardly be questioned because they are selected by the States.

Save and except the appointment of officers reserved to the States, but one power remains in the States, and that is to train the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress. What does this mean? It means that while the State shall superintend the actual drill and instruction of the National Guard, such instruction must be according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; that is to say, the method of drill and instruction and the observance of all things which go to make up military discipline must be according to Federal standards. To use a homely illustration, the case is as though the Federal Government should say to the States, "You must educate your children in certain schools; you may name the teachers, provided such teachers possess the qualifications we prescribe; these teachers may instruct your students, provided they use our textbooks, the course of study we prescribe, the length of hours of recitation we elect, examine them according to our requirements, and mete out such punishment for their delinquencies as we designate." It would seem that under these conditions the school would be rather largely controlled by the Federal head master.

It will be seen that the so-called weakness of the militia system is not the weakness of the system at all, but whatever deficiency exists in organization, personnel, or discipline is due wholly to the failures of Congress to exercise its rights and legislate along lines which will give the militia the unquestioned Federal status contemplated by the Constitution and make it the efficient force which, with proper legislation, it can be made.

The officers of the General Staff of the Army who have appeared before one of the congressional committees recently have criticized the National Guard because the different States have different regulations, systems of selection of officers, etc. This is in part true, but it is true only because Congress has failed to exercise its full power in the premises. As before stated, it possesses the most far-reaching power and authority over the militia, and certainly the National Guard is not to be condemned for not doing the things complained of when Congress has taken no sufficient steps to provide for the exercise of its constitutional powers over the Organized Militia. The Secretary of War speaks of the National Guard of the several States as 48 separate armies. It is true that there are 48 military subdivisions, all comprising the one National Guard, exactly as there might be 48 or any number of subdivisions of any army comprising the entire organization. The effect of these statements is to make it appear that the militia of the various States is entirely dissimilar in armament, equipment, and organization. This is not true, and if it was true the answer to such statement is that Congress should, by the exercise of the legislative powers conferred upon it by the Constitution, conform these 48 so-called separate armies to the same system of armament, equipment, organization, and discipline. If Congress passes appropriate laws in which it exercises its full rights under the Constitution, the National Guard of the United States can be made an effective force, the different parts of which will articulate with each other and with the general plan, and when this is done the fact that they happen to be stationed in the territory of the several States would not make them any more separate and distinct armies than are the several divisions of the Regular Army stationed in the different territorial departments of the country. In all these arguments, the power of Congress over the militia is entirely lost sight of and the National Guard is criticized for what Congress and the War Department have failed to do. The Secretary of War complains because some of the States have not organized sufficient auxiliary troops—that is to say, Artillery, Cavalry, and Signal Corps troops, etc. This complaint is based upon facts, but it should not be lodged against the National Guard, because the remedy lies with Congress. Congress has the right to say, or to vest the Secretary of War with power to say, what States shall organize auxiliary troops and in what proportion such auxiliary troops shall be distributed among the States. Let them do with the various States as was done with Rhode Island. In that case the War Department said to the State of Rhode Island that its militia ought to be Coast Artillery troops, and all Infantry troops of that State were accordingly transformed into Coast Artillery.

II. POWER TO REQUIRE ITS USE FOR FEDERAL PURPOSES.

There being no question, therefore, of the right of Congress to provide for the organization and discipline of the National Guard by suitable laws which will make it a thoroughly efficient force, organized in exact conformity to that of the Regular Establishment, with an enlisted and commissioned personnel meeting Federal requirements, trained according to the system of discipline prescribed by Congress and constituting, therefore, a reserve army thoroughly organized, equipped, officered, trained, and ready for immediate service, it may be inquired under what circumstances this force is available for national purposes. The words of the Constitution are:

"To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions."

The primary purpose of maintaining any force is to defend the country against invasion, but in view of the timidity with which some of the opponents of a real citizen soldiery seemingly shrink from the contemplation of the use of the National Guard unless a large hostile army is actually marching through the country, it will be interesting to note the manner in which the Supreme Court of the United States has met and dispelled these fears.

In the case of Martin *v.* Mott (12 Wheaton, 29) Mr. Justice Story, speaking for the court, said:

"It has not been denied here that the act of 1795 is within the constitutional authority of Congress, or that Congress may not lawfully provide for cases of imminent danger of invasion, as well as for cases where an invasion has actually taken place. In our opinion, there is no ground for a doubt on this point, even if it had been relied on, for the power to provide for repelling invasions includes the power to provide against the attempt and danger of invasion, as the necessary and proper means to effectuate the object. One of the best means to repel invasion is to provide the requisite force for action before the invader himself has reached the soil.

"The power thus confided by Congress to the President is doubtless of a very high and delicate nature. A free people are naturally jealous of the exercise of military power; and the power to call the militia into actual service is certainly felt to be one of no ordinary magnitude. But it is not a power which can be executed without a correspondent responsibility. If it be a limited power, the question arises, By whom

is the exigency to be judged of and decided? Is the President the sole and exclusive judge whether the exigency has arisen, or is it to be considered as an open question, upon which every officer to whom the orders of the President are addressed may decide for himself and equally open to be contested by every militiaman who shall refuse to obey the orders of the President? We are all of opinion that the authority to decide whether the exigency has arisen belongs exclusively to the President, and that his decision is conclusive upon all other persons. We think that this construction necessarily results from the nature of the power itself, and from the manifest object contemplated by the act of Congress. * * * If the power of regulating the militia and of commanding its services in time of insurrection and invasion are (as it has been emphatically said they are) natural incidents to the duties of superintending the common defense and of watching over the internal peace of the confederacy, these powers must be so construed as to the modes of their exercise as not to defeat the great end in view."

Clearly, then, under the wording of this article of the Constitution and the interpretation of the same placed upon it in the Supreme Court, Congress has power to provide for calling forth the militia for the purposes therein mentioned and to punish its members for failure to respond to the call. There can be no question of the absolute right of Congress to make laws requiring the militia to serve in case of Federal call, and any member of the same failing to respond to such call can be punished in such manner as Congress may provide. It is significant in this connection—that is, calling out the militia—the President need not direct his order to the governor of the State, but can direct it in the first instance to the commanding officer of the militia troops he desires to call for. To quote the language of Judge Washington in Houston *v.* Moore (5 Wheaton, l. c. 16), holding valid a statute providing for calling forth the militia:

"Provisions are made for drafting, detaching, and calling forth the State quotas, when required by the President. The President's orders may be given to the chief executive magistrate of the State or to any militia officer he may think proper; neglect or refusal to obey orders is declared to be an offense against the laws of the United States and subjects the offender to trial, sentence, and punishment, to be adjudged by a court-martial, to be summoned in the way pointed out by the Articles and Rules of War."

This would seem to dispose of the argument that the militia is not a dependable force, because its membership would not respond if the President, under the authority vested in him by Congress, ordered them so to do.

But it is argued that the President could not under the Constitution use the National Guard for service in a foreign country in case it was desired not only to repel invasion but to invade foreign territory. The underlying purpose in the program for preparedness should, of course, be the defense of the country from the assaults of a hostile power. Our situation is such that such assaults can only seriously menace us if an invasion is attempted by the hostile power. Indeed, at all of the hearings before the House committee, the officers from the General Staff of the Army have pointed out what ought to be done to properly defend against these possible invasions, and so serious have they made the danger to be apprehended from such attacks it is quite apparent our first consideration should be to provide against the same, rather than to organize for purposes of aggression, either on this continent or abroad. In case of war with a foreign country it may be apprehended that if such country is of sufficient size to make it necessary for us to use a large force and the war is to be a serious one, such power would contemplate sending some of its forces, in large or small numbers, into our territory. In short, certainly a part of its campaign would contemplate an invasion of this country in some form. Let us suppose that the President should mobilize the National Guard on, say, the Mexican or Canadian border; that having mobilized this force to resist invasion he concludes that it is the purpose of the enemy to send troops into this country in large or small numbers, and that in his discretion he decides that the invasion can best be repelled by meeting the invaders on their own territory before they reach ours, under such circumstances would it be questioned that he has the right to order the National Guard across the boundary line for this purpose? It would seem there can be but one answer to this question. And the Supreme Court of the United States gave a sufficient answer in the language of Mr. Justice Story, in Martin *v.* Mott (12 Wheaton, loc. cit. 29), when it said:

"In our opinion there is no ground for a doubt on the point, even if it had been relied on, for the power to provide for repelling invasions includes the power to provide against the attempt and danger of invasion, as the necessary and proper means to effectuate the object. One of the best means to repel invasion is to provide the requisite force for action before the invader himself has reached the soil. * * * We are of the opinion that the authority to decide whether the exigency has arisen belongs exclusively to the President, and that his decision is conclusive upon all other persons. We think that this construction necessarily results from the nature of the power itself, and from the manifest object contemplated by the act of Congress. If the power of regulating the militia and commanding its service in time of insurrection and invasion are (as it has been emphatically said they are) natural incidents to the duties of superintending the common defense and of watching over the internal peace of the confederacy, these powers must be so construed as to modes of their exercise as not to defeat the great end in view."

Again, if the question of the right of the President to order the National Guard outside the bounds of the United States be regarded as other than a purely academic one, under the power to raise and maintain armies Congress can provide for the drafting of any or all of the citizens of the country, and the power to draft carries with it the power to say who shall be drafted. Congress can by legislation provide that when war is imminent the President shall have power to draft into the military service all persons of military age who have passed the physical examination prescribed for officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, who have had military training in the National Guard and who have been armed, equipped, and trained at Federal expense. The power to draft has been specifically upheld by the Supreme Court, and the power of Congress to so draft the National Guard will not be seriously questioned. It is not an objection to the draft of the National Guard in this way to say that they are likewise members of the State militia. It will not be contended for a moment that if Congress should decide in 1916, as it decided in 1863, to raise troops by conscription, the fact that a man of military age and sound of body would be exempt from Federal service because he was a member of the militia. Under conscription there are no exemptions, except those made by the act of Congress.

Some who oppose the use of the National Guard as the real bulwark of our reserve military strength profess to hinge their objection upon the ground that the Constitution forbids its effective use for national purposes, basing their views upon an opinion given by Attorney General Wickersham on February 17, 1912. This opinion has been so generally misquoted and its application to the question in hand so grossly misrepresented that it is thought proper to mention it here. The opinion, which will be found in Opinions of Attorneys General, volume 29, page 322, was given by Mr. Wickersham in response to a question from Secretary of War Stimson, which question so answered he quotes in the opinion as follows:

"Whether or not under existing laws the President has the authority to call forth the Organized Militia of the States and send it into a foreign country with the Regular Army as a part of an army of occupation, especially should the United States intervene in the affairs of such country under conditions short of actual warfare?"

This question had reference, of course, to the use of the militia for the purpose of occupying Mexico at a time when the United States was not at war with the people or Government of that country. The opinion holds, in effect, that in the situation suggested in the question of the Secretary of War; that is, where we are at peace with a foreign country, in his judgment the President would not have the right to send the militia into such country with which we are at peace for the purpose of occupation. It is hardly necessary to say that the question as to whether or not the militia can be ordered into a foreign country with which we are at peace for purposes either of conquest or of policing it, is quite different from the question as to whether or not the militia can be used against a country with which we are at war. In the case suggested by the Secretary of War, should Congress decide to intervene between the Mexican factions in an effort to restore order and we were and continued to be after the announcement of such purpose on friendly terms with both factions, perhaps the proper procedure would be that said to have been contemplated by the War Department, to wit, to mobilize the National Guard on the Mexican boundary and then enlist it as volunteers under the provisions of the volunteer bill, it being well known in advance that the National Guard would volunteer to a man for service of this kind. But it is interesting to note that the opinion of the Attorney General does not conflict with the views above given; indeed, the right to send the militia into foreign territory under conditions which would actually exist if Congress decided either to declare war on Mexico or intervene in its affairs, is conceded in this language of the opinion, which will be found on page 324:

"The term 'to repel invasion' may be, in some respects, more elastic in its meaning. Thus, if the militia were called into service of the General Government to repel an invasion, it would not be necessary to discontinue their use at the boundary line, but they might pursue and capture the invading force, even beyond that line, and just as the Regular Army might be used for that purpose. This may well be held to be within the meaning of the term 'to repel invasion.'

"Then, too, if an armed force were assembled upon our border, so near and under circumstances which plainly indicated hostility and an intended invasion, this Government might attack and capture or defeat such forces, using either the Regular Army or the militia for that purpose. This, also, would be but one of the ways of repelling an invasion."

It is respectfully submitted that a careful reading of the Constitution and the interpretation placed upon the powers it grants to Congress by the Supreme Court of the United States in the cases of Houston *v.* Moore (5 Wheaton) and Martin *v.* Mott (12 Wheaton) leaves no room for question as to the absolute power of that body to organize, arm, discipline, and control the National Guard according to its own standards, and to provide for its use within or without the country under any and all circumstances which will ever require the use of a force to supplement the Regular Establishment. Every argument against the use of the militia as a defensive force is based upon the Wickersham opinion, and yet when this opinion is read it will be found to affirm every proposition herein contended for. The trouble is that those who would know the law did not read the opinion, but took it for granted that the reply to a question predicated upon conditions which we all know as a practical proposition would never exist, answered the question which was in the public mind, whereas such live question was not asked or answered at all. The peculiar phraseology of the question propounded by the Secretary of War calling for an opinion upon an abstract proposition of law, based upon highly improbable, if not an impossible, state of facts, certainly indicated a purpose not altogether compatible with perfect frankness.

The militia system has enabled Switzerland to preserve her neutrality and Australia to send more than a hundred thousand troops to the Dardanelles, the splendid efficiency of which has been commented upon by friend and foe alike. The military system of these countries is identical with that of our militia system, save and except service there is compulsory, while here it is voluntary. Switzerland is composed of a number of Cantons, which are civil subdivisions corresponding to our States. Under the Swiss system each Canton raises and trains its own force and selects the officers therefor. The Cantons furnish the equipment and meet the other expenses of maintenance and are reimbursed therefor by the General Government. The regular army of Switzerland consists of one brigadier general, a small general staff, and a supply department. The Swiss Government prescribes the system of training, but the Canton trains its own troops. The Australian system is the same. Australia is composed of a number of Provinces corresponding to our States. Each Province raises its own troops and selects the officers thereof. The authority of the General Government over the militia of the Provinces is exactly the same as that of Congress over the militia. Australia has no regular army. As stated, in both these countries militia service is compulsory, while here it is voluntary. In Australia military drill and instruction is given in the public schools.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, it seems to me that a careful reading of the foregoing statement answers any and all of the arguments which have been advanced against the constitutionality of federalizing the National Guard.

In the discussion of this bill we have heard much about the Swiss system and the Australian system. Both of these systems have many advantages and are well worth studying. However, what we need and what we should adopt is an American system. The social, commercial, and industrial conditions of the United States are different from those of any other country in the world, and for this reason we will have to have a military system that is peculiarly American, and when we adopt a system that is purely American—all our own—it will be one which will produce a good soldier in time of war and a good citizen in time of peace. Therefore, Mr. President, let us start now the great task that world conditions have thrust upon us and enact into law

this bill, imperfect, incomplete, and unfinished, yet the product of the honest endeavor of honest men in a serious attempt to place our country in a position to protect our flag and the rights of our people. I regard the passage of this bill as simply laying the foundation for a great structure that will grow and develop as time goes on into a finished and better one, which will give us an industrial army in times of peace that will be equaled only by our defensive army in times of war.

I am opposed to a large standing army, and believe that the passage of the pending measure will result in giving to the country a reasonable number of trained men who can be depended upon and called upon in case of war; and that in the meantime each arm of the Army will deal honestly and fairly with the Government and the people.

For these reasons I shall vote for the pending amendment and the bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY], who has just taken his seat, states that this bill will give us a great, firm foundation for this Army. I have serious doubts whether that statement will prove to be true. I agree with the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that the process which the bill describes as federalizing the State militia is very likely to break down and that the expectation of the members in the States, whether you call them State militia or National Guard, that they will become anything different after the bill is passed from what they are now, in contemplation of law, if they have such an expectation, is bound to be defeated.

Mr. President, I do not think that any lawyer who reads the opinions which have been given upon this proposition to "federalize" the National Guard by the Judge Advocate General of the Army, printed in the RECORD at pages 6802 to 6810, can believe that the State militia can become "Federal soldiers" after the passage of this act.

I have not the slightest feeling against the State militia, whether it is called that or the National Guard. I have not the slightest feeling against the Regular Army. I do not think that anyone who believes that a clause in a bill will not accomplish what it is assumed to accomplish and calls attention to it should be considered as hostile to it. If the Judge Advocate General is correct in his opinions on this proposition to "federalize" the militia of the several States, the militia are doomed to be disappointed in their expectations. If the United States Government relies upon what the bill calls a "federalized" militia to give the Government as complete control of the militia of the several States as it has of the Regular Army, in times of peace, or to put the militia in training in time of peace or to send it out of the country, then the National Government will be disappointed and the very purpose of this bill to provide a strong national defense will have failed.

Mr. President, all the State militia officers are not trying to defeat section 56 of the Chamberlain bill, which would provide, I think, an army under the exclusive control of the President of the United States. I want the Secretary in my time to read a letter which I send to the desk from the adjutant general of my State, which came to me entirely unsolicited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
MILITARY DEPARTMENT,
ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Hartford, April 7, 1916.

Hon. F. B. BRANDEGEE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BRANDEGEE: I note by the papers that you spoke for and voted for the retention of section 56 of the so-called Chamberlain bill. I feel that your position is an absolutely correct one, knowing just exactly where we stand in Connecticut on this preparedness question, and what my sentiments and the sentiments of all the officers of the National Guard of Connecticut are, who have always taken the stand that they wished to be federalized and they wished to be in a position to be of value to their country, and when called upon to be efficient for any service which may be required of them anywhere.

This is also, I believe, the sentiment of the enlisted men of the National Guard of this State.

Now, then, if with this sentiment and all that the good old State of Connecticut is doing to foster it in the way of encouragement by building armories and furnishing money for their maintenance the National Guard of Connecticut can not stand up and hold its own against the volunteer army, then I say it should fall because it isn't worth maintaining.

I feel that you are right, Senator.

Sincerely, yours,

G. M. COLE,
Adjutant General.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I send to the desk another letter from an officer of the Connecticut National Guard in relation to the question of militia pay which is very germane to this amendment. I ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

SEVENTH COMPANY COAST ARTILLERY CORPS,
CONNECTICUT NATIONAL GUARD,
Stamford Conn., April 7, 1916.

Senator FRANK B. BRANDEGEE, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I note in the New York Tribune of this morning that you were among those voting in favor of the volunteer army provision of the Chamberlain bill, and from the account I judge that those so voting are opposed to the militia-pay bill. If that is the case, I desire to commend your attitude.

While the passage of the militia-pay bill would be of pecuniary benefit to myself, I feel that it can not accomplish the result intended. Many officers whom I know and who were formerly in favor of the bill now have come to this opinion.

I think every officer who will give his honest opinion will say that our only hope of an efficient system of reserves must be based upon compulsory, universal service, and a greater power in the War Department to control the selection of officers. When this is done it will then be proper to talk about pay. There should be some remuneration, other than that for camp service, to compensate officers and men for many expenditures necessitated by the service, but which at present the State does not take over. I do not think that the pay feature should be as large as that contemplated by the militia-pay bill.

With some slight experience as a member of the Connecticut Legislature, I can understand how it may be that the various conflicting interests are so opposed that either no act may be passed at this session of Congress on this matter or that one in the nature of a compromise might result. I feel that it is the patriotic duty of Congress to take the bull by the horns and do the right thing regardless of what the pacificists or the advocates of militia pay or otherwise may want.

The country wants to be prepared. It will not accept in silence any halfway measure. As an officer of the National Guard I believe that our militia system is all wrong as a means of national defense and no amount of pay is going to remedy the situation.

Members of Congress need not worry about being knifed at the next election by militiamen who do not approve of their attitude. If they will come back the way Senator O'GORMAN did, and if they will look the situation squarely in the face they will find that they will have the support of a great many more people who are not in the guard than the opposition of those who are.

I trust that you will appreciate that this is not a personal criticism, but the contrary rather as well as an attempt to set forth the opinions of the writer which are struggling for utterance.

Very truly, yours,

WILLIAM M. FOORD,
1st Lt. Conn. C. A. C.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Now, I read a single extract from another letter in relation to this matter. This officer rather takes exception to being called a member of the State militia because he says they are the National Guard, and he says:

It is very true there are constitutional limits to the State militia, so called. The National Guard of Connecticut very much dislikes to be bound by this limitation.

Mr. President, that is at the root of this bill. It is an attempt to make these militiamen think by names and by statutes passed by Congress that their status under the Constitution of the United States is changed. It is not changed at all. When they are called the National Guard their standing remains exactly as it was before, and the President is the Commander in Chief of the militia of the several States only when they are called into the service of the United States. This is prescribed by the Constitution of the United States and can not be changed by any statute we may pass.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I wish to give notice now and have it entered of record that when the consideration of this bill is reached in the Senate I shall move to strike out section 56 of the bill and to insert in lieu thereof an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I desire to address myself for a moment to the amendment looking to the compensation of certain officers of the National Guard—those exceeding the rank of captain. It is known here on the floor of the Senate that I opened the warfare on section 56, that I am one of those who have espoused the interests of the guard and have opposed the assaults upon either their dignity or their rights.

I manifested my interest in this matter by a confession, which I repeat. I am a retired officer of this organization and now an officer of the Spanish War Veterans. I have been such for a long time, and I therefore am not without some prejudices. That prejudice necessarily is in favor of the guard and is in favor of any benefit which I could aid in conferring upon them consistent with their rights.

Mr. President, I am still at a loss to understand this continued assault upon the National Guard as an organization, and how it should come from eminent men such as the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and those who follow his lead I am at greater loss to understand.

Sir, let us recall the valorous service of the guard in the Spanish-American War and reflect how that the general who now commands the forces on the border of Mexico, Gen. FUNSTON, was himself an officer of the guard; that he obtained his reputation commanding the guard, whose splendid services, particularly those from Kansas, gave glory to the Nation in the

contest against the mutiny in the Philippine Islands. Sir, let us revive the names of those who led a volunteer guard—and among those how can we overlook, sir, that there is to-day in the Republican Party an eminent leader who got his reputation, after being an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, by becoming an officer of the Volunteers who came to the colors under the name of "Rough Riders." Leading these volunteers Col. Theodore Roosevelt achieved his reputation, which enabled him afterwards to be governor of New York, Vice President and President of the United States, and to-day to occupy a place in the Republican Party where I might paraphrase that expression from Cæsar, "Ye gods, he doth bestride them like a huge colossus, and they are compelled to peep about his huge legs to find for themselves an abiding place." [Laughter.]

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Illinois give his authority for his statement that the distinguished gentleman belongs to the Republican Party?

Mr. LEWIS. I must respond that the only information I have upon that subject is that which we lawyers usually have respecting titles. Whenever property yields to every command of a person, we assume that he must be the owner. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. President, we can not overlook the situation in Mexico. Without assuming to pass judgment upon the manner in which the campaign in Mexico is being conducted, nor assuming to offer my judgment against those who are in command, for all of whom I have great respect, I do here prophesy that the moment will come when the course must be taken that we send our Army in increased strength into Mexico rapidly to reenforce those who are present, that this reenforced number may move to surely execute the object which we assumed when we entered there—the punishment of Villa and his followers who murdered our citizens. But in order to have this force follow in sufficient number it will be necessary that the National Guard of those States surrounding that border be called out for border duty. Those on the border are to-day acclimated in the semi-tropic States where they live, equipped by their experience, and particularly competent by virtue of their knowledge of the situation.

Then why should such a body that we are on the eve already of pressing into the service for the national welfare be discriminated against here in this bill?

Sir, it is asked, Why should the National Government pay; it is the business of the States? I answer, It is the States which are paying the National Army officers. Every dollar these national officers are paid through the National Government comes from the States of the National Government. What form of justice is there that the States shall pay the officers of the National Army out of the money of the States, yet shall not pay the officers of the State-organized army who do the service of the National Government? That, sir, we can not justify. I contend that they shall be paid for the service they give, and I respectfully reiterate that here in this body we should not indulge in these discriminations against one arm of our national defense that even now, under the conditions which surround us, are in so much demand and so necessary to the welfare of the undertaking which we have entered upon in Mexico.

Mr. President, in support of this amendment let me recall the words of President Lincoln when there was an attempt made to have him favor one set of officers against another. We recall that his expression was, "Let there be no discrimination among heroes." As for myself as between the distinguished place held by the National Guard, the army of the State, and that held by the distinguished officers of the National Army in the Army of the United States, I am content to apply the observation history gives from the Sampson-Schley controversy, "There is glory enough for all."

I support the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS subsequently said: Mr. President, I do not desire to speak to the present amendment, but to make a statement that the RECORD may not be confused. Senators around me say that a few moments ago when I supported the amendment for the salary of officers I referred to myself as an officer. I desire to have it understood that while it is true I was an officer of the guard, a commanding officer of what is known as the Spanish-American force, of which I am an officer now, this is in nowise comprehended in the bill, and in nowise will any officer in the command in which I am a fellow get any compensation. I am anxious to have that fact clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think I will withdraw that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia withdraws the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I listened with close attention to the observations of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. He named the States in which the payment of money to the militia organizations were largely absorbed by officers and where the enlisted men received but little or nothing. His statements were based upon an official communication furnished by the War College. He has been criticized for giving the Senate the information. He is to be commended for it.

I did not feel called upon to make a defense for the National Guard of Wisconsin, because Wisconsin was not among the States against which he leveled his criticism. Sir, the Wisconsin Guard requires no defense. It has won high distinction for itself. I am not certain that it stands at the head of the National Guard of the Nation, but I do know that it has a very high place in that rank.

While I am on my feet I am going to suggest that possibly some legislation which was adopted many years ago in Wisconsin had something to do with the advancement of the National Guard of that State. I think the criticism made by the Senator from Idaho as to the value of the militia as an arm of defense, while it might apply to some States and possibly to many, would not apply in any State where the commanding officers of the National Guard have not been subject to change from time to time by the changes in the political administration of the State.

Some 16 years ago I was elected governor of Wisconsin. At that time I had no fixed notions about the National Guard. My attention had been absorbed in other things pertaining to State matters. But shortly after coming into the executive office I chanced upon the record and ranking of the National Guard of Wisconsin. Although the adjutant general at that time was affiliated in the politics of my State with those who were very unfriendly to me, after an examination of that record and after reading some correspondence with the War Department in reference to it I called Adjt. Gen. Boardman into my office and asked him to remain at the head of the National Guard of the State. He did so. During my incumbency of the office of governor I recommended to the legislature the adoption of the Regular Army provisions regarding the tenure of office of the head of the National Guard. Pursuant to those recommendations legislation was enacted adopting the Regular Army regulations and taking the National Guard of Wisconsin forever out of politics. Adjt. Gen. Boardman remained in that position at the head of our guard until he reached the retiring age of the Regular Army officers.

I ascribe to that legislation no small part in achieving and maintaining the high character and efficiency of the Wisconsin National Guard.

Mr. President, I have received but one communication with regard to legislation affecting the National Guard. I have here an article written by the present adjutant general of the Wisconsin Guard bearing upon the questions affecting the status of the militia, discussed yesterday and likely to recur as this bill is further considered. It is worthy the careful consideration of the Senate, and I ask to have it read in my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

The Secretary proceeded to read.

During the reading of the document,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask that the remainder of the document be read in my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done. The Chair hears none.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the document, and having read for 10 minutes,

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry. Will the remainder of the document which the Secretary has been reading go into the RECORD?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understand, Mr. President, that the document will be printed from the point where the reading ceased, so that it will appear all together?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will appear all together.

The entire document referred to is as follows:

THE NATIONAL GUARD A NATIONAL ARMY LOCALLY RAISED.

There is no institution of American government so generally misunderstood or so persistently misrepresented as its militia, especially the Organized Militia, more commonly known as the National Guard.

The militia, whether one body including all able-bodied citizens of military age, as originally provided by Congress, or organized and reserve, as later classified by the same authority, is the national force intended under the Constitution for use in every great national emergency. The control by individual States—each of the militia organized within its borders—is limited to such minor particulars as will better enable the State to use these troops in time of peace to supply the place of those which it is otherwise forbidden to keep.

It is to be remarked here that many years after the adoption of the American Constitution Switzerland and Australia, by the fuller exercise of even lesser powers than those conferred upon the Congress over the militia, and with essentially the same particulars of peace-time control reserved to their respective Cantons and Provinces as to the States of the Union, have created trained citizen armies which are now upheld as models.

The powers of the Congress over the militia are set forth in the following constitutional provisions:

The Congress shall have power—

"To raise and support armies; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

It is further provided by Article II: "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States."

And in section 10 of Article I: "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, * * * keep troops * * * in time of peace."

These are plain words, and their combined purport is clear. Congress, in the exercise of its unqualified power to organize the militia, may include in that force all citizens, or may select from the entire citizenry, by voluntary enlistment or by whatever other equitable method or combination of methods it may choose, a sufficient number of men to constitute a national army capable of being trained to meet every military exigency of the United States.

The Congress may prescribe the number and the kind of military units that shall make up this force, how many officers and men, and of what qualification, shall compose each unit, and may allot to and require from each State its fair proportion of the national militia army. This power of Congress does not stop short of conscription, if this is necessary to procure a sufficient militia, whether for constitutional use or for the training that will make such use effective.

It is not material that the appointment of militia officers is reserved to the respective States. Congress, whether as a matter of organization or of discipline, may acquire that, as in the Regular Army, a certain standard of military ability and knowledge shall be also necessary to qualify for a commission in the militia, and may appoint the method by which the possession or attainment of this standard shall be ascertained.

The equally unrestricted power of Congress to discipline the militia carries with it the right to prescribe whatever kind or period of training is reasonably necessary to fit these troops to accomplish the national purpose for which they are intended.

Nor does it matter if the authority to train, each its own militia in time of peace, is also reserved to the States when Congress, under the Constitution, may prescribe what that training shall be, both in kind and extent. This privilege, with that of appointing the officers, supplies for each State an army for peace time uses which instantly becomes exclusively national upon the call of Congress through its agent, the President, who thereupon becomes the sole Commander in Chief.

Those who framed and favored the Constitution and those who opposed its adoption put no other construction on its militia provisions. There prevailed at that time, however, unwarranted then or later, even greater repugnance and opposition to a large standing army than now obtains. The Regular Army of the United States in 1790 consisted of 1,273 officers and men. In 1792 the First Congress enacted the first compulsory training and service law of this country, which directed the enrollment in the militia of practically all able-bodied male citizens over 18 and under 45 years of age.

It is in no sense derogatory to the Regular Army to state that this Congress, the great majority of whose Members had participated in the Federal and State conventions which adopted the Constitution, by this legislation plainly evidenced their opinion that, under the Constitution, the militia was intended to be constituted the great national army.

Few men had greater experience with and knowledge of the hasty levies of Revolutionary times than Alexander Hamilton, yet in the Federalist (No. 22) supporting the militia provisions of the Constitution, he says:

"To render a (standing) army unnecessary will be a more certain method of preventing its existence than a thousand prohibitions on paper."

In the same article he advocated the organizing and disciplining by Congress, under the Constitution, of selected corps of militia, first because of the futility of attempting to organize all citizens and further on account of the hardship, then at least considered unnecessary, and the financial loss that would be occasioned if Congress required from the whole citizenry the amount of training necessary to make them well disciplined soldiers.

Patrick Henry, before the Virginia convention of 1788, said:

"Your militia is given up to Congress; all power will be in their own possession."

And, quoting the Constitution:

"By this, sir, you see that their control over our last and best defense is unlimited."

In other forms, the like uncontradicted assertions appear in the records of debates of every State convention of the time.

George Washington, in a presidential message to Congress in 1795, stated:

"In my opinion, Congress has power by the proper organization, disciplining, equipment, and development of the militia to make it a national force, capable of meeting every military exigency of the United States."

President Madison recommended to Congress the calling to field training, at public expense, of commissioned and noncommissioned officers of the militia.

President Monroe, in a message to Congress in 1823, said:

"As the defense and even the liberties of the country must depend in time of imminent danger on the militia, it is of the highest importance that it be well organized, armed, and disciplined throughout the Nation."

These doubted neither the constitutional status of the militia as the principal national army nor the constitutional power of Congress to require of the militia all things that are necessary to make it efficient as such national force, nor did they doubt the power of Congress to enforce whatever requirement necessary for this efficiency it might prescribe.

There is another and legally more authoritative interpreter of the Constitution—the Supreme Court of the United States.

Every decision of this court which treats of the militia provisions of the Constitution is directly or by inference favorable to the broad and effective interpretation given to them by their makers, and in part quoted above.

The case of Houston v. Moore (5 Wheaton) fully upholds the right of Congress to organize, arm, and discipline the militia in such manner and to such extent as it shall deem best calculated to promote the general welfare and to provide for national defense; and holds, further, that Congress, through its agent, the President, for purposes enumerated in the Constitution, may call forth all or any unit of the militia, and may punish, as adjudged by a court-martial, any militiaman who fails to respond to such call.

The opinion rendered for the court by Mr. Justice Story in the leading case of Martin v. Mott (12 Wheaton, 29), rendering nugatory an earlier and contrary decision of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, deserves the serious attention of every American citizen.

In part, Justice Story says:

"It has not been denied here that Congress may not lawfully provide for cases of imminent danger of invasion as well as for cases where an invasion has actually taken place. In our opinion, there is no ground for a doubt on this point, even if it has been relied on, for the power to provide for repelling invasions includes the power to provide against the attempt and danger of invasion as the necessary and proper means to effectuate the object. One of the best means to repel invasion is to provide the requisite force for action before the invader himself has reached the soil. * * * We are all of opinion that the authority to decide whether the exigency (for calling forth the militia) has arisen belongs exclusively to the President, and that his decision is conclusive upon all other persons. We think that this construction necessarily results from the nature of the power itself and from the manifest object contemplated by the act of Congress."

Under the interpretation and ruling established by this decision, high power and grave responsibility rest with the President.

If in his opinion invasion is gathering head at whatever point beyond the confines of this country and he shall determine that this danger is best overcome at its source, he has the power to call forth the militia to Federal service and to order these troops, equally with the Regular Army, either within or without the United States, wherever the threatened invasion can best be repelled or the danger of it removed.

The militia, under the Constitution, is provided as the great national Army, whose chief purpose and reason for existence is to repel invasions, and the power of Congress over it must be so construed as to best enable the accomplishment of its appointed purposes.

It is not common sense that the law which created such a force for such an end should halt it at the border of the country defended to await the gathering of strong enemy forces which threaten invasion and to invite their attack at points undefended or lightly guarded.

The limitation "to repel invasion" assures only that the militia may not be initially used to wage a war purely aggressive.

With this exception the militia may be called forth and used, to quote the words of George Washington, to meet every military exigency of the United States.

The power to organize all citizens if so great an army is deemed necessary, the power to require and direct the training that is needed to make this army well disciplined, and the power to command its services in every great national emergency save a war of aggression, and in this also if, in the judgment of the President, the enemy threatens invasion—what greater or other power have the rulers of any civilized nation over their citizen armies.

Even lesser powers, as has been stated, have enabled Switzerland and Australia to provide amply for security, and the German Emperor, in reality, has no greater over the federated armies of the German Empire.

That the militia army of the United States is not now the well-organized, well-disciplined force, commensurate in size with the requirements for national defense, which is contemplated by the Constitution, is due to the failure of Congress to adequately exercise its sweeping powers for the purpose.

For the Congress has not only the power to organize, arm, and discipline the militia, but also to make all laws that are necessary and proper to carry this power into execution.

If in its judgment national security is so best conserved, the Congress may require of the militia all things that are required of the Regular Army save routine service in peace and war service, initially for aggression.

The United States has suffered much from lack of trained armies.

It has suffered as well from a multiplicity of armies, Regular, Volunteer, and militia—the one in many particulars directly antagonistic to the others.

As the Regular and the Volunteer Armies, when coexistent, detracted, the one from the strength and efficiency of the other, so will all three, Regular, militia, and Volunteer react against each other if the third army is now created, whether for training or for actual service.

Unity of form and organization, like terms of enlistment and conditions of service, are at least desirable military features.

The Constitution, in the intent of its makers, provided for but two armies, a standing army ample for all the occasions of peace, and the great national army of the militia.

Volunteer armies were the creation of a later time, necessitated only by the failure to organize, arm, and discipline the militia, and if this failure be now remedied, will be justifiable hereafter only in a war of aggression.

What at this juncture is most serious and even vital is this: The Organized Militia has endured for years against misrepresentation and popular misconception of its true status and appointed purpose. Their own belief that they were national troops and for national service has kept its members steadfast and increasingly earnest to become well disciplined.

Nothing has so tended to keep down their number as the popular impression, industriously fostered, that they were not available for such service nor could be made fit for it; that they were soldiers for passing show whose possible gravest duty was to quell internal disorders.

The disastrous effect can well be surmised if there is now attempted to be organized within every district from which the militia draws its recruits, a separate and rival force which, in popular opinion at least, will have precedence for national use.

It may not always be wise to exercise in profound peace a right justified by custom only in extreme crises. The Imperial Constitution of Germany does not permit the German Emperor, even in war, to so raise troops in any confederated State of the Empire save his own kingdom.

If with the execution of this project the Organized Militia is also required to more than double its present strength, the very probable result will be two weak organizations where the Organized Militia, unhampered and granted the aid proposed for both, would have procured all the recruits that could have been secured by both; and division and discord will become rife where unity is the prime military consideration.

The States of the Union by express irrevocable constitutional contract are held to the militia system as to no other.

This system provides for their own military requirements in peace. Their departments of military administration are subservient to the lawful orders of Federal authority.

That class of the militia known as "Organized," measurably the selected corps advised by Hamilton, forms no inconsiderable nucleus of troops, organized and at least partially trained.

Its units have the advantages of definite permanent station and strong affiliation with their respective States and local communities—the basic characteristics of every national army that has ever been successfully recruited and maintained.

The Congress has over the militia, Organized or unorganized, in all essentials, the same powers of organizing, arming, disciplining, and developing that it has over any volunteer army.

If the great national army of defense, disciplined by training for its purposes, is to be had by voluntary enlistment, it will be had most certainly, most quickly, and most economically by exclusively developing the militia as recommended by Washington, and especially the Organized Militia, the selected corps originally advised by Hamilton and later recommended after an exhaustive investigation by a committee of the Nineteenth Congress.

In all that has been written, there is no word meant in opposition to or detraction from the Regular Army of the United States.

The calling forth of the militia army or any part of it is limited by the Constitution to national exigencies. The nature of that army is such and the responsibility of calling it forth so heavy that the exigency preceding such a call should not only be national, but also very grave.

The Regular Army should not only be constantly maintained at a strength sufficient to care for all the military concerns of peace, but this strength should be such as to render the Army reasonably capable of meeting minor exigencies of the character which, unrepressed, would necessitate the calling forth of the militia army.

Whether it will prove possible to procure by voluntary enlistment these greater Armies, both Regular and Organized Militia, depends upon a better understanding by American citizens in general, and, consequently, by the legislators whom they elect, of the true effect and merit of such enlistment. Their thought is now so perverted or heedless as to cause grave injustice to those who are enlisted, whether as Regulars or as militia.

Upon injustice and unfairness, nothing may have enduring foundation and growth.

The law is, that every able-bodied male citizen of this land, 18 to 45 years of age, owes it military service. It was and is equally within the power of the law to impose this service upon whatever citizens, however feeble.

Had there been no provision for a Regular Army, or if none enlisted therein, the turmoil attendant upon the levy of citizens to preserve public order, peace, and security would have been incessant and a very present apprehension at all times in the mind of every man.

He who does so enlist helps to relieve all citizens from this burden of trouble and anxiety. That this fact is well-nigh forgotten is but strong proof of the good service that has been rendered by the men of the Regular Army.

But their common reward too often has been slight and even disdainful regard, and their wage for periling body and life in a soldier's hazards and to possible war, is far less than that of those of like ability and circumstance whom their enlistment permits to follow uninterruptedly the gainful pursuits of peace.

When the exigency has arisen with which the Regular Army can not cope, the fulfillment of their liability to military service is one long step nearer to all male citizens of military age. The one remaining recourse before the confused levy and organization of untrained citizens is the second voluntary army, the Organized Militia. These troops have also by oath assumed the burden of military training and of possible war in advance and in the place of their fellow citizens. Reasonable security lies in their greater numbers and thorough training.

Yet in great degree the same slight regard is put upon the militiaman as on the regular. The parent too often withholds consent and approval of enlistment, the employer discriminates either by refusing the leave necessary for training or by discharge and nonemployment of militiamen.

The public and their legislators overlook that in any nation where compulsory service is not enforced, while the soldier is paid, the greater part of his maintenance cost represents merely the necessary cost of his equipment and training. Such annual cost per soldier in England for instance, is above $500 and in Germany under compulsory service, most economically administered, well above $200.

As the militiaman approaches a like standard of equipment and proficiency there has been spent in time, effort, or money, the like value. His oath of service puts his body and life in peril of possible war in the interest of his fellow citizens. He could not, as now, be expected to spend from his own time and money the major share of the cost of his necessary training.

If these things may be comprehended by the people of American communities and the injustice and unfairness substantially remedied, it may well be possible to raise sufficient armies without compulsory service, but otherwise, not.

O. H. HOLWAY,
Adjutant General of Wisconsin.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have been unable to attend the sessions of the Senate so as to participate in the discussion or to get the benefit of the discussion on this very important measure.

While I am in favor of educating and training the young men of our country as officers, I am one of those who are opposed to a large standing army. I believe it is little less than criminal to ask the young men of our country to spend the very best days of their lives in idleness in the barracks of a standing army. I am, however, in favor of encouraging the National Guard. I believe that the Federal Government should do something for that organization. Mr. President, there is one thing we can do, and that is not to throw any obstacles in their way.

I do not desire to take the time of the Senate to discuss this matter now, but I have before me a letter written to me by the adjutant general of my State. It is needless for me to say that he is a man of high character, of standing, and of ability. He has distinguished himself as a soldier, and I wish to have read in my time his letter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA NATIONAL GUARD,
ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Bismarck, April 11, 1916.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA, *Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. GRONNA: I am sorry to bother you, but I am interested in the militia bill now before Congress, and it is not a political question; it is too vital to be termed as such.

I notice in the Washington dispatches that a certain Senator took particular pains to criticize the militia lobby, as he called it, and a couple of us in particular. I am not making an apology for being interested. I have been in the militia for nearly 27 years, and know the needs as well as the condition of the guard, and you are getting more out of the guard than out of any branch of service in the United States. They work for nothing and pay their own board. What other body is doing as well?

The members of our State militia are as fine a body of men and officers as there is anywhere, and will compare favorably with any army; and with my long service I have had ample opportunity to compare them with the Regular Army, both here and in the Philippines, and our officers will show up favorably with the officers of the Regular Army of the same grade.

The members of the militia feel that they are in the service for patriotism only, as it is a deteriment to every officer and enlisted man that is in it, both in a business and financial way. We, of course, admit that every man is given a uniform after he has enlisted He pays nothing and gets nothing except the pleasure of going to drill each week, while the officers get $20 clothing allowance from the State every year after one year's service, and is asked to furnish his own uniform and equipment and allowed to wear it if he attends drill and performs 80 per cent of ordered military duty, and are expected to attend camps, officers' schools, etc.

In the State of North Dakota during camp the magnificent sum of $1.75 per day is paid to a lieutenant, $2 to a captain, $2.25 to a major, and $3 to a colonel, and with this magnificent salary he is supposed to keep up his work for a year and have an equipment that is up to date. Can you imagine anything more unreasonable, and is it any surprise that our condition is not up to standard of the Regular Army, where both officers and men are paid liberally?

Last fall during the National Guard convention we picked an executive committee, and, as far as the North Dakota guard is concerned, we stand by that committee to a man. During the latter part of February the National Guard Association of our State had a meeting, and by unanimous resolution agreed to stand by the action of the executive committee of the National Guard Association. At this meeting we had the officers of the regiment, the noncommissioned officers of the staff, and three delegates from each company that had been elected by their respective companies, and in that way I think we had a very good expression of the whole guard.

While the grain growers' convention was in session January 19, 1916, they took up the subject of preparedness, as follows:

"Whereas there is being urged an armament campaign and a vast expenditure for frenzied preparedness for war; and

"Whereas there is being urged a larger standing Army and a huge continental army to expend millions to private firms for a bigger Navy; and

"Whereas such an armament program, we fear, may plunge this Nation into needless wars and vast expense and our citizens into great distress; and

"Whereas the militia regiments of the various States were primarily organized to repel invasions, and are as such fundamentally the nucleus of a volunteer Army of the United States, and are thus, by the proposal of a continental army, to be cast aside as useless junk; and

"Whereas we feel there is a paid propaganda working throughout the Union to spend vast millions on increased Navy and war preparations: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, farmers and others, in assembly in Fargo, N. Dak., January 19, 1916, do hereby petition our Senators and Representatives at Washington to be calm and deliberate with care these proposals; that we ask Congress to assist the militia of the country to be equipped and increased as our ideal citizen soldiery; that we ask for an efficient Navy without the pork barrel; and that we demand the Government to build its own warships and own and build its own factories for ammunition, guns, and other equipment for the maintenance of an Army and Navy."

I believe that with the representatives of the militia and the resolutions of the farmers we have a very good expression of the sentiment of the people of our State. The guard is not against the Army by any means. We know that should be increased, particularly in enlisted men, as the strength of the companies should be greater in times of both peace and war.

If the people are afraid of militarism, they will never be afraid of an Organized Militia with some control in the State. What the people are afraid of is a big organized force controlled from Washington, with no control in the State. The militia force is just the kind of force to prevent a war of aggression. Such force will never be used in an unworthy cause, because the people in the State have direct control.

This is the reason the Constitution makers fixed it as they did. The militia is a constitutional force, required by and provided for in the Constitution, and by the Constitution was made the main reliance of the country. The country has always done well under that system, and Congress will make a mistake if they abandon this constitutional force or, I think, in assisting another force that is bound to put it out of business. I would like to see Congress put the Division of Militia Affairs in control of militia and appropriate enough money to enable the militia to do business; and the results are bound to be good.

The continental army was repudiated, and I hardly think that section 56 of the Chamberlain bill is anything but the continental army in another form, and, as far as I am concerned—and I believe 95 per cent of the fathers in the State of North Dakota feel the same—they do not want their boys to join the continental or the Regular Army; and if the militia is to be the third in the line of defense, then you are not going to have any militia, as they will not belong if their duties are only to quell riots and break strikes. I believe that I am safe in saying that if you should ask any militiaman how long they would stay in the service provided they were not subject to call for service except during riots and strikes I do not think you would find any man would say that he would want any such service; and I do not believe that the militia should be used in local trouble, as in such a case you are likely to have to fight your friends and neighbors, which is the reason the militia is so unpopular among the labor unions.

As officers of the National Guard we have district judges, doctors, dentists, and men prominent in nearly every walk of life, and these men have only one idea in view, and that is their country.

As far as the civilian camps are concerned, such as held in New York last year, they are of no value to anyone, and will not bring an army that is any use in time of need, as neither men over age nor the very rich will be likely to be found in the trenches at any time.

If a man is to take two months or more away from his business in any one year, his employer, if he has one, will be likely to tell him that he can get along without him the balance of the year.

I am personally willing to admit that the Militia make mistakes; they are also made in the Regular Army; they make them everywhere; and the only question in my mind, and I believe in the mind of every other citizen who is loyal to his country, is to get a system that will give the best protection for the least money. While our opinions may be divided on that, I think that records have proved that the National Guard is about the most economical of anything that has been given us up to this time, and conditions are too serious to cast aside the National Guard, which has proven fairly good under pitiable conditions, having received no Federal support to speak of, and take up something that is not even feasible to men who have made a study of the subject.

I do not want you to think I am attempting to tell you what to do, but simply to give you our views and hope that you will take them in the same spirit that they are given.

The officers of the Guard are not jealous, as charged, and men as a rule are not jealous of losing a job that brings them nothing but trouble; and we expect and ask nothing but partial pay for the work we perform, and personally I am old enough to escape Army service should I so desire, and I expect to sever my connections with the Guard during the next year or two; but I am interested in it, having spent the best part of my life in it.

With kindest personal regards, and hoping that I may see you when you come to the State, I remain,

Yours, very truly, T. H. THARALSON.

During the reading of the letter,

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that the remainder of the letter be printed in connection with my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that will be done.

After the reading of the letter,

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, there seems to be a great difference of opinion among the National Guard forces of the different States about this question of a volunteer army. I think we have in Massachusetts as competent a militia force as there is in any State in the Union. The Commonwealth has spent as much as $700,000 a year in recent years on a force aggregating about 7,000 men. We have nearly $6,000,000 invested in property entirely for the benefit of the militia force; yet our men in Massachusetts, almost without exception, if not entirely so, desire the establishment of the volunteer army, and propose, as far as they can, to transfer into the volunteer army if it is established. To carry out that purpose an enabling bill was introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature, a copy of which I put in the RECORD some days ago. That bill passed the Massachusetts senate early this week and it passed the house of representatives yesterday. I wish, in my own time, to read from the New York Sun an account of the proceedings which took place when this bill passed:

BOSTON, MASS., *April 14.*

Massachusetts, through its legislative bodies, declared to-day in no uncertain terms for national preparedness.

At the close of a long debate, bristling with patriotism, the house suspended the rules and passed the bill to permit of the federalization of the Massachusetts Militia. This is the first action of this kind taken by any State in the Union.

The declaration was made amid cheers and prolonged applause that "The sons of Massachusetts are ready to act to-day."

Opposition centered about the fact that the $6,000,000 worth of military property owned by the State should not be turned over to the National Government free of charge.

I am informed by leading National Guardsmen of Massachusetts that it is the purpose of the organization in our State to transfer to the volunteer army without delay if provision for it becomes a part of the law.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WEEKS. I do.

Mr. BORAH. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Does the Senator understand that that will leave the State of Massachusetts without any State militia?

Mr. WEEKS. If all the State militia transfer to the volunteer army, it would.

Mr. BORAH. And the Senator from Massachusetts approves of the proposition of destroying entirely the State militia of his State?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I stated the other day, in some brief remarks which I submitted to the Senate, that substantially the only purpose for which the National Guard could be used was in connection with strike and riot duty. I do not consider that a proper duty for the National Guard to engage in. I believe that every State, as I said then, should establish a State constabulary, which should be used for that purpose. If that were done, many men who are now prejudiced against the State militia or against any similar force would go into it, as they do not do now. Personally I do not think the State of Massachusetts gets any benefit from its State militia to-day, except along those lines and the possibility occasionally of a great fire, when the militia may be called on to protect property.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, suppose the transfer takes place and the State militia disappears and becomes a part of the national force, and that some other than the present incumbent of the governor's chair should be elected governor of that State and should appoint an adjutant general, and that adjutant general should proceed to organize a State militia, could he do so?

Mr. WEEKS. Well, Mr. President, I do not know about that; I have not followed the proceedings in the legislature closely enough to know whether that could be done or not.

Mr. BORAH. Undoubtedly he could do so, and he never could be prevented from doing so until the Constitution of the United States is amended.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Does the Senator think that the National Guard of his State would go into the Volunteer Army under section 56, if the amendment is agreed to, limiting the service of that Army to 30 days?

Mr. WEEKS. I do not think that the sentiment of the National Guard of Massachusetts would be that any limit should be placed on their service. I think it would be entirely opposed to that; and, furthermore, I think I ought to say that the question of pay has not in any shape been brought to the attention of my colleague or myself by the Guard of Massachusetts. I myself served 10 years in the National Guard of Massachusetts, and during 6 years of that time I commanded an organization of 600 or 700 men. During that time every man in that organization signed over to the organization, to be used for military purposes, every cent of pay he received for any duty which he was called upon to perform. The question of going into the service for pay at that time, from 1890 to 1900, had no effect whatever on enlistments, and I do not think any man ever thought for a moment whether or not he was to receive money for his service.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Question!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I ask that the amendment be stated, Mr. President. I thought the Senator from Georgia had offered an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia has withdrawn his amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Then, I will not ask to have the amendment stated.

Mr. REED. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out section 108 as proposed to be amended by the committee and in lieu thereof to substitute the following:

SEC. 108. Pay for National Guard officers: Commissioned officers on the active list belonging to organizations of the National Guard participating in the apportionment of the annual appropriation for the support of the National Guard shall receive compensation for their services (except during periods of service for which they may become lawfully entitled to the same pay as officers of corresponding grades of the Regular Army) as follows, not to include longevity pay: Captains and officers above the rank of captain, $500 per year; first lieutenants, $300 per year; second lieutenants, $250 per year. Regu-

lations, to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, shall determine the amount and character of service that must be rendered by officers to entitle them to said pay: *Provided*, That only line officers and officers of the staff corps and departments on duty with organizations of the line shall receive pay.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I move to strike out the last word. I do that merely to secure some time in which to ask a question. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Missouri, or of the chairman of the committee, if any estimate has been made as to the total amount which this proposed amendment would carry as an added appropriation to this bill?

Mr. REED. I have not made the estimate; but the language contained in this amendment is substantially the language contained in the House bill, except under the language of the House bill there were certain officers above the rank of captain not engaged in active service who would have obtained pay. This amendment is drawn in such manner that none of those who are not engaged in active service will get pay. The amount of money required can not be a very large sum. I proceeded upon the theory that the House had made its own estimates. My amendment is really a restoration of the House proposition, except that it will cut out some of those officers who are not actively engaged in military duties.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I correct one statement of the Senator?

Mr. REED. Certainly; if I have made an error, I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Under the House bill the pay given to the officers was smaller.

Mr. REED. That is, officers below the rank of captain, however.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Well, the House bill provides:

And the same pay shall be paid to every officer of higher rank than that of captain, a first lieutenant $240 per year, and a second lieutenant $200 per year.

So it will be seen that the amount fixed by the Senator from Missouri is larger than that fixed in the House bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, so that the matter may be clear, I will say that I have adopted the language of the Senate amendment as to the pay that captains and lieutenants are to receive, the Senate committee having increased the amount as to first lieutenants from $240 to $300, and as to second lieutenants from $200 to $250. I let that remain. Now, the Senate committee amendment cuts out all officers above the rank of captain, who were included in the House bill. I undertake to restore that, but I adopted the language that is found in the amendment after pretty careful consideration, in order to cut out certain men that would have been included in the House language, namely, those officers above the rank of captain who really do nothing. There are some such officers—staff officers, and so forth.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the amendment of the committee. The yeas and nays have been requested and seconded. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TAGGART (when Mr. KERN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. KERN] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. OWEN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] and will vote. I vote "yea." I wish to announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on business of the Senate, and if present would vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I announce the absence of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] on business of the Senate. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and will vote. I vote "yea." I am advised that the senior Senator from Virginia, if present, would likewise vote "yea."

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] and therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the explanation made upon the former roll call, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BECKHAM. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I rise to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] on public business. Were he present he would vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS. I inquire whether the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. That Senator, I believe, has not voted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. LODGE. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas (after having voted in the negative). May I inquire whether or not the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Then I wish to withdraw the vote I cast.

Mr. CLAPP (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]; but I understand he has released me on this matter, so I will allow by vote to stand.

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

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]; and

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

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Ashurst	Johnson, Me.	Page	Sterling
Bankhead	Jones	Pittman	Swanson
Burleigh	Kenyon	Poindexter	Taggart
Clapp	La Follette	Pomerene	Thompson
Cummins	Lewis	Reed	Underwood
Curtis	Martine, N. J.	Robinson	Vardaman
Gronna	Myers	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Harding	Norris	Sheppard	Walsh
Hardwick	Oliver	Sherman	
Hollis	Overman	Smith, Mich.	
Husting	Owen	Smoot	

NAYS—14.

Beckham	Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Warren
Borah	Gallinger	Nelson	Williams
Brandegee	Gore	Thomas	
Chamberlain	Hughes	Tillman	

NOT VOTING—41.

Brady	Fletcher	McLean	Smith, Ga.
Broussard	Goff	Martin, Va.	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Hitchcock	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Catron	James	O'Gorman	Stone
Chilton	Johnson, S. D.	Penrose	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Kern,	Phelan	Townsend
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Weeks
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Works
Dillingham	Lippitt	Shields	
du Pont	Lodge	Simmons	
Fall	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.	

So Mr. REED's amendment to the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. REED. 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. It is proposed to insert a new section near the end of the bill, just before the last section or the repealing section, as follows:

SEC. —. That as soon as practicable the Secretaries of War and of the Navy shall divide the continental United States into not less than 6 nor more than 12 districts. Said districts shall be laid out and apportioned in such manner as the Secretary of War shall deem most convenient for carrying out the purposes of this section. Said districts shall not necessarily be coterminous with any State or States. The districts thus created may be readjusted and new districts created from time to time in the discretion of the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That the total number of such districts shall not exceed 12.

There shall be established in each of said districts either a military training school or a naval training school, the number of each to be determined by the Secretaries of War and of the Navy, in accordance with the public needs. Said schools shall, whenever practicable, be located contiguous to established military or naval posts. The Secretaries of War and of the Navy may, in their discretion, cause both military and naval training at one or more of said schools.

The Secretaries of War and of the Navy shall prescribe the physical entrance examination to be passed by all students. They shall also, subject to the provisions of this act, prescribe a course of study in military and naval science and in the ordinary branches of learning and manual and vocational training. The Secretaries of War and of the Navy shall detail from the Army and Navy proper instructors in the several branches to be taught and may employ such civilian instructors as are necessary.

The students at said schools shall be known as United States reserve military cadets, or United States reserve naval cadets, as the case may be.

Said cadets shall be furnished by the Government the necessary books, quarters, uniforms, equipment, sustenance, and a stipend of $50 per annum.

Said cadets shall, before being permitted to enlist, present the written consent of their parents or guardians to such enlistment. The term of enlistment of said cadets shall be for 10 years, 4 years of which shall be for active service as cadets in said schools and 6 years for service in the Reserve Army of the United States.

All male persons over 14 years of age and less than 20 years of age who shall pass the required physical and mental examinations and who are of good moral character shall be entitled to enlist and become cadets in said schools as aforesaid, and when so enlisted shall not be discharged except for good cause shown and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretaries of War and of the Navy. The mental examination shall, as nearly as possible, be the equivalent of that required for graduating from what are commonly known as the first-class grammar schools of the various cities of the United States: *Provided*, That if said schools at any time become overcrowded the Secretaries of War and of the Navy may raise the grade of examination required or adopt proper selective regulations so as to limit the number of cadets within the capacity of said schools. The cadets at said schools shall attend the school of the district in which they resided at the time of appointment, but may for good cause shown be transferred to another school. Each of said schools when established shall, as nearly as practicable, be capable of accommodating 500 cadets.

The graduates of said schools shall receive diplomas issued by the Secretaries of War and of the Navy, and the holders of such diplomas shall be entitled to enter the Military Academy of West Point or the Naval Academy of Annapolis and shall be entitled to preference over all other applicants for appointment: *Provided*, That the said Secretaries shall make regulations which, if the number of cadets so graduating and desiring to enter said Military or Naval Academy is greater than the prescribed number of cadets for each of said academies, shall give the preference among said graduates to those who possess the best physical and mental qualifications.

The cadets graduated from said schools shall be subject to call at any time by the United States Government for a period of six years after their graduation and shall be eligible to appointment as second lieutenants, but shall not by reason of said graduation be entitled to a commission as officers. They shall likewise be entitled to enlist in the Regular Army of the United States and shall, where qualified, be preferred as noncommissioned officers.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I know that the Senate is weary of discussion and may be growing very weary of amendments. We have taken up, however, nearly a week's time in discussing the single question of the establishment of a plant to manufacture one of the chemicals necessary in the manufacture of powder. I want to try and get the attention of those Members of the Senate who are present to the question of manufacturing officers for a volunteer army or an army of the militia which may be necessary in time of actual war.

If this country ever comes to grips with a first-class power, we will not mass our men by the thousands or by the hundreds of thousands, but by the millions. I have heard some remarks here to-day about criticism of the Regular Army. It may be that something I said could have been so construed, but I did not intend, and do not now intend, to say a word in criticism of the established Army and Navy of the United States.

I recognize the fact that West Point and Annapolis are two great schools. I recognize the fact that the course of training therein prescribed is of a very high character. I also recognize the justice of giving the young men who graduate in those two schools the right to commissions either in the Army or Navy. These, however, are schools intended to provide officers who are to devote their entire lives to military service. They are not intended to supply officers sufficient in numbers to meet the requirements of a great war.

If we at some time find it necessary to put an army of a million or 5,000,000 men in the field, how are we to officer such an army from the graduates of West Point or Annapolis? It is absolutely impossible, and a moment's consideration will convince all candid men of the fact.

So far as I am concerned, I believe in an established army. I am willing to vote for a generous increase in a standing army. Nevertheless, I say to-day what has been so often said upon this floor, and so often said in the past—that when this country comes to the real grip of war its main dependence must be in the citizenry of the country. Just in proportion as we disseminate military knowledge among that citizenry, just in proportion as we bring to it the skill and the learning that is necessary in order to make an efficient force, just in that proportion we strengthen the Nation and make it invincible in times of war.

Mr. President, the schools provided for in this amendment are intended to furnish that kind of education. It is not intended in these schools to educate men who will follow the military profession as a life work. It is intended by this amendment to make these schools available to every boy possessing what is commonly known as a grammar-school education and who at the same time is physically fit and who is over 14 years of age. It is proposed that his term of enlistment shall be for 10 years; that he shall put four years of that time in active service in the schools; that the remaining six years he shall go into the reserve list and shall be subject to call, at any time within the whole period of his 10-year enlistment, into active service.

It is proposed to furnish free education to these boys. The reason for regional schools is to make it possible for the boy to attend without having to go an enormous distance from his home. It is proposed to put within the grasp of a large number of boys the opportunity to secure better than a high-school education, so that the son of the laboring man, the son of the mechanic, the orphan boy from the orphans' home, and all other classes of our youth can obtain the liberal education I have outlined and at the same time secure a thorough military training.

I say, with all the earnestness of which I am capable, that if a system of schools of this kind is established we can turn out every year from five to ten thousand young men who will be qualified to take command of a company in case our country is engaged in a great war. They will come in great numbers, because the liberal education they will obtain will compensate them for the military obligation they must assume.

Mr. President, it may be said that this system of schools will cost some money. I grant it; but I assert it to be true that every boy within the borders of the United States is entitled to the opportunity to secure at least a high-school education. I assert it to be true that no money properly expended in education is ever wasted. Instead of waste, it is the highest and most remunerative form of investment.

I make the further point that it does not make any difference what division of the Government pays for the maintenance of schools. If we start with the proposition that a boy is entitled to an education, then the expense of that education must be borne by the public; and whether it is paid by a township or a county or by a State or by the Nation, the cost, in the last analysis, must in every instance come from the citizens of the Republic.

Mr. President, another reason why I am very insistent upon this amendment is this: In these schools the students will actually enlist. They will actually be under the command of United States officers. They will actually obtain a real military discipline. They will learn that which is greater and more valuable than the mere manual of arms, than the mere foot movements, than the mere tactics; they will gain that discipline of mind which is essential to the creation of a good soldier.

I do not speak in derogation of military colleges under private management. I do not speak in derogation of those efforts which have been made to have a sort of system of national military school through the medium of land-grant colleges. I do say, however, that experience shows that while these schools have all done good, they have failed in teaching that rigid discipline and obedience which are necessary to those who are thereafter to command men.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I realize that the strength of this Republic consists in the moral qualities and intellectual acquirements of the individual citizen. The great battles of the past have been fought by the man whose labor feeds and clothes the world and maintains the nations' commerce in time of peace, and the battles that are to be fought in the future will be fought by the same character of man. I realize the advantages of proper early training. I understand fully that—

> 'Tis education forms the common mind:
> Just as the twig is bent the tree's inclined—

but I really think we are going a long way in the matter of military preparation. It seems to me to have become a kind of plutocratic fad.

The plan proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] will furnish an excellent opportunity for a boy to educate himself, but I am afraid it will be a very expensive system. Of course men are not given education. They educate themselves. We hear a good deal of talk about self-made men. There is no other sort who amount to anything in the world. Whether their early lives are spent in poverty or in affluence, the men and women who accomplish anything in this world are largely self-developed. I am heartily in favor of every wise and proper influence or agency that works for the spiritual and mental uplift of mankind.

If this Government is to establish schools for the purpose of developing the soldier, however, I submit that a more economical plan can be provided than the one embraced in the amend-

ment of my friend the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I should greatly prefer that the college or the school be established in the State, maintained partially by State taxation, and then let the Federal Government contribute to the conduct and management of the school by furnishing, if need be, instructors. The plan of the able Senator from Missouri is going a little bit further than the exigencies of the hour demand or the condition of the National Treasury will warrant. If we are going to make any provision for military education along the lines proposed in this amendment, I really think it would be very much better to confine it, as I said a moment ago, to schools that are established by the States and maintained in part by the States and then let the Federal Government render its help by contributing soldiers to instruct in the art and science of war.

I do not think it would be prudent for Congress to adopt at this time a measure of such magnitude and far-reaching consequences. Of course, if we are to become a government of the sword; if in the future all great questions are to be determined by the arbitrament of arms, and the United States has got to fight its way in the settlement of all questions; if force, rather than reason and righteousness, shall be the determining factor, then there will be ample time, I think, for us to make this departure. God forbid that the time for such a departure shall ever come.

I think it would be unfortunate, Mr. President, if the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri referred to the fact that his amendment if adopted will carry with it a very considerable expenditure for its development and operation, but he did not give an estimate of the amount necessary for that purpose. I should like to inquire of him whether he has made any estimate, and if so, what it is, of the annual added expenditure which his amendment would impose upon the Treasury.

Mr. REED. In answer to the Senator I will say that, in the first place, I have been able to make the only one that I think can be made, and that is to inquire into the cost of education, clothing, and maintenance of a certain military school of the highest class. The military school I have been able to inquire about is the Culver School, in Indiana, which, I think, perhaps, is one of the very best in the country. The annual expense approximates $500 a year a student. They have, however, a plant already established, which, of course, once established, is paid for.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the plant would, of course, require the construction of at least one school.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator permit me to add——

Mr. THOMAS. In just a moment. It will require the construction at least of one system of school buildings for each of the proposed districts in addition to the cost of maintenance.

Mr. REED. I wanted to add to what I have said that the school in Indiana is, as I understand it, a school of a very high class, where expense has not been spared. My own opinion is that the Government would establish these schools and maintain them at even less cost.

Mr. THOMAS. In my judgment the Culver School is one of the finest institutions in the world. I am convinced that the amount of money required to establish and maintain these schools would amount to many millions a year. While I do not underestimate the importance of education, and no one does that, I may refer to the millions which are annually spent by the States, respectively, for the education of their youth, and to the high character of the schools which they support. These are ample, and I am not impressed with the importance or even the necessity at this time of going into a supplementary course of national education, which once began will expand into vast and enormously expensive proportions. I affirm that if we embark upon this experiment the burden ultimately placed upon the Treasury will be as great as that required for the maintenance of the National Guard.

Mr. HARDWICK. I wish to ask the Senator a question. Can the committee give us any estimate as to what the system of military instruction in the colleges, carried in sections 42 to 55 of the bill, will cost?

Mr. THOMAS. The committee, I think, can not; and I am sure that is going fully as far as it is wise for us to go at present with the extension of technical military instruction.

Mr. HARDWICK. Can not the Senator tell me the cost?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I shall have to refer you to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HARDWICK. I thought perhaps the Senator from Colorado could give me the information.

Mr. THOMAS. My duties during the meetings of the committee were divided, as far as my poor health would then permit, between the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Public Lands, giving preference to the latter on account of the local importance of measures pending before it. Hence I am not as familiar with the details of the bill's construction as I should be.

Mr. HARDWICK. I did not ask the question critically. I merely wanted information.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand the Senator merely wanted an estimate; but assuming that the expense necessary for carrying out the plan which the bill embodies is considerable, it must be remembered that the proposed amendment is a supplement to it, not a substitute for it. There must be a limit somewhere to these expenditures, and as far as I am able to observe, no limit is in sight. We have several days in which to consider other amendments requiring appropriations to make them operative, yet instead of confining the expenditures within reasonable limits for this contemplated addition to the Army and Navy, we are adding unneeded burdens, which will confront us with an annual expense budget far beyond the estimated half billion dollars. Let us halt somewhere and inquire what more we can afford.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have a good deal of sympathy with the purposes which the junior Senator from Missouri has in view, but I think that he is going about it in the wrong way. I think the method selected by him is too expensive and that it is unnecessary. We already have in existence 48 State universities, some of them equal to any universities in America, equal in practical work to Harvard, or Yale, or Princeton, or the University of Virginia. I will leave out the latter because it is a State university.

Now, Mr. President, all that is necessary to accomplish the purpose which the Senator from Missouri has in view is that the United States shall furnish each of those institutions three or at the utmost four professors who can be detailed from the Army just as most of the professors at West Point are. The four topics taught by these officers detailed would be as follows: One of them would be tactics, drill, and target practice, as the ordinary Army officers now detailed to the agricultural and mechanical colleges teach these. Then they could go further and send another man to teach military history and strategy, still another to teach military engineering and ordnance, and those three would by the addition of the curriculum of the State university make practically out of each State university a West Point.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. One moment, please. Because everything else taught in West Point is taught at those State universities except these things which I have designated. Now I will yield for a question to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Does not the Senator know that has been attempted for years and years in this country? I want to ask him which one of those schools has risen to a West Point? Which one of those schools has really ever turned out a disciplined body of men?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know that it has been attempted, and as a matter of fact it has not. There has been a detail of one officer to teach nothing in the world except drill; that is all he pretends to teach; and the agricultural and mechanical schools have turned out magnificent battalions of men. The best trained force we have in this country to-day outside of the Regular Army consists of the men who have been turned out from the agricultural and mechanical colleges. But they have been taught nothing of course except company drill, battalion drill, and skirmish drill, and a little target practice. The Government does not even furnish them with the ammunition necessary for target practice.

Mr. President, if the Government will designate three men of the rank of colonel or major or above, retired officers or officers in the active service, perfectly competent to teach these three things—first, drill and tactics and target practice, that is taught now; second, military history and strategy; and third, military engineering and ordnance, and there might be added perhaps another professorship; then let the boys who want to go into that force volunteer for it and enlist for three years, binding themselves when they do it to go into the reserves for five or six years longer—my word for it you will find a splendid training school in each State university for officers of the volunteer army in time of war, which is the object which the Senator from Missouri has in view.

It may be asked why I have not introduced an amendment of that sort. My reply to that is that I do not think this is the proper place for it. I want it considered upon its own merits, and later on I do propose at some time to draw up an independent bill covering that question fully, providing for the professorships and providing for a certain amount of money to be expended in the way of rifles, cannon, and ammunition for the use

of those schools each year. It will not take a large amount, and the officers detailed will cost the Government of the United States nothing. The professors already are employed to teach the other things that are taught at West Point and they are being paid by the State and will continue to be paid by the State.

I have selected the State universities because there the boy has already received a high-school education and is therefore possessed of intellectual training and ability which enables him to learn to be an officer very soon. So when he leaves there he will be perfectly competent to be a second lieutenant or even a first lieutenant or even a captain in the volunteer army of the United States in times of war.

It seems to me that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri had better come as a separate bill to be considered as I propose that my idea shall. It seems to me that it is unduly expensive, unnecessarily expensive, and will involve absolutely new plants over the country, with the buildings that are necessary and with the other professorships that are unnecessary, because the State universities already furnish them English, modern languages, literature, the various branches of applied science, chemistry. It might be changed there a little in order that they should go into chemistry of ammunition as well as the sort of chemistry now taught.

I hope at some time in the future Congress may pass a bill of that sort. As I said when upon my feet the other day, when merely referring to this measure, the idea is not original with me. As far as I know it originated with Mr. Jefferson of Monticello, who suggested it to the State of Virginia; but the State of Virginia did not adopt it. He suggested it in connection with the State university which he founded for that State.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I sympathize with the purpose of the amendment the Senator from Missouri has proposed to the bill, but I am in entire accord with the Senator from Mississippi when he says that it is not a part of any reorganization Army scheme.

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. For only a short question. There are 11 sections of the bill which provide for military training. How did they get in the bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am afraid we are going to get lots of things in the bill that ought not to be there. The committee has had a gigantic struggle to keep things out of it.

Mr. HARDWICK. But it is in the bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is in, and it ought to cover every reasonable request that anybody could make.

Mr. HARDWICK. Therefore this subject is properly in the bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am not so sure that it is, but it is there; and we have a good many things in the bill that I am sorry could not be kept out. In crystallizing the sentiment of a large committee concessions had to be made on all sides. I think the provision which was put in and to which the Senator from Georgia refers ought to cover the reasonable demand of anyone with respect to the training of young men.

The section to which the Senator refers provides for the training of officers in the schools of the country and meets very nearly the suggestion which the amendment of the Senator from Missouri contains. Besides that we have doubled the number of young men in the Military Academy. There is a probability that the number of young men in the Naval Academy will be increased. Provision is made in the bill now for the training of young men in the different educational institutions all over the country. So, taking it altogether, it seems to me there will be enough of education along these lines for young men.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator permit me a question, not in any controversial spirit at all? How large an army could we officer from the graduates from West Point, assuming that its capacity is increased to the point named in the bill, approximately?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would not undertake to say. The report of the committee shows how many officers are necessary to officer the Army as far as the maximum strength of 250,000.

Mr. REED. And your military establishment at West Point would be just about able to supply officers for an army of that size?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Practically that is true.

Mr. REED. Then what would you do if you had to have 5,000,000 men on the battle line?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I answer that question by telling the Senator that we will meet an emergency of that kind when it comes. The fact is the country will not stand for it at this time. The committee has had to consider all these things in connection with this bill.

Now, the Senator provides for 12 districts of at least 500 men in each district school; that is 6,000. If the Senator is going to estimate that 6,000 to cost $500 each, which is about the cost of young men at Culver, I think, that makes about $3,000,000 the first year. Now, how much will have to be added to that for the buildings? If they cost anything like they do at West Point, it will cost a vast amount of money to establish those institutions. Equipment and ordnance and all have to be furnished.

Mr. REED. The Senator will admit he does not bat an eye at $25,000,000 to start out with the continental army.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Nor $45,000,000 for the National Guard, and the Senator votes for that part of the bill without batting an eye.

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am not quarreling with the Senator about that at all. I want to do what will place our country in a reasonable condition to defend itself, and whatever money is necessary to do it is not an expenditure; it is an investment.

Mr. REED. I agree with that. Therefore I think the Senator ought not to shy at $3,000,000 a year or $10,000,000 a year.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator from Oregon does not shy very much at anything.

Mr. REED. I do not mean to say that disrespectfully. The Senator must not misunderstand me. He knows the esteem in which I hold him, and I am sorry if my words were susceptible of that construction. But why should we hesitate? If the utmost capacity of West Point is to supply officers for an Army of 250,000, they are to be employed, if the Senator has his way, in a standing army of that size, and if we know there are possibilities which would call upon us for from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 men, why not educate some men capable of taking charge of the surplus?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I should like to allow the Senator to interrupt me, but I have very little time. Let me say to the Senator that this bill provides for the education of officers in the schools of this country, but I am willing to admit, in frankness, that we shall not have enough officers of the Army in case of a great war such as they are now having in Europe. Further than the provision which is made in the bill, let me say, that other educational institutions in this country, out of a patriotic sense of duty, are doing the very work which the Senator now proposes. Take Princeton, for instance, which has gone ahead now and made military training a part of its curriculum, allowing applicants for degrees to count their service in the military arm of the school as a credit toward the degree. Not only has Princeton adopted it in the last few days, but other large educational institutions have done so. That is without any expense to the Government of the United States at all; it is an elective system. I believe that with the efforts that the colleges and other private institutions are making, together with the training that is being had in the agricultural institutions, we might have a sufficient number of officers for almost any emergency that might arise.

I realize the importance of officers; there is no one who realizes it more than do I, but I do not think that this provision ought to be added as a part of the bill now, in view of the fact that the committee has gone a long way to provide for the training of young officers for the Army in the educational institutions of the country. Such a provision as that proposed would simply encumber the bill and, Mr. President, I think would not work out satisfactorily.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARDWICK. I want to inquire of the Senator from Oregon—and I do it in my own time so as not to take up his time—if he can give us any estimate as to the cost of the military training in the colleges which is provided and carried in sections 42 to 55, inclusive, of the bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The committee did not make any estimate as to that, Mr. President; but I assume that, inasmuch as the plant would have to be erected by the Government of the United States, it would cost possibly in the neighborhood of $200 per man; but I do not know.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is a mere guess?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is a mere guess; I do not know.

Mr. HARDWICK. I wish to say, Mr. President, to the Senate that a rather remarkable situation is presented in connection with this matter. Sections 42 to 55 of the Chamberlain bill, the Senate bill, are also embodied in the House bill, and yet, so far as I can ascertain, neither one of the committees, that of the House of Representatives or of the Senate, or the War Department, or anyone else, seems to have any idea or to

have furnished any estimate as to the cost. I can not ascertain myself as to what they estimate it is going to cost.

Mr. HUGHES. What difference does it make?

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator inquires, in an aside, what difference does it make? I do not know whether it makes any difference to other Senators or not; but I want to make this suggestion to the members of the committee: Why is it that it is urged that you can not support a proposition presented by a Senator not on the committee, on the ground that we can not tell what it would cost, when it does not appear that we can tell what a proposal submitted by the committee will cost? What is the difference?

Mr. President, regardless of what any other Senator thinks, I think we ought to have a little more definite information about what this plan proposed in the bill, and which is carried in both the House bill and the Senate bill, is going to cost before we vote on it. I think, moreover, that the plan proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is really a substitute, in its very nature, for the plan proposed by the War College, which is embraced in these two bills; and I am going to vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri, because I believe, after some study of the question, that it is a better plan than that suggested in the bill or proposed by the War College. I do so, also, with the hope that, when this matter goes to conference, the conferees will carefully weigh the two plans, both being involved in the conference, and take the best one. I am going to support it on that idea. I am not deterred from supporting it by the fact that we can not tell exactly what it will cost, because I do not think we can tell what the plan of the committee will cost, either. I think, if Senators will compare the two plans, they will conclude that the plan suggested by the Senator from Missouri will give us a better corps of officers and will give us more of them, and probably at no greater expense, although I admit that I am entirely in the dark on that question.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator will permit me, I desire to suggest that if the House provision is adopted it can not be changed in conference.

Mr. HARDWICK. That may be true, and that is one difficulty about the situation. If we adopt these 14 sections, from section 42 to section 55, inclusive, both Houses of Congress are going to put exactly 14 sections into this bill, about the cost of which neither of them, so far as I can discover, has the slightest information. I may be in error about that—I make that suggestion rather tentatively—but I have been unable to discover, and I can not find from inquiry, what it is going to cost. So I do not think that the objection urged by the Senator from Colorado to the proposition of my friend from Missouri is very sound in view of the situation that confronts us.

It would be a good deal better to put this amendment in also and let them both go to conference and there determine exactly what each of them would cost; weigh them against each other, and see which is better. It is on that theory that I expect to vote for the plan proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I think it will be found to be true that a great many people who are abstractly for preparedness will shrink a little when the cost of preparedness is thoroughly driven in upon them. I have not risen, however, to discuss the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, except to this extent: Early in the session I introduced two bills, one of them intended to reorganize the National Guard and the other to establish a series of reserve or Federal reserve schools. The Military Committee gave me an opportunity to be heard upon both of those bills. Without claiming any originality whatever, so far as the National Guard reorganization is concerned, I believe it is true that most of the suggestions in my bill in that respect are now found in the committee bill; but the other was for some reason or other not considered by the committee.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I want to say that I was told that the Senator from Iowa had prepared an amendment providing for military training schools. I tried to find it, but did not succeed. I hope that I have succeeded in drawing one that conforms sufficiently to his ideas so that he can support it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Not at all. The Senator from Missouri has not occupied the ground of my proposal in its details, and I rose to say that I think my proposal is better than that of the Senator from Missouri; but I shall be compelled to wait until the proper time and advocate it as best I can. I intend to offer it as an amendment to this bill. It provides, if I may gives its outlines very briefly, that the Secretary of War shall take not less than six of our useless Army posts—Army posts which have been constructed at vast expense and which are of no value whatever for the purpose of quartering the Regular troops—that he shall convert them into what I call Federal reserve schools, with an average attendance at each of 400 pupils; that they shall undergo a course of four years' instruction, the dominant note of which shall be military training and education; that upon graduation each of these students shall be commissioned as a second lieutenant, without pay and without service until called to the colors by the President. He is under obligation to come if that call is made at any time before he is 40 years of age, but he goes from the school into the civil avocations of life.

One of the purposes of my amendment, one thing I had in view, was this: The great complaint made against the National Guard is the alleged inefficiency of its officers, their want of training, and it was my purpose to prepare a body of men in civil life who would be eligible to appointment as officers of the National Guard. The obligation which each of these students should take would include the acceptance of service in the National Guard, if properly appointed or elected thereto.

I mention these things because the argument of the Senator from Missouri is simply unanswerable. We need these men; we need them from every standpoint; and those of us who really believe in preparedness, in having a body of men in this country who can command troops in the event of war, ought to find it a little difficult to oppose an expenditure of this sort.

Mr. REED rose.

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment. I have not had any estimate made with regard to the cost of maintaining these schools. Under my amendment the Government pays for everything except clothing; it does not supply the students with clothes, and it will cost the Government about $700 a year for each student.

The expense of converting these unnecessary Army posts into schools will not be great. There is one in Iowa that cost probably $2,000,000. It has not had a soldier in it for four years, save a caretaker, and I predict that it will never have another soldier, because I myself can not imagine why soldiers of the Regular Army should be quartered at that point.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to make a very brief suggestion, I wish to say that the amendment which I have prepared absolutely will admit of the use of these abandoned Army posts—indeed, it is provided that the schools shall be located as near as possible to Army posts. It is not expressly in the amendment that the Government shall use them, but, if the Senator wants that inserted, he can have it. I do not see much difference between the Senator's proposal and mine except in the matter of detail. If we could get the principle into this bill, so that it would go to conference, there would be something to work out. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, just as I entered the Chamber a moment ago some reference was made, I believe, to sections 42 to 55 of the Chamberlain bill, so called, and it was made in connection with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I am not prepared to support this amendment, and I shall very briefly state my reasons for my position.

It provides for the establishment of a number of schools, and necessarily the cost of establishing these schools is going to be something very considerable. In the sections from 42 to 55 of the bill are incorporated the provisions of a bill which I introduced, known as Senate bill 3946, which was prepared for the purpose of establishing a reserve officers' training corps. Under the provisions of that bill the land-grant colleges, which now receive substantial sums from the Government, will be entitled to the privileges of the bill; also State colleges and other colleges which are already established and which will agree to conform to those provisions. There are two divisions of this training corps provided for, one the senior and the other the junior. The purpose of the bill is to place at these different colleges officers of the Army who can teach military science and tactics, and they are also required to supervise the course of study which shall be prescribed by the War Department. This bill was the product of the brains of a good many of the educators of the country.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question.

Mr. POMERENE. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. The bill to which the Senator refers is identical with the bill that the War College suggested in 1914, is it not?

Mr. POMERENE. I do not know of a bill by that name. I became interested in this bill, in the first place, through the president of the Ohio State University, Dr. Thompson, who has given a great deal of attention to this subject, and the officer, Capt. Converse, who is now detailed by the Federal Government at that university.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me again, to make a brief suggestion, he will find, I think upon examination, that word for word, even as to punctuation, the bill to which he has referred is exactly the same thing, so far as its provisions are concerned, as the War College bill.

Mr. POMERENE. I think the Senator's statement is a little broad, because the bill, as I introduced it, has been changed somewhat, and it was slightly changed when it was incorporated in the so-called Hay bill in the House of Representatives; but it may be that the general principles contained in the bill are substantially the same as those in the bill to which the Senator from Georgia refers.

It has seemed to me that in these established colleges and universities, most of which now have a certain amount of military training, we will be able, with a minimum of cost and with a minimum amount of delay, to establish institutions which would be fully equipped for the training of officers. I think that it may be fairly said that our military forces are more wanting in trained officers than they are in any other particular. We realize very fully that one of the defects, for instance, in the system now prevailing in Great Britain has been their utter lack of officers who could be used for the purpose of training the soldiers; and I have thought that, as this bill has been given such very careful attention, there would be no objection whatsoever to it; and I trust that my friend from Georgia will a little later modify his views on the subject and not insist upon the adoption of the amendment which he offered some time ago.

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

Mr. POMERENE. Yes.

Mr. REED. What is the inducement to these students to enter the military service provided for in the sections of the bill to which the Senator is now referring? What is there to induce them to do it?

Mr. POMERENE. Well, Mr. President, there must be at each one of these schools or universities at least 100 students who are willing to take this training. They are pursuing their course of study. As applied to the Ohio State University, I think the situation is substantially this:

They have now about fifty-five hundred students in that college, and probably twenty-five hundred of them are taking military training. They have a very large number of students in their engineering course. There are a good many students in this university—and I use it not because it is the Ohio State University, but because I think it is typical of many of the State universities—who are interested in military training. They are anxious to have better facilities than they now have, and if these additional privileges were to be granted them, I think many of them would be quite willing to join this reserve officers' training corps, and for the prescribed number of years after that be subject to the direction of the Government.

Mr. REED. That is what I am asking. What are the additional advantages that they will obtain?

Mr. POMERENE. They will be allowed certain commutations. Those are very small. They will have all the privileges that might be accorded in a pretty good military institution, and their course of study would be so shaped that they could be prepared for the walks of both military and civil life. I think that is what we need, rather than to have a purely military institution.

Mr. REED. I do not want to take the Senator's time, but I am very much interested in this matter. Is it not true that in order to get into the military branch a man must be able to attend the college?

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, yes.

Mr. REED. There he pays his own expenses. When he enters the military branch, he does not get any additional advantage except such as flows from military education?

Mr. POMERENE. As I understand the provisions of the Senator's amendment, the student would be sustained at the expense of the Government.

Mr. REED. That is the difference; he would be educated at the expense of the Government.

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; but that would compel us to establish at the present time not less than 6 and not more than 12 of these institutions. I presented some time ago another bill which bears on this subject. I have not thought it wise to offer it as an amendment to this bill, and I do not think I shall, because I was hoping that it would be considered by the Committee on Military Affairs as well as the Committee on Naval Affairs. In brief, it was intended to meet this situation:

We are increasing the attendance at both the Military and the Naval Academies. They do not now have the necessary accommodations for these contemplated increases; and it was thought, particularly by officers of the Navy with whom I have talked, that if the first year's study for both the Military and Naval Academies could be provided for at a third institution it would be a benefit to all and at the same time would relieve the situation at West Point and at Annapolis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. REED. 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:

Beckham	Hughes	Pittman	Taggart
Burleigh	Husting	Pomerene	Thomas
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Reed	Thompson
Clapp	Jones	Shafroth	Underwood
Cummins	Lane	Sheppard	Vardaman
Curtis	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	Warren
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Mich.	Williams
Gore	Nelson	Smoot	
Hardwick	Oliver	Sterling	
Hollis	Page	Swanson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

Mr. ROBINSON and Mr. OVERMAN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there is not a quorum present, and it might be difficult to get one this evening, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m., Saturday, April 15, 1916) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 17, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *April 15, 1916.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, from our heart of hearts that we are privileged to live in this age of the world's history, with its accumulated wisdom and knowledge, its discoveries and inventions, its literature and art, its high ideals and religious attainments, and we most fervently pray that we may strive diligently to apply our wisdom, our knowledge, our energy to the things of the now, that we may prove ourselves worthy of the splendid opportunities which beckon us onward and upward to higher and nobler achievements, and departing leave the world a little better than we found it. In the spirit of Him who taught us the way and the truth and the life. Amen.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that next week the business in order on Calendar Wednesday be transferred to and be in order on Thursday instead of Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] asks unanimous consent that the business on next Calendar Wednesday be transferred to the succeeding day—Thursday.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, would there be any objection to dispensing with it altogether?

Mr. KITCHIN. Some matters ought to be taken up on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MANN. That would come up later.

Mr. KITCHIN. And we want this Agricultural bill to proceed without being broken into. Perhaps by doing that we could finish it without interruption.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. 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 bill H. R. 12717, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

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. 12717, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12717) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction of buildings at bureau experiment station at Bethesda, Md., and bureau experiment farm at Beltsvills, Md., $23,600.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. What buildings do they propose to construct?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, on the 31st of last March the sheep barn at Beltsville, Md., caught fire and was entirely consumed. That barn cost originally $8,000. They have an appropriation out of this fund of $2,000, and the increase of $6,000 is asked for in this item to replace that barn.

That covers that part of it. In addition to that it is desired to erect three additional silos for the dairy work and for the farm work generally there, and also one silo shed, which is to cost about $300, and a reservoir to hold something like 100,000 gallons of water. That will cost $1,200. They have no water protection there at all, and a great many rather important scientific investigations are going on at Beltsville, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. MANN. The appropriation last year was $6,750. This year it is $23,600. That is an increase of nearly $17,000.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. I will say that it is the intention to spend $10,000 out at Bethesda, which is the field station of the Bureau of Animal Industry, in the replacement of two large barns which are old and have been there for a good many years and have become entirely insanitary, so much so that a large part of the barns is not now used, because the department says it is dangerous to put infected animals in there, because they can not properly guard against the spread of disease. In addition they want to build out there one hay barn, which will cost $600. They want to build also an incinerator, which will cost $2,500, to take care of the dead stock. That accounts for the increase in that item.

Mr. MANN. Well, I presume it is all right, but it seems like rather a large sum to appropriate at this time for new buildings on a couple of farms—new buildings at a cost of $23,600, when we have not much money to spend for new things.

Mr. LEVER. The same thought suggested itself to me when Dr. Melvin was before the committee, and I pressed him rather strongly on the proposition and asked him if he regarded it as an emergency proposition, and he said he did.

Mr. MANN. I suppose that grows out of the fact that in the investigations of the bureau as to dairies they find all the barns in the country insanitary, and they want to construct two here that are sanitary. It would be rather expensive, however, for the average farmer to construct new barns at such a rate of expenditure.

But I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HELM. I move to strike out the first proviso, on page 14, beginning on line 7 and continuing down to the words "purposes," in line 9. Would that be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. That paragraph has been passed. It would not be in order.

Mr. HELM. Is the bill being read by paragraphs or by sections?

The CHAIRMAN. By paragraphs.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can ask to return to it.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the paragraph beginning on page 13, line 24, and extending down to line 14, on page 14, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] asks unanimous consent to return to the paragraph beginning on line 24 of page 13 and extending to line 13, page 14, for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. What is the purpose of the gentleman?

Mr. HELM. I want to move to strike out the first proviso.

Mr. MANN. We read it so quickly that I think the gentleman ought to be permitted to move to return to it.

Mr. LEVER. Would not the gentleman be satisfied with five minutes.

Mr. HELM. I will have to.

Mr. LEVER. With the understanding, Mr. Chairman, that 10 minutes only shall be consumed on that, I have no objection.

Mr. MANN. I would not do that. This is for the breeding of horses. You can cut off debate whenever you want.

Mr. HELM. I move to strike out, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 14, by striking out the proviso beginning on line 7 and ending with the word "purposes," in line 9, which reads as follows: "*Provided*, That of the sum thus appropriated $25,000 may be used for experiments in the breeding and maintenance of horses for military purposes."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, the district of Kentucky which I represent is very largely interested in the breeding of horses. It is what is known as the blue-grass section of the State, where the horse rises to its best types and highest development. I am thrown in contact daily when at home with men who own the sires of some of the best horses in the United States. That is their home. You find them there, the best in the United States. Now, the Government proposes to come in and interfere with a well-established, thoroughgoing business enterprise. Of course every man within the sound of my voice understands that the development of these high-grade, standard-bred, and thoroughbred horses requires a very considerable investment. In the first place, there is the get of the horse. Some of these sires stand as high as $1,000 a season for the service. The Government proposes now to place a stallion in a locality where these high-grade horses are developed, and there is no charge. Necessarily that beats down that business.

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

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that the Committee on Military Affairs has been taking care of this matter heretofore, and that at the present time there are stallions purchased and placed around in different sections of the country for the purpose of developing Cavalry horses that will be better than the horses which can be bought commercially?

Mr. HELM. This is that provision. If it belongs anywhere, its proper place is in the Army bill. It does not belong in this Agricultural bill at all. Now, conceding that this is a desirable type of horse for Army purposes, in the district of 11 counties, which I represent, in the heart of Kentucky, there is one of these Army horses stationed. I suppose in these same counties there are perhaps 100 or, perhaps, 200 noted sires, each coming from a distinguished breed or strain of horses. Now, would you rather have 1 or would you rather have 200? I would like to have the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture inform the Committee of the Whole, if he can, how many colts have been foaled under this particular provision?

Mr. LEVER. If some one will figure it up as I give the figures. There have been 93, 126, 264, 376, 182, and 220.

Mr. HELM. In the United States?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. HELM. Now, see what you are proposing. You are saving at the spigot but you are undermining the entire thoroughgoing business proposition. Here are how many colts altogether?

Mr. LEE. The total is 1,261.

Mr. HELM. Twelve hundred and sixty-one in the United States. Why, Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HELM. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this item close in 15 minutes, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] to have 5 minutes and the gentleman's colleague [Mr. KINCHELOE] 5 minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I may want five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I will yield to the gentleman my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the time to be used as indicated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. HELM. Twelve hundred colts in the United States. I may be putting it a little high, but I suppose there are that many foaled in the county of my residence this spring. I suppose that is a reasonably safe statement.

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

Mr. HELM. Yes. I ask the gentleman to be as brief as he can.

Mr. COX. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the sire of these horses is placed free of charge?

Mr. HELM. Yes. The Government stations one of these sires in my home county. They pay a farmer so much for the care and attention. Now, the Government exercises an option to take the colt within a certain number of years. Will the chairman of the committee tell me what that is?

Mr. LEVER. The option is that the Government will take the colt at $150 as a 3-year-old, unless the farmer is willing to pay the stud fee of $25.

Mr. HELM. Do you see that! Now, that is a ridiculous proposition, gentlemen. The idea of a 3-year-old horse, the descendant of the type of stallion that they put into a farmer's hands—to buy him at $150 when he is 3 years old is absolutely preposterous and ridiculous. The type of horse that you want and that the farmer raises is more apt to sell at 3 years old for a thousand dollars or twelve hundred dollars. Some of them go up to twenty-five hundred or three thousand dollars. If it is a colt by a type of horse that the Government wants, and if the dam is an animal that is fitted for these purposes, you see that it is a ridiculous proposition for the farmer to raise the colt by such a sire as that for three years and then get only $150.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Are these colts mostly thoroughbred colts? In other words, are the stallions bred to thoroughbred mares?

Mr. HELM. Now, that brings you to the consideration of a subject that is a little difficult to handle. Some men just bring this, that, or the other kind or type—the fellow that has a scrub—you understand what I mean.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Kentucky will yield, I will tell him the character of the stallions.

Mr. HELM. Oh, I understand about the character of the sires. I am talking about the dams that are the mothers of the colts.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Will a thoroughbred colt make a good Cavalry horse?

Mr. HELM. A thoroughbred horse—the best in the world, after he has been subjugated. Why, you can not beat him for a Cavalry horse, for speed and endurance; but a cross between the thoroughbred and the standard bred, the trotter and the racer, is the perfect type of a Cavalry horse, in my opinion. Of the two types, the thoroughbred is unquestionably a horse of endurance and speed, and if you cross the thoroughbred with the standard bred, you get the muscle, and there you have the perfect type.

Mr. McKENZIE. Gen. Aleshire, in his testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs on the point just brought out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD], stated:

> The plan contemplated that no mare should be bred to any of these stallions that was not certified as being a suitable mare to produce the kind of horses that were wanted, and if she had any sickness or defects of any sort that would operate against the animal as a brood mare, she would not be allowed the service of the horse.

Mr. HELM. That in practice is not carried into effect. Here is an opportunity for a man with a scrub mare to get the use of a good horse free of charge, and that is the sum and substance of it.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Is the gentleman's objection to this provision solely upon the ground that it is an interference on behalf of the Government with private enterprise?

Mr. HELM. My objection is that it is not a business proposition. You can not make it stand up as a practical business proposition. It has been tested and tried out, and it does not stand up; it does not get the results that you undertake to get.

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

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I am a little surprised at some of the statements of my colleague [Mr. HELM] about this proposition. I will say, for the benefit of the committee, that my colleague represents a district where they breed thoroughbred horses into the purple. They are bred for the purpose of derbies, they are bred for the purpose of harness and running horses. If it takes the character of stallion that the gentleman intimates it would, the horse business in his district under the provisions of this bill would be materially aided. There is not one Cavalry horse out of a million that is a thoroughbred horse. It would break this Government to undertake to get enough thoroughbred horses for the Cavalry of this country. But they have these splendidly bred stallions under the provisions of this bill to breed to cold-blooded mares, mares that are not thoroughbred. There are two or three of these stallions in my district. When the farmer brings his cold-blooded mare, as we say, to one of these stallions the Government has the option within three years of paying $150 for the get, but the owner of the mare has the option of paying the season of $25 and keeping the colt. Suppose he does keep the colt. You are building up a character of horse in breeding that appeals to the Government when they need them for Cavalry purposes to buy them after they are grown, or, if they want to sell it and the Government wants to buy the three-year old at $150, it has the right to do so under this bill. In other words, a thoroughbred stallion bred to a cold-blooded mare produces a get that makes the best Cavalry horse in the world, and it is done at a nominal expense by putting these stallions over the country so that they can serve these mares and obtain the get that is characteristic of a genuine Cavalry horse.

As I say, if you have a Cavalry horse that is a thoroughbred horse and you undertake to lay down the rule that all Cavalry horses shall be thoroughbreds, you will break the Government in doing it. If you buy the character of horse that is bred in my friend's district for Cavalry horses, you will break the Government, because the character of horses that are bred there that are 3 years old bring from two to three thousand dollars apiece, and why? They are not only bred in the purple by the sire, but in the purple by the dam. The purpose of this provision of the bill is to take the thoroughbred sire and breed to a cold-blooded mare in order to get a Cavalry horse that makes the best that can be produced. It would be a great mistake to knock out this provision of the bill. You would not only stop the breeding of the character of horse that is desired, but these stallions have already been purchased and are now all over this country in service.

If you knock out the $25,000 appropriation the only option the Government has is to sell these studs and absolutely stop this character of breeding. In view of the splendid results that have been brought about by reason of these stallions over the country breeding to the character of mares I have described, I think it would be a serious mistake to knock out the item.

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

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes.

Mr. HELM. The gentleman speaks of the splendid results that have been produced. How many of these colts have been purchased by the Government?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I do not know; and for the purposes of this bill I do not care.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, the work has not been going on more than three years.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I do not care whether the Government buys one of them or not. The process produces the character of horse that is needed in this country, so that if a war should come they can be then bought up by the Government after they are grown [applause], and they make the best horses in the world for that purpose. It is not a question of whether the Government buys them at three years old—by exercising its option. It is a question of breeding the character of horse all over this country that is needed in time of war, so that you will have them available. I hope that the provision will not be stricken from the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this item was put into the Agriculture appropriation bill some three years ago by the Senate, and retained in conference. The work is only three years old. The results so far have not been sufficient to ascertain whether or not it is a good work. The Committee on Agriculture does not have any pride in the item at all. We are perfectly willing to have the House vote upon it. Some of us on the committee are in favor of the proposition and others are against it. We have held it in the bill because it seemed to have been the desire of Congress from time to time, as expressed in the last three years, that this character of work should be carried on by the Department of Agriculture.

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

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. COX. Does the Government obligate itself to take these colts at the end of three years where they be crippled or decrepit?

Mr. LEVER. The Government has an option to take these colts at 3 years old at $150, provided the owner does not exercise his option and pay $25 for the stud fee.

Mr. COX. I can readily see now where a colt may be foaled that is blind or otherwise unsound.

Mr. LEVER. The Government would not exercise its option in that event.

Mr. COX. It would not have to exercise its option?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no.

Mr. COX. The Government can flatly refuse to accept such a colt?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. COX. And make the owner of the mare pay the service fee of $25?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know what arrangement they would make in a case of that kind. That question has not arisen. As a matter of fact I imagine that the owner would have to take his colt.

Mr. COX. And pay the $25?

Mr. LEVER. Very likely so.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. ANDERSON. If I understand the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky it is to strike out the proviso——

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course if that is done that leaves all the stallions with nothing to maintain them, and if we do away with that item some provision must be made for the disposal of those stallions.

Mr. LEVER. That is undoubtedly true and I am going to direct the attention of the committee to that fact.

Mr. EDWARDS. How many stallions have we now?

Mr. LEVER. We have 37 stallions now in this particular line of work. Of couse the Government has some stallions located in Colorado at the horse-breeding station there, and at Brattleboro, Vt., I believe, the Morgan-horse station.

Mr. EDWARDS. How many horse-breeding stations has the Government throughout the country?

Mr. LEVER. The Government has only two real horse-breeding stations, one in Kentucky and one in Colorado.

Mr. HELM. How many horses have been purchased by the Government?

Mr. LEVER. I am not able to state to the gentleman. I know of one very fine horse that was recently donated to the Government.

Mr. HELM. Is it not a fact that that is generally the case, and that they are generally superannuated animals whose owners think that their services are at an end?

Mr. LEVER. I take it that a horse of the character of Navarre is superannuated for the purpose of racing.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. They are patriots who have given these horses to the Government to help improve the stock of the country.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, this seems to be a question of Kentucky having too much competition in the breeding of good horses. I will say that in our State, which has not progressed as far in horse raising as Kentucky, we would be happy to have this station. Not only that, but last summer there was considerable agitation at El Reno over the possibility that something of this sort would be brought out there, and the working out of this provision was called very forcibly to my attention by one of the officers at Fort Sill, Okla.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma this: I think there is no special objection to this provision in the bill, but the only thing that Congress has to do is to see that it does not grow beyond its initial purpose and that there is no reckless extravagance in the spending of this money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired, all time has expired, and the question is on this paragraph and all amendments thereto. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the disease of hog cholera, and for its control or eradication by such means as may be necessary, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and other methods, either independently or in cooperation with farmers, associations, State or county authorities, $360,000: *Provided*, That of said sum not less than $175,000 shall be available for expenditures in carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1913, regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or shipment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product manufactured in the United States and the importation of such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic animals: *And provided further*, That of said sum not less than $35,000 shall be available for researches concerning the cause, modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention of this disease.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 3, strike out the figures "360,000" and insert "410,000."

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment for the purpose of asking this additional appropriation in order that the districts in which this work has been carried on may be surrounded by other districts, which will prevent the spread of the disease in those districts where this work has been carried on. In Marshall County, in the State of Kansas, and in several counties in other States of the Union, counties have been designated as places where this eradication of hog cholera will be carried on. I wish to call attention to the fact that this work is carried on in conjunction with the State and with the State agricultural colleges. The Department of Agriculture here in Washington sends a representative of this department to those counties. The agricultural college in that State sends a representative and the State Live Stock Sanitary Commission sends a representative to look after the work in those selected districts. I want to read the experience resulting from the work carried on in Marshall County in my State, and I read from a letter received from the president of the Hog Cholera Eradication Association of Marshall County. He addressed this letter to me, under date of March 28, as follows:

MARSHALL COUNTY HOG CHOLERA ERADICATION ASSOCIATION,
Marysville, Kans., March 28, 1916.

Hon. GUY T. HELVERING,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I desire to give you a synopsis of the Government hog cholera demonstration work that has been conducted in Marshall County, Kans. The Government began work here in July, 1914, and organized the county so that one farmer had charge of each 4 square miles in the county.

The first duties performed were to take a survey showing the number of hogs in the county on each farm and the number that died from cholera. This survey was taken every year, and the figures are as follows:

Year.	Raised.	Lost.
1912	65,294	3,853
1913	72,036	7,230
1914	65,592	3,432
1915	101,207	561

The Government work here has been an unqualified success, especially under the management of Dr. Murphy. Their annual report shows that during the year 1915 they visited nearly 900 farms in the county and traveled over 11,000 miles in the automobile. From the census figures it will be seen that the number of hogs in the county has increased over 38,000 during 1915, as the direct result of the practical absence of hog cholera and the assurance that the farmers have of keeping hogs without the danger of loss from hog cholera. In the adjoining counties surrounding Marshall County and near the border, in order to protect the farmer in Marshall County, with the assistance of the State authorities, they organized 17 cholera control communities.

Nearly 200 hog cholera educational lectures, illustrated with stereopticon views, have been held in every schoolhouse in Marshall County and within 6 miles of the border in the surrounding counties.

Farmers in the adjoining counties are clamoring to have this Government work extended to cover their sections. Farmers in 12 other counties in the State are beseeching not only the Government but the State authorities to have the work extended.

Hogs are being raised successfully on over 200 cholera-infected farms in Marshall County which have been cleaned and disinfected under the State supervision, notwithstanding that the hogs on these farms have not received or needed serum protection. Confidence has been completely restored, and hog raising without the need of serum has been fully established.

We believe that this work is one of the best efforts that the Government has ever done to assist the farmer in his work, and I would be glad if it could be extended over the entire State.

Yours, truly,

ANDREW SHEARER, *President.*

This shows conclusively the work which has been done by these Government experts. In order that I might have at first hand information from the farmers, I addressed letters to the farmers, and I want to read extracts from one or two of those letters. The letter to which I wish to call attention is one addressed to me by Harry Smith, Home City, Kans., who had hogs treated by the Government experts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HELVERING. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Is it not a fact many years, one year after another, you did not have hog cholera in Marshall County or any other county in your State?

Mr. HELVERING. I will say to the gentleman that since Marshall County has become settled as it is now, and since the hog cholera became prevalent, as it did along in 1900 and 1901, we have not been able to control it satisfactorily each year.

Mr. BOOHER. Do you mean to say they have hog cholera every year in your section?

Mr. HELVERING. We have had it ever since——

Mr. BOOHER. Are there not years when they do not have hog cholera in the community?

Mr. HELVERING. Not since I have been observing the condition in our county.

Mr. BOOHER. I have never known a community being afflicted with it year after year and year after year. There would be years when there would not be any of it at all.

Mr. HELVERING. I will say, in answer to the gentleman's question, that in 1901 the cholera became very prevalent in Marshall County, and has continued in my State ever since. In 1914, when this work commenced, as I have stated, there were something like 7,000 hogs lost by the disease.

Mr. BOOHER. Did the Government furnish the serum that was used on Mr. Smith's farm? I refer to the letter read by you.

Mr. HELVERING. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. The Government saved him, then, $500; that is, treated 50 head of hogs without any cost to him at all?

Mr. HELVERING. Yes; that is true.

Mr. BOOHER. In the counties adjoining Marshall County the farmers bought their own serum and went to all that expense?

Mr. HELVERING. What I am trying to explain to the gentleman is this, that the farmers have been imposed upon so many times and so long by spurious serum that had no effect that this work was antagonized on the part of many farmers at first, until it was clearly demonstrated by the application of the proper serum that this disease could be controlled.

Mr. BOOHER. May I ask another question?

Mr. HELVERING. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Would it not be better to take this $160,000 provided in this bill for this demonstration work and put it in laboratory work, and permit these Government experts to investigate the serum and the other toxin that is used, so that all the people might have the benefit of it instead of one county in all the hog-raising States of this country?

Mr. HELVERING. I want to say to the gentleman that there is $175,000 appropriated in this bill for the very work which he has mentioned, and $35,000 additional for investigation. But what we desire to do is to make this one county a sample county, showing what can be done if properly protected and properly handled, and in order to do this we want to protect this county in which the experts have been working from being encroached upon by the counties around it. And I am informed by Dr. Hess, who has charge of the field work, that the $150,000 which is appropriated for the field work is simply to take care of the counties which have the work and will not protect them from the counties around.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the use of this serum in one year protect the hogs of another year?

Mr. HELVERING. The following year?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. HELVERING. I do not think it is a permanent preventive.

Mr. BOOHER. One injection of this serum into the animal lasts only three months. You have got to keep this thing up always.

Mr. HELVERING. Not if it is entirely eradicated.

Mr. CULLOP. If the gentleman will permit me there, the officer in charge of this demonstration work educates the farmer so that he can keep cholera off of his farm, and the farmer now can get this toxin for the purpose of treating his hogs by paying the cost to the Government for making it.

Mr. LEVER. The Government does not make it.

Mr. CULLOP. It is made at Ames, Iowa, and other places. Or he can get it from the agricultural college of a State, and the cost of administration is all there is to it.

Mr. HELVERING. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say in these counties surrounding these experiment counties it is not intended that the Government pay for this serum. The department informs me they will protect the counties around these individual counties by furnishing the doctors to explain the situation to the farmers and protect them, but the farmer must pay for his own serum.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] has expired.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing extracts from the few letters that I have indicated, and also print in full the letter of the president of the association of Marshall County, Kans.

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

The following are extracts from letters referred to:

EXTRACTS ON THE SUBJECT OF HOG-CHOLERA ERADICATION.

J. E. Benson, Vermillion, 148 hogs: "The treatment received from the Government officers is just fine. My herd of hogs improved greatly since they were vaccinated. The place is plumb cleared of hog cholera."

Irving Nauman, Frankfort, 50 hogs: "In regard to the work done in this county, I must say that it has been very satisfactory, and I hope that it continues the same." He further states that he thinks it better to give treatment before the hogs become ill, and after the herd is immune to afterward vaccinate all pigs when they weigh about 50 or 60 pounds.

C. D. Tompkins, Vermillion, 20 hogs: "The Government doctors are doing good work. I believe they saved part of my hogs and think this work should be encouraged." In his opinion there should be a bigger bounty on crows, as he believes they scatter the cholera more than anything else.

S. W. Tilley, Irving, 106 head: "We were very much pleased with the treatment we received from the Government men with our hogs. We had an outbreak of cholera and out of 106 head we saved 100 head." He thinks that if the raisers could be insured good serum and permitted to do their own work they would be in fine shape hereafter, as the disease gets such a foothold at times before the doctors can get around.

H. A. Floyd, Vliets, 30 hogs: "I should say in my case it was very satisfactory. I lost 7 out of 30 head that were vaccinated, and all that died had the fever."

F. W. Heath, Vermillion, 14 hogs: "I think that if the vaccinating is done in time it is all right, but it ought to be as soon as the first hog shows signs of sickness. I had my hogs vaccinated and lost only one hog. I am very well satisfied with the work that was done for me."

L. W. Davis, Vermillion, 29 hogs: "I had the cholera last fall in my hogs, lost two, and then called in the Government men. They came in about 16 hours after I called them. Nearly all pigs had the fever, but we vaccinated them and I did not lose any more, so you see I ought to be well satisfied, and I am, and I believe this movement will be a great help to Marshall County."

E. F. Casebeer, Axtell, 14 hogs: "As to my opinion of vaccination, would say that when one knows that his hogs have been exposed to real, genuine cholera, and will vaccinate at the right time, with good serum, that he can save a large per cent of his hogs. But where hogs are sick and dying with diseases other than cholera I believe vaccination to be a detriment. For that reason I do not think that wholesale and promiscuous vaccination will ever be practical, and, furthermore, one is always running a chance of getting worthless serum."

M. Cutshall, Frankfort, 20 hogs: When the experts reached his place one-half of his hogs were sick. All were treated. He then says: "Some of those that were sick when they treated them got well and some of those that were apparently well died. In all, I lost nine head. Old sows did not get sick at all. I have reason to believe that if hogs were treated or vaccinated before they got sick that it is a good preventive."

Harry Smith, Home City, 50 hogs: "The Government experts treated 50 head of hogs for me in November, 1914. Ten of these had cholera; some had a high fever, some not so high. Of these 50 head I never lost a single one that they treated. I can truthfully say that the Government experts saved me $500. I have not had a sick hog on the place since the treatment. I am fully convinced that the Government has saved thousands of dollars in the last nine months in Marshall County for the farmers. Hereafter, if my hogs show any signs of cholera, they get a dose of serum, if I can possibly get it."

Andrew Kjelberg, Vermillion, 49 hogs: "As to results on this farm, would say that we have two different places where we keep hogs. One of these herds took sick about the 20th of November last. The eradication office was not notified before the 29th, when an examination was made and the hogs were found to be sick with the cholera. These hogs were then treated on the 30th of November, but, owing to the advanced stage of the disease only 7 head were treated. Out of these 7, 5 of them recovered, and 1 out of the other 32 that were not given the treatment. The other herd, having been badly exposed, were also given the treatment the same day and not one was lost out of this herd of 50, which is, I think, a very good showing in favor of the work, as the hogs showed signs of being affected with the cholera."

Willis Hull, Bigelow, 36 hogs: "I recommend that if cholera has been on the farm the preceding year, or is in the neighborhood, it is a wise plan to treat the hogs. Hogs that have been treated you can put them in the lot with a bunch of sick hogs and they will not miss a feed. I tried that experiment here at home. I do not think that it is advisable to treat a bunch of healthy hogs—that is, if the cholera is not close."

S. R. Heisey, Frankfort, 16 hogs: "I felt, just as did the majority around here, that vaccinating for cholera should be done before the disease appears in the herd. But after having my herd successfully treated by the Government experts last October I am convinced that the work of the treatment of hog cholera is carried on in the best and most practical manner, and if continued for some time longer will result in great good, not only to the farmers of Marshall County but also to the surrounding country."

J. D. Anderson, Beattie, 63 hogs: "Much of good could be accomplished if the Government doctors would treat all hogs that are directly exposed, instead of waiting until they are sick, as they are doing in this county." He then goes on to explain that he lives lower down on the creek from five farmers each of whom had had hog cholera on their places. On account of the creek receiving direct drainage from these farms, and he was below all of them, he requested the doctors to treat his herd, and they refused on the ground that they could not give treatment until cholera invaded his herd. "As a consequence, out of 77 hogs treated, I saved 43" He favors the double treatment, and further states that out of 32 head given this treatment by the Government experts he saved every one.

W. H. Snodgrass, Frankfort, 38 hogs: "As to the treatment of the eradication of hog cholera, I believe it to be all that is claimed for it. I am satisfied that hogs treated by the Government experts here in Marshall County are immune. The experts are doing great work here. At first they met with some opposition, but now they have the cooperation of this community."

Levi Denny, Frankfort, 36 hogs: "In my opinion, Marshall County has, by the help of the Government experts, made progress in the eradication of hog cholera. In this county the experts did not work on unaffected herds, as they had more calls than they could attend to from

affected herds. Their work for us was highly satisfactory, and the only thing needed is a more efficient following up for cleaning up infected premises. As to the per cent saved, I do not now remember; they saved about 75 per cent of mine. There are herds infected here that the owners will not report, and they did not give any help or encouragement to the organization. How can we clean up the county without the authority and the help to treat all infected herds in the county?"

Mrs. Maggie Cobb, Vliets, 7 hogs: "The Government experts have done good work in hog-cholera eradication. The work is a very valuable proposition and will be of great benefit in the future as in the past."

G. H. Nelson, Vermillion, 35 hogs: "I think the work of the hog-cholera eradication is a good thing if properly carried on. I had about 30 head vaccinated, and out of that herd I lost 6. These 6 all had high fever when vaccinated except 2. I think that the vaccination should be done before hogs are too far gone. The rest of my hogs lived and thrived and were sent to market."

Henry Anderson, Axtell, 67 hogs: "I had about 65 head of hogs treated. Out of them were 12 head of old hogs. Twenty-three of the whole bunch died. Two of these were old hogs. I think 6 young and 2 old had th fever at the time of treatment. These 8 hogs all died. I have lived on the farm, right here in Kansas, for 40 years, having raised hogs every year. Have had the hog cholera three times. Twenty years ago I had the disease, two years in succession, and the last time was in 1914. My idea is this: That I would rather have my hogs vaccinated when hog cholera is around and not have to wait till the disease is in the bunch. These Government men would not work on a bunch of hogs unless they were off of feed. I think when the men are in a locality where hog cholera is they ought to stay there and work, sick or not sick. This is just a little of my experience in hog business. Of course vaccination is more or less new to us in Marshall County."

F. T. Howell, Frankfort, 26 hogs: "My hogs were in good health until I thrashed, and it is a question to me whether cholera was brought to me in thrashing or the hogs ate too much wheat and that started them to dying. One got sick in about three or four days after I thrashed. After the wheat was binded there was quite a lot spilled in scooping, and they ate all they wanted. I had been keeping them on a green pasture and shorts and meal slop, and wheat might have been too strong for their stomachs. As to the vaccination of hogs, I think it is a good thing if they can be treated while they have a normal temperature, but after they are sick I think it is time and money wasted. All of my hogs that were treated that had a normal temperature were all right and did fine. All those that were sick died."

J. W. Johnson, Vliets, 27 hogs: "I lost 105 hogs in six weeks in 1913 and 12 in 1914. Had 9 of the 12 treated by the Government men while sick, but they died. Had 15 well hogs treated, and they never took sick. Now, then, the most complaint all over the county is that they will not treat the hogs before they take sick. After they are sick they might as well throw the serum in the river for all the good it will do. It kills them quicker, as I have not heard of one single hog get well after treated, but I have not heard of one hog die after treatment that was well when treated. They complain that they have not enough serum. Is there no way to enlarge the serum plant at Ames or build one in Kansas? Any place, so that they can have all they need when needed. There is no question but that they are doing some good in Marshall County, but could do ten times as much good if their hands were not tied and they had all the serum they needed. And the educational work is worth the money for those who will follow it; but there is where we all fall down, as I think sanitation is 99 per cent of prevention of any disease. But if you could see the condition of the hog lots and pens in Kansas to-day you would not blame us, as the mud is knee-deep all over Marshall County, with 6 inches of snow on top."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman for or against the amendment?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am against the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Pending that, Mr. Chairman, I want to inquire how much time we have consumed on this. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire time?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman from Iowa also desire time?

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the chairman that we let the time go on for a few minutes and see how we get along. This is a very important matter. I may want 5 minutes and I may want 15 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman's suggestion is a very good one.

Mr. HAUGEN. I have an amendment to offer, and I would like time in which to discuss it.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Missouri opposed to the amendment?

Mr. RUBEY. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Missouri first.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss just for a moment the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas and call his attention to the fact, which he possibly does not know, that we have left over from the appropriation which we made in 1914 $45,000. In that year we made an appropriation of $500,000, a continuing appropriation, and there is now in the Treasury $45,000 of that amount, and that added to the appropriation which we propose here, of $360,000, will give the department $405,000 to work on during the coming year.

Mr. HELVERING. As a matter of fact, there is only $150,000 of that which is for field work.

Mr. RUBEY. One hundred and sixty thousand and $45,000, making $205,000 for field work.

Mr. HELVERING. I was informed at the department that that would give no chance to protect those counties from the surrounding counties.

Mr. RUBEY. The work will be carried on during the coming year in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. I have his communication here in regard to that, but I will not take the time to read it. He says county demonstration work will be carried on during the coming year in the same way that it has been carried on for the past three years, but not necessarily in the same counties. It may be put into other counties and into other States and into other parts of the same States, so as to give communities that have not had it heretofore an opportunity to see this demonstration, so that they can be shown what can be done toward the eradication and control of hog cholera.

I believe it is unnecessary to increase the appropriation at this time. We have given what the department has asked. We have given even more than the department asked. We gave them $500,000 in 1914, and the department has left of that sum now $45,000, showing that it has been impossible for them to use that money in such a way as would justify them in the use of it. They want to use it and we want them to use it to the best advantage in order that they may accomplish the best results possible by the expenditure of the money. They are doing a splendid work, and we want to continue that work, but we do not want to give them money that they do not need and can not use to advantage.

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

Mr. RUBEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I just wanted to ask what have been the results of the work thus far done? Has there been a very considerable decrease in hog cholera?

Mr. RUBEY. I will give the gentleman the figures in the 15 counties where the demonstrations have been carried on during the last three years. In 1913, with more than 1,000,000 hogs raised, 179,225 died, or 17 per cent. That was in 1913. In 1914, with 1,121,229 hogs raised, 59,862 died, or 5.3 per cent. In 1915 there were raised in those 15 counties 1,278,741 hogs, an increase over both of the preceding years, and yet that year there died only 23,565, or 1.8 per cent.

Mr. BAILEY. That is certainly a fine showing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All debate on this amendment has been exhausted.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, here we have a striking example of the fact that when once an appropriation is made it never can be stopped. Hog cholera was noted and the serum for its cure was discovered some 15 or 20 years ago. Millions of dollars have been expended by the Federal Government and by the States in the attempt to stamp it out. So far we have no additional information; nothing is suggested except this serum that has been experimented with and demonstrated for 15 long years.

As stated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY], $500,000 was appropriated in 1914. I believe $235,000 was appropriated last year. The estimates of the department this year are $185,000. But, mind you, gentlemen, that estimate was made at the time we had foot-and-mouth disease in this country, and a number of employees of this division of the department were assigned to the foot-and-mouth disease work; but suddenly the foot-and-mouth disease disappeared. And here comes a supplementary estimate bringing the total up to $360,000. Not because of any new cases of hog cholera, but, by a strange coincidence, the supplementary estimate comes at the heels of the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease.

Are we to infer from that that these people, riding in automobiles, drawing salaries ranging from $1,000 to $2,000 a year, and drawing, in addition, from $1.50 to $5 a day for subsistence, are to be taken care of rather than the hog cholera? Why, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] called attention to the average earnings of the farmer. Think of it! The farmer, with his family, with an average of 4.6 persons, gets $142 in cash every year as the earnings of a family of 4.6 persons; in addition, $260 for food and fuel and house rent. These people receive each $30.87 cash for a year's work, to provide themselves with groceries, clothing, and other necessaries to maintain life. Are they to be taxed with a portion of the $175,000 to give joy rides to certain very excellent people in the employ of the Government and at a time when, according to estimates submitted by the department, there is no need for the appropriation?

Now, gentlemen, if the purpose is to assist the farmer, why not do the practical thing? Why not deal with the farmer in this instance as you did in the case of this blackleg vaccine? Why not manufacture it and distribute it free of cost, or, if not free of cost, at the cost of manufacture?

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman, but I have not much time.

Mr. RUBEY. Is it not a fact that the gentleman from Iowa does not believe that this serum will have the effect of preventing the hog cholera?

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, we have been experimenting with this serum for 15 years, and probably more than that. Many people of this country believe that if it is properly applied it will in many instances——

Mr. RUBEY. I am asking for information.

Mr. HAUGEN. And I am answering the gentleman's question. If properly applied it will in many instances cure or prevent the cholera. Others believe that more hogs have been killed than have been cured. Others believe that the expense incurred, taking into consideration the stunting of the hogs and the expenses of treatment, is greater than the saving.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa may proceed for five minutes more.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. As I started to say, Mr. Chairman, many splendid eulogies have been showered on the farmers, and we have those beautiful declarations in the party platforms respecting the farmer, and we have spellbinders declaring from the stump their great love and admiration for those excellent people. Now, then, if we are to assist them, rather than to provide for automobiles and for these joy rides and these salaries for employees of the department, and $1.50 or $5 in addition as subsistence, and appropriate $360,000, let us do something practical. Let us do something that will be of service and benefit. Let us manufacture this serum. Let us appropriate $150,000 or $200,000 for the construction and equipment of a laboratory. When that money is once appropriated, when that plant is once constructed and equipped, the appropriation will cease, as the plant will be self-sustaining, and we shall have for once disposed of this large appropriation, one of very many.

I propose to offer when the time comes an amendment that I offered here a number of times before, that a certain amount of money be set aside for the construction and equipment of this plant, and that the serum manufactured may be sold at cost. I believe by so doing we can accomplish something. If this serum has any value whatever, it must be a potent serum. Its efficacy depends upon its potency; and we find that at the present time the only complaint from the department is as to the nature of the serum that is being sold. We are appropriating here $175,000 for the supervision of the private plants, and yet we find that the foot-and-mouth disease is being spread through the use of this serum. As I say, if the serum has any value whatever, it depends upon its potency, and in my opinion the only way you can guarantee a potent serum is by this Government manufacturing it under its own supervision, and let it then distribute it; if not free of cost as is being done in other instances, then let it distribute it at cost. That is all I have to say at this time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. LEVER. Now, may I submit a request for unanimous consent that debate——

Mr. MANN. Several gentlemen want to be heard. I should like to remind the gentleman from South Carolina that we used two or more days on a cotton proposition here——

Mr. LEVER. That was on Wednesdays.

Mr. MANN. I know, but Wednesday is just as good as any other day.

Mr. SLOAN. Holier than any other day.

Mr. MANN. Now, when we have a cholera proposition——

Mr. LEVER. I will let the debate drift along for awhile.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the speech of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] was an inspiration. When that sort of speech is indulged in in this House, it is a happy augury for the future. The time will yet come, if it continues, when we of the city and the country will understand each other better.

But, Mr. Chairman, this question of "pork" is extremely appropriate just now. [Laughter.] Some of the gentlemen from the seat of this new pork trouble have recently inveighed against rivers and harbors, but we now hear a voice in opposition to more "pork" in the center of the country, where it seems to be used, not for the eradication of a disease, but for the employment of various agents, who, in the last analysis, "ride around in automobiles," and who after they have had probably 15 or 20 years of Federal service, will probably come to Congress petitioning for pensions on the ground that they ought not to be turned out of the service, to starve in their old age.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Does the gentleman fear that this hog cholera will attack the pork in the river and harbor bill? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Now, just listen to the laughter. Are we laughing at the State of Michigan, which, having taken $50,000,000 of pork out of the river and harbor bill, now desires to see that no other State shall be considered? That is the situation. Having obtained its pork, Michigan does not desire to see any other State obtain any pork for itself. [Laughter.] I am going to give the gentleman from Michigan a real definition of pork. It is an original definition. I gave it to the River and Harbor Congress. Pork, if the gentleman will permit me, is not that which you get for your own river or for your own particular hog cholera, but it is what the other fellow gets for his. [Laughter.] The longer you think about it the more you will find that that is about the essence of the agitation on the subject of "pork."

The gentleman who spoke a few moments ago [Mr. HAUGEN] comes from the State of Iowa, which I understand has been or is the seat of the hog-cholera trouble. Kansas, Nebraska, and some other States around about that section of the country are also involved. Their hogs are inclined to cholera, and they need serum and things, in order that the farmers may send to the great cities a pure food product which we in turn consume, without danger of infection. I glory in the fact that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] is strong enough and bold enough, in the face of an irresistible country constituency, to say that we ought to stop spending money for pork, if in the last analysis a hog-cholera appropriation means the employment of high-salaried scientists to "ride around in automobiles" to tell the farmer what he ought to do.

There is one proviso in this paragraph that I do not quite understand. As I read it, it confirms the statement made by my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]. It is the last proviso—

And provided further, That of said sum not less than $35,000 shall be available for researches concerning the cause, modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention of this disease.

Leave it to the man who is already in on the "pork barrel" to devise a new method of expenditure, and you will find it in just such a proviso as that. The whole paragraph, which at one time, I think, carried $600,000 for meeting a hog-cholera emergency, and which has been reduced to $360,000, although the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] would like to increase it to $410,000—this paragraph provides for investigating the disease of hog cholera; it provides for the control or eradication, by such means as may be necessary, including demonstrations; that is, telling the farmer how to do it, riding up to the place of the man who works on the farm and telling him how to treat his hogs. The investigator provided for in this $35,000 proviso is all covered apparently in the paragraph. The last proviso is not necessary, but we must find a new method of spending $35,000. That keeps the thing going.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I would pit my judgment on matters relating to agriculture against the judgment of the Committee on Agriculture, but I do feel perfectly safe in putting it up against the judgment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], because he and I are on a par in such matters. I want to say, however, that during the vacation last summer we were all at home a good many months, and I took occasion to visit several hog farms around in my county and in my State, and I found that this serum was of real value and real service to the farmers, and the difficulty of which they complained was that they had to pay extortionate prices for it; that they had to go to Oklahoma City—some 90 miles away—to get it, and they hoped some way might be devised so that they would not have to pay so much for it or go so far away to get it. I will say that I am not so very paternalistic in my views, and I do not believe that the Federal Government ought to run around serving the farmer on a silver platter with all the various panaceas for ills, because I believe that destroys the initiative of the farmers. I do not believe it does them much, if any, substantial good; but if some way could be devised by the Agricultural Committee so that they could prevent extortion and could get this serum to the farmers more cheaply and more economically, that is the thing that would be of benefit to the farmer.

Another complaint was made, and I give it to the committee for what it is worth, because I have not given attention to it here in the House at all. That was that the Agricultural Department was spending too much money on tick eradication and for the benefit of the big cattlemen, so called, who were more able to take care of themselves, and that not enough was being spent on the fellow who had a few pigs and a few hogs, who was usually destitute of any means to look after himself or provide himself with all such necessities.

I do not make the complaint myself, nor do I vouch for it, but I confess I was impressed somewhat at the time by the facts presented. The hog industry is a very important one. There is no longer any doubt about the real effectiveness of this serum. Therefore I am glad to see it growing. I am glad to see the Government giving it attention. I have also wondered if the chairman of the committee or the committee itself could not in some way reach the Agricultural Department and put a little more steam behind the hog-cholera proposition.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. LEVER. I will say that if the gentleman will recall, this item has been in the bill only about three years, and this committee has put considerable steam into it to the extent of about $3,000,000.

Mr. FERRIS. I am not criticizing the committee; I have nothing but commendation for the committee. The men who raise hogs say that this serum is a preventive—it is a razor that will shave—and if they can get a brand of this serum at a reasonable rate, they can make money out of raising hogs. It is a matter of deep concern to the farmers. It is so important. I am so glad the committee is dealing with it. It is a matter of concern to the consumer too. Meat is so high in price that we can scarcely pay for it or afford to longer have it. I do not see how a man with a large family on a small wage can sit down in front of a piece of ham or a piece of beefsteak when they have to pay such exorbitant prices. While my good friend from Pennsylvania was delivering his somewhat paternalistic remarks about pork I thought I would rather say something in commendation for the committee in helping the farmer to produce more meat and therefore get it to the consumer more cheaply. [Applause.]

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, the question of hog cholera is one to which I have given close attention as a farmer, and I take considerable pride in the connection that I have had with the growth and development of this legislation. I think perhaps the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] and myself deserve credit for bringing this question prominently before the House after the Agricultural Committee had actually refused to give it attention or to report any appropriation for a campaign of education by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman state what year that was?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. In 1912–13; the bill which carried the very first appropriation that was made for hog-cholera demonstration work by using serum as an agent of control. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] knows that this appropriation was put in the Agricultural bill by an amendment which was offered from the floor of the House after the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] appeared before the Agricultural Committee asking for an appropriation for this purpose and the committee had refused the request. I was at that time chairman of the Committee on Expenditures of the Agricultural Department, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] was a member of that committee. Following the refusal of the Agricultural Committee to act I called Dr. Melvin and Dr. Dorset before our committee, and with the assistance of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] developed this subject very fully. It was the information secured by the hearings before my committee that aroused the country to a full realization of the importance of this work and secured the appropriation by Congress, which was necessary to start the work along the present lines of demonstration.

In the beginning, Dr. Dorset, of the Department of Agriculture, discovered a method of control of hog cholera by vaccinating the hog with virus and with serum—the so-called double method of treatment. The distinguished doctor patented this process and gave the people of the United States the free use of the process. It was found on investigation that the Government, though it had conducted many expensive investigations which led to the discovery of serum and its usefulness as an agent of control, had not attempted any demonstration work to popularize the method, and hence the farmers secured no practical benefit from Dr. Dorset's great labors.

The several State experiment stations took hold of the work and did what they could to introduce it. Our State—the splendid State of Indiana, with its usual foresight and initiative—erected a station for the production of serum.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] is now offering an amendment to this bill that the United States shall manufacture serum and sell it at cost to the people of our Nation. Mr. Chairman, Indiana is a pioneer State in this work. For many years we have maintained a splendid State station for the production of serum and have sold it to the farmers of our State at cost. But even with this splendid service on part of the State no general interest could be built up among the farmers of our State.

I regret to say that among the farmers of our country, taking them as a large productive class, a great many are not as alert and well educated along lines of economical management as are business men. Before the new method could come into general use it was necessary to have some demonstration work by the General Government. It was this phase which was overlooked by the Agriculture Committee in their failure to appropriate to start this work. I do not wish to criticize the Committee on Agriculture. Under its present chairman and with its present membership it is one of the strongest committees of the House, and one which always is liberal in its appropriations for any purpose which can be proven to be worthy. It is my confidence in this committee which shall cause me to vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas to increase the amount carried in this item.

As a result of the investigation had by my committee, we secured an appropriation in 1913 of $75,000, available after July 1 of that year, to demonstrate the efficiency of Dr. Dorset's method to control hog cholera. This work has been under way less than three years. What have been the results? I have the official figures from Hendricks County, in my district. The work in this area did not begin until September 11, 1914, and hence has been in actual operation less than two years. I will give the official report for this period and the comparative data for the three years immediately preceding. The result is impressive and most abundantly vindicates this work.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY,
Danville, Ind., April 7, 1916.

Hon. RALPH W. MOSS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of the 4th instant received and contents noted.

Will say that the first duty was to take a survey and get an organization. This was done by sending cards to the 2,500 farmers in Hendricks County, and the results of this information is tabulated on the sheet herewith. It is evident from the farmers' reports that three years prior to our coming they had lost on an average of 18 per cent of all the hogs raised, and that after opening this station for active operation on September 11, 1914, and treating hogs for the balance of the year, the death rate dropped to 6 per cent of all the hogs raised in 1914, and with the whole year's work in 1915 it dropped to 3 per cent, including hogs where local veterinarians treated. You will notice a large increase in the number of hogs raised, 21,250, in 1915 over any preceding year. This is due to this fact: We asked a great number of farmers if they had more hogs this year, 1915, than they had last year, 1914, and every one answered in the affirmative. We asked them to give us their reason for raising more hogs, and they replied by saying, "We had less cholera and a small death rate where you treated in our neighborhood last fall after you came than we had had for a number of years, and we understand that you are to be here another year, 1915, so I saved an extra gilt or two for brood sows." This is the way that we account for the increase in hogs in 1915, 21,250, over any preceding year. It is always safe to judge the future by the past. They had lost an average of 18 per cent of all the hogs raised for three years prior to our coming. They no doubt would have lost 18 per cent of all the hogs raised in 1915, which would have been 19,297, but they did lose 3,216. We made a saving, then, of 16,081. Add to this the increase which was 21,250, making a total of 37,331, at $10 per head, we have $373,310 saved in sick herds. Knowing the amount of serum used, the number of hogs treated, and our fixed scale per pound whereby we administer serum, the average market value of the hogs when treated exceeded $10, and this did not include a great many valuable brood animals. We must figure that the unit base of the United States is the individual; and that the investment that the Federal Government has given to this unit basis, or the farmer, shows a saving or an earning upon every dollar invested by the Federal Government $28 in pork to the farmer. You no doubt know that we treat in nothing but herds affected with hog cholera. As above stated, there are 2,500 farmers in this county, and 247 got the entire investment from the Federal Government except the knowledge disseminated to them through our campaign of education. We have held in this county since our coming 89 educational meetings, stereopticon and chart lectures, and had present 9,020. Of all the herds treated in 1915, 70 per cent of the farmers said that they had not attended any of our educational meetings. We feel that from this campaign of education that we carried on in 1914 and 1915, that a great number of the 2,253 men kept their hogs from having cholera by following our advice. It is easy enough to estimate the good in dollars and cents in the herds where we have treated, but that is but a small per cent of the great amount of good done here. The modes of carrying cholera are well understood by the farmers in general in this county, and the results of this educational campaign will last for years.

Trusting that the above data will be satisfactory to you, and that you will be able to use same to your advantage, I remain,

Very respectfully,

G. N. WICKWIRE,
Inspector in Charge.

Hog-cholera control in Hendricks County, Ind., from Sept. 11, 1914, to Dec. 31, 1915.

	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915
Hogs raised	66,439	66,259	77,211	85,955	107,205
Hogs lost	11,436	13,532	12,908	5,190	3,216
Per cent loss	17	20	17	6	3
Infested farms	509	603	575	461	247

But these gains are in reality but a small part of the entire value of this demonstration work. We have educated the public and have popularized this method of control and brought it into general use. This has resulted in private capital and private enterprise going in the business of manufacturing and selling serum to the farmers of every section of our country. The Government is confining its demonstration, it is true, to small areas; but private initiative is carrying the same methods into all our territory, so that everybody—both producers and consumers—are benefiting alike from this demonstration work.

These figures compare closely with those submitted by Mr. HELVERING, of Kansas, and thus confirms their entire accuracy. The loss from cholera in this area fell from an average of 17 per cent of the entire number of hogs grown to 3 per cent within less than two years. At the same time the number of hogs grown increased from 85,955 in 1914 to 107,205 in 1915. The same results are true if all the areas under control by the Government be combined. The general results are that wherever these demonstrations have taken place the loss by hog cholera has fallen off on an average from 17 per cent down to 2 or 3 per cent, and at the same time the number of hogs in that same area has increased 25 or 30 per cent. Thus we have to-day perhaps 100 private plants in the United States producing hog serum. We have educated the public and the practitioners of veterinary science until there is scarcely a farmer in the United States who is not well acquainted with this method of control.

Now, for every farmer to whom the Agricultural Department gives free serum in this demonstration work there are ten thousand who pay for it out of their own pockets; and for every hog that is protected by this work of the Government of the United States there are many thousands protected by farmers at their own expense. No man can stand on the floor of the House and point to a dollar in any appropriation bill which yields so great a return to the people of the United States. All I wish to ask of the Congress of the United States is to continue this necessary work long enough to demonstrate two things: First, that pure and potent serum, proper sanitation, and skilled supervision make it possible to grow hogs profitably and to escape the ravages of hog cholera. When that result is finally determined I shall consent to striking this appropriation from this bill; but we can not do it in three years. It has been stated truly by Judge BOOHER, of Missouri, that some years hog cholera is worse than others. I had one expert tell me that it comes in cycles of seven years; that in any locality you would find hog cholera a great deal worse than it had been in other years.

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

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. This experiment has been running three years, and it has had the effect to stimulate the private manufacture of serum until we now have approximately 100 plants. It has stimulated and encouraged the use of serum until farmers are buying liberally from private sources and are hiring veterinary surgeons to give this treatment to their herds. In every area that is protected the production of hogs has been largely increased and the loss largely decreased.

Now, as to the proposition advanced by my friend from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] that the Government manufacture serum, I want to call his attention to the fact that in Indiana, where we have been producing serum by our own State, we have been unable to meet the demand, and the great majority of our farmers are forced to purchase from private manufacturers. If the State can not supply the demand, I do not believe the Nation will be more successful. In the end, if this method is to be generally introduced, we must encourage private capital to enter the field and to produce this remedy.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I will.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman has taken credit for this legislation, but I wish to call his attention to the fact that an item was carried in the bill for 15 years—carried in a lump-sum appropriation—and I think it carried $600,000, and every dollar available for hog cholera. Now, I wish to ask the gentleman is it not a fact that the appropriation made for the joy riders was stricken from the bill a year ago largely at the suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I did not quite catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is it not a fact that the appropriation made for the joy riders to lecture to empty seats was stricken out of the bill a year ago at the suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I am glad to say that "the gentleman from Indiana," so far as he has had any influence over the appropriation of public money has never favored the expenditure of a dollar that the public did not get 100 cents in return. [Applause.] On such questions I am glad to say that I generally find myself, either in committee or in the House, standing by the side of the gentleman from Iowa.

The question of private manufacture and sale of virus and serum brings the question of control or supervision so as to guarantee not only the potency, but also the purity, of these fluids. Our unfortunate experience with virus which contained the germs of the foot-and-mouth disease brings that question up at the present time. Can farmers be assured that they will be sold serum from private plants in this country which will be pure and potent? If the gentleman from Iowa had set himself to this task, which is one worthy of his concededly great ability, I would have been glad to assist him in any possible manner. If that can be guaranteed by the Department of Agriculture, then we have no need whatsoever for any great central plant in the United States.

How did it happen that we got contaminated virus? It came like a thief in the night. There was no one who suspected the presence of the foot-and-mouth disease in the United States at that time. This disease attacks hogs. Virus is taken from a hog that is sick from cholera. It happened that certain hogs were attacked by foot-and-mouth disease and cholera at the same time. As no one had reason to suspect foot-and-mouth disease the error was easily made and virus was taken from hogs sick with cholera and which had also at the same time the foot-and-mouth disease, and in that way virus was obtained which was infected with the germs of foot-and-mouth disease. That could not have happened if the Department of Agriculture had known of the presence of the foot-and-mouth disease in the United States. I am glad to be able to say that by a very careful study lasting less than a year the Department of Agriculture has an infallible method of testing the serum and can at once tell whether it is pure or impure. If that be true, and I believe it is, then the Department of Agriculture has absolutely swept aside all real difficulty of private manufacture of virus and serum, and all we have to do is to give them the power of general regulation and supervision over the manufacture and sale of serum. We have no need to appropriate huge sums to erect Government plants, as is proposed by the gentleman from Iowa. If the committee is supported in its wise and patriotic recommendations, we will speedily settle this most difficult question, and I shall look for this appropriation to pass from the Agricultural appropriation bill within less than five years from the present date. I should say that an experiment running 8 or 10 years would be sufficient to settle the whole question and that it is not a matter which is going to hang on during the lifetime of any living man; but adopt the proposal of the gentleman from Iowa and you will enter upon a new field of governmental activity, which will constantly grow and which can never end.

Mr. Chairman, I shall close by asking permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD by placing therein the figures given to me from the hog-cholera station in Hendricks County, Ind., for I would like to show that splendid progress which this work has made in my State, which only confirms what my friend from Kansas has said, and is another one of the many evidences that this money has been well spent. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] now having acquired for his district all of the hog products distributed under the river and harbor appropriation bill would like to prevent any distribution elsewhere. Having grabbed the biggest ham he proposes to deny the farmers of the Middle West even a sparerib. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Pennsylvania, of course, is a remarkable man. He has just flushed or rinsed out the creek known as the Delaware that runs in front of his door with an appropriation of something over $2,700,000 from the National Treasury.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Not just now. I have too good a subject to dispose of, and I want to finish it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to furnish transportation to get the farmers' products to the markets. I am for the farmer.

Mr. SLOAN. And he now announces through his organ, the Philadelphia Inquirer, the fact that, having obtained this munificent appropriation, Philadelphia is now ready to receive a new post-office building. After this Government has invested $6,115,143.49 from time to time in a public building and site in that city they would like to have a new post-office building. They are now ready to receive one, we are told. Yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] rises in holy horror at the thought of the farmers having this pittance allowed to them. Note the modest statement from the Inquirer:

TIME FOR A NEW POST-OFFICE BUILDING.

The time has arrived when Philadelphia should have a new post-office building, and Postmaster Thornton urges the business men of the city to send a delegation to Washington to present the claims of the city to the proper congressional committee.

Calling attention to the history of the legislation, I fear the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture on the minority side has not his dates on straight.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman intimate that all of the hogs are not on the Iowa farms?

Mr. SLOAN. As a matter of pride, I am not prepared to admit that all of the hogs are in Iowa.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I mean in the West.

Mr. SLOAN. Oh, we have some very promising shotes in other parts of the United States. [Laughter.] They may develop some wonderful hams and shoulders. I say this on account of the way they take the generous donations in the river and harbor appropriation bill to wash out the little streams in the lower Atlantic and Gulf States. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Dorset discovered about 10 years ago—in 1906, I think—the serum, which was then the first effective remedy or preventive this country found with which to combat the greatest constant economic loss agriculture has had in America for the last 50 years. Yet for six or seven full years, if I have the dates correctly—from 1906 to 1913—not a single dollar was specially appropriated by this Government to put in operation and press upon the attention of the people this serum, that we now know to be effective.

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

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Will the gentleman tell us why no appropriation was made?

Mr. SLOAN. I do not know. I was not in Congress until 1911; but this I do know: Coming in as a new Member and a minority Member, and having some time on my hands and having regard for the great economic loss that was going on in the States in my section of the country, the great Northwest, I put in a great deal of time studying this particular problem. After I had studied it and gathered together all of the facts that I could from all sources, both as to loss and the history of the disease, and the question of whether this remedy would be effective, I went before the Committee on Agriculture, which at that time had a different chairman from the one who now presides over its deliberations. He was one of the most lovable characters I ever met, one of the best men we ever had in the House, but, unfortunately, he had a rigid prejudice against this proposition. When I went before that committee and asked for an appropriation for this purpose it was denied.

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

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLOAN. When the proposition was wholly denied I asked leave to bring Dr. Melvin and Dr. Dorset before the committee to give testimony as to these investigations which had been made and the facts I had to present. I was refused that privilege. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss], who early took a deep and active interest in this matter, was at that time chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department, and of which I was a member. We induced that committee to take up the subject and took the testimony of Dr. Melvin and Dr. Dorset. Having obtained that evidence and it having been printed and having gone to the country, we took it before the Committee on Agriculture and were again met by a rebuff from the then chairman. But I want to say as a matter of justice, looking at this enterprise, which the Government has entered upon and which is well on the way to success, that credit to a large extent should be given to the present chairman of that committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], who at that time was the ranking majority member on that committee. He rose in his place and insisted that that committee should make an appropriation for the purpose of fighting hog cholera. [Applause.]

Further credit is due to a number of Members then on the committee and who are still members of that great standing committee and who are doing a great work in behalf of agriculture for the whole country. And, to be more explicit, pleading economy, he suggested $30,000. We thought that was not enough. My bill called for $100,000. Finally the committee announced if there would not be a fight on the floor of the House the committee would grant $45,000. It went through in that form in the House. A member of the committee, a Member from my own State, was directed to present the amendment in the House. The amendment was presented formally, it became a part of the Agricultural bill, passed, and went to the Senate. The Senate raised it to $100,000. In conference it was reduced to $75,000, and $75,000 was the first money that was ever appropriated for that specific purpose to combat the hog cholera.

Mr. RUBEY. If the gentleman will permit, I will state that the date of the approval of the bill was March 4, 1913.

Mr. SLOAN. Whatever the date may be; probably that is the date. I accept the gentleman's statement if he has looked it up. Now, the proposition was to go into the great swine-producing States and establish areas where they would have an opportunity to demonstrate the efficacy of this serum when properly administered; and further not only to demonstrate but to develop the methods of combating—because it is not alone a matter of applying the serum, but it is a matter of proper quarantine against its spread. That is one of the most difficult features. And so in four States there were stations established. In my own State they did not get under way the first year—1913—but they selected an area composed of one small county and half of a large county, and in those two counties, now, for two or three years they have established areas, and the results are beyond expectations.

True, it looks as if the Government was clearing up hog cholera over these particular areas. But if that were the only purpose it would not be fair, because every county in the United States would be entitled to the same privilege as the counties selected. But that is not the real value. The real value is this: The Government, in whom people have confidence, places a man in charge who is given control of an area, and and he works out the various problems. There are a great many, not alone the administering of the serum, but working out problems showing what the effect of the administering the serum had upon the young, whether it will injure them, and what effect, if any, will it have upon the second generation. All of those things had to be worked out, and they are being worked out very satisfactorily in our State. The next year we made a more generous appropriation, providing for demonstrations in 16 States. The figures presented by Mr. HELVERING, of Kansas, show the result. But those figures do not show the large result. The large result lies in the fact that demonstrations in a central point are being made, and, the United States leading the campaign, it drives into activity the State authorities. Every veterinarian throughout the State becomes interested because there are inquiries about it and demands for his action. He learns these methods. He keeps in close touch with the activities of these various areas. Every veterinarian in all those States is interested in doing this work most effectively.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SLOAN. I do.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman states this experiment station was inaugurated, one or more, in the State of Nebraska.

Mr. SLOAN. In one area. A demonstration area, rather than one of experiment.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. In one or two counties.

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. To what extent does the State of Nebraska appropriate for the help of this work of educating the people in the matter of serum and its application and the stop of the spread of the hog cholera? Has the State made any appropriation?

Mr. SLOAN. It has. I think a year ago I submitted a statement of the contributions of the various States. But I will say the State of Nebraska has appropriated and expended three or four times as much as the Government has expended in Nebraska. It has become cooperative and is very successful. For instance, Nebraska the year past reduced its loss, which has been for 10 years an average of nearly 8 per cent, to 5 per cent, which is a very large factor when we come to consider the very large annual loss.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. I will.

Mr. BOOHER. That reduction of the percentage of loss in the gentleman's State, was it caused from the fact the gentleman has in one of his counties this demonstration work or because the disease was not so bad in the State that year?

Mr. SLOAN. First the county or the two counties within the area almost entirely knocked out hog cholera, so far as that factor would tend to reduce it. A large part, however, was the general activity that was inspired by this working area throughout the State. We have a number of county agents, and those county agents became very active in working it out and following out and explaining to up-to-date farmers and others interested the proper methods to be pursued. I know what is in the mind of the gentleman from Missouri. I want to state this: One county adjoining Gage, which is in the area, has perhaps the largest loss this last year that it has had in a great many years because it refused to follow the suggestion and lead of the Government and State authorities working in the Gage County area.

So I am satisfied of this, that Nebraska, had it not been for this plant and these activities that were started, would have had instead of a decrease an increase to report to the country.

Mr. BOOHER. I dislike to take the gentleman's time, but I would like to ask him another question. Does not the gentleman think it would be better to use all this money in laboratory work and inspection of serum plants and serum and virus throughout the country, so that the people may have better serum and better virus? Would not that be better than this demonstration work?

Mr. SLOAN. I do not think so. You are working to save the farmer, but you are also working for the larger result of making uniform the production of pork, so that the consumer will ultimately get the benefit of it.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman what are these experiment stations? What is the purpose of them and what is the procedure?

Mr. SLOAN. The Bureau of Animal Industry, in the Department of Agriculture, makes, through the advice and cooperation with the governor or other authorities of the State, the selection of an area. That is usually a county, and that county is taken as a laboratory for demonstration of the means and methods of clearing the area of hog cholera. So, having worked along the lines that are approved, and being able to present results that are satisfactory, they can say, and say with authority, to the other counties and communities throughout the State: "This is the course that we followed in the application of the serum; this is the course we followed in preventing it from being carried from one place to another; this is the course we followed with reference to old hogs and young hogs and hogs under various conditions, and these are the results."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska may have five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLOAN. The results have been really marvelous.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman refers to them as experiment stations.

Mr. SLOAN. If I used the word "experiment," I did not intend it. It is "demonstration."

Mr. MANN. The gentleman used the word "experiment" a number of times.

Mr. LEVER. I think he used it in reference to the matter of serum at stations.

Mr. MANN. It is not experiment.

Mr. LEVER. It is demonstration.

Mr. SLOAN. So far as the serum is concerned that is past, but so far as the effects are concerned it is a matter of some experiment.

Mr. CULLOP. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if it is not quite as important to educate the farmer as to how to treat the disease and keep the animal from getting it as to treat the animal after he has the cholera?

Mr. SLOAN. It certainly is. I have stated the result. It is the result that the American people are after. You have your high-priced meat, beef and mutton, but the real poor man's meat is pork. It furnishes him the meat in bulk. It furnishes gravy, a substitute for butter, and it furnishes on the poor man's table more of the means of subsistence than any other class of meat or food.

Mr. HELVERING. Is it not a fact that from all over the State of Nebraska—I know it is in Kansas—come requests through these demonstrators in the country for information as to how they shall proceed in the work they are doing?

Mr. SLOAN. That is true, because I have kept in close touch with this demonstration area all the time since it was inaugurated, and I know that is the case. I know this, that, outside of the demonstration, these men who are at work are daily advising with veterinarians and the farm agents and the farmers themselves, so that the veterinarians and farmers and farm agents are becoming efficient in the matter of combating hog cholera, so that results are coming and better results will continue to come if this Congress will give the means and the opportunity to continue in the work.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman tell us how many of these demonstration stations there are in the United States?

Mr. SLOAN. I understand that there are 16, in 16 different States.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. I will.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Does the gentleman think the amount provided in the bill is sufficient for the coming year?

Mr. SLOAN. If it were left to me I would increase the amount. But still it is a rather generous sum, and, all things considered, the hog raisers of this country will have to be reasonable in demands on the Government.

Mr. LEVER. May I call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that the appropriation carried in this bill is $175,000 more than was estimated for by the department and $105,000 more than is being used by the department? I think the committee has been very liberal.

Mr. GARNER. And in that connection I would like to ask, if it carries more than the department thinks can be used is it not likely to be wasted?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. In that connection, it ought to be said that the department is not entirely friendly to continuing the experiments in areas which have been selected. I think the gentleman from Nebraska will bear me out in this statement.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman whether this appropriation, if it goes into this bill, is not to be used for demonstration work but is for the purpose of providing a test laboratory for serum?

Mr. SLOAN. I do not understand that this item that I have been talking about is for that purpose.

Mr. HAUGEN. Not a dollar is intended for a laboratory.

Mr. MANN. It is available for that purpose, and that is what the Secretary asks it for, and I have no doubt that is what it will be used for.

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. How can you spend $175,000 to carry out the act with reference to serums except to establish a station that the Secretary estimates will cost $150,000 a year for maintenance? How else can you spend the money?

Mr. HAUGEN. Here is what the bill says——

Mr. MANN. Oh, I understand what the bill says. That is what is intended.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I make the same request, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to find out if we can not reach an agreement as to closing up the time. Does the gentleman from Iowa want 5 or 10 minutes?

Mr. HAUGEN. I would like to discuss my own amendment, but I do not want time on this amendment. I want five minutes on my own amendment.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on the paragraph and the pending amendment be closed in 40 minutes. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] says to me he may need 10 minutes. I will modify my request, Mr. Chairman, by making it 50 minutes. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we may then proceed. I do not want to unduly rush this debate, but we want to make progress.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and the pending amendment close in 50 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLINE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CLINE. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, that I shall take the entire five minutes. However, in the language so often used by my distinguished friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] "in the last analysis," certain facts are well established. If I remember the hearings on this bill, Dr. Dorset and Dr. Melvin both testified that good serum, such as the Government puts out, would last as a good serum for a year. The testimony also discloses the fact that the vicious serum that was sold throughout the country was manufactured by private concerns.

Now, if that be true, it seems to me that the Government ought in some way to take charge of the manufacture and have supervision over the manufacture and distribution of serum. Hog products and beef products, Mr. Chairman, constitute one of the largest, if not the largest, export item of this country, amounting to $150,000,000 annually.

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

Mr. CLINE. Certainly.

Mr. RUBEY. I will say for the information of the gentleman that a bill has been prepared and reported by the Committee on Agriculture providing that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have complete authority to investigate and regulate every factory of serum where the product goes into interstate commerce in the United States.

Mr. CLINE. Well, that bill ought to pass, in my opinion. Mr. Chairman, if that is done, it will, of course, take out of the market improper serum.

Another question, raised by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]——

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point for a moment?

Mr. CLINE. Certainly.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I represent one of the very largest agricultural districts, I think, in the United States, where the hog and cattle industries are the leading agricultural industries, and our farmers are afraid to use the serum to-day, because they fear it will give the animals disease rather than prevent it.

Mr. CLINE. That will be overcome if the Government undertakes the manufacture of serum and puts its O. K. on the serum that is put out on the market by private manufacturers.

Now, in reference to what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has said regarding the expense of administering this serum, I want to call attention to the fact that in my section of the country the farmers are absolutely posted on this question. Every veterinarian in that country knows how to administer that serum, and has taken short courses, for instance, in Perdue University, in my State, to become acquainted with the best methods of administering this preventive.

It is also disclosed by the hearings that the serum manufactured by the Government is not only a cure but a preventive of the disease. If that is true, it is one of the strongest arguments why the manufacture and distribution of the serum should be placed in the hands of the Government, so that if a farmer could purchase a quantity sufficient to last him a year at cost price he would be amply provided with protection against the hog cholera.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say, with reference to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] increasing by a considerable amount this item of appropriation, that the committee gave a great deal of time to this matter, with no disposition whatever to limit the amount except as it could be properly used by the department, and we believe the amount we have recommended, $360,000, is all the department needs, and all it can use profitably.

As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] said, there is about $45,000 now in the Treasury as a part of an old appropriation available for use in addition to the $360,000 appropriated here, if that amount be appropriated.

Now, as to the work that has been carried on, about 15 counties in the United States were selected, and special work was done within those counties. They have been demonstration areas. The work has been intensified there. The experts of the Bureau of Animal Industry have worked in each county in cooperation with the officials of the State, carrying on the work, and a part of that work was to give the best kind of instruction to the officials of the State, so that when the Department of Agriculture has done what it ought to do, when money from the Federal Treasury has been appropriated to a reasonable amount and the proper officials in the States have been given instruction in this way, they may be able themselves later on to go through the State and do the work for the State just as well as the work could be done in cooperation with the officials of the department.

In many of the counties of the State there are county agents, and the money for their employment is provided under the Lever law, which is a graduated law, the amount available for the work being larger as years go by until the law matures. Under those appropriations, in a very few years county agents will be employed throughout the country and there will be farm agents in almost every county. Almost every county in each State will be supplied; and it seems to me that after the officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry have gone into a State and carried on for a year this intensive work in one county, and after the officials of the State, working in cooperation with them, have had an opportunity to learn all the secrets of the business, and just how to carry it on, they ought to be able, in cooperation with and with the assistance of the county agents, to do this work without the further assistance of the officials of the Department of Agriculture.

The sum of $175,000 is recommended in this clause of the bill for additional and better inspection of factories in which serum is made, a very important and necessary work; and I believe if the work is properly carried on, the danger of the manufacture and use of impotent or impure serum will largely be removed, and when the education is extended the county agent can use the serum safely, and later the farmers themselves can use the serum safely. The amount provided by the bill is, in my judgment, large enough; the amendment ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I am as much in favor of this appropriation as any man on this floor. I think I was among the first to introduce a bill asking the Committee on Agriculture to make an appropriation of $250,000 for this work. I am not in favor of the division of the funds, as has been set out in this bill. I think it is time to stop this demonstration work and to use the money for the purpose of the most thorough inspection of every serum plant in the United States where the serum goes into interstate commerce, and where it is only to be used in the State the State ought to provide for such an examination of the serum plant and such an examination of the manufactured product that when the man who wants to use it goes and buys it he will know he is getting a pure material. That will be of far more benefit to the people at large than the taking of one county in a State and demonstrating there year after year how to use this serum.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. Most of the States have laws requiring their veterinary service to inspect these serums and to prohibit from sale any that are not up to the standard. We have such a law in Indiana.

Mr. BOOHER. Nearly every hog-raising State has a manufacturing plant at the State agricultural college. They have it in Iowa and we have it in Missouri, and I am informed that they have it in Ohio. Now, they examine their serum, and it is supposed to be perfect; but, in addition to the examination made by the State authorities, I would have a thorough examination made by competent men representing the Government when that serum is to go into commerce for the country.

Hog cholera does not come every year. I have had more or less acquaintance with it for 46 years. Sometimes in a large community every hog in one neighborhood will die and other surrounding farms will not lose a single hog during that epidemic. During another year it attacks another community, and so it goes, but scarcely ever two years in the same community in succession. It is a good deal like smallpox. If the vaccine is good, you will not have smallpox. If your serum is good, you will not have hog cholera.

The idea is that this money ought to be spent for the express purpose of getting pure serum. There are four serum manufacturing plants in my district, and all four of them are under the jurisdiction of the national inspection service; and I want to say to you that they are inspected, and the Government had a hard time with one or two of those fellows to get them to do right, but they finally saw they had to do it or go out of business. That is what you want everywhere in the country.

There are so many farmers here who know all about this that I feel at some loss to talk about it, but I do not believe that three-fourths of the gentlemen who have spoken, with all their investigation of this subject, know how to administer this serum

or which end of the hog it is administered to. They do not know the difference between virus and serum.

Mr. OVERMYER. But you do think that when they are talking about pork, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] did yesterday, it is about time that the swine are getting some of the pork.

Mr. BOOHER. I am in favor of the pork that is made out of the carcass of a hog, and I am not in favor of the yellow journals of this country or the men who talk about pork in a river and harbor bill.

Now, gentlemen, the hog product of this country is not decreasing. Notwithstanding we have hog cholera nearly every fall in different sections of this country, the hog product is not decreasing. In my district is the fourth largest packing industry and live-stock industry in this country. I picked up my home paper this morning and glanced over that item, and in the city of St. Joseph, at the stockyards there, since the 1st day of January, 1916, they have slaughtered 663,278 hogs. Just a year ago in the same time they had slaughtered 537,018 hogs, showing an increase for the corresponding period in 1916 of 126,260 hogs. And what is true at St. Joseph is true of Omaha, is true of Kansas City, and is true of Chicago.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word with reference to this appropriation, and what I say is largely founded upon personal experience. The lack of knowledge and the ignorance that obtain throughout this country with reference to the remedy provided by this serum and virus occasions a great deal of objection to its use. For the purpose of explaining that, I want to state to the committee something of the manner of its use. Demonstrations have shown conclusively that the best time for the administration of the remedy is when the pig weighs about 60 pounds.

There are two separate elements that go into the remedy. One is called the virus, the other the serum. One of these inoculates the pig with hog cholera. The other is in the nature of a preventive, which in some measure overcomes the effects of the virus that creates the disease in the pig. The two remedies are introduced simultaneously by hypodermic injection. The result is that the animal gets a mild case of hog cholera, but by reason of the serum, which counteracts the virus, it is not fatal nor really serious. After its recovery, which takes a week or 10 days, that pig is for life immune from hog cholera.

The trouble in the first instance was that neither the veterinarians nor the farmers knew the proper proportion of the two remedies to give, and in many cases they gave more of the virus than the serum would overcome, and the hog died of cholera. In other instances they did not give a sufficient quantity of virus as against the serum to inoculate the hog with cholera, and as a result it was not immune. Because of the failure occasioned in this way hogs continued to contract hog cholera after the remedy had been administered, and the farmers set up the cry that there was nothing to the remedy.

There are many people in the world who do not believe that the world moves. There are many people who are opposed to vaccination for smallpox and for typhoid. There are many people who resent any change or any new remedies. There are a great many people who have seen practical demonstrations of what they call the inefficiency of the remedy, and it has given many farmers of the Middle West the opinion that the remedy is not efficient.

The demonstrators provided for by the appropriations go to the area and teach the farmers not only within the immediate area but farmers of the vicinity, first, the proper amount of the two remedies to use. Next they teach the farmers by results that the remedy is efficient, and when they convince these farmers that it is efficient the prejudice against it is removed.

You will find in every community some one or some farmer who says that there is nothing to the remedy; that it has been proved to be valueless and he will not use it. Your answer is that if you want your hogs to die, do not use it. But that is not the danger. The farmer who does not use it, even though his herd is small, will bring cholera into the whole neighborhood and endanger the herds of all the other farmers in that community.

The demonstrators are doing two things: First, clearing the area in which they work of the dreaded disease, and next, showing the farmers that this remedy is efficient. The chart shown the other day by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEPHENS] shows that hogs are the only meat animals in America that have increased in numbers, and one reason that the number of hogs and the quantity of pork in this country has advanced instead of decreased, as have cattle and sheep, is that there has got out into the United States a remedy for hog cholera. [Applause.]

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Nebraska, who has just taken his seat, as to the treatment and precautionary action to be taken in reference to the spread of the disease of hog cholera, and the importance of it, and that it is probably worthy of greater consideration than most of the people of the country conceive. Every year the farmers of the United States are losing, on an average, $65,000,000 worth of hogs from death by hog cholera alone. This is an enormous sum. There is probably no other legitimate business in the country which each year sustains as great a loss as the farmers do from the hog cholera without becoming bankrupt. And yet, notwithstanding this enormous loss, the farmers continue the business of hog raising.

Now, it is not only important for the manufacture of serum for the cure of the disease, if cure is possible, but it is most important to educate the farmers how to prevent the disease from being disseminated in localities where it occurs, and that can only be done by a circulation of literature treating the subject, or by men who are experts in the treatment of the disease going among the people lecturing in order to educate them how to handle the disease when it breaks out, and how to eradicate it. The result of the work so far done clearly demonstrates it can be done. But interest among farmers must be aroused so they will take advantage of the means afforded in order to cooperate with the Government in carrying on the splendid work it is doing in this regard.

One farmer in a neighborhood who is opposed to the treatment proposed, who has no confidence in the success of the treatment, may be the cause of having inoculated every herd in his neighborhood with the disease of hog cholera. Many farmers have been so outrageously imposed on by fake remedies on the markets that they are discouraged, and have but little faith in all proposed remedies.

Now, the treatment used by the Government has been successful, as the reports of the Government clearly demonstrate. I am going to take an instance in my own State—the State of Indiana. I will take the county of Hendricks, where a demonstration station has been carried on for more than a year. In 1912 in that county they raised 63,259 hogs. There died from hog cholera alone 13,532 hogs. The loss was 204 to every 1,000 raised from the disease of cholera alone. In 1913 in that county they raised 72,211 hogs, and there died from hog cholera alone 12,908, a loss per 1,000 of 178.

They commenced the demonstrating work there under Dr. Wickwire on September 3, 1914. During the year 1914 in that county they raised 85,955 hogs. The number that died from hog cholera was 4,065, or a loss per 1,000 from hog cholera alone of 42.

Here was a saving of 66⅔ per cent as the result of the demonstrational work carried on in that county by Dr. Wickwire, the gentleman who had charge of this demonstration station. In that county he saved by his work of education and treatment $200,000 to the farmers of Hendricks County. [Applause.]

Now, in view of this fact, does anyone doubt the advisability of not only continuing the work but also expanding it? Does not the result of this work clearly establish its importance and establish its value to the public?

It is not the treatment of the afflicted swine which is so essential, but the organization of the farmers to prevent against its outbreak and the eradication of it when it occurs. If interest can be aroused among farmers so they will organize to prevent the occurrence of the disease—its spread when it does occur—this can best be accomplished by the dissemination of literature, public lectures, and practical demonstration. They have in many localities become skeptical on this matter because of the fake remedies which have been placed on the markets—remedies with no merit whatever. This difficulty, however, has been practically eliminated by legislation which prevents the sale of such products; and now this difficulty, which has embarrassed this work, has been obviated—we hope it has been entirely so. All remedies placed on the market should be inspected and tested, and such only as have merit should be permitted to be sold; all others should be prohibited, and if any such are sold the parties guilty of so doing should be severely punished.

Conditions regarding the meat supply of the country are such that every reasonable effort available should be employed to conserve the supply in order to protect the country against a meat famine. The supply of meat product does not increase yearly, but the population to consume the supply does increase yearly; and hence the necessity for the encouragement of the industry is apparent. If the dangers incident to the industry are removed, or even lessened, the supply will necessarily increase and the industry grow, because of the profits necessarily accruing to those who engage in it. The importance of this matter, therefore, can not be treated otherwise than serious, as it is a question in which all are vitally interested.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of the hog industry as well as the cattle and other industries in Texas. I have mixed around over the world and seen a good deal of distress growing out of hog cholera. I remember a number of years ago staying all night at a modest farm home in Illinois, the county where Springfield is situated. I remember the next morning the gentleman of the house and his laborers hauled out the last of 22 big, fine specimens of hogs which had died of cholera, and under the law of the State as I recollect it, they had to cremate them.

And I remember the good farm wife stating that that meant that her boy had to be called home from college, because those 22 hogs represented, as the man said, all of his surplus corn and cash, it having been fed to his hogs, and now they were in the cremation pit. I remember staying all night in another place in Illinois, about two years later, when three farmers who had pooled themselves together in a hog-feeding process, and I saw them haul off the last of 62 hogs with similar consequences. I remember staying all night in Collin County, Tex., about 17 years ago and seeing the good farmer haul to the cremation pit, or to the ditch where they were to be buried under the rules in that State, the last of thirty-odd big fine hogs. Sixty-odd million dollars of wealth goes into the death pits through hog cholera in a year, and yet our friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], moans and groans over the hog death and seems to be opposed to trying to cure it, because they still die. My God, we have been trying to cure the diseases of humanity for 6,000 years, and yet they still die, but we do not give up the doctors because humanity still dies.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I stated that we have a number of people who have experimented and demonstrated and that many people believe in the efficiency of the serum and that others do not. The only difference between the gentleman and myself is that the gentleman favors the joy ride, while I propose to set aside $150,000 for the construction, equipment, and maintenance of a plant, and thereby make it possible for the farmer to procure a potent serum.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I am not in favor of giving up a gracious good remedy simply because somebody rides in an automobile. My doctor comes to see my family in an automobile, but I am not raising any row about it. I believe the remedy ought to be applied. I believe it is one of the very best methods, and the hope of this situation is in preventing the disease rather than in curing it. I am one of those who believe that as long as there is an ignorant or uneducated boy in a community there is an element of danger in that community. I am one of those who believe that as long as there is a fellow in the community who refuses to treat his hogs, and allows them to contaminate the other hogs in a community, there is an element of danger there, and I want to make these demonstrations so complete that even the wayfarer, though he come from Iowa, will understand and realize the truth of it.

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

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MANN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. MANN. I desire to offer an amendment, but I shall be glad to defer to the gentleman from Kansas. He has already had 10 or 15 minutes, but I like to listen to him.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Chairman, I shall try to confine my remarks to five minutes. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has mentioned on several occasions the joy rides taken by the experts sent out by the Department of Agriculture to these various counties. I do not know whether the fact that service given by men who go from place to place in an automobile in less time than it would take to go otherwise is joy riding or not, but I do know this, that more farmers have been served in Marshall County, Kans., because these experts are able to ride over the county in a Ford automobile and not being compelled to use a team and wagon. The fact is that I have known these men in Marshall County to be out late at night, to be out in all kinds of weather, in order to visit the farmers, and it is no joy ride, because when they get to the farm they go into the hogpen and instruct the farmer how to disinfect the pen and how to keep it sanitary, and they go in and corral the hogs and treat them with this serum. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] intimated that possibly in Marshall County, where this great showing was made, it was an accident that the hog cholera did not come there last year. That is the very reason for my offering this amendment—to continue that work there to show that the work itself has been profitable and that it will bring the result it is recommended to bring.

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

Mr. HELVERING. Yes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Is it not a fact that there is a demand that the work that has been carried on in Marshall County be extended to the surrounding counties both by the demonstrators in Marshall County and the farmers and the stock raisers in the adjoining counties?

Mr. HELVERING. I will say, in answer to the gentleman's question, that from all over the State they get requests that Dr. Murphy, in charge of the eradication work in Marshall County, be sent to those various counties to lecture and inform them of the methods used in doing such good work in Marshall County, and it is the desire of the men in charge of the work in Marshall County to surround that county with counties where the work will be carried on under the direction of these doctors and where the farmers themselves will purchase the serum. We can not do that, as I understand it, with the appropriation which is now carried. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] referred to the fact that $45,000 was left out the previous appropriation, and that was an appropriation of $500,000, $455,000 having been used, while, if this amendment of mine carries, the appropriation will be only $410,000, or $45,000 less than that of last year.

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

Mr. HELVERING. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. In the gentleman's State how is the serum manufactured; by the State or by private individuals?

Mr. HELVERING. The serum that we use in Marshall County is brought from Ames, Iowa.

Mr. NORTON. From the agricultural college?

Mr. HELVERING. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. That is manufactured under the supervision of the Government officials?

Mr. HELVERING. Yes. In further answer to the question of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOOLITTLE], I want to say that if this work can be carried on another year in this county, surrounded by these counties, which have quarantine regulations, we can then fully demonstrate whether or not this work has been accidental, and whether the great production of hogs in Marshall County was a matter of accident, whether this work has really been good for the farmer and the country generally. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] referred to the increased slaughter of hogs at St. Joe, Mo. Marshall County is tributary to St. Joe, and it is possible that 35,000 of these hogs, or one-third of the increase, came from that county alone, because the increase in the hog production in that county has been from 62,000 in 1912 to over 100,000 last year. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, what is pending now, may I ask?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING].

Mr. MANN. To increase the amount. Has debate been exhausted on that?

Mr. RUBEY. I understand there are 15 minutes time remaining.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is an increase from $160,000 to $360,000 in reference to hog cholera. That is a considerable increase, and it may be that it can be wisely expended.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. RUBEY. Last year there was left $185,000 of the old appropriation. Of that $140,000 was used in connection with $160,000, making $300,000 used last year.

Mr. MANN. Yes. For somewhat different purposes, though practically the same thing. Of the amount this year, $175,000 is to be available for expenditures for the purpose of carrying out the act of 1913 in reference to serum. Last year there were $50,000 available for that purpose under the appropriation. There is no way they can expend $175,000 that I can conceive of under that act unless it is to be expended in the maintenance of a serum-testing station. I have no objection to that. The Secretary of Agriculture in his annual report says:

> It is probable that an adequate testing station could be provided for about $50,000. If several were found to be desirable a suitable appropriation for each would have to be made. The cost of maintaining a station capable of testing the entire output of commercial serum in the United States probably would not exceed $150,000 annually.

If this testing station is to be established, according to the statement of the Secretary in his annual report, it ought to provide $50,000 for the establishment and possibly $150,000 for the maintenance. That would be $200,000. The bill does not carry that much money for that purpose.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. RUBEY. The matter of the establishment of a factory by the Government has been abandoned.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I am not talking about a factory.

Mr. RUBEY. For Government serum.

Mr. MANN. I am not talking about a factory where they manufacture serum.

Mr. RUBEY. But the Government testing-station idea has been abandoned.

Mr. MANN. There is no method, in my judgment, by which you can expend $175,000 to carry out the act of 1913 concerning the regulation of serum except by the maintenance of a testing station. How can you do it?

Mr. RUBEY. I will in my own time explain that.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman means to be courteous to me; I am asking.

Mr. RUBEY. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I have waited a long time to get an explanation of it, and nobody has given an explanation. Now I am asking the gentleman to tell me.

Mr. RUBEY. I did not desire to be discourteous.

Mr. MANN. I know that.

Mr. RUBEY. The idea of the department is this: There are now in the United States 87 factories that are licensed to manufacture this serum. It is proposed to put men at each one of these factories and to have the serum manufactured under Government supervision. The men placed at these factories will see to it that the hogs to be used in testing the serum are healthy and that they are kept under the absolute control of the Government inspectors while the test is going on. The expenditures that are to be made in this work are set out by the Secretary of Agriculture in detail in a communication to the chairman of our committee.

Mr. MANN. Then instead of having one of these testing stations you are practically going to have a testing station at each manufacturing establishment?

Mr. RUBEY. At each manufacturing establishment there will be a representative of the Government to supervise the testing of the serum.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman be given further time. He is asking for information and he is entitled to the information sought.

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

Mr. MANN. How much time is left?

Mr. RUBEY. There are 10 minutes. The gentleman can have 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I will take time later if necessary.

Mr. RUBEY. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire time?

Mr. HAUGEN. No. I was just asking if the gentleman from Missouri had finished his explanation.

Mr. RUBEY. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Then if I may be permitted, I do not wish to take up the time of the gentleman from Illinois except to say that the plan indicated in the Secretary's report has been abandoned. It was found expensive; that it would require the purchase, I believe, of some 16,000 hogs to carry out the plan suggested in the Secretary's report. The first estimate made for this year was $185,000, as before stated; later a supplemental estimate was submitted; it calls for an appropriation of $360,000, and the bill states for what purposes.

Mr. MANN. All right, Mr. Chairman; I am sorry they did not provide for the test stations where the examination of the serum would be made by careful scientists instead of by the mere inspectors at the different manufacturing establishments. I am quite willing, so far as I am concerned, they shall make the effort in the way contemplated by the bill, though I do not believe it will be effective. There is a large amount of this serum now that is worthless, although we now try—and I think the department does its best—to regulate and examine the serum that is sent out.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. I will; but I want to get on another subject. I yield, however.

Mr. LEVER. I was just about to say, in connection with the testing plant to which the gentleman referred a moment ago, that the Committee on Agriculture has reported a bill which will enable the department to have testing stations at all of these serum-manufacturing plants, and to see that no serum or virus is shipped into interstate commerce at all except such as has undergone the test of the department.

Mr. MANN. That is what is contemplated by this appropriation, but it will not work out.

Mr. LEVER. The bill goes a good deal further than this.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes. I have examined the bill, but I doubt whether that will be praticable or economical.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Will the gentleman explain why it will not work out?

Mr. MANN. I do not think you can maintain a testing station successfully at each of the establishments under the corps that you can provide there and be sure of your serum, whereas you can take samples of serum provided by the Government inspector at each of the establishments and properly test it at a test station, so that you would know whether you had a good serum or not. I will not say that all of them do, but most of them probably honestly attempt to test their serum themselves. They are not always successful about it.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. If the gentleman will yield further, it is contemplated, as I understand it, in the bill which the chairman of the committee has said has been reported to the House, to establish one of these stations at each of these plants.

Mr. MANN. Oh, but the gentleman would readily see that you would not be able to establish a hundred test stations throughout the country at different places and get proper attention. The expense would be too exorbitant.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. They could certainly examine——

Mr. MANN. You could call it a test station.

Mr. HAUGEN. The Government maintains inspection at more than 900 packing houses. They have inspectors in all of these places, and why could they not have inspection at these 86 manufactories of serum?

Mr. MANN. But the testing of hog-cholera serum or other serums of that kind is a very different thing from the examination of meat to see whether it is contaminated or diseased or the examination of animals on the hoof.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know just what is intended to be accomplished by what is called the "demonstration" work for which this appropriation is largely provided. I suppose the purpose is partly to excite the curiosity of the hog raiser and then to show to him what he can do by the use of the serum. It never will be very effective.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I will take time later on the bill.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time is there remaining on this?

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes.

Mr. RUBEY. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] desire some time?

Mr. HAUGEN. If you have the time to spare.

Mr. RUBEY. There are only five minutes remaining.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will take my share, but I am not particular about it. If you have others, very well.

[Mr. RUBEY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 10, strike out the words "That of said sum not," and all of lines 11, 12, and 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$150,000 of the sum appropriated shall be set aside and used for the purchase and production of antihog-cholera serum, to be sold and distributed at its approximate cost."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman withhold it for a moment?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is to give the department $175,000, the amount asked for by the department, for the inspection of these 86 plants, or whatever the number may be, $35,000 for research work, and that $150,000 of the $360,000 shall be set aside for the production and distribution of the serum at its cost.

The question of the efficiency of the serum has been raised. Now, I have no quarrel with the department. I have not raised the question. The only difference between the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] and myself is that the gentleman from Indiana insists that the $150,000 shall be used for demonstration work, the employment of veterinarians, traveling over this country lecturing and demonstrating the efficiency of this particular article. I contend, as he does, that the most important element of all is the potency of the serum.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. I am perfectly willing to trust the department, and I hope that the gentleman from Indiana will concede that it is safe to leave it to the department to manufacture and distribute its own product.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. The gentleman would not contend that it is any more important that the department shall furnish pure serum for the farmers than that the farmers shall be able to get the same quality of serum from any source that is possible?

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, I provide for the inspection exactly as is suggested by the department.

Now, the gentleman must deal with the facts. We have the inspection service. We have the 86 manufacturers distributing it. We know that the serum produced by them has been distributing the foot-and-mouth disease. The gentleman will give the department credit for integrity and he will give the department credit for doing its best in its efforts to protect the people. Yet we have this contaminated serum being distributed throughout the country. My purpose is to lodge the responsibility with the department. If the serum manufactured has any claim or any virtue whatever, let the department be given an opportunity to manufacture it and demonstrate its efficiency.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there again?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I think it very important to limit those words that the gentleman is just using. Is it not a fact that the department claims that with the so-called test serum it will be an impossibility for contaminated serum to be distributed and to spread the foot-and-mouth disease?

Mr. HAUGEN. I dislike to take issue with the department, but——

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Is not that what the department claims?

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, they make many claims. We know these excellent gentlemen. I have no quarrel with them. They are most excellent gentlemen, but they allow their enthusiasm to carry them away from the facts. The gentleman from Indiana has referred to the marvelous results attained.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit one other question?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. If the gentleman does not care to answer the question, all right.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will answer if I can.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Does not the gentleman think it would be impossible to distribute serum that has the germs of foot-and-mouth disease in it if there is no foot-and-mouth disease in the United States?

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, we have no assurance that it will not again appear.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Have we not the assurance of the department that it has been exterminated throughout the United States?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; but no assurance that it may not again appear. The gentleman has referred to the marvelous results to date, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] has also done so. I am perfectly willing to give the gentlemen credit for having accomplished everything that is good in the Agricultural bill; I am perfectly willing that the gentlemen shall have the credit of it; both are among the most industrious, intelligent, and useful Members of this House, but the gentleman from Nebraska allows himself to depart from the facts. He referred to the ranking member of the committee on the minority side as opposing it. If he referred to the gentleman from Iowa, he stated what is not the fact. The gentleman was kind enough to give the conferees credit for bringing in a report appropriating $75,000 when the amount called for in his bill had been decreased to $45,000 in the committee, at the suggestion of the chairman of the committee. I had the honor to serve as a conferee. It is possible I might take a little credit for the $75,000, but I am perfectly willing that the gentleman shall have the credit.

But we appropriated $75,000, and what happened? A lot of ambitious politicians throughout the country grasped at the opportunity. Bills came in for $1,000,000; others for greater amounts. They worked overtime. Appropriations were made, money was spent, and yet we have the condemned serums.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Would the gentleman like more time?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; I have not got started yet.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa have five minutes additional. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] has referred to the marvelous results. Evidently the gentleman is satisfied to decide all these questions on ex parte evidence. It has not been my custom to do that. As I say, I have no quarrel with the department, but now that the matter has been brought up, for the gentleman's information I will read a letter from a gentleman whom he knows, whose statement he will not question. I will read this so that it may go into the RECORD, that the country and the Congress may know exactly what information we are supplied with. Here is the letter:

APRIL 29, 1914.

Hon. G. N. HAUGEN, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAUGEN: I noticed in the hearings before the Agriculture Committee on hog-cholera work that there was some discrepancy in the figures furnished concerning the losses of hogs in Dallas County, Iowa. I believe the Government people were using figures showing that there was a loss of 9,180 head and that you used figures sent out—the bankers' estimate—showing that there was a loss of 15,967 head. As you are perhaps aware, every assessor in Iowa this year was asked to gather data in every township concerning the hog-cholera losses. I have just received the figures from Dallas County as compiled by the county auditor, and they show that the farmers in Dallas County during the year 1913 lost 16,124 hogs from cholera.

Gentlemen, here is the discrepancy—9,180 loss claimed by the department, while the actual loss was 16,124 hogs from cholera.

Mr. SLOAN. In 1913?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; in 1913. The letter is dated April 29, 1914. That was the time when the experiment was carried on in Dallas County, Iowa. It has been carried on since, I trust with better results than in that year.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman calls attention to 1913. Does not the gentleman know that not a dollar of that appropriation became available until the 1st of July, 1913?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; and that hog cholera generally makes its appearance in August and September. If the gentleman will read the appropriation bills, if he will take the time to inform himself, he will know that these appropriations have been made year after year. We have carried lump-sum appropriations, of which every dollar was available for this very work. The demonstrations have been going on in Iowa as they have in Nebraska and all over this country, usually in 17 counties, 2 of them in the State of Oklahoma, I know not how many in Indiana, I know not how many in Nebraska. I know there is one in a district in Iowa that annually goes Democratic.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. The gentleman is well informed. He seems to leave the impression on the House that this hog-cholera demonstration has been carried on for a great many years by appropriations. Now, will he state definitely and affirmatively whether there was any money spent in this demonstration work that we are speaking of prior to the 1st day of July, 1913?

Mr. HAUGEN. I know that the appropriations have been made and I have confidence in the department to believe that it has and will expend the money along the lines which it believes itself will bring the best results.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Before the gentleman prints his remarks will he verify the figures, and state in the RECORD exactly how much was spent in the years he has been going over, so as to give us the correct figures?

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, Mr. Chairman, if the department has overlooked the importance of this line of work, I am not responsible for the department. We appropriate, and in this bill or other bills much is left to the discretion of the department. We will appropriate this year nearly $30,000,000; much of it will be left to the discretion of the department as to how the money appropriated shall be expended, and properly so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like another minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman has referred to the general interest. I recall in one of my counties meetings were held in the schoolhouses for the purpose of discussing the use of this serum, and finally a meeting was called at the county seat. Farmers were invited to attend; according to press reports none appeared. The merchants' association of another county sent letters to farmers in the county inviting them to attend the meeting; the press reports stated that not a single one came.

It is proposed now to appropriate $360,000, as I have said; much of it to give joy rides, to give lectures from the platform. Very well. These are most excellent gentlemen. I would like to accommodate them; but in view of the statement

made by the chairman, as to the average earnings of the farmers, I confess that I can not quite see my way clear to add to the burdens of these people, with each member of their families now receiving on an average of only $30.87. It does not seem fair now to call on them to pay their share of the $150,000 for demonstration. I believe the money can be used to better advantage by providing the farmer with a potent serum.

Mr. Chairman, the issue raised here is, Shall $360,000 be appropriated, shall $150,000 of it be made available for a laboratory in the Department of Agriculture, making it possible to distribute a potent serum, or shall we do as we have been doing in the past—buy and give away serum to a few at the expense of others?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN rose.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire some time?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] desire some time on this amendment?

Mr. MANN. I desire some time; yes. I do not know how much. Most of the gentlemen who have spoken have had 10 minutes each, and they never got to the subject I want to talk about.

Mr. SLOAN. I desire some time.

Mr. LEVER. I wonder if we can not agree on a time for closing debate on this?

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not ask for that just now. This is a live subject with us.

Mr. LEVER. I know it is, but there are lots of live subjects in this bill. The one following this is a very live subject.

Mr. MANN. I will again remind the gentleman that hogs are just as important to the Northwest as cotton is to the South.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true, and hogs are important to the South also.

Mr. MANN. I noticed that in the river and harbor bill.

Mr. LEVER. We have got hog cholera in South Carolina. Let us see if we can not agree on 25 minutes. I think the gentleman from Illinois can get all the time he wants.

Mr. MANN. I assure the gentleman that I will get all the time I want, because I do not take very much time on the agricultural bill. We want some time on this item, and if the gentleman will not give it to me, I will get it in some other way.

Mr. LEVER. There are only two requests on that side. The gentleman can have 15 minutes out of the 25. That will give him plenty of time.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps I may not want that much time. My observation is that if one attempts to say anything about one of these subjects on the floor, then the committee take up most of the time.

Mr. LEVER. That is usually true.

Mr. MANN. I am not complaining about that, but I can see no reason for limiting the time.

Mr. LEVER. We have got to close the debate sometime.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]. I do not believe the Government ought at this time to commence to give away free hog-cholera serum.

Mr. HAUGEN. There is no such proposition.

Mr. MANN. Or even to manufacture and sell it at cost, which amounts to the same thing as far as the theory of it is concerned. We make quite an appropriation now for hog-cholera demonstration. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] take to themselves great credit for this, and I think they are entitled to it. I have no doubt each of them has a hog-cholera demonstrator at work in his district, but the most of the Members of the House do not have hog-cholera demonstrators at work in their districts, and you can not provide money enough to put a hog-cholera demonstrator in every place in the United States.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. We try to make it apparent that we get beneficial results from it just the same.

Mr. MANN. Oh, everybody who reads can form his opinion as to whether the use of hog-cholera serum is effective or not. That has passed the point of demonstration. Those who do not believe it will not believe it. That is the case with hog-cholera serum. If you are willing to believe it there is information enough now. But these demonstrators go into a small area, and there prove to a very limited number that it is effective. Now, if the farmers were willing they could get that information themselves.

The demonstrator is necessarily limited to a small area, and a small number of farmers, because large numbers could not see the demonstration. The Secretary of Agriculture makes a fair statement of the proposition in his annual report, and I suppose he will stick to that. I do not know, because it is impossible for me under this administration to tell how long the President or any of his executive officers will stick to any proposition which they name in their message or reports. But the Secretary of Agriculture, in his annual report, says:

> Experiments for the purpose of determining the best method to control or eradicate hog cholera demonstrate that by employing certain systems involving the use of hog-cholera serum, losses can be reduced to a minimum and the swine industry greatly benefited. The work also shows, however, that success over a large territory would require the employment of an immense force of men and the expenditure of enormous sums. It seems that, at the present time, a country-wide campaign for the eradication of the disease would be ill advised.

I do not suppose the Secretary has retracted that statement, but whether he has or not the statement is true. It is only a few who are getting the benefit of this expenditure. The gentleman from Indiana has somebody in his district doing the work at Government expense; the gentleman from Nebraska has somebody in his district doing the work at Government expense. I am glad of it; they are doing good work; but the most of the counties in the United States do not have anybody in their community doing this demonstration work. It is not experimental work, it is not to learn anything that is being done. It is to teach the farmers by demonstration that which they could learn by reading if they would believe it.

[The time of Mr. MANN having expired his time was extended five minutes.]

Mr. MANN. How far we ought to go with that I do not undertake to say. I am not opposed to the appropriation; on the contrary, I voted for the amendment to increase the appropriation because the appropriation is an experiment, if the demonstration work is not.

This is the fact, you could have the most dreadful disease known to the human kind and tell everybody here that if you will take a certain serum once in three months you will never have that disease. That may be true about cholera, and probably is, but who is taking the serum? Nobody. Why? Nobody is expecting the cholera. Hog cholera does not come continuously, it is sporadic. A man raising hogs goes along and in the course of time he loses his hogs by hog cholera. He quits raising hogs for a while, and then he gets back to raising hogs again and for a while he is very successful until the hog cholera again comes along. He is not looking for it, if he thought it would come he would give the serum in advance and ward it off. But he waits until it has done most of the damage before he applies the serum, and then it is too late to do much good.

That will always probably be the case. Meanwhile we have learned that if we will only follow our learning it can be avoided.

It may be that we will do some good, and now the farmers have found that even if they apply the serum it is not good. Much of it was not good until we passed a law for governmental inspection. Much of it is not good now although it is inspected by the Government. The Secretary of Agriculture proposed that we have an inspection plant where all the serum could be scientifically tested under proper conditions by the Government. I had supposed when I read the bill that it was intended by the appropriation to cover that because the money is nearly enough to do it. But the committee say that is not the purpose, that we have provided $175,000 with a view to having a test made at each manufacturing plant right there where it is made. Now, it may be that the Secretary of Agriculture has changed his mind on this. I do not know, but here is his annual report in which he said:

> Tests, however, are a necessary and most important part of any system of control. They are now made by the commercial establishments themselves on animals procured by them and at all times under their care. It is impracticable for the Government to make them within privately owned and operated plants. Furthermore, so long as the plants conduct the tests, it is manifest that the Government can not select and know the complete history of the animals. In the preparation of the serum, the inspectors can see that the steps necessary to produce a good article are carried out. In this particular the inspection is adequate and effective. It appears, therefore, that the weak point at present is the inspection of the tests, and the department believes that these should be under Government control.

And he recommends the establishment of a governmental inspection plant. He says that it is impracticable for the Government to make these tests within privately owned and operated plants. I do not know. That is the weak point in the system. You can not expect that the farmers, although they have brought home to them the knowledge that the serum may prevent hog cholera, will constantly apply it unless they know that the serum will not communicate some other disease.

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

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], the ranking member of the committee, my really good and genial friend, demonstrates the great truth in his life and

living that, however sound one may be on practically every proposition, there is usually a flaw. There is usually a "fly in the ointment" somewhere. The only evidence of unsoundness I have ever discovered in him in the five years I have known the gentleman is on the hog-cholera question.

I want to say in answer to his charge that I was claiming credit for hog-cholera campaigns was that I have not made any such claim. I merely stated the facts necessary to meet the statements made by the gentleman from Iowa. He stated in substance that for about 15 years appropriations had been made and money expended by this Government for the purpose of exterminating hog cholera, based upon the serum process. In order to state the facts, it was necessary to give the full history of the appropriations made by this Congress. I stated then that it was in the earlier part of 1913 that the first dollar was appropriated by this Congress for the specific use of a serum in the eradication of hog cholera. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that if he desires to go to the archives of his committee he will find a letter from the former distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wilson, from his own State insisting on action being taken in this matter just a short time before the appropriation was ingrafted on the Agricultural bill.

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

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman now adds the word "specific." I call his attention to the fact that money has been appropriated in lump sums and that that money was available for the hog-cholera proposition. How was this serum discovered, how could it have been discovered, if it were not appropriated for?

Mr. SLOAN. I was talking about the demonstration, not the discovery of the serum, and I made myself clear on the floor as to the specific appropriation and the general appropriation. I want to call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that the letter he read showed a large loss from cholera in 1913. Not a dollar of that appropriation as made in 1913 was available until July 1, 1913.

Mr. HAUGEN. The experiment was going on.

Mr. SLOAN. No experiment until after July, 1913. In fact, they did not begin the demonstration until sometime after July 1, 1913. As a matter of fact, it took at least 60 days after July 1 before a start could be made. As my colleague, Mr. REAVIS of Nebraska, suggests it could not get well under way because the serum was not available. I have just conferred with the Member from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] in whose district the county of Dallas is, and where these demonstrations have been going on in 1913, 1914, and 1915. His statement is that hog cholera has been practically eradicated from Dallas County, Iowa, as it has been from the district in Nebraska within the area. The large value of these demonstrations is not in the fact of favoring a community as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], or favoring a particular Congressman who may have a county that has been selected as an area. I said in my other talk to this committee on this subject that if that were the only reason I would not stand here and ask the appropriation of a dollar, because it would not be fair. The value comes in the demonstration that is accomplished, and, further, that which will come, first, from the continuation of a demonstration to show the best methods of eradicating; and, second, from these centers there will radiate throughout the State and from the various areas throughout the country the means, knowledge, and information that will contribute to the eradication of hog cholera from the country at large.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] proposes is the expenditure of $150,000 for the erection of a plant for the manufacture of hog-cholera serum. If the Government proposes to manufacture hog-cholera serum, the amount proposed by the gentleman from Iowa is wholly inadequate. The testimony before the committee is to the effect that the erection of a plant large enough to produce the hog-cholera serum used in this country would cost anywhere from three to five million dollars. The amount proposed by the gentleman from Iowa would be a mere drop in the bucket, and instead of encouraging the use of hog-cholera serum it would discourage it, for every man who wanted to use the serum would naturally wait until he could get the serum from the Government, which he could purchase at cost, and which there would be probably ground to believe would be potent and uncontaminated.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Dr. Melvin, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, suggested $100,000, and my amendment provides for $150,000. It is up to Dr. Melvin and the gentleman from Minnesota to settle the matter between themselves.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman from Iowa himself elicited from Dr. Melvin, who has charge of this work in the bureau, the very information which I have given the committee. I read from the hearings:

Mr. HAUGEN. Do I understand you to contend that it would take $3,000,000 to construct a suitable plant?

Dr. MELVIN. No; I only gave my figures as a rough estimate.

Mr. HAUGEN. Would you estimate it at $2,000,000, $3,000,000, or $5,000,000?

Dr. MELVIN. I think it would be nearer $3,000,000; but possibly it would go to $4,000,000.

I think from the testimony before the committee as to the amount of hog-cholera serum used and the amount that probably will be used in the future the estimate of Dr. Melvin was too low rather than too high.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think the gentleman means to be fair, but the gentleman knows that when Dr. Melvin appeared before the committee he was opposed to this proposition. If the gentleman will look over the hearings to which I refer, he will find that Dr. Melvin recommended the appropriation of $100,000 for a laboratory in the department and that later it was turned down by the department. The gentleman knows, and I am not surprised he has acquiesced to the wishes of his superior.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understood Dr. Melvin did recommend and the Secretary recommended the expenditure of something like $100,000 for the establishment of a testing station, but so far as I know there never has been before the committee any testimony to the effect that $100,000 or any such sum would serve to erect a plant for the manufacture of serum in any such quantities as would be required. Now, it is not fair for the Government to produce only a very small part of the serum used in the country, because the proposition then becomes a special privilege, which you can not grant to all. If the Government is going into this business, the only fair way to do is to erect a plant which is capable of taking care of the entire consumption of hog-cholera serum, and the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa absolutely fails in that respect. Now, there are several theories about handling the hog-cholera proposition. One is the method proposed by the gentleman from Iowa, for the manufacture by the Government of hog-cholera serum. The other plan, which is incorporated in the bill and which has been reported by the committee, is a proposition to give the Government complete supervision over the manufacture of hog-cholera serum, and also the testing of the serum, and to give the Government such control of the animals and materials used in the testing of the serum as will insure its potency when it is put on the market. In my judgment, that is the most economical plan that can be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, matters of this kind and this particular matter has been considered by the committee, and the expenditure of money for the erection of a factory by the Government and its operation by the Government is not thought by the committee to be wise. As I remember, the estimate of $100,000 was for the erection and operation of a laboratory or testing plant, not for a factory in which all the serum needed for use in the country might be made. If a factory for that purpose were erected it would cost millions of dollars and would cost millions also for operation.

It is true there has been trouble about the inspection of privately owned factories. A special committee of the Committee on Agriculture has been working on a bill. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY], a member of the Committee on Agriculture, was chairman of the subcommittee, and under his very able direction a bill has been prepared, and I am not sure but it has been reported in the House and is now on the calendar, providing, among other things, for more authority to the officials of the Bureau of Agriculture, the Bureau of Animal Industry, in the work of investigating private factories; and it is to be hoped that if the bill becomes a law the officials will have authority enough to do this work as it ought to be done, and that we can look for pure, potent serum from private factories. Now, it would be an immense undertaking for the Federal Government to enter upon the work of making all the serum. Twenty-one States of the Union are now operating their own factories and turning out considerable serum, and there are, as I remember the figures, 86 private concerns, large and small, throughout the country.

Just a word as to the expense of operating these factories and as to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said as he read from the report of the Secretary of Agriculture about the difficulty of inspecting the privately owned factories. There is difficulty, because in making the inspection of serum it is necessary to have at least nine hogs on which to make an inspection of each and every batch of serum turned out by a factory. There is difficulty under the present way of doing business for the Government to be sure that these hogs upon

which the serum is tested have not been previously treated or doctored in some way by persons interested in the factory where the tests are being made. It is hoped that the bill which the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] is chairman is to report will provide for such inspection and give such authority to the officials of the department making the inspection that those difficulties will be removed, and that the inspection can be made in such a way that the officials will be satisfied that they have not been interfered with, and that the hogs provided for their use by the factories have not been doctored.

Now, just a word as to the expense of the Government erecting and carrying on a laboratory for testing serum. Besides the money necessary to erect and equip a building, one can readily see that unless all private factories go out of business thy will continue as at present, and each one from time to time must send its product to the Federal laboratory for inspection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. May I proceed for five minutes, or such part of it as may be necessary to complete the statement I wish to make?

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And for the inspection of each batch from each factory it will be necessary for the Federal Government at its laboratory to supply itself with nine hogs. It is difficult to make a calculation or to estimate the expense, but a suggestion as to the kind and amount of work to be done gives you some idea of the immense expense to the Government involved in carrying on a laboratory on that scale in that way. It is infinitely cheaper and much better to have inspection by officials of the bureau and tests made by them at factories in which the serum is made, if, of course, inspection and testing can be done thoroughly and in such a way and under such conditions as will secure satisfactory results.

It seems to me it is not feasible for the Government to undertake to make all the serum, nor is it feasible for the Government itself to do the work of making inspection of all the serum in its own laboratory. The only feasible way, in my judgment, is to have proper and efficient inspection of each private factory, and I believe that that work can be carried on right and that it will not cost nearly as much money as it would for the Federal Government to do the work in its own shop.

Now, just a word more as to this work that is being done in the counties. It is not experimental work. It is demonstration work. It is carried on for the purpose of bringing skilled and scientific gentlemen from the Bureau of Animal Industry into close touch with the officials of the States, as, for instance, in our State, the officials of the Sanitary State Live Stock Commission, so that the State officials may see the work done and learn for practical purposes all that the officials of the department know; and, speaking broadly, all that it will be necessary for those State officials to know in order to enable them to take up the work and continue it throughout the State with the assistance of the county farm agents.

Now, this is great work, of course. The Federal Government is interested in it. There is no disposition whatever to limit the amount of money. We have always been pleased to accede to every reasonable demand the officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry have made.

There is some criticism here of the chairman [Mr. LEVER] and his disposition toward appropriations of this kind. All censure of that kind is undeserved. He has shown great familiarity with the entire subject and has directed the work of the committee with unusual ability. No one could have shown more interest than has the chairman of this committee, no one could have been more friendly to the work, no one could have been more courteous to those appearing before the committee and to the members of the committee, when this matter was under consideration, than he. [Applause.] The committee has recommended every dollar asked for by experienced and scientific men of the department—all they believe they can use to advantage. There is no disposition whatever to restrict the work. There is a serious doubt as to the advisability of the Government engaging in the business of manufacturing serum. I doubt the advisability of it, and I shall not support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]. As a principle I do not believe in the Government engaging in work that private interests can carry on, at least until it is shown that private interests are unable properly to do it. In this particular case I believe private interests can properly carry on the work, and that under proper Federal inspection the work will be satisfactorily done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have recognition for five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe anyone has been more patient, but, of course, I can not object to the gentleman having five minutes. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is recognized.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, this is, as has been several times said, a very great question. It is a very great problem, and there is no one on the floor of this House—and a great many of us have given a great deal of attention to the matter—that feels that we ought to assume a dogmatic attitude in regard to it.

Primarily the House should consider the question as to whether or not it would be best for the Government to attempt to assume the entire and exclusive duty of furnishing this serum to the people of the country directly, or whether they ought to assist in accomplishing the result desired by encouragement of the States and other influences.

Now, the Government has always hesitated, and I am not sure but they have acted wisely, about incurring the tremendous expense that would be necessary to be incurred if they should assume the duty of furnishing virus directly to the people. And yet we all know that until there can be a greater securement of purity and uniformity in the production of the serum there will be continual loss and a measure of failure in the work that is sought to be accomplished. We all know, I think—those of us who have given the question consideration—that it will take tremendous expense on the part of the Government of two or three or even four millions of dollars, for the purpose of undertaking in a systematic and complete way to meet the demands.

We have thought we could not do that, but let me suggest to members of the committee that when you expend only $35,000 for "pure research work," as it is called here, we are not meeting, as I think, the requirements of the situation. Pure research work can not mean the ascertainment of what a pure serum is. It should mean, and it must mean if it is to be practical in its operation, more a question of methods, more a question of reaching the standard that is already pretty generally understood as being established. If that be true, it occurs to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], who is the ranking member of this committee, will more effectually put it within the power of the Government to see that there is an adequate amount of money expended not only in research work but in standardizing, in furnishing to the various States and these various laboratories the results of their research and while, perhaps, not absolute inspection, demonstration work of such a character that might be called purely scientific in its nature. I am quite sure that $150,000 expended in this way, which would not mean the endeavor to disseminate all the serum that would be required throughout the United States, but would enable the Government to cooperate with every institution that was authorized to handle the serum for individual use, might be used in a very efficacious and helpful manner.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any doubt that the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] is subject to a point of order, but in order to get the judgment of the committee on this subject, which is very important, I am going to withdraw my reservation of the point of order and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 15, line 3, by striking out the words "not less than."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 3, strike out the words "not less than."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the reason why I offer the amendment is that this same language is used in another place. It provides that of the sum appropriated not less than $175,000 shall be available for a certain expenditure. If it means anything at all, which I doubt, it means that if the department should expend less than $175,000 it would not be a legal expenditure.

Mr. RUBEY. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MANN. This was in the estimates.

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

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HAWLEY. If the gentleman would strike out those words, would it not be necessary to put in the word "of"?

Mr. MANN. It would be, "Of the said sum, $175,000 would be available." It is in the right place now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, in lines 10 and 11, I move to strike out the words "not less than."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, lines 10 and 11, by striking out the words "not less than."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Meat inspection, Bureau of Animal Industry: For additional expenses in carrying out the provisions of the meat-inspection act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. L., p. 674), there is hereby appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, the sum of $344,500.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. I notice this provision is reduced from $375,000 to $344,500. Is this sufficient, in the opinion of the department?

Mr. LEVER. This is the estimate of the department and is sufficient, in their judgment. There is no difference between the provision in this bill and the current law. The difference is only apparent. It is due to the transfer of places from the lump-sum to the statutory roll, but the employees are doing the same kind of work. The sum of $30,000 is involved in the transfer.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, as I went to lunch to-day I happened to sit by one of the veterinarians employed in the meat-inspection work, and I happened to ask him how many hogs each man was supposed to inspect per hour, and he said 250. I asked him what kind of an inspection he could give in that way; I asked him, "What do you do?" He said they had to cut into the glands of the hogs in order to assure themselves that the hogs did not have tuberculosis, and then they have various other processes to go through with; and yet every man is supposed, when those hogs pass by in a continual stream all day, to inspect four hogs a minute. I was wondering what kind of protection the American people were getting for the money expended in this service.

I said to this man, "How many beef carcasses are you expected to inspect per hour?" He said 25. In the case of a beef they had four glands to cut into, cutting the skin off the jaws of the animal in order to find the disease they were looking for, and to examine their vital organs. Yet they had only half a minute in which to do it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the expenditure of $344,000, or ten times that amount, if it will give the American people the protection they need in order to know that we are getting eatables that are healthy and free from disease; but the effectiveness of the inspection is and has always been a doubtful question with me.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HELGESEN. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. All this inspection is not done by one man. The animals first pass under the eye of one inspector, and then pass before another, and another, and another—a long line of them; each one has only that limited time, but altogether there is a great deal of time, and, as I understand it, sufficient time. Is not that true?

Mr. HELGESEN. No. This man said that that was not true. He said, as to those four hogs per minute, if the man who was inspecting them found anything that was suspicious, he would hang a tag on them, and they would go to another man for further examination, but if he passed them in the first instance they were passed for good. Now, if that is true, the inspection does not amount to anything worth while.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HELGESEN. Yes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Did this inspector say that they did not have time to make a proper inspection?

Mr. HELGESEN. He said they did not have time enough to make it certain that they were doing the work right. He said:

We are compelled to handle so many hogs an hour in order to hold our jobs, and we do the best we can; and, judging by the amount of meat we condemn in a year, it is shown that we are doing as good service as we can.

But he said they ought to have more help.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Did he say how much more time they ought to have?

Mr. HELGESEN. No. He did not go into details about it.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HELGESEN. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman says he was talking with this gentleman this afternoon?

Mr. HELGESEN. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. He was on a vacation, I think?

Mr. HELGESEN. No; he was not on a vacation.

Mr. NORTON. Was he looking for larger salaries or more assistants?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Even an inspector has to eat sometimes, you know.

Mr. HELGESEN. He did not bring up the question. I brought it up myself, because I wanted to get some information from a man who was on the job and who ought to know what he is talking about.

Mr. NORTON. Is this man employed in the city?

Mr. HELGESEN. No.

Mr. NORTON. Where is he employed?

Mr. HELGESEN. In Chicago or New York, I think.

Mr. NORTON. He stated that the inspectors were too few in number, did he?

Mr. HELGESEN. Yes. I asked him if they did not need more help, and he said, "Certainly; but we are doing the best we can with the amount of help we have."

Mr. NORTON. And he said that he examined how many hogs?

Mr. HELGESEN. Two hundred and fifty per hour.

Mr. NORTON. That is four every minute?

Mr. HELGESEN. Yes. I will leave it to you to tell whether any man can inspect four hogs a minute and tell what their condition is.

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELGESEN. Yes.

Mr. ADAIR. Was the gentleman ever in a packing house to see this inspection going on?

Mr. HELGESEN. No.

Mr. ADAIR. I have been.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that a health officer inspects immigrants a good deal faster than that when they are coming into port.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from North Dakota may be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. I only want to suggest to the gentleman that I have been in some of these packing houses and I have stood for quite a while watching these men inspect hogs and cattle. I never saw such rapidity of inspection as the gentleman mentions. I have stood not only for one minute, but for three or four minutes, watching a man inspect one animal, and he did not leave one hog or one steer during that time.

Mr. HELGESEN. What does the gentleman mean by saying he did not leave one hog or one steer?

Mr. ADAIR. I mean that the inspection of one animal was not completed within the time that I stood there. I watched a man inspecting a beef for more than five minutes.

Mr. HELGESEN. Oh, well, by the thousands of animals that go through, the gentleman will see that is not possible.

Mr. ADAIR. I am only telling you what I saw.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That was over in Indiana. They do not work so swiftly over there.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I asked the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN] if each animal does not pass under the eyes of several inspectors, and if I understood him he answered that it does not. Now, that is not my information. A short time ago we had hearings on what is known as the Lobeck bill, to provide promotion and increases of salaries for men engaged in the meat-inspection work, and I gathered from testimony given before the committee that there are several inspectors, many of them engaged in the same kind of work, and that each animal passes before and is inspected by several of them.

Mr. HAWLEY. Each man does a certain portion of the inspection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And we were told particularly that the work of each one of these inspectors is checked up. The work that each one does is looked over and reviewed by several others, each one making his mark on a card or indicating in some way that that animal has passed before him and has been inspected, and if an error is found it is traceable back to the man who made it. Now, that being the case, it is hardly possible, as the gentleman from North Dakota says, that one man is required to inspect four hogs in every minute of the hours that he works and that there is no relief and no assistance and no further precaution taken to secure correct inspection. It seems to me that the gentleman from North Dakota did not get all the facts, or if they were given to him that he has not drawn the right conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Bureau of Plant Industry: One physiologist and pathologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $5,000; one chief clerk, $3,000; one executive assistant in seed distribution, $2,500; one officer in charge of publications, $2,250; one landscape gardener, $1,800; one officer in charge of records, $2,250; one superintendent of seed weighing and mailing, $2,000; two esecutive clerks, at $1,980 each; one assistant superintendent of seed warehouse, $1,400; one seed inspector, $1,000; one seed warehouseman, $1,400; one seed warehouseman, $1,020; one seed warehouseman, $1,000; one seed warehouseman, $840; 6 clerks, class 4; 12 clerks, class 3; 3 clerks, at $1,500 each; 20 clerks, class 2; 47 clerks, class 1; one clerk or draftsman, $1,200; one clerk, $1,080; 8 clerks, at $1,020 each; 23 clerks, at $1,000 each; 45 clerks, at $900 each; 1 clerk or draftsman, $900; 19 clerks, at $840 each; 2 clerks, at $720 each, 1 laborer, $780; 41 messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 11 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $660 each; 26 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $600 each; one artist, $1,620; one clerk or artist, $1,400; two clerks or artists, at $1,200 each; one photographer, $1,200; one photographer, $840; one laboratory aid, $1,440; one laboratory aid, $1,380; three laboratory aids or clerks, at $1,200 each; one laboratory aid, clerk, or skilled laborer, $1,080; two laboratory aids, clerks, or skilled laborers, at $1,020 each; three laboratory aids, at $960 each; one laboratory aid, $900; five laboratory aids, at $840 each; six laboratory aids, at $720 each; one laboratory apprentice, $720; one map tracer, $600; two gardeners, at $1,440 each; four gardeners, at $1,200 each; eight gardeners, at $1,100 each; 15 gardeners, at $900 each; 19 gardeners, at $780 each; one skilled laborer, at $960; two skilled laborers, at $900 each; three skilled laborers, at $840 each; one assistant in technology, $1,400; one assistant in technology, $1,380; one mechanician, $1,080; one mechanical assistant, $1,200; one blacksmith, $900; one carpenter, $900; one painter, $900; one teamster, $840; one teamster, $600; 21 laborers, at $540 each; 24 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at $480 each; two laborers or charwomen, at $480 each; two laborers or messenger boys, at $420 each; 20 charwomen, at $240 each; 11 messenger boys, at $360 each; four messenger boys, at $300 each; in all, $418,240.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What is the object of making an appropriation for one laboratory aid, clerk, or skilled laborer? Do they not know what they want?

Mr. LEVER. What item is that?

Mr. MANN. There are a number of items just like it in this paragraph. Here is an item, "One clerk or artist." Here is another item, "two clerks or artists." Here is another item, "three laboratory aids or clerks." Then here is another item, "one laboratory aid, clerk, or skilled laborer." Another item is "two laboratory aids, clerks, or skilled laborers," and so forth.

Mr. HAWLEY. If the gentleman will yield, the explanation made to the committee was that in this way they could be sure that they could use the individual assigned for this work for any one of these three things, that there was not work enough to employ the individual at one of these duties all the time for the entire year, so that they were compelled to use the person in three employments. In that way they could keep them profitably employed during the entire year.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that it is advisable to employ a man with the idea that he can be a laboratory aid, and also a clerk, and also a skilled laborer?

Mr. HAWLEY. The man or woman employed would be competent to do work in either of the three places.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; probably incompetent in either place.

Mr. HAWLEY. We were presuming that they were competent for the work in either of the three places.

Mr. MANN. Here are three places—laboratory aid, clerk, or skilled laborer. I am of the opinion that the average, or for that matter any skilled laborer, does not make the best clerk, or any clerk make the best skilled laborer, and that neither one makes a very good laboratory aid.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. I notice here we have the classification "one artist." What is meant by that? What kind of an artist is that?

Mr. HAWLEY. They make drawings of plants, or when they put them under the microscope and examine them and find them diseased, they make drawings of the cross sections of the plants, showing the appearance of the diseased plant.

Mr. TOWNER. The next item is "one clerk or artist." I would not suppose they would use a clerk for artistic purposes or an artist for clerical purposes.

Mr. HAWLEY. If the person employed is a competent artist and can do clerical work at times, when not needed for making drawings or descriptions of plants, they can keep that person employed during the entire year. His duties as an artist probably would not take his entire time.

Mr. TOWNER. It would seem as if those two employments were not entirely compatible.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Iowa will notice, it is not merely one clerk or artist. The following item is two clerks or artists. The explanation that they do not have work enough to keep them employed during the year might apply to one, but could not apply to three.

Mr. HAWLEY. It might apply.

Mr. MANN. Oh, it could not apply to all three.

Mr. HAWLEY. If the gentleman will yield, there might be certain times in the year——

Mr. MANN. There might be, but there are not.

Mr. HAWLEY. Well, we will take it the other way. There are certain times in the year when they need the work of the artist, and there are other seasons when they need the work of the clerk. I am stating the explanation made to the committee.

Mr. MANN. All this kind of office work piles up.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease of citrus trees known as citrus canker, and by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, $250,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay such expenses and employ such persons and means, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and to cooperate with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers, or individuals as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It looks to me as though the committee had not followed quite the same course in this item as in the next one, although I may be mistaken about it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, there is so much noise in the Hall that I did not hear the gentleman. I have only one good ear.

Mr. MANN. If my distinguished and beloved friend from South Carolina only hears with one ear, I congratulate myself that I have usually been able to get close to that ear. This item which is for the citrus canker has this proviso:

Provided, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

That is very plain, but the next item, which is in reference to the chestnut-bark disease and the white-pine blister, as well as other tree diseases, provides not only for the investigation but for applying methods of reduction or control already discovered. Now, the principal method of reduction being to destroy the tree, that would apparently make the appropriation, which is increased by $30,000, available for the destruction of chestnut and other trees which are affected by these diseases. Is that the case?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman understands, in reference to the white-pine-blister rust, that the only trees destroyed at all are trees which are hosts for the insect that causes the disease, such as currants and gooseberries, and the method of destruction of the trees would be entirely different.

Mr. MANN. Of course, you kill one tree one way and one tree another way. Some prefer to cut them down and some prefer to put fire around them. This is for the destruction and not for advice. Is not that correct?

Mr. LEVER. Let me make this statement: Some years ago, as the gentleman will remember, we had an outbreak of chestnut blight and appropriated a considerable sum of money for a while in an effort to eradicate it. Last year when the bill came in the committee frankly confessed that there was no possibility of eradicating chestnut blight in this country, and that the only way to handle it was to provide resisting chestnut trees.

Mr. MANN. And that is a long process, and they will not know whether it is effective until our great-great-great-great-grandchildren appear on the scene.

Mr. LEVER. This year attention was called to the fact that a new disease had broken out in New England and the Middle

West, called the white-pin-blister rust, which threatened the white-pine industry in this country, and the testimony before the committee was to the effect that there was a host to these diseases in the gooseberry and currant, and by the destruction of the gooseberry and the currant the disease could be entirely eradicated. It was the understanding of the committee, and in this item we drew the inference from what had taken place with reference to the chestnut blight a year or two years ago, that none of the money in this item should be used for payment for trees destroyed. Although I am frank to say, so far as I am concerned, I would have no hesitation in accepting a proviso to that item, but I am sure there would be no disposition on the part of the department to use the money to pay for trees destroyed.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to paying for these things if you are going to destroy them. How do you differentiate between destroying currant and gooseberry bushes which are of value to the markets and destroying other trees which help to spread the disease?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure the gentleman knows that the currants and gooseberries referred to by the gentleman from South Carolina are bushes that grow wild in the forest and have no relation to the ordinary common varieties of garden currant and gooseberry bushes; that is, so far as this item is concerned.

Mr. MANN. That depends. The Missouri currant grows wild all over the West—that is, the sweet black currant and gooseberries grow wild—but the tame gooseberry and the tame currant do the same thing. The country where this white pine grows has more tame gooseberries and tame currants than they have wild. The wild gooseberries are in the West, while the tame ones are in the East, where the white pine grows.

Mr. LEVER. We had a disease which affects the apple trees—the host of that disease was the cedar tree—and we are providing an appropriation for that.

Mr. MANN. There are a great many diseases of plants, and they have plant hosts. The common barberry is the host of one of the principal diseases the name of which I have forgotten, and yet we are not trying to destroy them all.

Mr. LEVER. I will say, further, that when the subject of citrus canker was first brought before the Committee on Agriculture there was the suggestion either in the RECORD or by one of the Members personally that payment ought to be made for the destruction of these orange trees on the same principle that you pay for destroying cattle with the foot-and-mouth disease or horses with dourine. But the amount involved was so big that it staggered some of us, and we thought that if we could go in and wipe out this disease the owners and the States involved ought to be willing to bear a part of that burden, as they are now bearing a part of the burden. That is the theory on which the committee acted. We were afraid to open the door, and therefore we kept it closed and sealed. I may say, further, that the representatives of the citrus growers made no objection to that proposition.

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

Mr. MANN. I yield.

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not need to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to the fact that the citrus canker is so far as known a virulent and incurable disease, and if it attacks a tree there is no use of trying to cure the tree. When they are dealing with it they do not even touch the trees that have the disease, because the disease will adhere to the fingers, and if they touch another tree of the citrus variety will spread the disease to that tree. The only way is to go into an orchard and burn the tree as it stands, consuming it beneath the bark with burning gas. There was strong pressure brought by a number of those who are interested in the growing of citrus trees, that if we intended to destroy the trees where the citrus canker was found in an orchard we ought to pay them for that destruction; that we ought not to come in in order to save one man's orchard and destroy the orchard of another without paying for it. Then out of an excess of caution—for, as the chairman said the estimated value of the orchards as made before the committee was very great—we inserted this proviso, it being a new item in the Agricultural bill.

Mr. MANN. We put it in the deficiency bill in the House on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes; but this is the first Agricultural appropriation bill that has carried that item.

Mr. MANN. That is true.

Mr. HAWLEY. And in order to relieve the department of the pressure that would be brought upon it in case it insisted upon the destruction of trees, as they will have to do if they ever get any control of this disease, because eradication is the only method of controlling it, out of an excess of caution this proviso was inserted to make it clear that the Government was not to pay for trees destroyed.

Mr. CALDWELL. I understand that this is the situation, that in the case of citrus canker the tree that is attacked will naturally die in any event, whereas in the other case of the parasite that appears in the gooseberry bush it is not, and if you destroy the bush to get rid of the parasite you are actually destroying a plant that would not die by reason of this attack.

Mr. MANN. Neither of the gentlemen probably is very familiar with orange trees. I used to raise orange trees myself, though I do not any more. I know something about the business. No one has ever suggested that you pay for the trees which have the disease. If you did pay for them, it would not cost anything, because they are not worth anything. When the tree gets the disease it is valueless, but here is a disease, say, in a locality which is likely to be spread by the birds. The question is whether you can stamp out the disease by killing all of the trees that are susceptible to it within a certain range of that orchard which is affected. It is perfectly evident to anyone with common sense that a man who has an orange grove a little ways off from one that is diseased, whose orange grove is sound, is not going to kill his trees in order to stamp out the disease. It is of no value to him to stamp out the disease if when it is stamped out all of his trees are dead, and it may be of some benefit to him to take the chance that the disease will not come to his grove. Yet, if they do not stamp out the citrus canker in some way, it is liable to spread all over the United States, wherever they grow citrus fruit; and if it does, it will be too late to accomplish any good purpose.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment? I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. MANN. Very well, I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. I would like to ask the chairman whether they have provided the relative part of this expense that the State is to pay?

Mr. LEVER. We have not provided it in this item. The State of Florida has already expended $195,000 in this work. The growers themselves, I understand, have spent about $100,000 in the work. The Federal Government has expended $35,000, and we passed a deficiency appropriation bill some time ago appropriating $300,000. I understand that about $100,000 of that deficiency appropriation will be still available at the beginning of this fiscal year, so that we shall have during the next fiscal year about $350,000 of Government money.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I am biased in any way by the fact that I have some small interest in Florida, having relatives there, but I doubt it. I think possibly I am biased by the fact that I have some knowledge about the business.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. While the citrus-canker disease and its destruction is not on all fours with the foot-and-mouth disease, it is somewhat similar. The foot-and-mouth disease could be spread by cattle moving from one State to another, although very often that was not the way in which it was spread. It was often spread by birds or animals that were not cattle at all or human beings, or by serums, or by clothing or something else being sent from one State to another, in some places by passing down a running stream from one place to another. The canker disease can be spread by the shipment of trees from one State to another, but probably will not be spread in that way. It may be spread by birds or animals or human beings or by other methods. The foot-and-mouth disease itself was not very fatal to cattle, so far as killing them off was concerned, but if the foot-and-mouth disease had been allowed to spread all over the United States you never could have stamped it out, and it would have been a loss to the country of millions or perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

If the citrus canker, which is now confined to a very few localities, and which entered the United States by importation, is allowed to spread all over the South and then out to California, we will be in a position that gentlemen do not appreciate. The Mediterranean or fruit fly is now in the island of Hawaii. They used to raise all kinds of fruits over there—it is a great place for fruits—and ship them to the United States. There are only two kinds of fruits now that you can bring here from Hawaii, and those are bananas and pineapples, and they have to be carefully inspected and go through a process before they can be brought in. You can not pick out in the Hawaiian Islands

to-day any kind of fruit but what you will find a lot of worms in it and there is no way of stamping it out. All the money in the United States Treasury possibly could not do it because these wild fruits out there that grow everywhere in the mountains have these worms in them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What the gentleman says about the citrus disease applies also, does it not, to the San Jose scale?

Mr. MANN. Oh, not at all. It is entirely different. It is easy enough to get rid of the San Jose scale, but it takes a little time. But if this citrus-canker disease ever gets around in the South you never can stop it. I would rather appropriate a little money now to kill it out than to appropriate hundreds of thousands of dollars in the next 10 or 20 years in a vain effort—and it would be a vain effort—to stamp it out after it got well started.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in the criticism he has just made against the proviso that no part of the appropriation shall be used for the destruction of trees. I did not favor the insertion of that provision either in this bill or in the deficiency bill which passed earlier in the session. I do not think there ought to be any such limitation placed upon the expenditure of the money appropriated. A part of the plan for the eradication of citrus canker often involves the destruction not only of infected trees, but others not apparently infected at the time, as it is not easy at all times, or at any time, to tell just how far the disease has spread when you undertake to apply the remedy, which is fire. You at first discover it upon a tree, or maybe upon a dozen or more trees. But before its discovery it may have been carried by human agency, by birds, or animals to the other groves in the immediate vicinity, where it may not be discernable. But whether such is the case or not, prudence would dictate the destruction of near-by trees even in neighboring groves.

Now, in this emergency you go to the owner of the apparently healthy tree and propose its destruction. He says, "Why, the tree is uninfected, or the canker is not in my grove; or if so, it is not discernible, and I object to its destruction. I am willing to take the chance." Now, such an objection comes with a great deal of force under such conditions, and yet if the owner were paid something for the suspected trees the difficulties in the way of the experts would vanish. But under this provision no compensation can be given, which, I fear, will hamper very materially the efforts of the Department of Agriculture in the eradication of this greatest of orange-tree pests.

Another objection to this provision is that the amount of money appropriated is, in my judgment, too small. I think it should have been at least as much again, and yet I do not propose to offer an amendment to the bill. I do not desire to do that for two or three reasons. In the first place, the committee have given careful consideration to this item and are thoroughly in sympathy with the efforts of the Department of Agriculture to stamp out the disease, and I realize that they do not desire, in making an appropriation, to go beyond what the Secretary of Agriculture advises. He has recommended $250,000 and they are following his recommendation. Hence, I for one do not care at this time to offer any amendment increasing the amount, although I believe it entirely too small.

I am willing to accept for the present the amount inserted, with the hope and belief that whatever is needed will be furnished later. We do not know just what progress is being made in Florida and other States where the disease prevails toward its destruction. The experts who are undertaking the expenditure of the money are very hopeful of the ultimate eradication of the pest, and I feel confident they will succeed; but I am fearful we will have to have a great deal more money. Not only Congress, but likely the State of Florida and the other States—there are five or six of them in which this disease has made its appearance—will have to furnish considerable sums before it is finally destroyed.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Why does not the gentleman make a motion to strike out the proviso? From what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said, I should think the proviso ought to be stricken out.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I said a moment ago, I do not desire to interfere with the work of the committee. They have, no doubt, done what they think is right, and I do not care to embarrass them. There was a similar provision in the item inserted in one of the deficiency bills the early part of the year, and which, passing the House, became a law, and the committee is simply following the law. Hence I do not care to do anything to embarrass the committee, though I should prefer that the provision be stricken out, because, as I have said, if it remains there I fear it will hamper the department in its work.

Now, the State of Florida and the people of that State have already contributed quite liberally toward the eradication of citrus canker. Not only has the State furnished a considerable sum of money for that purpose, but individuals, first and last, have contributed sums aggregating a much larger amount, while many growers have given over to destruction large numbers of apparently uninfected and healthy trees to make certain that the work of eradication in a given locality was complete. Such contributions already far exceed the amount already appropriated by Congress, even including the sum carried in this bill.

This not only shows that the people of Florida are doing their share, but that they are willing to aid the Government by making any reasonable sacrifice toward the destruction of this the most infectious and deadliest of orange-tree pests—a disease which, if not effectually eradicated, will destroy the citrus industry throughout the country.

This thought, Mr. Chairman, suggests another: That no effort should be spared to check this disease. We do not have any too much knowledge of citrus canker, but enough is, I think, known to make it certain that no half-way measures in the war upon it will suffice. Both in the interest of economy and of the orange industry itself, we should leave nothing untried that will insure speedy and complete success. A few hundreds of thousands of dollars or even a million or two now may save millions to the Government and many more millions to the industry we are trying to protect and preserve.

And, Mr. Chairman, it is well worthy of protection. So, too, are the growers worthy of the aid they are receiving and all they may receive. There are only a few States of the Union where citrus fruits can be grown. These are far to the southward, mostly on the Gulf or the Pacific, Florida and California furnishing the chief output. If this pest is permitted to destroy the groves there, which it is likely to do if not checked, we will have to rely on foreign countries to supply our demands, which they can not begin to do, even though they should escape the disease, which is not probable. So that with our own industry destroyed we would either have an inadequate source of supply or none at all from abroad to take its place.

But there is no need for the total loss of our domestic supply if we make the proper effort to stamp out the disease, for it has been demonstrated that it can and, I feel confident, will be done. It will cost more if we do not take hold of it in the right manner, but it will be done in any event.

The outlook, however, for the industry in other countries is not so hopeful, for if the pest could get into our country, as it has, over the safeguards we furnish, how much more likely is it to find its way into other citrus-growing countries where no safeguards against its entrance are afforded, and then, meeting inadequate means of defense, completes its work of destruction there. Such a condition, not beyond the range of probability in the opinion of expert observers, would make this country the only source of supply for this hemisphere and the greater part of the eastern, if not for the whole world.

Now, it is the duty of the Government to aid in this work, because the people of no one State can effectually deal with the disease. It can be transported in so many ways inside and across State lines, is so insidious in its progress from place to place, so easily carried from State to State that only the Federal authority, with power in such matters to reach across boundaries and go into all the States, can successfully cope with it. It is already in several of the citrus-growing States, and it might be totally eradicated in one of them, as in Florida for instance, but unless it were destroyed in all the others the industry would not be safe.

Now, the growers, as I said, are deserving of aid. While under normal conditions the citrus industry is a profitable one, it is not so under all conditions. The producer has his ups and downs, his fat years and his lean years. The high cost of distribution, inadequate transportation facilities at times, overproduction at others, cut into the profits of the grower, but the consumer, the great American public, is always served, even though it be at the expense of the producer. Hence, Mr. Chairman, the public have an interest in this fight, and Congress is clearly within the purview of its duties in making adequate provision for the protection of this great industry, one of the most important in the country.

I do not desire that Congress should appropriate any more money than is needed to do the necessary work, but, as I said, I fear the amount carried in this bill is not sufficient. I believe it should have been larger, yet if it is found to be inadequate, as I fear it will, we can, later on in the session, have it increased, which I have no doubt Congress will do if it should be found necessary.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. I shall want about three minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend 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.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make it 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have two minutes of that time myself.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman a question. Is it the gentleman's idea that the action of this provision would limit the States themselves from any action that they might care to take in the matter of the extermination of this disease?

Mr. LEVER. Not at all. This will be a great encouragement for them to do this same work.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. That is my understanding—that there is no attempt in any way to prevent the States from going the limit.

Mr. LEVER. Not at all. As I said a moment ago in answer to the gentleman's question, Florida herself, although a very small State, has already expended $195,000, and the fruit growers of that State have expended $100,000. And the fruit growers of other citrus-fruit States have spent money for the same purpose.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Any State could order by legislative enactment the destruction?

Mr. LEVER. No doubt.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. For information, as it is very important in Michigan, that being a very large fruit-growing State, I would like to inquire whether or not there is any proviso in the bill for the control of the San Jose scale?

Mr. LEVER. Not by name; but there is a general paragraph in the bill which carries money for diseases of fruit trees.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I was hardly satisfied with the answer I received from our minority leader when he said it was easy enough to control the San Jose scale. We know that it is spread similar to the way he said that the citrus canker spreads—by birds, by the wind, by being carried and communicated—and it is destroying a great many of the orchards there. And I would like to inquire of the chairman, who has made a great investigation along this line, whether or not he considers this a serious condition in relation to our fruit-growing industry?

Mr. LEVER. I have not made any investigation of that particular territory, but I appreciate the destructiveness of the San Jose scale. The difference between that, however, and the citrus canker is that a spray has been discovered by which the San Jose scale can be checked; but there is no spray which will check the spread of the citrus canker. Nothing has been found to be of any value except burning.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is it the understanding of the gentleman upon investigation that has been made that it can be eradicated and can be controlled without chopping out or destroying the orchards, which they are doing?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. HAWLEY. Permit me to say that we had that problem in the State of Oregon, where we raise a great many apples and other fruits. We have a law which provides that if a man will not spray and care for his trees the county authorities can remove them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would like to ask the gentleman if you have controlled it in that way and gotten rid of it?

Mr. HAWLEY. They are getting rid of it. It is a very minor disease out there now.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. In the case of destroying trees, does the county pay for the trees?

Mr. HAWLEY. Not only does the county not pay for the trees, but they make the man who will not keep his orchards clean pay for them.

Mr. LEVER. It is a penal provision.

Mr. HAYES. Does not the gentleman think that $250,000 is a small sum to stamp out this canker?

Mr. LEVER. The committee considered that very carefully, and after the assistant chief of this bureau, Mr. Kellerman, the gentleman in charge of this work, had made a thorough examination of the territory involved, we had him before the committee, and his statement to the committee was to the effect that after very careful consideration of all the factors involved the department felt that $250,000 would be sufficient for them to carry on the work in the coming fiscal year, especially in view of the fact that they estimate they will have out of the $300,000 deficiency appropriation at the end of this fiscal year $100,000, and in addition to that they hope, with some degree of certainty, to get probably $50,000 or $100,000 from individuals and the States involved, which would give them a reasonably large sum of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I will take my other two minutes if I have them, because I think the gentleman wants information.

Mr. HAYES. Has there been any further information given to the committee than when I was present, wherein he said, if I remember, that they would be glad of $250,000, but could use twice as much if they could have it?

Mr. LEVER. I presume the gentleman from California refers to the first hearing on this subject, in December.

Mr. HAYES. That was probably the one where I was present.

Mr. LEVER. We had a later hearing, ten days or two weeks before the committee reported this bill, after Dr. Kellerman had made an extended visit through this section and had returned with full information of the situation. There has been a later hearing than that to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. HAYES. The disease is not yet prevalent in California, and so I know nothing personally about it, but it seems to me it would be a mistake to deal with it piecemeal. It ought to be stamped out without delay, because it threatens the citrus industry absolutely, and if this is not ample let us give $500,000, and place it at the disposal of the Department of Agriculture to use such sum as they think it necessary to finally and completely stamp it out.

Does not the gentleman agree with me that that would be best?

Mr. LEVER. No; I do not. There are two reasons for not thinking so. First of all, the department feels, and has indicated both in the statement made before the committee and in a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee, that $250,000, supplemented by the other funds to which I referred a moment ago, will give the department as much money as it can expend wisely and economically in the handling of this situation. I have always been afraid that in appropriating a large lump fund we are liable to fall not only into habits of large extravagance but also into habits of doing the work in a slipshod way. The committee and the department feel that this amount of money will do the work, and do it effectively, and do it economically. It is not going to clean up the disease by any means, but, in our judgment, it is as much as we can spend wisely in the next fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] is misinformed as to the testimony before the committee. The official of the department, Dr. Kellerman, to whom the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has referred, stated that $250,000 is all that can be economically used. The disposition of the committee was to allow just as much as was necessary, just as much as can properly be used, and after a good deal of time and careful thought the amount of $250,000 was arrived at.

Now, as to the proviso that no part of the money should be used to pay for trees injured or destroyed, the association of Florida more directly interested in this matter had a representative or attorney, I believe, present. I am not sure about his name, but I think it was Gillett. He appeared, and he drafted the provision himself, leaving a copy of his draft at the office of each member of the committee. The draft prepared by Mr. Gillett himself contained this proviso, "That no part of the money shall be used to pay for trees injured or destroyed," or words to that effect, so that now, after further consideration of it, and seeing the willingness of Congress to appropriate money sufficient to carry on the work, gentlemen of that part of the country who first were inclined to ask for money to pay for trees destroyed are not now asking for money for that purpose.

There was an effort on the part of some to place this citrus-canker trouble on an even footing with the foot-and-mouth disease. If it were so placed, and if money were used as it was used in taking care of the foot-and-mouth trouble, the work would not be carried on as the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says—that trees already affected or destroyed would not be paid for, because they are of no value. That may be true; they are of no value; but where this serious disease of foot and mouth attacked the cattle, the animals are so affected that they are of no value whatever and for the protection of everybody they ought to be killed, still the Federal Government provides money to pay a part of their value, or,

rather, what would be their value if they were not affected; so if we were to place this citrus canker on a footing exactly with the foot-and-mouth disease, we would be paying for trees already affected, and which, just as the gentleman from Illinois says, are worthless. We would be asked to pay, and find it necessary to pay, the value the trees were supposed to have before the disease struck them.

Now, in my judgment, it is not wise at this time, right off the reel, to provide hundreds of thousands of dollars to pay for trees destroyed, those already affected, those that are exposed, those that are in the neighborhood and the destruction of which seems necessary in order to prevent the spread of the disease. It seems to me that the department, cooperating with the States, ought to be given a fair chance, ought to be given all the money it can use, to see if it can not find a remedy, find some way to check the spread of the disease and perhaps eradicate it, without involving the immense expenditure of money that will be necessary if we embark on the proposition of paying for all trees destroyed.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If my time is extended, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has fixed a limited time for debate on this paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have three minutes, and I will yield to the gentleman one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman a question. I gathered from the discussion here that it is not the policy to attempt to stamp out the disease in the next fiscal year.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The plan is to do everything possible.

Mr. HAYES. I want to ask the gentleman if he thinks his committee will cooperate with us who are interested directly in this citrus canker disease—will cooperate with us, if necessary, in the next fiscal year to secure a deficiency in order that the work may be properly carried forward?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If those to whom we look for information ask for the money and say it can be efficiently and economically used, I shall certainly support a proposition looking to such an appropriation.

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

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, there are two principal ways in which this disease might be dealt with. The first is by the destruction of all the trees that are affected. But this disease has no host plant. It lives on the citrus trees only. We have adopted a different plan, a strict supervision and examination of the orchards. Young men can be trained to readily detect the disease when it appears on any tree—on the branches or leaves—and as soon as it has appeared on a tree to destroy the tree and to eliminate every diseased tree from the orchard.

That will leave the grower, then, to have the advantage of the product of his other trees in the orchard, and to eliminate the ones that are affected. That is the policy adopted by the committee in the bill. We hope ultimately to eradicate the disease by this method, and do just as little damage as possible to the growers who are dependent on this industry for their livelihood.

There is one other observation I would like to add, and that is this: If we undertake to destroy all the trees in the orchards affected it would cost a very great deal of money, and if no compensation were paid to the growers there would be a very great deal of opposition on their part to the destruction of their trees, because many of them are dependent solely upon the product of those trees for their livelihood. By the adoption of this plan we get the cooperation of the States and of the growers with the department. The States and the growers will contribute money, so that the amount that can be used will be greater than is indicated in the bill and the amount left over from the last deficiency bill, that will be unexpended at the end of the fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation of diseases of forest and ornamental trees and shrubs, including a study of the nature and habits of the parasitic fungi causing the chestnut-tree bark disease, the white-pine blister rust, and other epidemic tree diseases, for the purpose of discovering new methods of control and applying methods of eradication or control already discovered, $87,175.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CLINE. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether the phrase or clause "other epidemic tree diseases" is intended to cover other investigations, like that of the San Jose scale? That is in line 13.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that this item applies only to diseases of forest and ornamental trees, and not to diseases that attack fruit trees. That is carried in another item further on in the bill.

Mr. CLINE. I just wanted to make that clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I should like to make inquiry relative to the chestnut-tree blight disease and the white-pine blister rust. These are both diseases which are very prevalent in Massachusetts and New England; and I would like to inquire how much larger this appropriation is than has been the customary one for these diseases in years past? I understand there is an added item, is there not?

Mr. LEVER. There is a $30,000 increase in this item, to be devoted entirely, however, to the work in eradicating the white-pine blister rust.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will any portion of this amount be used for eradication of the chestnut-tree blight?

Mr. LEVER. The appropriation for the chestnut-tree blight is carried in the rest of the paragraph, such portion as the department desires to use, but none for the eradication of chestnut blight—only for the study of the disease and, if possible, the development of a strain of chestnut trees in this country that will resist the disease.

Mr. TREADWAY. As I understand it, the work of the department is not really field work—it is more pathological?

Mr. LEVER. As affecting the chestnut blight that is true, but as affecting the white-pine blister rust it will be largely field work—in eradication.

Mr. TREADWAY. In what section?

Mr. LEVER. In the New England and Middle Atlantic States principally.

Mr. TREADWAY. One more question, if I may ask the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is the work which the department is endeavoring to follow up, in the eradication of this disease, carried on in conjunction with the State officials—the forestry departments of the various States?

Mr. LEVER. I am not sure about that, but I am strongly of the opinion that it is carried on in cooperation with the State authorities.

Mr. TREADWAY. I know that in my own State of Massachusetts a great deal of interest has been taken in this subject by the forestry department, but I was not aware whether or not there was any cooperation between the Federal Government and the States.

Mr. LEVER. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the departments of forestry of the various States, particularly in New England, have shown a great deal of interest in this white-pine blister problem and have sent resolutions to the Committee on Agriculture and communications to the chairman of the committee asking that this be allowed, and there has been a deficiency appropriation allowed by another committee, and this committee has allowed a supplementary estimate of $30,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am sure that there is very great interest in the work, both of the Federal Government and of the State departments, because both diseases, as I know from my own knowledge, have spread very materially in the western portion of the New England States, and we hope that the cooperation between the Federal Government and the actual field work by the various forestry departments will result in much good in the timber sections.

Mr. LEVER. We join in that hope.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] is evidently interested in the chestnut-blight proposition, I will say to him that after several years of field work, and scientific investigation also, the conclusion has been reached that the only way to deal with the chestnut-blight disease is to destroy the affected trees. It becomes a matter of expending money and putting forth physical effort to destroy and remove the trees, and the Committee on Agriculture thinks this scientific department ought not to be asked to do and ought not be permitted to do that kind of work, but that it is up to the

States themselves to take charge of the work after the investigation had been made and the remedy, as far as it may be called a remedy, is well known and it simply involves the expenditure of money and the physical work of cutting down the trees. That is something of the history of the field work relating to the chestnut blight. That is the reason the appropriation is not larger than it is; and while I am not as familiar with it perhaps as I ought to be, my understanding of the appropriation is that no part of this money is intended for field work, for the reasons I have given. The money that is to be devoted to the chestnut-blight disease is for investigational work, to try to find out the cause and some scientific way, if possible, of eradicating it.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is correct about that. That is the understanding of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and improvement of cereals and methods of cereal production, and the study of cereal diseases, and for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases, and for the investigation and improvement of broom corn and methods of broom-corn production, $157,005: *Provided*, That not less than $40,000 shall be set aside for the study of corn improvement and methods of corn production: *Provided also*, That not less than $10,000 shall be set aside for the investigation of the diseases of wheat known as black rust and stripe rust.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McFADDEN: On page 21, line 10, after the word "production," add a comma and the following: "and the manufacture of alcohol for commercial uses as a by-product therefrom."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the reason I introduced this amendment is that I find on investigation at the Agricultural Department that their knowledge of this special phase of the production of alcohol—from corn, which is one of the best known grains for that purpose—is very limited. It seems to me this is a subject on which our people ought to be informed at this time, because of the growing increase in the demand for gasoline and the increase in price of the same. If alcohol can be produced as a by-product from corn, it will be of vital importance to the farmers of this country. It is for that purpose I offer this amendment.

Such experimental work as has been done has been along the line of utilizing waste products of the farm, while in a situation like the present the investigations should be conducted with the by-product in view and the use of the by-product as a feeding proposition for dairying. The protein feeds are becoming more scarce each year, and as the farmer is becoming convinced that a well-balanced ration is the most desirable, the tremendous possibilities of industrial alcohol are at once apparent.

One of the farmer's greatest needs in this connection is to know just how to proceed, and how much waste there is in the feeding quality of the operation; in other words, how much would be consumed in the operation of eliminating the alcohol from the corn.

Such records as we have prove that the mash after the alcohol has been removed is a better balanced ration for dairy cows than that previously used.

If it is found a profitable operation after investigation, it would seem to me that plants could be established in conjunction with creameries now operating in country districts, and the farmers could take the mash for prompt feeding, and many economies could thus be effected in the joint operations of those plants, and central refining and denaturing plants could be established at convenient places nearby. The farmers would thus be furnished a cheap power, light, and heat basis and the country generally receive much relief by the use of a commercial denatured alcohol.

I beg to submit herewith a letter, under date of March 23, 1916, from the Department of Agriculture bearing on this subject:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 23, 1916.

Hon. LOUIS T. McFADDEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. McFADDEN: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of March 15. In reply the following data on the yield of alcohol from corn, the cost of extracting alcohol, and the value and analysis of the dairy feed obtainable from the residue are submitted for your information. They have been compiled from several sources as stated below. You will realize that of necessity the costs will vary under different economic conditions. The data given, however, may be considered as a working basis upon which those interested may form an opinion as to the probability of manufacturing alcohol in plants of the capacities described, making due allowance for the variation in cost of raw materials, equipment, labor, and other conditions. A plant of larger capacity than the ones described would undoubtedly produce alcohol at somewhat lower costs.

YIELD OF ALCOHOL FROM CORN.

Approximately 2.75 gallons of 180 proof alcohol can be made from a bushel of well-dried corn.

COST OF EXTRACTING ALCOHOL FROM CORN IN PLANT OF AMERICAN MANUFACTURE, PRODUCING ALCOHOL OF 180 PROOF, AT RATE OF 104 GALLONS PER DAY.

COST OF RAW MATERIAL.

The grains used daily will weigh about 2,198 pounds and will consist of 88 per cent corn, 10 per cent malt, and 2 per cent rye, or 34.54 bushels of corn, 6.47 bushels of malt,, and 0.8 bushel of rye. The cost of this material will be 28.82 cents with corn, rye and malt at 65, 85, and 88 cents per bushel, respectively, or 27.7 cents for each gallon of the 104 gallons of alcohol produced.

INVESTMENT COSTS.

The cost of machinery and other equipment for milling, fermenting, and distilling, consisting of steam boiler, steam engine, high-pressure cooker, necessary pumps, vats, shafting, and still	$10,000
Cost of building	5,000
Cost of press and drier for the press cake	1,500
Cost of single-effect vacuum evaporator, complete with condenser and pump, for the liquid slops	2,000
Total investment costs	18,500

Fixed charges consist of interest on the investment at 6 per cent, and depreciation at 12 per cent, and amount to $3,330 per annum.

For a 200-day year these charges amount to $16.65 per day, or to $0.16 per gallon of 180 proof alcohol.

DAILY OPERATING COSTS.

2 tons of coal, at $3	$6
1 foreman, at $3, and 3 laborers, at $2	9
Incidentals, including oil, barrels, and drayage	6
Total operating expenses	21

or 20.2 cents per gallon of alcohol.

SUMMARY.

Cost per gallon of alcohol of 180 proof.

Raw material	$0.277
Investment	.160
Operating cost	.202
Total	.639

There will be produced about 967 pounds of dried distillery grains worth at least $30 per ton, or $14.51, or $0.14 per gallon of alcohol produced. This should be subtracted from the above cost, making the net cost per gallon $0.499.

The data given above are taken from the information which the department secured some years ago in its experimental work on the manufacture of alcohol and from other sources.

COST OF EXTRACTING ALCOHOL FROM CORN IN PLANT OF GERMAN MAKE PRODUCING ALCOHOL AT RATE OF 419 GALLONS OF 180 PROOF PER DAY.

RAW MATERIAL.

Cost the same as in the above estimate, namely, $0.277.

INVESTMENT COSTS.

The first cost of the equipment, including packing for shipment is $8,760.

To this must be added duty of 20 per cent, making the total cost of equipment purchased abroad	$10,512
Freight and erection costs	1,000
Cost of building	5,000
Cost of press and drier for distillery grains	2,600
Double-effect vacuum evaporator, completed with condenser and pump	3,100
Total cost of plant	22,212
Interest at 6 per cent and depreciation at 12 per cent, or $20 per day, for 200-day year	3,998

This amounts to an investment cost of $0.048 per gallon.

OPERATING EXPENSES.

4 tons coal daily, at $3	$12
1 foreman at $3 and 6 laborers at $2	15
Incidentals, including oil, barrels, and drayage	24
Total operating expenses	51

or $0.122 per gallon of alcohol produced.

SUMMARY.

Cost per gallon of alcohol of 180 proof.

Raw material	$0.277
Investment	.048
Operating costs	.122
Total	.447
Less value of distillery grains	.14
Making net cost	.307

The composition of distillery grains is shown on page 37 of Farmers' Bulletin 22, a copy of which accompanies this letter.

The data given above have been obtained from various sources, as follows:

The yield of alcohol from corn is given by Maercker-Delbruck, Handbuch der Spiritus Fabrikation, ninth edition, page 681. The yield given is that obtained under good working conditions, using high pressure in cooking.

The proportions of grains used are substantially those given by Mr. W. E. Lummus in hearings before the House Committee on Ways and Means, February to March, 1906, third edition, pages 196 and 413. The value of corn has been taken as $0.65 per bushel, which an expert of the Bureau of Plant Industry states is a fair value at the present time for the grades of corn available for alcohol manufacture.

The cost of the smaller plant is the present value of the equipment purchased by the department in 1908 plus cost of installation. The cost of the press and drier are estimates from trade catalogues describ-

ing machinery manufactured in this country. The cost of the single-effect vacuum evaporator is also an estimate and is not a definite quotation from a manufacturer. Such equipment is made in this country by a large number of firms.

In the daily operating costs the figures given by Mr. W. E. Lummus have been used as a basis, but the costs given are necessarily approximations only. This applies to the coal consumption and incidentals. The labor cost is the same as given in Farmers' Bulletin 410 for operating a plant of this size, working on potatoes, with an additional laborer to attend to the drying of the grains.

The cost of the equipment of the German plant for making alcohol was obtained by the Bureau of Plant Industry several years ago, and plans showing installation and detailed estimates of first costs are available at the department. Freight and erection costs, cost of building, and cost of press and drier for distillery grains are necessarily estimates only. A substantial building is required to house the machinery, and the $5,000 cost is not regarded as at all excessive.

The cost of a double-effect vacuum evaporator was obtained in connection with another subject from an American manufacturer. The cost of coal, incidentals, and labor are but estimates, using, however, to some extent the data given by Mr. Lummus, already referred to.

The yield of distillery grain is taken from Maercker-Delbruck, page 956.

As stated in the opening paragraph of this letter, you will realize that these costs, particularly the operating costs, will necessarily vary under different conditions and can not be stated very definitely.

Very truly, yours,

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary*.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McFADDEN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. I offer an amendment to the paragraph in conformity with a suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as to another part of the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 21, line 9, strike out the words "not less than."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. In line 11, on the same page, I move to strike out the words "not less than" after the word "that."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 11, after the word "that," strike out the words "not less than."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and improvement of methods of crop production under subhumid, semiarid, or dry-land conditions, $160,000: *Provided*, That the limitation in this act as to the cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in the free distribution, or propagation for free distribution, of cuttings, seedlings, or trees of willow, box elder, ash, Caragana, or other common varieties of fruit, ornamental, or shelter-belt trees in the northern Great Plains area, except for experimental or demonstration purposes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. What farm buildings do they construct under this item?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that the Government has 26 stations in this subhumid and semiarid dry-land country, and they have little field stations from which they make their investigations. A station costs from $8,000 to $10,000.

Mr. HAWLEY. They also have a building for the man in charge of the station.

Mr. MANN. They do not ordinarily cost more than $1,500, do they? What buildings do they have that cost over $1,500?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It was recommended that some dairy work be undertaken at two of these stations, and for that experimental work it was proposed that a farm shed, and so on, be constructed, and one estimate includes $4,000 for a barn. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, without violating any committee secrets, that I did not think that was a wise provision.

Mr. ANDERSON. That was in a new item where they wanted an appropriation of $87,000, which the committee disallowed.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It was an experimental purpose, and it did not seem to me wise to put up a $4,000 barn on a doubtful proposition to make an experiment. The recollection of the gentleman from Minnesota is better than mine. I had in mind another provision. I may say that my understanding of that kind of work is that it is largely experimental, and that expensive buildings are not needed. I doubt very much the wisdom of doing away with this provision of law which limits the cost of farm buildings to $1,500.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Illinois will permit me, I hold in my hand a report covering the cost of all of these buildings. It is voluminous, but I will read a few of them:

Ardmore, S. Dak. (field station): Frame barn, 30 by 50 feet; housing horses, storage of forage and farm machinery, $1,500 Frame shed, 36 by 80 feet, with concrete floor; storage of farm machinery, $1,950. Frame house, 22.6 by 38 feet, residence of station superintendent, $1,750. Frame shed, 10 by 17 feet, storage of wood and coal, $200.

Dalhart, Tex. (field station): Concrete house, 28 by 50 feet, two stories, administrative headquarters and laboratory rooms for carrying on experiments, $2,061.39. Concrete bunk house, 20 by 34 feet, one story; sleeping quarters for station employees, $1,000.

Lawton, Okla.: Frame house, pebble dashed, 29.6 by 47 feet, two stories, residence of station superintendent, $3,167. Frame barn and implement shed, 36 by 80 feet, with frame "L," 35.6 by 30 feet, housing station animals and storage of machinery and forage, $3,467. Frame house, pebble dashed, 28 by 50 feet, two stories, administrative headquarters and laboratory rooms for carrying on experiments, $2,460.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order, and I move to strike out the last word. You put in a provision here that they shall not distribute any trees or cuttings.

Mr. LEVER. I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota to explain that item to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I will say that about two years ago the station at Mandan engaged in the propagation of the ordinary belt shelter trees like box elder, willows, caragana, and so forth, and at that time they sent out to the newspapers circulars that they would furnish farmers a sufficient number of shelter belt trees to plant half an acre. In this way the Government came in direct competition with the nurserymen who were selling trees in this section, and that is the purpose of this amendment, to stop the distribution of shelter belt trees.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that this last proviso should be retained in the bill. I should move as an amendment to strike out the proviso were it not for the fact that I am led to believe that an agreement has been reached between the Department of Agriculture and certain members of the Committee on Agriculture to the effect that this provision will be reasonably satisfactory to all concerned. The only reason the proviso has been placed in the bill is because the nurserymen of the Northwest, more particularly those in Minnesota, have strenuously objected to the distribution of trees and shrubs that has been made and that is contemplated to be made by the Northern Great Plain Experimental Station at Mandan, N. Dak. The nurserymen complain that on account of the cuttings, seedlings, and shrubs furnished free by the experimental station to farmers in the Northern Great Plains area in North and South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming, the volume of their business has been decreased and their business has been greatly injured. Dr. Taylor, of the Department of Agriculture, takes direct issue on this complaint and maintains that the work being carried out by the Northern Great Plains Experimental Station will increase rather than lessen the demand for the purchase of trees and shrubs by farmers and others in that section of the country. It has not been attempted in the past by the experimental station at Mandan, to supply cuttings, seedlings, and shrubs to all farmers in the Northern Great Plains area who might make application for the same. It has been their plan and purpose to distribute for demonstration and experimental purposes to a few farmers in each locality cuttings, seedlings, and shrubs in quantity sufficient to plant a shelter belt of two or three acres. It is further planned to send out experienced horticulturists from the station to demonstrate the best way to care for these trees and shrubs, and to encourage farmers in the cultivation, care, and growing of trees, shrubs, and small fruits. This has not been done to a large extent in the last few years, but those in charge of the experimental station plan in the future to give more emphasis to this feature of the work.

I can say from my own personal observation that they are doing a good work at this station. They are creating a commendable and much-needed interest on the part of the farmers in the growing of trees and the setting out of shelter belts on their farms all through the Northern Great Plains area.

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

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. What is this caragana tree? I am familiar with the caragana species.

Mr. NORTON. That is an item that was inserted in the bill at the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], and I am most confident he can give the gentleman from Illinois all of the desired information concerning that particular tree.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman I never attempt to give the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] any information.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not attempt to do it without doing it. Whatever he does it is not ever merely an attempt. I would not have asked the question, but he used the word a short time ago, and it is written in the bill also.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am unable to give the gentleman any description which will enable the gentleman to identify it. All I know about it is that this is one of the ordinary varieties of shelter-belt trees or shrubs which the department has been distributing in this section and which is a very ordinary common variety.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations in connection with western irrigation agriculture, the utilization of lands reclaimed under the reclamation act, and other areas in the arid and semiarid regions, $75,380.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman if there is not another department that is doing the work provided for in this paragraph? Is there not a special fund set aside from receipts for the sale of lands in each of the States for irrigation purposes and for the investigation of irrigation plants to be erected by the Interior Department?

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. There is a bureau in the Department of the Interior known as the Reclamation Service, which constructs irrigation plants, including canals and ditches for the irrigation of arid lands. This is an entirely different procedure. After the irrigation districts have been developed and farmers go on the lands this work begins then in cooperation with the farmer to study the problems on the projects, of growing crops, of drainage, and of every other factor in the farmer's work that arises in an irrigated section. It is an entirely different branch of work.

Mr. LEVER. This is purely agricultural.

Mr. FORDNEY. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

To cultivate and care for the gardens and grounds of the Department of Agriculture in the city of Washington, including the keep and lighting of the grounds and the construction, surfacing, and repairing of roadways and walks; and to erect, manage, and maintain conservatories, greenhouses, and plant and fruit propagating houses on the grounds of the Department of Agriculture in the city of Washington, $11,690.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Is that what this appropriation has been used for heretofore—simply the grounds down here?

Mr. LEVER. This appropriation has been used for that purpose heretofore, but some question as to the erection of greenhouses arose with the comptroller, and it is for the purpose of making the authority of the department certain as to the erection of permanent greenhouses, as contrasted with temporary greenhouses, that this change in language was adopted.

Mr. MANN. There is no change that would affect that is there?

Mr. LEVER. We have dropped the word "experimental," and we have inserted the word "erect," which the department feels gives them authority to meet the ruling of the comptroller.

The Clerk read as follows:

For horticultural investigations, including the study of producing, handling, and shipping truck and related crops, including potatoes, and the study of landscape and vegetable gardening, floriculture, and related subjects, $56,080.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not like to take up the time of the committee, but I desire to have some information if I can get it. The central part of southern Indiana is fast becoming a great apple-producing section. Several years ago a few men went into it on a rather light scale, but in the last 10 years a number of men have gone in and have planted thousands upon thousands of acres of apple orchards. Last summer what was known through that section of the country and what I learned later was characterized by the Agricultural Department as fire blight began to sweep through that section of the country until it almost ruined thousands and thousands of acres of orchards. I have a little orchard myself of 10 acres, and it almost desolated it. I learned the only remedy for it was to prune it and cut off every infected limb. I got that information from an extensive fruit grower in my section, who said he got his authority from the Agricultural Department. I found it did not do any good. I would like to know whether or not the department has any remedy or has discovered anything that will stop that fire blight. It is extraordinarily bad in our section of the country. In addition to apples it started on pear trees, and the owners of the orchards finally cut down the pear trees and burned them, because they came to the conclusion that the disease, whatever it was, was being bred on the pear and spread from there to the apple.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that as to the blight in apples I do not recall any statement being made to the committee, but I do know that some statement was made in reference to the pear blight, and as far as I have been able to ascertain there is no remedy for pear blight except the destruction of the diseased part of the tree.

Mr. HAWLEY. The gentleman spoke of fire blight.

Mr. LEVER. I understood from what the gentleman said it was the same kind of disease.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I got the impression that this fire blight struck the orchards in New England and particularly in New York in 1910, and that they were then investigating it, but had not discovered a remedy for it. If the department has anything on earth for that section of the country and can inform us of it, it will be doing southern Indiana a very great service.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, the disease the gentleman speaks of, which is known as fire blight, is not a new disease. It has been in the United States for the last hundred years. It attacks seed-bearing deciduous fruit trees to a greater or less degree. It also attacks the common thorn tree, and attacking trees of that character makes it almost impossible to eradicate the disease. The information given the gentleman from Indiana was correct as to the remedy. The only way to eradicate the disease is with the knife. The only way that it can be handled is by careful pruning, and the reason that method is not nearly always successful is either from lack of knowledge or from carelessness in following out the directions for pruning. The disease is of the same nature as the citrus canker disease, spoken of a while ago, only not as virulent probably as the citrus canker. Unless you get clear below the disease you fail, the disease being bacteriological and works in the sap, and you can not reach and spray against it, only the knife will do the work. If you do not get below the diseased wood and the knife becomes infected, the next cut you make may infect a tree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY].

Mr. FINLEY. Does the gentleman find that pear trees suffer to the same extent or not?

Mr. COX. I think the pear trees of central and southern Indiana suffer.

Mr. FINLEY. I will say to the gentleman I have found every variety on my own premises died with the exception of one variety, and that is a late variety, a very hardy one, I believe called the Keifer.

Mr. COX. Now, in response to the statement made by the gentleman from Washington, this may be an old disease in some sections of the United States, but it is not an old disease in my section of the State. Last summer was the first time it ever made its appearance upon the apple trees in that section of the country. I did my best and followed out the advice I had by using a pruning hook and supervised the pruning myself, and the man who did the pruning put on a pair of rubber gloves. I had a pail of water thoroughly disinfected. The cut was made far down below the infected part, and if I entertained any question that the pruning hook did not go beyond the infected part it was thoroughly disinfected, and yet it did no good. The result was it practically ruined my orchard, but that is neither here nor there; but there are tens of thousands of acres of growing orchards through my section of the country which this disease literally ruined last year, and all pursued the same method. I have searched the agricultural bulletins on this subject and I have not found any bulletin that has been issued by the Bureau of Horticulture treating of this particular disease or advising people how to get rid of it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I confess I never heard of the disease before, but I will say to the gentleman from Indiana, if he will permit, that on page 18 of this bill, which we have already passed, we have a paragraph for $63,615 for the investigation of the diseases of orchard and other fruits, and I trust the gentleman will have this matter brought to the attention of the department, although I presume he already has done so.

Mr. COX. I have not; I will say that; but I will say that I raise the point at this particular time so that the Bureau of Plant Industry would see what we have said upon this subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and give some attention to it later, and perhaps it will cause the department to look into this matter because it is a serious matter for men to have thousands of growing orchards simply swept off when they can not do anything to stop it.

Mr. LEVER. I am satisfied, however, the gentleman from Indiana will find that if this disease is at all of long standing in this country, or even of rather recent standing, the department has already discovered it and is doing some work upon the subject. Whether they have found a remedy that works successfully I do not know.

Mr. COX. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Is the disease to which the gentleman refers a form of blight?

Mr. COX. Fire blight, it is called.

Mr. FESS. Of the pear tree?

Mr. COX. No; of the apple.

Mr. FESS. And it struck the pear trees, too.

Mr. COX. It struck the pear trees in our section of the country some years ago but never touched the apple trees until last summer.

Mr. LEVER. A good deal of study has been given to the pear blight. Is there any difference between the ordinary apple blight and the pear blight?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I think if the gentleman from Indiana will take this up with the department he will learn that they had cognizance of this disease for many years and they have issued bulletins on the disease, and that it has been treated of in the Agricultural Yearbooks for many years past, at times. It is a disease, as I have said before, that has been in the United States for more than 100 years, yet it was only within the last 10 years the origin of the disease was simultaneously discovered by the Nebraska State experiment station and by Cornell University. It is a bacterial disease and works in the sap of the tree.

Mr. COX. Do you have it out in your great fruit belt?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should say we did.

Mr. COX. What do you do to get rid of it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We use the knife.

Mr. COX. Does that cure it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It will not cure it always. I will say we have had the same experience the gentleman has had. We have cut orchards, and still would lose the trees in spite of it; but I will say this that for 14 years I ran a large orchard, and when the disease first struck my part of the country some of my neighbors became disheartened and grubbed out their trees, but I fought it and used the knife continuously, and, while with a few varieties I lost practically all, on the whole I shipped four or five thousand boxes of good pears each year.

Mr. COX. Did it hit your apple trees?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It hit our apple trees, our pear trees, and it hits all seed-bearing deciduous fruit trees, and even the thorn trees. It does not attack stone fruits, such as peach trees, cherry trees, and so forth.

Mr. COX. Is it the same kind of a blight that works on the pear that works on the apple?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The same thing—the fire blight. There is a leaf blight that makes the leaf of the pear tree turn brown, but the latter disease is a very innocuous one as compared with the fire blight.

Mr. FESS. What is the San Jose blight?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is not a blight at all. It is a louse that fastens on the bark of the tree and becomes covered by a scale. There is an exudation from it, and after a short time it becomes fastened to the tree.

If my time has not expired, I will say to the gentleman that the San Jose scale will fasten on the bark of the tree; it breeds very rapidly, and in a short time the bark of the tree will look as though you had taken a pepper box and sprinkled black pepper thickly over the tree. It is an easy disease to fight compared with fire blight, because by using the proper ingredients of sulphur, salt, and lime anyone who will exert intelligence and is not afraid of work can eradicate it. I shipped 100 cars of fruit a year on an average for 14 years, and I fought the San Jose scale all those 14 years. As I said a while ago, I also shipped thousands of boxes of pears every year, but I had to continuously keep, at the proper season, men in the orchard trimming and keeping the disease down. And if you take it in time and do not let your orchard become thoroughly infested, you can eradicate it much quicker than you can if you once let it get a good hold. After that it is almost impossible to stamp out the disease.

Mr. OVERMYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will.

Mr. OVERMYER. This fire blight is also known as "twig blight" in some sections of the country, is it not?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It might be known as that.

Mr. OVERMYER. They had that in Ohio, and it was known as "twig blight," and it may be that it was the same trouble.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will say to the gentleman that I have no doubt but that it was the same. As I have traveled from Washington City to the Pacific coast for the last two years I have noticed in the orchards, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, thousands of trees infested with fire blight. It is not always so virulent sometimes. Thousands of twigs will be inoculated, and it will probably get in 6 inches on the limb, and then die for some cause. It fails to work against the sap in that tree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington have five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Does this disease occur every year, or is it sporadic?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not think it occurs every year in all localities, but I think you will find it is working in some parts of the country every year. If not, I think it would finally die out.

Mr. COX. What is the gentleman's experience as to when it once gets into an orchard. Does it permanently stay there?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think you can eradicate it from that orchard. But the trouble is always this: One man fights it and another man does not fight it. Consequently, you eradicate it from your orchard this year, and everybody in your neighborhood may eradicate it, but it is carried by birds, on their feet, maybe 10 miles, from some orchard which the owner neglected, and the trees of your orchard will become infected again. For that reason it is only by eternal vigilance you can keep down the fire blight or any other disease. I ran an orchard for 14 years, and you can not do it successfully unless you are watchful all the time.

Mr. COX. I think you are right about that. I am getting disgusted as a fruit grower.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of new and rare seeds; for the investigation and improvement of grasses, alfalfa, clover, and other forage crops, including the investigation of the utilization of cacti and other dry-land plants; and to conduct investigations to determine the most effective methods of eradicating weeds, $140,920: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed $60,000 may be used for the purchase and distribution of such new and rare seeds: *Provided further*, That $5,000 of this amount shall be used for a reconnaissance survey of the noxious-weed situation in the spring-wheat areas of the United States.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I see the committee has very much enlarged the scope of the work to be done by the $60,000 item which was inserted a few years ago in the bill to try drought-resistant seeds in the arid regions. They have left all that out and they now provide for "new and rare seeds." I believe that item, the same thing, is covered in another place in the bill, is it not?

Mr. LEVER. I think this is the only place.

Mr. MANN. There has always been a provision for the distribution of new and rare seeds.

Mr. LEVER. This is the history of the item for new and rare seeds. That, until about two or three years ago, was carried in the item for the purchase and distribution of valuable seed, and it was then transferred here.

Mr. MANN. I understand that. This item carries an appropriation of $140,920, which is a considerable increase over the existing appropriation. That appropriation itself is for the distribution, and so forth, of new and rare seeds.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And then we inserted under that paragraph a proviso for $60,000, which might be used for the distribution of drought-resistant seeds throughout the arid regions. You cut that part out and repeat here the language, "That of this amount not to exceed $60,000 may be used for the purchase and distribution of such new and rare seeds." What is the balance of it used for?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I will say that in the last bill, as the bill passed this House, this paragraph for new and rare seeds carried $39,000 in this proviso as recommended by the department.

Mr. MANN. In this paragraph, this item?

Mr. LEVER. In this paragraph.

Mr. MANN. It is not in the proviso.

Mr. LEVER. It was in the proviso; $39,000 in the proviso; but the proviso did not confine it to the dry-land country at all. Then when the bill reached the Senate—I am speaking somewhat from memory——

Mr. MANN. My recollection is very much along the same line.

Mr. LEVER. I say that because the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] has a copy of the act before him.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have the estimates.

Mr. LEVER. When the bill reached the Senate, the Senate inserted a provision restricting this amount to the distribution of drought-resistant field seeds and increased the appropriation from $39,000 to $100,000. In conference the amount was reduced to $60,000. It was not the intention on the part of the

conferees, certainly not on the part of the conferees for the House, that the distribution of these new and rare seeds should be confined to any one section of the country, so that when the department made its estimates this year the language submitted broadened the scope of the distribution so that those seeds might be distributed to all sections of the country. That is the explanation of this item for "the distribution of new and rare seeds."

Mr. MANN. Under the existing law it is provided that $60,000 of this item "may be used for the purchase and distribution of drought-resistant field seeds throughout the Great Plains area."

Mr. LEVER. This appropriation, I will say to the gentleman, is not all used by any means for the purchase and distribution of new and rare seeds. If the gentleman will observe, he will notice the paragraph says further, "For the investigation and improvement of grasses, alfalfa, clover, and other forage crops, including the investigation of the utilization of cacti and other dry-land plants; and to conduct investigations to determine the most effective methods of eradicating weeds," and so forth. The truth about the matter is that in setting aside this amount in the proviso, $60,000, which the conferees allowed, we very much infringed and encroached upon the work that the department was doing along investigational lines. It is to cure that mistake that we are increasing the appropriation, and by changing the language here we are also broadening the scope of the distribution of new and rare seeds that we introduce into this country.

Mr. MANN. It is true, of course, that all of the work carried on by this paragraph is not confined to the distribution of seeds.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true.

Mr. MANN. It does other work. Last year we made an appropriation of $119,920 in the paragraph. Then, on the insistence of gentlemen representing the Great Plains area, including the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and other gentlemen who made the fight in the House, the law provided that the $60,000 of the $119,920 should be used for the distribution of drought-resistant field seeds in this region. You cut that all out. Of course, in the first place, the department might have used all the money for that purpose if they had wanted to do so, because the general authority to distribute new and rare seeds would have allowed them to use it where they pleased.

Mr. LEVER. That is true.

Mr. MANN. It is very true that the $60,000 probably cut off part of their other work.

Mr. LEVER. It did.

Mr. MANN. But you have increased the appropriation sufficiently to cover that now.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended five minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. I may say further to the gentleman from Illinois, as I refresh my memory, that the statement was made before the committee that the department this year was enabled to get its new and rare seeds at a bargain. I do not recall just exactly what the bargain was, but that statement was made, and I think the figure stated was that it was enabled to get as much seed for $46,000 as under normal present conditions it can ordinarily get for $65,000.

Mr. MANN. Of course, they were not required to use $60,000 this year for this purpose. It was only to call their attention that it was not to exceed $60,000.

Mr. LEVER. That is true.

Mr. MANN. The intention of Congress, as enacted into law, was that the department should give special attention to the subject of drought-resisting field seeds in the Northwest. If we change the law the department will probably think that they will keep on doing that, but they will not do it long.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think it is the intention of the department under this proviso, and I will say frankly to the gentleman that it is not the intention of the committee, that the distribution of these new and rare seeds shall be confined to any one section of the country. The expression "new and rare seeds" includes seeds which are not new to all of this country, but which are new to certain sections of the country.

Mr. MANN. Nobody wants it confined to any one section of the country.

Mr. LEVER. But under the law that might be the effect.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; the old law did not confine them to any one section of the country. The old law only called their attention to it. I can read the language.

Mr. LEVER. I wish to see it myself.

Mr. MANN. The language of the law was, first, so much money for the distribution of new and rare seeds.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Then, with the proviso:

> Of this amount not to exceed $60,000 may be used for the purchase and distribution of drought-resisting field seeds throughout the Great Plains area or other dry-land sections of the United States.

That is the language of the law.

Mr. LEVER. Now, the point I make to the gentleman from Illinois is this, that I believe almost any head of a department might construe that language in accordance with the supposed intention of Congress, and so might confine this $60,000 to distribution in the area of country specified in the act.

Mr. MANN. I doubt whether they spent $60,000 in the distribution of that class of seeds.

Mr. LEVER. Possibly not.

Mr. MANN. I do not think they were required to do it, and I do not think they did, but I think they ought to give special attention to that subject. We have been distributing—properly distributing, and I am glad of it—large quantities of cotton seed for many years. I do not get a quota of any of those seeds myself.

Mr. LEVER. That comes under this item.

Mr. MANN. I know it does now. The people there wanted to try drought-resisting field seeds, and they wanted the department specially to help them. I think the department ought to give special attention to that subject. Of course, they may continue to do it.

Mr. LEVER. My own thought, as a matter of fact, is that the department will do what I think the department ought to do; that it will as nearly as possible send these seeds to such sections of the country as give promise of growing them to advantage.

Mr. MANN. In my judgment, if this provision is to stay in the bill at all, it ought to be stricken out, I was going to say. That would be an Irish bull worthy of anyone. The first proviso has no place in this bill. You first appropriate $140,920 for the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of new and rare seeds, and for other purposes. I do not think you want to limit the seed distribution to $60,000, and you do not limit it to that. You may limit it to that by saying not exceeding $60,000. Last year the $60,000 was called to the attention of the department for drought-resisting field seed.

[The time of Mr. MANN having expired, his time was extended five minutes.]

Mr. MANN. That covered the cotton seed, the ordinary alfalfa seed, the soy bean, and the cowpea that was sent all over different places in the United States.

Mr. COX. And the Soudan grass seed.

Mr. MANN. Yes; and grass seeds not confined to the Northwest. I do not know how much they expended for that purpose, but I dare say it amounted to more than $60,000. I understood the gentleman to say that they spent $46,000 for drought-resisting field seed, and I am sure they spent more than $14,000 for the other seeds. Here you make an appropriation of $140,000 and then limit the amount they can expend for seed to $60,000. I do not think you want to do that.

Mr. LEVER. I disagree with the gentleman; it is a matter of judgment, and not of fact.

Mr. MANN. In the main it is a matter of fact—what they have done with it.

Mr. LEVER. As a matter of judgment the committee, as the gentleman knows, has for a good many years undertaken, as far as possible, to segregate the various lump-sum appropriations in this bill, and this, while not an entire segregation, is in a measure a segregation of the items. The Committee on Agriculture feels that $60,000 is a sufficient sum for this purpose.

Mr. MANN. Here is what the Committee on Agriculture found—an item that purported to appropriate $60,000 for the purchase of drought-resisting field seed. They said we will change that, cut out the limitation, and make it new and rare seed; but in changing that you limit the other appropriation, which was for the purpose of purchasing new and rare field seed. There is no earthly object in carrying in two places in the paragraph the provision for the purchase and distribution of new and rare seed. You have it in once as a limitation and once as a general authorization. I am sure the committee was not careful and considerate of the matter or they would not have put it in twice.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman's interpretation of the committee's action is hardly accurate. We put the authorization in for the seed and then we put the limitation on the amount that might be used.

Mr. MANN. You have a limitation that was already on and cut out the provision that the limitation was for—drought-resistant field seeds.

Mr. LEVER. We broaden the limitation.

Mr. MANN. That is all you did. You first make an appropriation of $140,000, and then you say only $60,000 can be used for certain purposes. That you have a right to do, but I do not think that was what was in the committee's mind. I think what was in the committee's mind was to permit that money to be expended for seed without confining it to the arid regions. I think that you will find that considerably more than $60,000 is now being expended for this purpose. I do not believe that you wanted to cut it down. I believe the distribution of this field seed throughout the country has been of inestimable benefit to farmers throughout the country. I have no doubt that the distribution of cotton seed has been of great benefit to farmers in the South.

Mr. LEVER. It has, undoubtedly.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my testimony to what the gentleman from Illinois has said—that it has been of inestimable benefit, especially in the boll-weevil district, where it has enabled us to raise a crop of cotton notwithstanding the boll weevil.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general administrative expenses connected with the above-mentioned lines of investigation, including the office of the chief of bureau, the assistant chief of bureau, the chief clerk, the officers in charge of publications, records, supplies, and property, and for miscellaneous expenses incident thereto, $31,020.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the production of table sirup and the utilization of cane by-products.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For purchase, propagation, testing, and congressional distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; all necessary office fixtures and supplies, fuel, transportation, paper, twine, gum, postal cards, gas, electric current, rent outside of the District of Columbia, official traveling expenses, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same; for repairs and the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $252,540. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated, and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes and the packeting, assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States. An equal proportion of five-sixths of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, shall, upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the department upon the receipt of their addressed franks, in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General may jointly determine: *Provided, however*, That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each Member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided, also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery not later than the 10th day of January: *Provided, also*, That any portion of the allotments to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress remaining uncalled for on the 1st day of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the department: *And provided, also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, mulberry and other rare and valuable trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to make an inquiry of the chairman or some member of the committee who may be able to give the information, and to relate a little of my own experience with reference to seed distribution for the present year. I naturally supposed that the department officials who look after these things would know about the kind of seed that was best for distribution in Tennessee. Do the best I could, I have not been able to get a list of all the farmers in my State who may want seed. Many write for seed whose names are not on my list. In order to immediately send out single packages thus asked for I had 500 packages of vegetable seeds sent to my office and the same number of flower seeds for the same purpose, and out of the 500 packages of vegetable seed there was not a single bean seed, not a single English pea seed, not a single tomato seed, not a single cucumber seed, not a single watermelon seed, not a single muskmelon or cantaloupe seed, and without any of these seed they were an absolute disappointment to the people who received them, and they wrote back and complained of them. They were not what the people wanted in my district. They did not meet the demand and only created trouble. I want to know if there is any way by which this bill may provide that a Member of the House may designate to the department before these seeds are put up the character of seed that his constituents desire in their locality. I do not expect to have all kinds of seed in each package, but when it comes to getting 500 packages at one time and not a single seed in it that anybody in my district wants, it is not only a disappointment but an irritation.

I wanted to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill if anyone knows how we may be able to get for our constituents what they want? They pay the taxes, whether they want to or not, and they ought to be accommodated as far as it is possible to do so, by getting the variety of seeds that they want and need.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the gentleman that we could easily amend this bill so as to provide that Members in advance should designate the kind and character of seed they wish to send to their districts the year following, but I have a slight notion that it would be a pretty hard job to carry that out on the part of the department, because the designations would be so varied from the different districts.

Mr. SIMS. We get about 25,000 packages to a congressional district. Every district in west Tennessee is practically the same, and nearly all in middle Tennessee are practically the same. The gentleman knows, if he knows anything about the average demands of a farmer, that there is nothing that the farmer wants or that the farmer's wife or the farmer's family wants or needs more than a splendid variety of bush and pole bean seed, English-pea seeds, cucumber and melon seeds. The new and rare varieties that my people want are those that they can make the best use of. Besides, many families can beans, corn, and tomatoes for use during the year. Besides for family use, there is a large amount of canning done in my district for sale, by canning factories; and they want something that they can use for themselves or that they can sell to the factories, and to get package after package, hundreds of them, without a single seed in them that they want is simply a vexation and a disappointment.

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

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. I have no charge to make that this was intentional on the part of the department officials, but when I wrote my letter I asked for the varieties of seeds most commonly used in the section of the country in which my district is located. I wanted bean seed, common every-day bean seed, that the farmers' families would rather have than all of the new and rare varieties of seeds known to the department. I do hope our Agricultural Department may be a little more practical in putting up seeds hereafter, and by so doing a real service to the country will result.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] has been here as long as I have been here, and during that time he ought to have learned the ropes a little better. In putting up these seeds the department does it by machinery. If a man sends over 500 franks, he will probably get 500 of the same kind of seed in each of the 500 packages, because ordinarily they do not split it up in a 500 allotment. If you send over a large number of frank slips at one time, it is divided up so that there is an assortment; but all you have to do if you want packages sent to your office carrying bean seed or corn or something else is, when you send your frank slips over to the department, to ask them in putting up your seed so that they shall include certain kinds of seed. Now, my secretary learned that long ago. Anyone can do it, and they will do it.

Mr. SIMS. If the gentleman will permit me, I made out two lots of franks and addressed seed labels, one for 7,000

and one for 10,000. In both instances I wrote exactly what kind of packages were wanted.

Mr. MANN. You sent over 500 frank slips, and said nothing about what you wanted?

Mr. SIMS. No; the gentleman is mistaken——

Mr. MANN. They have a large number of different kinds of seeds, and put five packages of various sorts in each one of the mailable packages with the different lists they have and say nothing about it. They do not stop with 500 and divide up a number of different lists and ought not to do so. But a gentleman can easily indicate when he wants seed sent to his office if he wants a certain kind of seed included in his list, and they will do it, because they have that list and can fill it.

Mr. SIMS. But from many of those to whom the 18,000 or 20,000 packages were sent I am getting letters saying that they do not get what they wanted.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well—very likely; no one ever gets what he wants.

Mr. SIMS. I mean of standard common varieties of which we have spoken.

Mr. MANN. They can not send half a dozen different varieties of beans—lima, bush, and pole beans. All they can send is one kind at the best, in most of the packages. In most packages they include one large package of seed, and the large package of seed has either beans, peas, or corn. They do not include the large packages in any frankable packages. In the main, the others probably are onions, lettuce, radishes, or something of that sort. They send me too many——

Mr. SIMS. If I lived in Chicago, I might be the same way.

Mr. MANN. Cantaloupes, muskmelons, watermelons, that I did not specify I wanted, yet I think it is a very good thing on the whole if the constituents of the gentleman from Tennessee are introduced to some new kind of vegetables. They have had pole beans down there long enough. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. They do not seem to think so.

Mr. MANN. They have had peas enough.

Mr. SIMS. They have not had the seed they wanted.

Mr. MANN. They ought to get acquainted with some new kinds and understand their names and learn how good they are.

Mr. SIMS. My people want beans rather than new variety names.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman proceeds, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the gentleman that this is Saturday afternoon.

Mr. LEVER. Just look at the brethren rise!

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can not expect to pass this paragraph in reference to seeds to-day, and the gentleman might as well—we certainly could not get through with it until we hear from the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. LEVER. I was reserving 5 minutes of time for the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is 10 minutes to 5——

Mr. LEVER. I was hoping to pass this item, and then I would move to rise.

Mr. MANN. But this is Saturday evening.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is not nearly as tired as I am.

Mr. MANN. I do not think the gentleman can accomplish anything by going ahead to-night, not a minute, and I hope the gentleman will move to rise.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. This is a very important item—one of the most important provisions in the whole bill.

Mr. LEVER. May I suggest this to the gentleman from Illinois and see how it strikes him: Let us agree upon the amount of time to be consumed so that when we meet again the time will be fixed. I do not think we ought to consume an hour or two hours on a proposition which we have debated here year in and year out and we know exactly——

Mr. MANN. But think how much comfort some gentlemen get out of it.

Mr. LEVER. There is something in that, and I am a very charitable man, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. MANN. I do not think gentlemen ought to be shut off on this item. I think we have been making pretty good progress on this bill.

Mr. LEVER. I think we have, too, but I think that 30 minutes' debate on this paragraph ought to be sufficient.

Mr. MANN. Make it an hour and 30 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. What would the gentleman say to an hour? I really want to close the debate.

Mr. MANN. Make it an hour and 30 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. That is too long.

Mr. MANN. We used two or three hours before.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman will agree to an hour's debate on this.

Mr. MANN. All right.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in one hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman take care of me for five minutes in that time?

Mr. LEVER. I will not have the control of the time. The Chair will have control of it.

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, this is an old question, that has been discussed, to my knowledge, for 10 years.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has been here for 10 years, but lots of us have not.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the use of discussing an old proposition like this? To take an hour's time to discuss this proposition again seems to me ridiculous.

Mr. LEVER. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SIMS. There are 140 Members of this House that have never opened their mouths on this.

Mr. FOSTER. The new Members are intelligent.

Mr. MANN. It might develop that they are more intelligent than the old Members.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it is a case of the old Members trying to instruct new Members. They might need some instruction themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMS. I object.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] and I agree upon this proposition.

Mr. SIMS. But I saw them debate here eight hours on the sugar repeal bill. So do not talk about speeding up on something everybody is interested in. Then, on the sugar bill, the gentlemen did not confine themselves to the subject, either.

Mr. LEVER. The people down in the gentleman's district would rather that Congress passed the bill and permitted them to get the seeds than to hear the gentleman talk on this subject.

Mr. SIMS. There were eight hours' debate on the sugar repeal bill, and it was not all confined to the subject, either.

Mr. LEVER. 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. HAMLIN, 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. 12717, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

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

To Mr. THOMAS, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. MOON, for 15 days, on account of important business.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1916.

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please extend my leave of absence through next week, as the doctor says it will be better for me not to leave home until I am more improved than at present.

Thanking you, I am,
Sincerely, yours,
E. J. HILL.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

SIR FRANCIS DRAKE CELEBRATION.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. NOLAN. I desire to ask the Speaker to lay before the House Senate concurrent resolution 20, on the Speaker's table, a similar resolution reported from the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions being now on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House Senate concurrent resolution 20, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 20.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to appoint a representative of this Government to appear at the

celebration of the landing of Sir Francis Drake on the shores of Marin County, Cal., on the dates of May 19, 20, and 21, 1916: *Provided*, That the expenses of such representative shall be paid by those in charge of the celebration, and that no expense whatever shall be required of the Federal Government.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is a concurrent resolution, and a similar concurrent resolution was reported in the House. It proposes to authorize the President to do something, which, it is true, is not to be at the expense of the Government, but a concurrent resolution is invariably and necessarily confined to those things which the House and Senate can do themselves, and they can not by a concurrent resolution confer any authority upon the President. Therefore, I move to amend the resolution by striking out the resolving clause and inserting:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

And striking out the words "Concurrent resolution" and inserting the words "Joint resolution."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "Concurrent" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Joint." And amend the resolving clause by making it read:
"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution as amended was passed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the title be amended to conform to the text.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 121) authorizing the appointment of a representative of the United States Government to appear at the celebration of the landing of Sir Francis Drake on the coast of California."

By unanimous consent, House concurrent resolution 21 was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. NOLAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that hereafter until otherwise ordered the House meet at 11 o'clock a. m.—that is, that the daily meeting of the House be at 11 o'clock a. m. instead of 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] asks unanimous consent that hereafter until further ordered the House meet at 11 o'clock a. m. instead of 12 o'clock m.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, does not the gentleman think we are doing pretty well about that now? Why should we do it by unanimous consent? I do not think we ought to meet at 11 o'clock every morning.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think we are doing pretty well, but I think we ought to meet at 11 o'clock. Let us go through with the business and go home as soon as possible.

Mr. MANN. I am willing to get through with the business and go home as soon as possible, but I doubt if that will expedite it.

Mr. ADAMSON. I suppose the gentleman does not include Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. MANN. It would probably result in a point of no quorum being made.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will except Calendar Wednesday from my request.

Mr. MANN. Why not except this coming Monday, too?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I will except this coming Monday.

Mr. MANN. We consent every night. Why not let it go that way. We may not want to meet at 11 o'clock every day. There is no objection meeting at 11 o'clock for the consideration of these bills that are up, and there will not be.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think we ought to meet at 11 o'clock, except on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MANN. And I, too, think we ought to meet at 11 o'clock, and we have been doing it all along; but there might be something that would arise that would lead us to desire otherwise.

Mr. KITCHIN. I modify my request, Mr. Speaker, and make it 11 o'clock, except as to Calendar Wednesday and next Monday.

Mr. FERRIS. Let us have a full day on the unanimous-consent day.

Mr. KITCHIN. There are a great many things on the Unanimous Consent Calendar that we would like to dispose of.

Mr. FERRIS. The Unanimous Consent Calendar is very much congested. Let us have a full day on that day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to put the request when the gentleman has decided upon its form.

Mr. KITCHIN. I except next Monday and Calendar Wednesdays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that hereafter, until further orders, the House shall meet at 11 o'clock a. m. except on next Monday and on Calendar Wednesdays. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 5229. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Warren County, Pa., to construct a bridge across the Allegheny River, in the borough of Warren, county of Warren, in the State of Pennsylvania.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, April 16, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa. (H. Doc. No. 1029), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. COADY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14340) to furnish all seagoing vessels in the Lighthouse Service and all other seagoing vessels of the Department of Commerce with radio equipment and auxiliary power for the operation thereof, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 551), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14338) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 552), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1553) granting a pension to Henry F. Baldwin; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8381) granting a pension to Eva E. Schildgen; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9093) granting a pension to Walter L. Jewell; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14574) granting an increase of pension to James J. Scally; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: A bill (H. R. 14663) to acquire a site for a public building at Lewistown, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 14664) to provide for the establishment of aids to navigation to mark the channel of Shelter Island Sound, off Sag Harbor, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 14665) to construct a national highway from Gainesville, Ga., to Hightower Gap; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 14666) providing for the registration of designs; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 14667) to amend an act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters by allowing certain fog signals to be used by vessels at anchor; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 14668) to prohibit exhibition or use of films or pictorial representations calculated to reflect on any race or nationality; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 14669) authorizing the acceptance by the United States Government from Pueblo Post, No. 8, Grand Army of the Republic, of a monument located on the grounds of the Federal building in Pueblo, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 14670) for the relief of street railway crossing policemen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 14671) to provide for the training of officers for the merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DYER: Resolution (H. Res. 202) to investigate the increased cost of paper; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KITCHIN: Resolution (H. Res. 203) providing for the daily sessions of the House of Representatives and suspending certain standing rules thereof; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RODENBERG: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 202) laying an embargo on arms, ammunition, and war supplies; to the committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 14672) granting a pension to Mary Ladd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 14673) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14674) granting a pension to Mary Biddle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14675) granting a pension to Hiram Baer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 14676) granting increase of pension to Frank Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 14677) granting a pension to Mary A. Heinz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 14678) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under the joint resolution of July 14, 1870, authorizing the Postmaster General to continue in use in the Postal Service Marcus P. Norton's combined post-marking and stamp-canceling hand-stamp patents, or otherwise; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 14679) for the relief of Jacob B. Moore; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14680) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Hodgkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 14681) granting a pension to Edward Evans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 14682) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. McPherson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14683) granting an increase of pension to Omer E. Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14684) granting an increase of pension to John A. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14685) granting an increase of pension to Louisa V. Wortman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14686) granting an increase of pension to Elias White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14687) granting an increase of pension to John T. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 14688) granting a pension to Daniel O'Brien; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 14689) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14690) granting an increase of pension to Emanual L. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 14691) granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Bingaman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 14692) granting an increase of pension to Darius Emmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 14693) granting a pension to Ellen A. Cardenas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 14694) granting a pension to Louis A. Rowe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 14695) for the relief of Mrs. H. O'Neill; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 14696) to correct, on the lineal list of officers of Cavalry, the position of David Livingston Roscoe, now a first lieutenant of Cavalry in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 14697) authorizing the President to appoint Clifford W. Sands a second lieutenant in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 14698) providing for the reimbursement of Manuel A. Sanchez on account of certain expenditures in connection with the last illness of his father, a veteran of the Civil War; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14699) granting a pension to Isabel Sandoval; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 14700) granting an increase of pension to James O'Brien; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 14701) granting an increase of pension to Irvin T. Patton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14702) granting a pension to Caroline Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 14703) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Prewitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14704) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. McIntosh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14705) granting a pension to Sarah A. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14706) granting an increase of pension to David A. Stonebraker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 14707) for the relief of Thornton Jackson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OAKEY: A bill (H. R. 14708) granting an increase of pension to Leverett W. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14709) granting a pension to Sarah E. Strickland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 14710) granting an increase of pension to Lee Brand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 14711) granting a pension to Amanda E. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 14712) granting an increase of pension to James Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14713) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan W. Counts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14714) granting an increase of pension to Gary Hilligass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 14715) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Marlette; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 14716) granting a pension to Ann Dumphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14717) granting an increase of pension to Ann Elizabeth Capner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14718) granting pension increase to Pierson Hendrickson, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14719) granting an increase of pension to Howard Forster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14720) granting an increase of pension to Ann Hoban; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 14721) granting a pension to Nancy Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 14722) granting a pension to John Seidel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 14723) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Caswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14724) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Brayton; 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 the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York, relative to retirement of superannuated employees of the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), memorial of Greek-American League, against immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BAILEY: Protest of W. A. Fry, E. C. Osborn, Miss M. Fry, Irvin Osborn, M. A. Swank, K. Lahman, M. L. Douglass, C. E. Reep, J. W. Reep, C. R. Vaughn, L. E. Vaughn, E. Chery, M. L. Vaughn, A. M. Fury, A. B. Cochran, L. E. Miller, P. White, B. Dixon, H. C. Dixon, James M. Bell, V. M. Fry, V. M. Kaiser, S. A. Bell, M. Morgan, Gabriel Seigel, B. M. Wood, J. S. Wood, and C. A. Reep, all of Blair County, Pa., against the passage of House bills 652 and 13778, relating to enforced Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, protest of Gabriel Seigel, E. C. Osborn, Irvin Osborn, K. Lahma, M. L. Douglass, M. A. Shank, S. B. Vaughn, L. E. Vaughn, E. Chery, M. L. Vaughn, J. M. Fry, C. E. Reep, J. W. Reep, A. B. Cochran, L. E. Miller, P. White, C. C. Dixon, William Seigel, James M. Bell, V. M. Kaiser, V. M. Fry, M. J. Morgan, William A. Fry, S. A. Bell, H. Vaughn, E. Vaughn, M. Vaughn, G. R. Vaughn, H. Hite, F. Hite, W. R. Markel, E. E. Detwiler, Rev. Charles F. Ulrich, and C. M. Veach, all of Blair County, Pa., against the passage of House bills 6468 and 491, denying admission to the mails to certain publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Eureka Grange, No. 607, of Bedford County, and sundry citizens of Johnstown, Pa., opposing passage of House bills 491 and 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Evidence to accompany House bill 12728, granting an increase of pension to Butler Bond; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 6986, granting a pension to Henry Blankenship; to the Commitee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE: Petition of 44 citizens of Sheboygan County, Wis., asking for elimination of all provisions for support of sectarian institutions from the Indian bill, etc.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of C. Meyer and 15 other citizens of Theresa and 44 citizens of Greenbush, Wis., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of Automobile Club of Fulton County, N. Y., favoring an export tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLEMAN: Petitions of 57 citizens of Turtle Creek, 60 citizens of Allegheny, 60 citizens of Allegheny City, 30 citizens of Allegheny, 24 citizens of Turtle Creek, 28 citizens of Pittsburgh, and 33 citizens of Pittsburgh, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURRY (by request): Petition of L. E. Davison and others of Lodi, Cal., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of L. E. Davison and others of Lodi, Cal., against compulsory Sunday observance bill in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Charles L. Sicard, of New York, favoring the Chamberlain bill relative to preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Board of Aldermen of New York City, favoring bill to grant indefinite leave to aged employees of the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DARROW: Memorial of Philadelphia Union, No. 89, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, in behalf of the Tague bill, House bill 7654; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of M. E. Murphy and 36 other citizens of Mount Airy and Germantown, Pa., in opposition to bills providing for the sale of Indian reservations or for taking the management of Indian affairs out of the power of the Indian Bureau and Commissioner; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of Mrs. George Breed and 6 other residents of Germantown, Pa., in opposition to the Hastings bill, House bill 108; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DILL: Petition of Amos H. Matthew and other residents of Colville, Wash., protesting against the passage of House bills 6468 and 491; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Mr. John Schaber and other residents of Colville, Wash., protesting against the passage of House bills 6468, 491, and 652; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Mr. J. C. Caswell and other residents of Newport, Wash., protesting against the passage of House bills 6468 and 491; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Mr. Phil Flett and other residents of Spangle, Wash., protesting against the passage of House bills 6468 and 491; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Mr. C. B. Janeoo and other residents of Wenatchee, Wash., protesting against the passage of House bills 6468 and 491; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of sundry citizens of South Dakota, against Sunday-observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of National Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association, favoring passage of House bill 651, relative to undercharges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of sundry citizens of Chaseburg, Wis., against passage of House bills 26, 677, 6823, and 6871; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FESS: Memorial of members of Jamestown United Presbyterian congregation, of Greene County, Ohio, relative to a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Port William, Ohio, against increase of Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of American Cotton Manufacturers' Association relative to tariff for protection of home industries, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Board of Aldermen of New York City, favoring bills relative to leave for aged employees of the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Charles L. Sicard, of New York City, favoring the Chamberlain bill, relative to preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Papers to accompany a bill granting an increase of pension to Darius Emmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: Petition of citizens of Humboldt, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of Illinois Publishing Co., against severance of diplomatic relations with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Board of Aldermen, of New York City, favoring bill to grant indefinite leave to aged employees of the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Fifth Avenue Association on National Defense, relative to adequate national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Philippine Railway Co., against the Clarke amendment relative to severance of relations between the Philippines and the United States; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of American Woolen Co., relative to more sheep and more wool in United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Toledo (Ohio) Scale Co., against passage of House bill 9323; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of Lumbermen's Engineering Co., of Portland, Oreg., relative to disposition of timbered lands in Oregon and California—railroad land grant; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Arthur McDonald, Washington, D. C., against United States joining England in European struggle; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of five citizens of Westport, Conn., for prohibition in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of five citizens of Westport, Conn., asking for prohibition of exportation of liquors to Africa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of nine citizens of Westport, Conn., in favor of prohibition in Porto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of nine citizens of Westport, Conn., in favor of prohibition in Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of eight citizens of Westport, Conn., for Federal censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petitions of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of Washington, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 19 citizens of Ridgefield and 13 of Puyallup, Wash., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 25 citizens of Puyallup, Wash., against passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Eli T. Hunt and 94 others of Fairview, Mich., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor, in favor of House resolution 137; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. M. Camp, J. Toner Barr, F. H. Parker, J. K. Hurick, Harry Hefflin, A. L. Snyder, Thomas Fleming, jr., G. M. Baker, T. J. Wilkersen, W. A. Phillis, T. W. Spellman, James H. Offitt, P. W. Pone, F. G. Gasche, William P. Flint, Maurice R. Scharff, Arthur Erockett, Edw. J. Dittmar, K. T. Stearns, Charles L. Fox, L. B. Duff, J. L. Klindworth, E. L. Messler, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of House bill 10845 and Senate bill 3946; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Lumber Engineering Co., of Portland Oreg., in favor of reexamination of timber in the Oregon & California Railroad land grant; to the Committe on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Dr. C. U. Jennings and Dr. H. B. Patterson, both of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of passage of Chamberlain bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of G. W. Speakman, C. L. Summers, G. W. Handley, James S. Dugan, John B. Collins, George Silvins, Jeremiah Duling, Charles F. Boyle, Louis F. Kinley, James R. Connell, Patrick M. Cuniff, John Williams, and William Watkins, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of House bill 6823; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Also, petition of John S. Garber, superintendent of schools of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of House bill 11250 and Senate bill 703; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of R. W. Thompson, of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of national preparedness of Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of United States, opposed to Deitrick amendment in appropriation bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of India House, of New York City, in favor of national preparedness of Army and Navy to maintain peace and protect commerce; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Sarah B. Leeds, of West Chester, Pa., in opposition to national military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Shane Bros. & Wilson Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of House bill 10405; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Felton, Sibley & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., opposed to Kenyon bill; to the Committee on Manufacturers.

Also, memorial of City Council of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of adequate and complete facilities to be provided for mail service in Pittsburgh; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of E. C. Griggs, of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of improving condition of post-office service and civil-service employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of M. I. Black, of Wilkinsburg, Pa., in favor of prohibiting export of intoxicants to Africa, use of intoxicants in Porto Rico, and in favor of Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OAKEY (by request): Petition of Methodist Episcopal Church of Hazardville, Conn., favoring Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Petition of A. D. Foote and 26 other merchants of Wood County, Ohio, asking for the passage of House bills 270 and 712, taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Elmira Star-Gazette, of Elmira, N. Y., and the Groton and Lansing Journal, of Groton, N. Y., favoring the passage of House joint resolution 173, directing the Secretary of the Navy to accept the Marjorie Sterrett battleship fund; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Neils Creek Grange, No. 345, Mr. C. N. Demorest, of Avoca, N. Y., secretary, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Owego, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Gillett bill prohibiting the exportation of intoxicating liquors to Africa; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of Harriet C. Wallace and 54 other citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the passage of House bill 13048; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of Southeastern Tract Society of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of California Christian Endeavor Union, favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Hattie B. Johnson and 30 other citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of E. Horchheimer, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Moran Towing & Transportation Co., of New York City, against passage of House bill 8036, relative to crews on tugboats; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of National Light & Power Co., of St. Louis; and Julius Petersen, of Nyack, N. Y., against passage of bills requiring numbering of motor boats; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of citizens of McNairy County, opposing House bills 491 and 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Memorial of Hailey Civic Improvement Club, urging the establishment of the proposed Sawtooth National Park, House bill 6799; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, opposing House bill 652; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Winona and Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, opposing House bills 6468 and 491; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions from the Daughters of the Revolution, the General Herkimer Homestead Association, and others, favoring the establishment of a national park on the Oriskany (N. Y.) battle ground; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Letters from Simon Levi Co., Nathan W. Tarr, Capitol Milling Co., Southern California Music Co., Shattuck & Nimmo Warehouse Co., John Parkinson, and the Rotary Club, all of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring Mount Whitney road, lying within the National Forest Reserve; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, communications from T. W. Price and 40 others of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the Warren bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition from B. M. Hall and 116 others, all of Uplands, Cal., favoring the freedom of speech and the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, communication from Council of Jewish Women and four others of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, letter from George F. Eberhard Co., San Francisco, Cal., protesting against stamp tax on checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Sawtelle, Cal., and from mass meeting, Downey, Cal., favoring national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letter from Harbor City Post, Grand Army of the Republic, San Pedro, Cal., favoring the widows' pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, letter from San Antonio Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, Upland, Cal., favoring adequate protection for the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, letter from Metal Polishers, Buffers, and Builders' Union, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 137; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, telegram from William Mulholland, president Southern California Association Civil Engineers, favoring the Gard and Pomerene bills; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, letter from Retail Hardware Association of Oakland, Cal., favoring the Stevens-Ayres bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of Jewell Howard and other citizens of Sherman, Potter, and Armstrong Counties, Tex., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Hotchkiss, Colo., favoring rural-credit bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of Summit County Metal Mining Association, of Breckenridge, Colo., against passage of House bill 12276, to create the Denver national park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: Petitions of Reformed Congregational Church of Akron and 98 people of Akron, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petitions of 25 voters of Milford; 23 citizens of Milford; and 57 people of East Douglas, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.